

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE SECOND SESSION OF THE
MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE AGREEMENT ON
THE CONSERVATION OF AFRICAN-EURASIAN
MIGRATORY WATERBIRDS**

**BONN, GERMANY
25-27 SEPTEMBER 2002**

published by

**Secretariat of the
African-Eurasian Waterbird Agreement
Martin-Luther-King Str. 8
UN Premises in Bonn
53175 Bonn
Germany**

This document is also available in French.

TABLE OF CONTENT

Foreword	3
----------	---

PART I

Report of the Second Session of the Meeting of the Parties	4
Index of Contents Resolution	27
Resolutions	28
Recommendation 2.1	
International Action Plan on the Dark-Bellied Brent Goose	117
List of Participants	118

PART II a

Opening Statements made during the joint Opening Ceremony of COP7 and MOP 2 AEWA	144
Mr. Jürgen Trittin; Federal Minister for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety	145
Ms. Bärbel Dieckmann, Lady Mayor of Bonn	153
Mr. Yousoof Mungroo, Chairman of Technical Committee	156
Mr. Demetrio L. Ignacio, Chairman of Standing Committee of CMS	158
Mr. Shafqat Kakakhel, Deputy Executive of UNEP	160
Mr. Claude Martin, Director of the WWF	175

PART II b

Opening Statements made during the Opening Ceremony of the Second Session of the Meeting of the Parties	177
Statements of Observer Organizations	178
Statements of Contracting Parties	183
Statements of Non-Contracting Parties	193

FOREWORD

In accordance with Article VI of the Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds, the Agreement Secretariat shall convene an ordinary session of the Meeting of the Parties, the decision-making organ of the Agreement, at intervals of not more than three years. The Second session of the Meeting of the Parties took place from 25-27 September 2002 in Bonn, Germany. This meeting was organised back to back with the Seventh Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS).

The Proceedings of the Second session of the Meeting of the Parties include, *inter alia*, the Report of the Meeting, the Resolutions and Recommendations adopted by the Meeting of the Parties and Opening Statements made during the joint Opening Ceremony for CMS COP7 and AEWA MOP2 as well as during the Opening Session for MOP2.

PART I

Report of the Second Session of the Meeting of the Parties

MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE AGREEMENT ON THE CONSERVATION OF AFRICAN-EURASIAN MIGRATORY WATERBIRDS

**Second Session
Bonn, Germany, 25-27 September 2002**

REPORT OF THE SECOND SESSION OF THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES

Introduction

1. The second session of the Meeting of the Parties to the Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds (AEWA) was held at the International Congress Centre, Bundeshaus, in Bonn, Germany, from 25 to 27 September 2002 at the invitation of the Government of Germany. A list of participants at the Meeting is attached to the present report as annex I.

I. OPENING OF THE SESSION AND WELCOME ADDRESSES (Items 1 and 2)

2. A joint opening ceremony for the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) and the second Meeting of the Parties to AEWA took place at 9.30 a.m. on Wednesday, 18 September.

3. Opening statements were made by Mr. Jürgen Trittin, Federal Minister for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety of Germany; Ms. Bärbel Dieckmann, Lady Mayor of Bonn; Mr. Demetrio L. Ignacio, Undersecretary for the Environment and Natural Resources of the Philippines and Chair of the Standing Committee of CMS; Mr. Yousoof Mungroo, Director of the National Parks and Conservation Service of Mauritius, Chairman of the Technical Committee of AEWA; Mr. Claude Martin, Director of the World Wide Fund for Nature, representing of the community of non-governmental organizations; and Mr. Shafqat Kakakhel, Deputy Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), representing Mr. Klaus Töpfer, Executive Director of UNEP. A message from HRH Prince Charles of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland was delivered by Mr. Arnulf Müller-Helmbrecht, Executive Secretary of CMS.

4. Mr. Trittin said that his Ministry was willing to contribute a total of €1 million over the period 2004 to 2008 to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbird Flyways project aimed at creating a network of habitats for African-Eurasian waterbirds, which AEWA had developed with the Bureau of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat, Wetlands International and BirdLife International. He said that the Ministry would strive to secure the inclusion of funding for this project into the German budget.

5. Mr. Mungroo said that the growing number of Parties was clear evidence of the mounting recognition of the important role of CMS and AEWA. The number of Parties to AEWA had doubled since the first Meeting of the Parties, in 1999. He urged all Range States to CMS and AEWA to join the agreements as soon as possible.

6. The opening plenary of the second Meeting of the Parties to AEWA took place on 25 September. The Chair of the Technical Committee presided over the meeting pending the election of a chairperson for the Meeting of the Parties.
7. The representative of Germany welcomed participants to Bonn and explained the history of the Congress Centre. He recalled the joint opening ceremony for CMS and AEWA held on 18 September. He drew attention to a report to be circulated at the Meeting on the protection of migratory species in the Federal Republic of Germany.
8. The Chair of the Technical Committee welcomed participants and thanked the host Government and the Secretariat.
9. The Executive Secretary of CMS expressed greetings from CMS to the largest agreement under the Convention. He said the seventh Conference of the Parties to CMS had been a great success, adopting many far-reaching decisions. Of special interest to AEWA Parties were resolutions on wind turbines, by-catch, and the CMS Information Management Plan, which stressed links with the Global Register of Migratory Species (GROMS), an important new tool developed with the support of Germany and other cooperating institutions. He said that AEWA now had the opportunity to share in the advantages of the new headquarters agreement signed by the German Government, the United Nations and the CMS Secretariat.
10. Mr. Robert Hepworth of UNEP, speaking on behalf of Mr. Klaus Töpfer, commended AEWA for offering a living example of collaboration between different environmental agreements through the co-located secretariats of CMS, AEWA, the Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans of the Baltic and North Seas (ASCOBANS) and the Agreement on the Conservation of Populations of European Bats (EUROBATS).
11. He reminded participants that this was the first time the Parties to AEWA had met since the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg, which had called for a significant reduction in loss of biological diversity by 2010. The Summit had also called for international support for the preservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and the protection of endangered species, and had urged that developing countries and countries with economies in transition should be helped with the resources needed for conservation and environmental protection.

II. ORGANISATIONAL MATTERS (Items 3 to 6)

A. Adoption of the rules of procedure

12. The Meeting adopted the draft rules of procedure, as contained in document AEWA/MOP2.3.

B. Attendance

13. The following Contracting Parties to the Agreement attended the session: Benin, Bulgaria, Congo, Croatia, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Guinea, Jordan, Kenya, Mali, Mauritius, Monaco, Netherlands, Niger, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Senegal, Slovakia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, The Former Yugoslav

Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United Republic of Tanzania.

14. The following States not Party to the Agreement were represented by observers: Algeria, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belgium, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Mauritania, Morocco, Nigeria, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

15. Observers from the following United Nations bodies, convention secretariats and intergovernmental and international and national non-governmental organisations were also present:

a) United Nations bodies: United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), UNEP Mediterranean Action Plan and UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre;

b) Convention secretariats: Secretariat of the Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans of the Baltic and North Seas, Secretariat of the Agreement on the Conservation of Populations of European Bats, Secretariat of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals and Bureau of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat;

c) Intergovernmental organisations: Regional Organisation for the Conservation of the Environment of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden and World Conservation Union (IUCN);

d) Non-governmental organisations: BirdLife International, International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC), Federation of Associations for Hunting and Conservation of the European Union (FACE), Wetlands International, World Wide Fund for Nature, British Association for Shooting and Conservation, Fédération Nationale des Chasseurs (France), International Fund for Animal Welfare (Germany), Naturschutzbund (NABU) (Germany), Oiseaux Migrateurs de Paléarctique Occidental (France) (OMPO), Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (United Kingdom), Society for the Lesser White-fronted Goose (Germany) and Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust (United Kingdom).

C. Election of officers

16. The following officers were elected by acclamation:

Chair: Germany (Mr. Michael von Websky)
Vice-Chair: Senegal (Mr. Mbareck Diop)

D. Adoption of the agenda and work programme

1. Adoption of the agenda

17. The Meeting adopted the following agenda based on the provisional agenda contained in document AEWA/MOP2.2/Rev.1.

1. Opening
2. Welcome addresses
3. Adoption of the Rules of Procedure
4. Election of officers
5. Adoption of the agenda and work programme
6. Establishment of the Credentials Committee and sessional committees
7. Admission of observers
8. Opening statements
9. Reports of:
 - (a) Secretariat;
 - (b) Technical Committee;
 - (c) Depositary
10. Amendments to the Agreement and its Action Plan
11. Report on the African-Eurasian Flyway GEF project
12. Review of the implementation of the Agreement
 - (a) International implementation priorities of AEWA
 - (b) Phasing out lead shot for waterbird hunting
 - (c) Synthesis of Party reports
 - (d) UNEP support for the harmonization of national reporting and information management for biodiversity-related treaties
 - (e) Cooperation with other bodies
13. Adoption of conservation guidelines
14. Review and approval of new projects for inclusion in the Register of International Projects
15. International Single Species Action Plans:
 - (a) Sociable Plover
 - (b) Great Snipe

- (c) Dark-bellied Brent Goose
 - (d) Black-winged Pratincole
 - (e) Format for AEWA species action plans
16. Development of the Action Plan for the Central Asian-Indian Flyway
 17. Institutional arrangements:
 - (a) Headquarters agreement and juridical personality
 - (b) Standing Committee
 - (c) Technical Committee
 18. Financial Arrangements:
 - (a) Adoption of the budget for 2003-2005
 - (b) Consideration of accepting contributions to the budget of the Agreement in kind in lieu of cash
 - (c) Establishment of a small conservation grant fund for the Agreement
 19. Report of the sessional committees
 20. Adoption of resolutions and amendments to the Agreement and its Annexes
 21. Date and venue of the third session of the Meeting of the Parties
 22. Adoption of the report of the meeting
 23. Any other business
 24. Closure

2. Work programme

18. The meeting adopted the draft work programme prepared by the Secretariat contained in document AEWA/MOP 2.4.

E. Establishment of the Credentials Committee and sessional committees

19. A Credentials Committee was elected, comprising representatives from Denmark, Kenya, Mali (Chair), the Netherlands and the United Republic of Tanzania.

20. The meeting decided to establish two sessional groups, a Working Group on Administrative and Financial Matters and a Working Group on Technical Matters. The representative of Senegal was elected to chair the Working Group on Administrative and

Financial Matters and the representative of Mauritius was elected to chair the Working Group on Technical Matters.

III. ADMISSION OF OBSERVERS (Item 7)

21. At the 1st plenary meeting, on 25 September, the Meeting of the Parties admitted as observers representatives of intergovernmental organisations, as well as international and national non-governmental organisations that met the criteria set out in paragraph 4 of article VI of the Agreement, listed in paragraph 0 above.

IV. OPENING STATEMENTS (Item 8)

22. Introducing agenda item 8, the Chair reminded participants that opening statements from Contracting Parties should not be presented orally. Written statements would be circulated and compiled for inclusion in the report of the meeting. He thanked delegates for their understanding in that regard. Non-Parties, however, were invited to make brief statements on the position of their Government with regard to accession to AEWA.

23. Brief statements were made by delegates from a number of States not Party to the Agreement. The observer for Algeria said that he hoped to be able to convince his authorities to sign the Agreement. The observer for Burundi said that documentation had been submitted for adherence to the Agreement, and that he hoped the instruments would have been concluded by the time he returned home following the current meeting. The observer for Chad said that he hoped that the process of ratification of the Agreement would be completed by the end of December 2002. The observer for Comoros said that measures were under way for ratification of the Agreement. The observer for Côte d'Ivoire said that his country had begun the process of ratification and hoped to be a Party by the time of the next Meeting. The observer for the Democratic Republic of the Congo said that his Government had firm intentions to sign the Agreement. The observer for Djibouti said that he hoped that ratification of AEWA would be completed within the coming weeks. The observer for Estonia said that legislation for ratification of the Agreement was expected to be passed early in 2003, and that he hoped his country would be a Party by the next Meeting. The observer for Ethiopia said that AEWA would be ratified by his Government in the very near future. The observer for Gabon said that by the next Meeting, his country would officially be a Party to the Agreement. The observer for Ghana said that he hoped that the Agreement would be ratified by the end of 2002. The observer for Guinea-Bissau said that work on conservation of waterbirds had been started in 1995 and that his country would participate in AEWA projects to a greater extent in the future. The observer for Hungary informed the Meeting that the Hungarian Parliament had ratified a decision to join AEWA in September 2002. The observer for Ireland said that he was confident that Ireland would ratify the Agreement within the next few months. The observer for Kazakhstan said that he hoped that his country would join CMS by the end of the year, and that the following step would be to join AEWA. The observer for Lebanon said that the Agreement had been ratified on 13 June 2002. The observer for Nepal said that, while Nepal was not party to AEWA, national legislation was in place to support the conservation of migratory species of waterbirds. The observer for Nigeria said that accession to AEWA was at an advance stage and instruments of accession were being prepared. The observer for Norway informed the Meeting that Norway expected to become a full member during 2003. The observer for Rwanda said that his Government was working to adhere to the Agreement in the near future. The observer for Sierra Leone said that efforts were under way for the Agreement to be signed as soon as possible. The

observer for Ukraine stated that his country had ratified the Agreement on 1 July 2002. The observer for Uzbekistan said that he hoped that his country would become a Party to the Agreement during 2003. The observer for Zimbabwe said that the bureaucratic process to sign the Agreement was well under way.

24. The representative of Togo, noting that his Government had signed the Agreement in 1996, reiterated its commitment to the protection of migratory waterbirds.

25. The Chair welcomed the fact that non-Parties were overcoming administrative and other obstacles, and that many of them were close to becoming signatories to the Agreement.

V. REPORTS (Item 9)

A. Secretariat

26. At the 1st plenary meeting, the Executive Secretary introduced his report (AEWA/MOP2.6) covering the three-year period since the first Meeting of the Parties, and gave a brief PowerPoint presentation. He informed the meeting that there were currently 33 Parties to the Agreement, with six more Parties due to become members in the very near future. He reported on three major areas of activity: (a) voluntary fund-raising, through which \$50,000 had been secured in the first year and \$250,000 in the second as well as in the third year, which was the level at which voluntary contributions were expected to remain; (b) development of the "African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbird Flyways" project under GEF, which would be submitted to GEF by the end of the year for anticipated funding of \$12 million, for which matching funds would have to be secured; and (c) development of the AEWA web site.

27. The Chair welcomed the focused and precise report of the Secretariat, and congratulated the Executive Secretary on the progress achieved, as well as on his good relations with GEF.

B. Technical Committee

28. Also at the 1st plenary meeting, the Chair of the Technical Committee introduced a report on the activities of the Technical Committee (AEWA/MOP2.7) covering the intersessional period, during which the Committee had met three times. Issues considered by the Committee included implementation priorities for the period 2000-2004; amendments to the AEWA Action Plan; conservation guidelines; phasing out of lead shot in wetlands; guidelines for the acceptance of contributions in cash and in kind; development of GROMS; draft budget proposals; and the GEF African-Eurasian Waterbird Flyways project. He said that considerable time had been spent on administrative and financial matters, and he therefore hoped that the Meeting of the Parties would decide to establish a Standing Committee in order to allow the Technical Committee to concentrate on scientific issues.

C. Depositary

29. Also at the 1st plenary meeting, the representative of the Netherlands, as Depositary for the Agreement, presented an oral report. A written report was subsequently distributed in document AEWA/MOP2.8. He said that the Agreement had entered into force on 1 November 1999. It now had 33 Parties: 19 from Eurasia and 14 from Africa. The thirty-fourth Party would be Israel, effective 1 November 2002. He welcomed the new Parties to the Agreement, and invited other Range States to join.

VI. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGREEMENT AND ITS ACTION PLAN (Item 10)

30. Agenda item 10, on amendments to the Agreement and its Action Plan, was considered at the 1st plenary meeting, on 25 September. The Meeting had before it document AEWA/MOP2.9, containing a report prepared by Wetlands International on proposed amendments to the Action Plan. Mr. Derek Scott, a consultant for Wetlands International and author of the report, said that it contained a discussion of three proposals for amendment to the Action Plan. These were (a) a proposal by South Africa to add 11 species to Annex 2 of the Agreement and Table 1 of the Action Plan; (b) a proposal arising out of Resolution 1.9 of the first Meeting of the Parties to add six species; and (c) a proposal from the AEWA Secretariat, in discussion with various Parties, to add 48 species, in order to include all species of regular occurrence in the AEWA area. Since the report had been submitted, a vast amount of new information had become available in the context of work on the third edition of *Waterfowl Population Estimates* on populations and trends, to be published by Wetlands International in November 2002. The new information would imply changes to 95 of the 500 populations and 237 species listed in the revised version of Table 1. Although in many cases the changes would be relatively minor, in 35 populations the new information would result in a change to their conservation status. Details had been summarized and would be provided to the Working Group on Technical Matters.

31. Further discussion on the amendments to the Annexes was referred by the Chair to the Working group on Technical Matters.

32. The Chair of the Working Group on Technical Matters, reporting to the 3rd plenary meeting, on 26 September, said there was so far no consensus on the desirability of adding further wetlands-dependent birds, such as birds of prey and passerines, to the Action Plan. On the one hand it was argued that if a species was wetlands-dependent it qualified under the text of the Agreement; on the other hand it was argued that listing all qualified species might dilute attention given to species already listed.

Resolution 2.1: Amendments to the Annexes to the Agreement

33. At its 4th plenary meeting, on 27 September, the Meeting of the Parties considered revised draft resolution 2.1 (AEWA/Res.2.1/Rev.2), submitted by the Working Group on Technical Matters, on amendments to the Annexes of the Agreement. The Chair of the Working Group informed the Committee that the Group had held detailed discussions on the draft resolution, including on the definition of long-term decline, potential change in status for the Mallard, Eider and Pintail Ducks, development of action plans, and census activities. He thanked representatives of Wetlands International for their assistance during the deliberations of the Working Group.

34. During the discussion, a number of amendments were proposed. In operative paragraph 4, a reference to an apparent decline in the Northern Europe/West Mediterranean populations of *Anas platyrhynchos* was added to the first line, and the word “three” was amended to read “four” in the fifth line of the English version. In operative paragraph 6, the words “and in close consultation with the relevant bodies of the Convention on Migratory Species” were inserted after the words “close cooperation with the Agreement Secretariat.”. In Annex I, in Table 1 on the status of the populations of migratory waterbirds, the word “Coastal” was inserted before the words “Southern Africa” under the listing for *Phalacrocorax carbo lucidus* (page 9 of the English text); the conservation status of the Northern Europe/West Mediterranean population of *Anas platyrhynchos platyrhynchos* was changed from category 2c under column B to category 1 under column C (page 14 of the English text); and the word “Coastal” was added before the words “Southern Africa (excluding Madagascar)” under the listing for *Larus cirrocephalus poiocephalus* (page 23 of the English text).

35. The Meeting of the Parties adopted Resolution 2.1, as orally amended, on amendments to the Annexes to the Agreement, contained in annex II to the present report

VII. REPORT ON THE AFRICAN-EURASIAN FLYWAY GEF PROJECT (Item 11)

36. At the 1st plenary meeting, Mr. Chris Baker, GEF Coordinator for Wetlands International, gave a presentation on the GEF project “African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbird Flyways”, outlining the status of the project and the remaining requirements. The goal of the project was a substantial improvement in the conservation status of African-Eurasian waterbirds as an important component of biodiversity, by enhancing and coordinating catalytic strategic measures to conserve the critical network of sites those birds required to complete their annual cycle. The project was intended to support both AEWA and the Ramsar Convention. There were three linked components to the project: establishing a network of sites, enhancing technical capacity, and improving communication and coordination. Project activities included development of the network of sites through surveys, training and knowledge base development; a training and awareness raising programme; demonstration projects for best practices, which aimed at showing practitioners how to manage sites in a sustainable manner; and communications, including web-based resources, a project newsletter, and publications.

VIII. REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AGREEMENT (Item 12)

A. International implementation priorities of AEWA

37. At the 2nd plenary meeting, on 25 September, introducing item 12 (a), Mr. Ward Hagemeyer (Wetlands International) gave a brief presentation on the progress made in the implementation of the international implementation priorities. He drew attention to the report on the performance of the AEWA international implementation priorities plan (AEWA/MOP2.10), the introduction of which gave the background to the activities under way. Referring to the overview of projects in that document, he said that of the 33 activities planned, funding had been secured for 12; 11 activities had been included in the GEF African-Eurasian Flyways project; and only 10 projects remained for which no funding had been found at all.

38. Concerning the proposals for implementation priorities 2003-2007 (AEWA/MOP2.19 (Rev.1), there were 16 new activities proposed, in addition to those activities which had not been implemented from the previous period, giving a total of 41 proposed activities. The report also indicated where linkages existed with the GEF African-Eurasian Flyways project.

39. In answer to a query, the Chair confirmed that, following the recent successful replenishment negotiations on GEF, the Facility was indeed in good financial shape. Noting that its procedures could be complex, and access to its funds could be complicated, he recommended that those seeking further information should seek it in the Working Group on Technical Matters.

Resolution 2.4: International implementation priorities for 2003-2004

40. The Chair proposed, and the Meeting agreed, that draft resolution 2.4 (AEWA/Res.2.4) would be submitted to the Working Group on Technical Matters for consideration, which would report to plenary on the results of its deliberations.

41. At the 4th plenary meeting, on 27 September, the Chair of the Working Group on Technical Matters reported on the proposed international implementation priorities for 2003-2007 (AEWA/Res.2.4/Rev.1). He said that with the greater number of AEWA Contracting Parties there was a greater need for waterbird censuses at the national level. The Working Group had added a specific reference to the importance of supporting the further development of the international waterbird census in Africa, the Middle East and Central Asia.

42. The Meeting of the Parties adopted Resolution 2.4, submitted by the Working Group on Technical Matters, on international implementation priorities for 2003-2007, contained in annex II to the present report.

B. Phasing out lead shot for waterbird hunting

43. Introducing the item at the 2nd plenary meeting, Ms. Nienke Beintema (Consultant), referred to the background document to draft resolution 2.2 (AEWA/Res.2.2) on phasing out lead shot for hunting in wetlands (AEWA/MOP2.11), and described the problems caused by lead shot, even though cheap and effective alternatives were available. Section 4.1.4 of the AEWA Action Plan specifically addressed the issue and called upon Parties to endeavour to phase out use of lead shot for hunting in wetlands by the year 2000. To date, only six AEWA Range States plus the United States of America had done so.

44. Concerning recent AEWA activities on the issue, she noted that document AEWA/MOP2.11 also described the outcome of a review of the experiences of those countries that had phased out lead shot, carried out by Wetlands International with financial support from the AEWA Secretariat and the United Kingdom Joint Nature Conservation Committee. The report had been published in July 2001, and she outlined some of its conclusions and recommendations. In October 2001, an International Non-Toxic Shot Workshop, organized by FACE and the AEWA Secretariat, had been held in Bucharest, and it was hoped to hold a similar workshop in Italy in early 2003. A special edition of the *AEWA Newsletter*, on lead poisoning in waterbirds, had been issued in September 2002 and was available as document AEWA/Inf.2.2.

45. Despite the measures taken to date, it was clear that much still needed to be done and compliance also needed to be enforced. The Meeting had before it draft resolution 2.2 on the

phasing out of lead shot in wetlands, which had been discussed by the Technical Committee at its meeting in Arusha, where, in cooperation with FACE, amendments to the draft had been agreed. She concluded by summarizing the content and aims of draft resolution 2.2.

46. The Chair underlined the importance of AEWA measures to deal with the issue within the context of a harmonized phase-out of lead shot for hunting. He underlined the importance of lobbying hunters to achieve such a phase-out.

47. The representative of Sweden said that his country should be included in the list of Parties that had phased out lead shot use in wetlands. He also reported that Sweden was aiming for a total national phase-out of lead shot from 2006. The representative of Denmark, speaking on behalf of the European Community member States, stressed that the extent of mortality of waterbirds from lead poisoning was unacceptable and serious initiatives were needed to ensure phase-out of lead shot. He expressed full support for draft resolution 2.2.

48. The observer for CIC drew attention to a poster exhibition on the issue arranged by his organization and displayed at the current Meeting.

49. The observer for Norway, expressing particular thanks to Wetlands International for its work on the issue and for the *AEWA Newsletter*, said that the issue was also one of animal welfare in general. Evidence in his country had shown that 72 per cent of the lead in the environment was due to hunting, and it had been controlled by use of pollution control legislation governing lead, rather than by environmental legislation. Such a course of action could have an impact on how to formulate actions for the phasing out of lead for hunting.

50. The representative of Senegal, noting that in his country some hunting areas were adjacent to designated national parks, called for a close and detailed examination of the question and expressed support for draft resolution 2.2.

51. The Chair proposed, and the Meeting agreed, that draft resolution 2.2 would be submitted to the Working Group on Technical Matters for consideration, which would report to plenary on the results of its deliberations.

Resolution 2.2: Phasing out of lead shot for hunting in wetlands

52. At the 4th plenary meeting, on 27 September, draft resolution (AEWA/Res.2.2/Rev.1), submitted by the Working Group on Technical Matters, was introduced by the Chair of the Working Group. He said that the recommendations of the Technical Committee in its lead poisoning review had been added to operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. In addition, as decided by the Technical Committee at its meeting in Arusha, no dates for phase out of lead shot had been specified.

53. The Meeting of the Parties adopted Resolution 2.2 on phasing out of lead shot for hunting in wetlands, as contained in annex II to the present report.

C. Synthesis of Party reports

54. Introducing item 12 (c) at the 2nd plenary meeting, on 25 September, the Executive Secretary explained that, to date, the Secretariat had received reports from only 10 countries, 8 of which were Parties. Moreover, they had not been received in time to allow any meaningful synthesis to be carried out for submission to the current Meeting. He proposed, and the Meeting agreed, that the Secretariat would wait until it had received further reports from the countries, and then prepare a synthesis for dissemination after the current Meeting of the Parties.

D. UNEP support for the harmonization of national reporting and information management for biodiversity-related treaties

55. Introducing item 12 (d) at the 2nd plenary meeting, Mr. C. Zöckler (UNEP-WCMC) drew attention to document AEWA/Inf.2.18, which described UNEP support for the harmonization of national reporting and information management for biodiversity-related species. Reporting on progress made, he said that pilot projects facilitated by UNEP were being carried out in Ghana, Indonesia, Panama and Seychelles to test information management concepts in the context of national reporting to the five biodiversity-related conventions. Document AEWA/Inf.2.18 reported on the current status of those projects.

56. Concerning harmonization of the Action Plan, he underlined the need for further harmonization and streamlining of the reporting on migratory species. The species information database for CMS had already been implemented, and the Parties to CMS had been invited to participate in the process of adopting the new reporting format to facilitate data entry. In conclusion, he pointed to web sites where participants could see the results of such harmonization of information.

57. The Chair drew the attention of the Meeting to the harmonization process under way within the national reporting process under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).

E. Cooperation with other bodies

58. At the 2nd plenary meeting, the Executive Secretary noted that the Secretariat comprised one Professional and one General Service staff member and said that, within its possibilities, it strove to cooperate with other intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, with which institutional linkages were desirable. These included but were not limited to CBD; the Ramsar Bureau; the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification and Drought, especially in Africa; Wetlands International; BirdLife International; WWF, OMPO; CIC; and FACE. Such cooperation would include joint work programmes, either already in place or to be concluded.

59. The Secretariat already had joint activities with FACE and close cooperation with CIC. Work had progressed to develop a tripartite joint work programme with the Ramsar Bureau and the CMS Secretariat which, it was hoped, would be endorsed at the Conference of the Parties to the Ramsar Convention later in the year. Some progress had been made in the development of a joint work programme with Wetlands International, which might also be finalized later in the year.

60. The Executive Secretary of CMS reported on the joint work programme between CMS and CBD, which had been endorsed by the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CBD, in April 2002, and by the recently concluded seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CMS, in its Resolution 7.5. That programme signified important synergies between the two Conventions and proved that CMS was completely complementary to the implementation of CBD, and set specific targets for all stakeholders. It also meant that where a country was Party to both Conventions, the national focal points for the respective conventions would liaise. Resolution 7.5 of the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CMS, in its operative paragraph 2 (d), invited “the decision-making and advisory bodies of the Agreements concluded under the auspices of CMS to expeditiously consider, endorse and implement the CBD-CMS joint work programme, as appropriate”. The matter was thus referred to the current Meeting for its attention.

61. The representative of Senegal underlined the importance of cooperation also with regional conventions and bodies in particular the Bern Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats, the Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy and especially the Pan-European Ecological Network. The Executive Secretary of CMS said that there was considerable potential for such cooperation, which the Secretariat was trying to promote. The Executive Secretary of AEW, noting that currently no memorandum of cooperation with the Bern Convention had been concluded, said that a number of the Action Plans were however being carried out in cooperation with that body. The issue would be further considered under item 15 of the agenda of the current Meeting.

62. The Chair noted that there was broad consensus on the usefulness of cooperation with other conventions, and that AEW and CMS had a number of programmes in place to further such cooperation.

63. The observer for BirdLife International, drawing attention to document AEW/Inf.2.4 (Rev.1), containing the draft joint work plan between the Ramsar Convention and CMS and between the Ramsar Convention and AEW, stressed that, while the agreement was concluded between secretariats, the synergy went far beyond that, reaching to regional and national administrations. He underlined the fact that, in its paragraph 9, the draft joint work plan stated that it was “anticipated that subsequent phases of joint work will focus more on implementation by Contracting Parties and Range States at the national and international level”.

IX. ADOPTION OF CONSERVATION GUIDELINES (Item 13)

64. At the 2nd plenary meeting, on 25 September, the Chair drew attention to documents AEW/MOP2.12 on draft conservation guidelines on national legislation for protection of migratory waterbird species and their habitats, AEW/MOP2.13 on draft conservation guidelines on avoidance of introduction of non-native migratory waterbird species, AEW/Inf.13 containing nine sets of various conservation guidelines prepared by Wetlands International and AEW/Res.2.3 containing a draft resolution on conservation guidelines. He invited participants to consider how draft resolution 2.3 should be used at the national and international levels, by multilateral donors and by the Secretariat.

65. The representative of Denmark, speaking on behalf of the European Community member States, welcomed the guidelines, which were in keeping with developments in international environmental law. He particularly welcomed the inclusion of guidelines on

non-native, invasive species, which should be seen in the context of other sets of guidelines such as those adopted under CBD.

Draft conservation guidelines on national legislation for protection of migratory waterbird species and their habitats

66. At the 2nd plenary meeting, Ms. Tomme Young of the IUCN Environmental Law Centre (IUCN-ELC) gave a Powerpoint presentation on the draft conservation guideline on national legislation for protection of migratory waterbird species and their habitats, contained in document AEWA/MOP2.12 which she introduced. The document had been drafted in furtherance of the AEWA international implementation priorities adopted by the first Meeting of the Parties. A bibliography would be attached to the document at a later stage. All the national legislation which had been consulted, from over 90 countries, was available in hard copy through the IUCN-ELC library.

67. The IUCN Commission on Environmental Law had been consulted in the drafting of the guidelines, whose purpose was to offer suggestions on how to approach gathering and using information so that the legislative process could be effective in achieving conservation objectives, with the emphasis on conservation and enforcement. However, they deliberately did not cover the setting of penalties and the nature of punishments for infractions; the question of liability for causing harm to wildlife and habitats and compensation for harm done by protected species or national protective measures; or the question of rights over genetic resources, traditional knowledge and related issues. Those issues were socially and culturally complex, and the last set of issues was being discussed under CBD and elsewhere. Whether those three sets of complex issues should be covered was a decision for the Parties.

68. Nor did the draft guidelines contain any model legislation, even though the international implementation priorities had included a request for case studies. The reasons were given under subsection 2, on page 8 of the document. However, Burkina Faso was recommended as a possible subject for a case study, as IUCN-ELC had been active in its legislative revision process and much of the information was therefore available to it. Also, no other country had been identified which came as close to meeting all the criteria for a successful case study. She expressed the hope that Burkina Faso would join AEWA, which would reinforce the IUCN-ELC recommendation.

Non-native species

69. At the 3rd plenary meeting, on 26 September, Mr. Myrfyn Owen (Just Ecology) presented the draft Conservation Guideline on Avoidance of Introduction of Non-native Waterbird Species in the Agreement Area, based on the review of the status of introduced non-native waterbird species in the Agreement area (AEWA/Inf.2.17) prepared by the British Trust for Ornithology. He said there were 113 known non-native species in the area, of which about 5 represented a high degree of risk because of competition with native species for food and breeding sites, hybridisation or the fouling of water by high-density populations. There were no known examples where they had introduced disease, but that was also a possible threat. Leading examples included the Canada goose (*Branta canadensis*), the Ruddy duck (*Oxyura jamaicensis*) and the Mallard (*Anas platyrhynchos*). Trials had shown that control measures could greatly reduce populations, but were expensive and subject to political and practical considerations.

Resolution 2.3: Conservation guidelines

70. The Meeting agreed that the draft resolution on conservation guidelines (AEWA/Res.2.3) would be discussed in the Working Group on Technical Matters.

71. At the 4th plenary meeting, on 27 September, the Chair of the Working Group on Technical Matters presented a revised draft resolution submitted by the Working Group (AEWA/Res.2.3/Rev.2) in which the Working Group had added a reference in the preamble to a decision taken at the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CBD.

72. The Working Group had also discussed the terminology used in addressing “the avoidance of introduction of non-native migratory waterbird species”. It was suggested that standard CBD terminology should be used. It was agreed that because the guidelines were in draft form those issues should be borne in mind during finalization.

73. The Meeting of the Parties adopted Resolution 2.3 on conservation guidelines, contained in annex II to the present report.

X. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF NEW PROJECTS FOR INCLUSION IN THE REGISTER OF INTERNATIONAL PROJECTS (Item 14)

74. At the 2nd plenary meeting, the Executive Secretary reported that the Register of International Projects (contained in document AEWA/MOP2.14) had been reviewed and amended by the Technical Committee at its 3rd meeting. Shortly before the current Meeting of the Parties, all the Parties had been contacted and asked to provide information on the current status of projects. He requested Parties to provide relevant information about projects to the Secretariat. The Technical Committee would keep the Register up to date and improve it as much as possible intersessionally. He stressed that the purpose of the Register was to avoid duplication of effort.

XI. INTERNATIONAL SINGLE SPECIES ACTION PLANS (Item 15)

A. Sociable Plover

D. Black-winged Pratincole

75. The action plans for the Sociable Plover and the Black-winged Pratincole, under agenda item 15 (a) and (d), were considered jointly, at the 2nd plenary meeting. Mr. Umberto Gallo-Orsi (BirdLife International) gave detailed PowerPoint presentations and introduced documents on the draft international action plans for the Sociable Lapwing (*Vanellus gregarius*), also known as the Sociable Plover (AEWA/MOP2.15), and the Black-winged Pratincole (*Glareola nordmanni*) (AEWA/MOP2.18). The two draft international action plans had been produced by the same method and the same group, and the ranges, habitats and problems facing the two species were somewhat similar, although the Sociable Plover was by far the rarer, with only 200-600 breeding pairs reported in Kazakhstan and the Russian Federation, and a single known wintering locality in India with 50 individuals. He particularly highlighted the lack of firm knowledge about the two species, the problems of ensuring they had the habitat they needed and the difficulty of determining what their equilibrium level might be. In connection with the Sociable Plover, he touched on an initiative with IUCN and WWF to reintroduce wild ungulates to abandoned grazing land in the Central Asian part of the species' range in order to rehabilitate their habitat. In connection with the Black-winged Pratincole, he stressed that the rate of decline was very steep in the Russian Federation part of the range, down to between 10,000 and 15,000

breeding pairs, a 60 per cent decline. Given the similarities between the two species, a joint working group, the Threatened Steppe Waders (ThreSWa) Working Group, had been sent up to handle conservation and related matters.

76. The Chair noted that the Meeting of the Parties was requested to review and take note of the draft international action plans under the agenda item, whereas Range States were invited to implement them. A resolution on the action plans was subsequently adopted by the Meeting of the Parties (see paras. 75 and 76 below and annex II).

B. Great snipe

77. At the 2nd plenary meeting, Mr. Gallo-Orsi (BirdLife International) gave a detailed Powerpoint presentation and introduced document AEWA/MOP2.16 on the draft international action plan for the Great Snipe (*Gallinago media*). While the species was not as endangered as either the Sociable Plover or the Black-winged Pratincole, having a total population of over 250,000, little was known about it and there was an apparent decline in a number of countries. The species had two different populations with a variety of habitats. The aim of the draft plan was to keep the species off the IUCN Red List. He mentioned poisoning from lead shot as a suspected hazard for the species, which might require establishment of special protected areas.

Resolution 2.13: International action plans on the Sociable Plover, the Blackwinged Pratincole and the Great Snipe

78. At the 4th plenary meeting, on 27 September, the Chair of the Working Group on Technical Matters introduced a draft resolution, submitted by the Working Group, on international action plans on the Sociable Plover, the Blackwinged Pratincole and the Great Snipe. (AEWA/Res2.13/Rev.1).

79. The Meeting of the Parties adopted Resolution 2.13 on international action plans on the Sociable Plover, the Blackwinged Pratincole and the Great Snipe, as orally amended to correct the Latin name of the Great Snipe, contained in annex II to the present report.

C. Dark-bellied Brent Goose

80. At the 2nd plenary meeting, a representative of the Netherlands introduced document AEWA/MOP2.17 on the draft international action plan for the Dark-bellied Brent Goose (*Branta bernicla bernicla*). There had been controversy about the equilibrium level for the species (present or absent mortality from hunting), and a population model was required. He addressed a plea to participants for funding to be allocated to the development of such a model; much was not known, although it was suspected that the decline was attributable to a lack of reproductive success which was conditioned by the status of the species' breeding grounds. In that connection, he drew the attention of participants to document AEWA/MOP2/Inf.20 containing the report of the Brent Goose Working Group at its second meeting (Bonn, 24 September 2002).

81. He recalled that of the six Range States, two, France and the Russian Federation, were not Parties to AEWA.

Recommendation 2.1: International action plan on the Dark-bellied Brent Goose

82. At the 4th plenary meeting, on 27 September, the Chair of the Working Group on Administrative and Financial Matters introduced a revised draft recommendation on an international action plan on the Dark-bellied Brent Goose. (AEWA/Rec.2.12/Rev.1).

83. On the proposal of the Secretariat, operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution was amended to read “*Authorizes the Standing Committee, in close cooperation and consultation with the Technical Committee, to adopt the Action Plan on an interim basis so as to allow the Dark-bellied Brent Goose Working Group to continue its activities;*”.

84. The Meeting of the Parties adopted Recommendation 2.1 on an international action plan on the Dark-bellied Brent Goose, contained in annex II to the present report.

E. Format for AEWA species action plans

85. At the 2nd plenary meeting, Mr. Gallo-Orsi (BirdLife International) introduced document AEWA/MOP2.20, on the format for AEWA single species action plans. He noted that using tables where possible had the effect of keeping the documents short, easy to read and to the point. The aim had been to develop a format, which used internationally agreed standards to define threats and appropriate actions and which facilitated monitoring and evaluation. It should not differ too significantly from existing formats, and should be easily adopted as a common format. The proposed format included sections on biological assessment; available key knowledge; threats; relevant policies and legislation; a framework for action; activities by countries; and implementation measures.

XII. DEVELOPMENT OF THE ACTION PLAN FOR THE CENTRAL ASIAN-INDIAN FLYWAY (Item 16)

86. At the 2nd plenary meeting, Mr. Hagemeyer (Wetlands International) reported that the Parties involved had agreed that the proposed Central Asian-Indian flyway should henceforth be referred to as the Central Asian-South Asian flyway. In connection with the flyway, he introduced documents AEWA/MOP2.21 and AEWA/Inf.2.16. He noted that migratory species along the flyway faced a number of alarming hazards, the most serious of which was shortage of water, resulting from human water allocation choices, drought and water pollution.

87. India was taking the lead in the project, and a workshop would be held on the flyway in India in 2003, involving the Range States. AEWA would need to wait for the results of that expert workshop before deciding how to proceed on the matter of the Central Asian-South Asian flyway.

88. The Executive Secretary introduced his note on the three options for concerted international action in the region (document AEWA/MOP2.21). As described, the region could decide between a legally binding or non-legally binding instrument. Also, on behalf of CMS, the Executive Secretary informed the meeting that if the wish of the Range States of the Central Asian-South Asian flyway was to have a legally binding Agreement, the position of CMS and AEWA was to include the flyway in AEWA. He stressed that to cover the Central Asian-South Asian flyway, either AEWA must expand its geographical range; a new CMS Agreement must be reached; or the flyway should be covered by the Asian Pacific Migratory Waterbird Conservation Strategy (APWCS). The Secretariat preferred the first option, but, in keeping with the general understanding of the Meeting of the Parties, would await the outcome of the workshop in India in 2003.

XIII. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS (Item 17)

A. Headquarters agreement and juridical personality

89. A representative of Germany introduced document AEWA/MOP2.22 on the provisions of the new headquarters agreement signed by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Nations represented by UNEP, and the CMS Secretariat. The headquarters agreement allowed another agreement which had administratively integrated its Secretariat with the CMS Secretariat to choose to be covered by the same headquarters agreement by its own unilateral act, should the Meeting of the Parties adopt draft resolution 2.11.

90. He explained that the documentation must be read in conjunction with the 1995 United Nations Volunteer Programme (UNV) headquarters agreement between the Federal Republic of Germany and UNV, and in conjunction with an exchange of notes on the new headquarters agreement, copies of which were made available to participants.

91. The advantages of the agreement included diplomatic status for officers of the Secretariat, including those of grade P-4, who were granted such status under other headquarters agreements. Also, dependants of Secretariat staff members of non-European Community States would not need work permits to work in Germany.

92. The headquarters agreement extended diplomatic immunity to those travelling on official business. Participants in meetings who had been unable to apply for visas in advance could receive provisional visas at their point of entry into Germany.

93. The agreement with CMS was in force as a provisional agreement and was expected to be formally ratified by the Federal Parliament in about a year.

94. The Executive Secretary strongly recommended that the Meeting of the Parties should approve the headquarters agreement.

Resolution 2.11: Headquarters agreement for and juridical personality of the Agreement Secretariat

95. At the 4th plenary meeting, on 27 September, the Chair of the Working Group on Administrative and Financial Matters introduced a revised draft resolution on the headquarters agreement for and juridical personality of the Agreement Secretariat. (AEWA/Res.2.11/Rev.1).

96. The Meeting of the Parties adopted Resolution 2.11 on the headquarters agreement for and juridical personality of the Agreement Secretariat, contained in annex II to the present report.

B. Technical Committee

C. Standing Committee

97. With the agreement of the Chair to take the two subitems together, the Chair of the Technical Committee outlined the Committee's recommendation on the establishment of a Standing Committee (AEWA/MOP2.23). A small Standing Committee could take over intersessional financial and administrative tasks under article VI, subparagraph 9 (e), of the

Agreement, allowing the Technical Committee to concentrate on scientific and technical matters. The proposal was embodied in draft resolution 2.6 (AEWA/Res.2.6).

98. The suggested composition of the Standing Committee was seven members: five regional representatives, one each for Europe, Central Asia including the Russian Federation, the Middle East and North Africa, Western and Central Africa, and Eastern and Southern Africa; a representative of the host country of the next Meeting of the Parties; and a representative of the Depositary. The Chair of the Technical Committee would be invited to attend as an observer.

99. The Chair of the Technical Committee said that if a Standing Committee was established, the Meeting of the Parties might wish to review the given tasks of the Technical Committee. The proposals of the Technical Committee in that regard were embodied in draft resolution 2.5 (AEWA/Res.2.5).

Resolution 2.5: Institutional arrangements – Technical Committee

100. At the 4th plenary meeting, on 27 September, the Chair of the Working Group on Administrative and Financial Matters took up the subject of the altered role and rules of the Technical Committee in the light of the adoption earlier in the same session of Resolution 2.6, which established a Standing Committee and would permit the Technical Committee to dedicate itself primarily to scientific issues. The Working Group had considered a draft resolution on institutional arrangements for the Technical Committee and had made some changes of language (AEWA/Res.2.5/Rev.1). The Working Group had also discussed what was meant by “suitably qualified technical expert” in the context of the request that Parties should nominate such a person as a contact point for the Technical Committee. The United Kingdom, the only country that had nominated its technical focal point so far, had appointed its senior ornithological advisor.

101. An editorial correction was made to the draft resolution.

102. The Meeting of the Parties adopted Resolution 2.5 on institutional arrangements for the Technical Committee, contained in annex II to the present report.

Resolution 2.6: Institutional arrangements – Standing Committee

103. At the 4th plenary meeting, on 27 September, the Chair of the Working Group on Administrative and Financial Matters reported that the Working Group had supported the proposal that a Standing Committee should be established to guide the Secretariat on administrative matters, as contained in revised draft resolution AEWA/Res.2.6/Rev.1, so that the Technical Committee could dedicate itself primarily to scientific issues. It recommended that the Standing Committee should meet at least once between sessions of the Meeting of the Parties.

104. The draft resolution was orally amended by inserting the words “*administrative matters*” after the words “*financial and*” in the fourth preambular paragraph. Furthermore it was agreed to specify clearly in the operative paragraphs that the region of Europe and Central Asia would have two delegates and the other regions only one.

105. The Meeting of the Parties adopted Resolution 2.6 on the establishment of a Standing Committee and its institutional arrangements, as orally amended, contained in annex II to the present report.

Nomination of members of the Technical Committee

106. At the final plenary meeting, the Chair recalled that members of the Technical Committee had been appointed by the Meeting of the Parties at its first session to serve six-year terms, as representatives of their regions rather than their countries, until the third session of the Meeting of the Parties, unless they stepped down earlier. He called for nominations to fill the vacancies on the Committee, which had arisen as a result of resignations.

107. The Meeting of the Parties confirmed the following nominations to the Technical Committee:

- Game management expert: Mr. Preben Clausen (Denmark);
- North and South-Western Europe: Mr. Olivier Biber (Switzerland), member; Mr. Sami Niemi (Finland), alternate;
- Western Africa: Mr. Momodou L. Kassama (Gambia), member, Mr. Mohamed Abdoulaye (Benin) alternate;
- Southern Africa: Mr. Yousoof Mungroo (Mauritius), member, Mr. Les Underhill (South Africa) alternate.

108. The representative of Uganda expressed concern that over such a long term of office, a member of the Technical Committee whose performance was unsatisfactory could do damage to the interests of his region. Although the decision of the Meeting of the Parties at its first session in that regard must stand, the Meeting of the Parties should consider a mechanism for dealing with the problem at its third session.

109. It was agreed that the remaining vacancies would be filled through consultations within the regional groups. Their nominations would be circulated by the Secretariat when received.

Nomination of members for the Standing Committee

110. At the final plenary meeting, the Chair stressed that, although when serving on the Standing Committee members would be representing their countries rather than their regions, they should engage in consultations with their regional colleagues both before and after meetings of the Standing Committee and bring to it a sense of what their regions' views were. The Meeting of the Parties approved the following nominations to membership of the Standing Committee:

- Western Africa: Senegal (member);
- Europe and Central Asia: Germany and Romania (members), Spain and Slovakia (alternates)
- Eastern and Southern Africa: Tanzania (member) and South Africa (alternate);
- Middle East and North Africa: Egypt (member) and Jordan (alternate).

111. In response to a question raised by the representative of the Sudan, the Chair clarified that consultations within regional groups should confirm the region to which a particular country belonged. The Secretariat would issue clarification of the membership of each group once information in that connection was received from the regional groups.

XIV. FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS (Item 18)

A. Adoption of the budget for 2003-2005

112. At the 3rd plenary meeting, on 26 September, the Executive Secretary introduced a report on financial and administrative matters (AEWA/MOP2.24/Rev.1 and its addendum) and gave an outline of the draft budget. He said the budget for the past triennium had been very modest, about \$385,000 a year. It had supported only a very small Secretariat, which was facing an increasing workload. The Secretariat hoped for a realistic budget that would provide for more staff and allow funding for activities. That depended, however, on the number of Parties that subscribed to the Agreement and the size of their contributions under the United Nations scale of assessment.

113. He also noted that a time consuming process was required each time a new Party subscribed to the Agreement, with the contributions of the existing Parties being consequently recalculated. The Secretariat proposed that the contributions of present Parties should be frozen from 1 January 2003 until 31 December 2005, and that the contributions of new Parties up to the next triennium should go into the Trust Fund. Withdrawals from the Trust Fund should be used to reduce the budget to be shared among the Parties.

114. The Chair drew attention to the fact that if draft resolution 2.6 was adopted, the costs of a Standing Committee would have to be provided for in the budget.

115. The meeting agreed that further discussion would be held in the Working Group on Administrative and Financial Matters.

Resolution 2.7: Financial and administrative matters

116. At the 4th plenary meeting, on 27 September, the Chair of the Working Group on Administrative and Financial Matters reported that the draft budget had been amended in the light of advice received from UNEP regarding the use of the Trust Fund and the treatment of contributions expected from Parties yet to ratify the Agreement, as well as in the light of comments made by some of the Parties. He introduced draft resolution AEWA/Res.2.7/Rev.1, which was submitted by the Working Group.

117. The draft budget recommended by the Working Group showed an 8.3 per cent increase in the level of the Parties' contributions in comparison with the previous triennium. The levels of contribution shown in the annex to the resolution were, however, indicative, since the number of new Parties to the Convention would not be known until the 31 October deadline for the submission of instruments of ratification/ accession.

118. The representative of Germany suggested that the budget estimates should rank, by priority, the projects to be funded from contributions of new Parties that acceded to the Agreement after 1 January 2003. If the contributions were less than anticipated, the funding of projects listed higher would take precedence over those listed below. He suggested that the highest priority should be given to the funding of regional meetings, followed by matching funds for the development of international species action plans, support for the implementation of GEF projects, consultancies regarding research/surveys, and finally informational material.

119. Representatives of Denmark, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and the United Republic of Tanzania said that ranking of the funding priorities might result in lower listed projects receiving no funds at all. It was pointed out that following the adoption of Resolution 2.6, the Secretariat would have the help of the new Standing Committee in assessing priorities for funding.

120. The Meeting agreed that the holding of regional meetings was of primary importance and that, if insufficient funds were available for that purpose, the Secretariat should call upon the guidance of the Standing Committee.

121. At the 4th plenary meeting, on 27 September, the Meeting of the Parties adopted Resolution 2.7, contained in annex I to the present report, as orally amended.

B. Consideration of accepting contributions to the budget of the Agreement in kind in lieu of cash

122. At the 3rd plenary meeting, on 26 September, the Executive Secretary introduced discussion of a report on guidelines for accepting contributions in kind in lieu of cash (AEWA/MOP2.25) and a draft resolution on the subject (AEWA/Res.2.8). He recalled that the idea had been raised at the final negotiation meeting held in The Hague in June 1995 and that in Resolution 1.6 the first session of the Meeting of the Parties had instructed the Secretariat to develop guidelines. He said there was no precedent for, or experience of, accepting in-kind contributions under any known international agreement or convention. As examples of possible in-kind contributions, he said that a Party that had difficulty paying cash might offer to host a meeting or to carry out printing work.

123. The representative of Sierra Leone asked how the cash value of contributions in kind would be determined and whether there should be an upper limit.

124. The Meeting agreed to continue the discussion in the Working Group on Administrative and Financial Matters.

Resolution 2.8: Guidelines for the acceptance of contributions in kind in lieu of cash to the budget of the Agreement

125. At the 4th plenary meeting, on 27 September, the Chair of the Working Group on Administrative and Financial Matters introduced a revised draft resolution on acceptance of contributions in kind (AEWA/Res.2.8/Rev.1).

126. The Meeting of the Parties adopted Resolution 2.8 on the acceptance of contributions in kind in lieu of cash, contained in annex II to the present report.

C. Establishment of a small conservation grand fund

127. At the 3rd plenary meeting, on 26 September, the Executive Secretary introduced discussion of a report (AEWA/MOP2.26) on establishment of a fund for small conservation grants mandated by the Meeting of the Parties at its first session (Resolution 1.7) and a proposal (AEWA/Res.2.9) to develop the fund. He said that no funds earmarked for that purpose had yet been received and no separate fund had been created. He cited the experience of the Ramsar Convention, which had such a fund. The Ramsar Bureau considered that the fund had had a valuable impact on the accession of Parties. However, the Ramsar Bureau had also found that it was difficult to obtain contributions for such a fund and consequently in some cases expectations had been raised only to be followed by disappointment.

128. The Meeting agreed to continue the discussion in the Working Group on Administrative and Financial Matters.

Resolution 2.9: Future development of the small conservation grants fund for the Agreement

129. At the 4th plenary meeting, on 27 September, the Chair of the Working Group on Administrative and Financial Matters introduced a revised draft resolution, submitted by the Working Group, on the future development of the small conservation grants fund for the Agreement (AEWA/Res.2.9/Rev.1). He drew attention to the fact that a paragraph had been included to request that the 13 per cent programme support costs should be reinvested in the fund.

130. The Meeting agreed that efforts should be made to ensure that the fund under AEWA and the similar fund under the Ramsar Convention were mutually supportive and that there was good cooperation between the two secretariats.

131. The Meeting of the Parties adopted Resolution 2.9 on the small conservation grants fund, contained in annex II to the present report.

XV. REPORT OF THE SESSIONAL COMMITTEES (Item 19)

Report of the Credentials Committee

132. At the 4th plenary meeting, the Chair of the Credentials Committee reported that the Credentials Committee had reviewed the credentials of the 32 Contracting Parties registered for the second session of the Meeting of the Parties, of which 21 had been accepted. The credentials of three Contracting Parties had not been accepted as they had not been provided in original form or were not in one of the two working languages of the Meeting. The Chair encouraged those Parties that had not presented acceptable credentials to the Meeting to forward them to the Secretariat within the following two weeks, in order to ensure that the list of participants for the Meeting included all legitimate participants and observers.

Report of the Working Group on Technical Matters

133. The Chair of the Working Group on Technical Matters, Mr. Mungroo, thanked all delegates for their full collaboration in the Working Group. The Group had reviewed a number of draft resolutions and documents and had had extremely fruitful deliberations. The introduction of individual draft resolutions by the Chair of the Working Group appears under the relevant agenda items in the present report.

Report of the Working Group on Financial and Administrative Matters

134. The Chair of the Working Group on Financial and Administrative Matters, Mr. Diop, thanked all delegates, together with the representatives of UNEP and the CMS Secretariat, for their contributions to the work of the Group. The introduction of individual draft resolutions by the chair of the Working Group appears under the relevant agenda items in the present report.

XVI. ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS AND AMENDMENTS TO THE AGREEMENT AND ITS ANNEXES (Item 20)

Resolution 2.12: Tribute to the organizers

135. At the 4th plenary meeting, on 27 September, the Chair of the Working Group on Administrative and Financial Matters introduced a revised draft resolution submitted by the Working Group paying tribute to the organizers of the second session of the Meeting of the Parties. (AEWA/Res2.12/Rev.1).

136. The Meeting of the Parties adopted Resolution 2.12 paying tribute to the organizers of the second session of the Meeting of the Parties, contained in annex II to the present report.

Resolution 2.10: Date, venue and funding of the third session of the Meeting of the Parties

137. At the 4th plenary meeting, on 27 September, the Chair of the Working Group on Administrative and Financial Matters introduced a draft resolution submitted by the Working Group on the date, venue and funding of the third session of the Meeting of the Parties (AEWA/Res.2.10/Rev.1). It was noted that no offers to host the third session has been received.

138. The Meeting of the Parties adopted Resolution 2.10 on the date, venue and funding of the third session of the Meeting of the Parties, contained in annex II to the present report.

XIX. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE MEETING

139. The present report was adopted at the 4th plenary meeting, on Friday, 27 September, on the basis of the draft report circulated in document AEWA/MOP2/L.1 and on the understanding that the finalization of the report would be entrusted to the Secretariat taking into account the oral amendments proposed during the meeting.

XX. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

140. No other matters were raised.

XXI. CLOSURE

141. After the customary exchange of courtesies, the Secretariat presented a coffee-table book on migratory bird species to the Head of the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany as a token of appreciation for their contribution to the success of the meeting.

142. The Chair declared the Meeting closed at 3.30 p.m. on Friday, 27 September 2002.

Index of Contents Resolution/Recommendations

No.	Title	Page
2.1	Amendments to the annexes to the Agreement	28
2.2	Phasing Out Lead Shot or Hunting in Wetlands	60
2.3	Conservation Guidelines	62
2.4	International Implementation Priorities for 2003-2007	64
2.5	Institutional Arrangements: Technical Committee	84
2.6	Institutional Arrangements: Standing Committee	96
2.7	Financial and Administrative Matters	99
2.8	Guidelines for the Acceptance of Contributions to the budget of the Agreement in Kind lieu of Cash	109
2.9	Future Development of the small Conservation Grants Fund for the Agreement	111
2.10	Date, Venue and Funding of the third Session of the Meeting of the Parties	113
2.11	Headquarters Agreement for and Juridical Personality of the Agreement Secretariat	114
2.12	Tribute to the organizers	115
2.13	International Action Plan on the Sociable Plover, the Blackwinged Pratincole and the Great Snipe	116
	Recommendation 2.1 International Action Plan On The Dark-Bellied Brent Goose	117

RESOLUTION 2.1

AMENDMENTS TO THE ANNEXES TO THE AGREEMENT

Recalling the Final Act of the negotiation meeting to adopt the Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds, held in The Hague, the Netherlands, in June 1995, inviting the interim secretariat to prepare amendments to the Action Plan with regard to species or families listed in Annex 2 of the Agreement,

Recalling Resolution 1.9, adopted at the first Meeting of the Parties in Cape Town, South Africa in November 1999, which amended the Action Plan and requested the Secretariat and/or Technical Committee, inter alia:

- (a) To consider addition of species, as specified in the resolution, to the Agreement and Action Plan;
- (b) To review current data on population status;
- (c) To stimulate the preparation of single species action plans,

Recalling article X of the Agreement concerning the procedures to amend the Action Plan and its Annexes,

Convinced that urgent actions are needed for many species not yet included in the Action Plan as adopted at the final negotiating meeting (The Hague, June 1995), and to regularly update the Action Plan,

Having reviewed document AEWA/MOP2.9, entitled "Proposed Amendments to the Action Plan", and *having taken note* of the proposed changes to Annex 2 of the Agreement and Table 1 of the Action Plan, which include the following:

(a) A full update of the conservation status of the species currently listed in the Action Plan, as presented in Table 1a of document AEWA/MOP2.9;

(b) The inclusion of an additional 11 species and their population status, as specified in Table 1b of AEWA/MOP2.9, in Annex 2 of the Agreement and Table 1 of the Action Plan;

(c) The inclusion, as requested in Resolution 1.9, of an additional six species, as specified in AEWA/MOP2.9 Table 1c, in Annex 2 of the Agreement and Table 1 of the Action Plan;

(d) The inclusion, following the specifications in Table 1d of AEWA/MOP2.9, of a further 48 species of waterbirds to Annex 2 of the Agreement and Table 1 of the Action Plan, and the inclusion of an additional 16 migratory populations of 12 species already listed in Annex 2 of the Agreement, to Table 1 of the Action Plan;

(e) The amendment of the conservation status of the populations of 38 species as proposed in an informal working document "Further amendments to Table 1 of Action Plan" presented to the Meeting by Wetlands International,

Noting the established international process for updating and revision of population estimates and 1 per cent thresholds for waterbirds established by the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Wildfowl Habitat, which envisages an update of Wetland International's *Waterbird Population Estimates* being prepared, following international scientific review and consultation, for each triennial Ramsar Conference of the Parties,

Aware of the considerable practical difficulties that are caused when the timing of the AEWA Meeting of the Parties precedes the publication and endorsement of *Waterbird Population Estimates* by the Ramsar Conventions,

Considering that the supporting review by AEWA of the status of waterbird populations in the Agreement area would benefit from the inclusion of additional analytical content, inter alia, patterns of changing conservation status by geographic area, by taxonomic and ecological groupings, and by other themes, in particular to act as a high level summary for decision makers and so as to inform directly the revision of the Agreement's implementation priorities,

The Meeting of the Parties:

1. *Agrees* to include an additional 65 species in Annex 2 of the Agreement as appended to the present Resolution, comprising 11 species as specified in Table 1b of AEWA/MOP2.9, six species as specified in Table 1c of AEWA/MOP2.9, and 48 species as specified in Table 1d of AEWA/MOP2.9;
2. *Adopts* the revised version of Table 1 of the Action Plan as appended to the present Resolution, to replace the current Table 1 of the Action Plan, as previously amended by Resolution 1.9;
3. *Requests* the Secretariat to monitor the implementation of the amendments and to stimulate the preparation of single- and multi- species action plans for those species identified as having an unfavourable conservation status;
4. *Noting* apparent declines in the North-west European and Northern European/West Mediterranean populations of *Anas platyrhynchos*, the North-west European population of *Anas acuta*, and the Baltic, Denmark and Netherlands population of *Somateria mollissima*, determines to retain existing categorizations for these populations in Table 1 of the Action Plan, and *calls upon* the Technical Committee, working with Wetlands International and other experts, as a matter of priority, to review further the status of these four populations in the light of additional information, and to report their findings to the Meeting of the Parties at its third session;
5. *Encourages* Parties to consider, where appropriate, the development and implementation of international multi-species action plans for populations of two or more species listed in column A of Table 1 when those populations share the same habitat (ecosystem), are exposed to similar threats, and require similar measures for their conservation. Priority shall be given to those groups of species which include two or more populations in category 1 in column A of Table 1. Populations of species listed in column B of Table 1 may be included in these action plans if they interact with other species in the group and require similar conservation measures;

6. *Requests* the Technical Committee of the Agreement, in close cooperation with the Agreement Secretariat and in close consultation with the relevant bodies of the Convention on Migratory Species, to review further development of the Agreement by including additional species of wetland birds and species traditionally considered to be seabirds, looking in the first instance at the species listed in Table 2 and Table 3 of AEWA/MOP2.9, expanding Table 3 to species from the whole of Africa, and considering, in particular, the extent to which the existing Action Plan is adequate in its scope to address differing conservation problems faced by birds of prey, passerines and other taxonomic groups using wetlands;
7. *Calls upon* the Technical Committee of the Agreement to develop guidelines for the interpretation of the term “significant long-term decline” in the context of Table 1 of the Action Plan;
8. *Further calls upon* the Technical Committee of the Agreement to provide clarification on the procedures used to delimit bio-geographical populations of waterbirds, noting their significance as practical units for conservation management;
9. *Takes note* of the second edition of the *Report on the Conservation Status of Migratory Waterbirds in the Agreement Area* (AEWA/Inf.2.14) as the current best available knowledge of the status of populations of waterbirds included in the Agreement;
10. *Requests* the Technical Committee to develop, at its next meeting, proposals for enhancing the analytical content of the third edition of the *AEWA Report on the Conservation Status of Migratory Waterbirds in the Agreement Area*, and to consider how that information may be used to direct input to future reviews of the Agreement’s implementation priorities;
11. *Takes note also* of the *Report on the Population Status of *Lymnocyptes minimus** (AEWA/Inf.2.12), which contains an evaluation of the current data and information on the species;
12. *Calls upon* all Parties to provide the necessary resources to undertake, on an international level, priority actions such as the drafting of single- and multi-species action plans where most needed on the basis of the amended Action Plan;
13. *Requests* the Secretariat to liaise with the Ramsar Convention Bureau to endeavour to ensure that in future the timing of the AEWA Meeting of the Parties follows the Ramsar Conference of the Parties, thus facilitating the review of waterbird population estimates by AEWA and further encouraging a globally coordinated and effective process for the review of waterbird population estimates;
14. *Urges* those countries with waterbird monitoring schemes not supplying data to the International Waterbird Census, to encourage the provision of a regular supply of such information as a matter of priority in order that International Waterbird Census outputs may be based on the most complete assessments possible.

Table 1^{a/}

STATUS OF THE POPULATIONS OF MIGRATORY WATERBIRDS

KEY TO CLASSIFICATION

The following key to Table 1 is a basis for implementation of the Action Plan:

Column A

Category 1:

- (a) Species, which are included in Appendix I to the Convention on the Conservation Migratory species of Wild Animals
- (b) Species, which are listed as threatened in Threatened Birds of the World (BirdLife International 2000); or
- (c) Populations, which number less than around 10,000 individuals.

Category 2: Populations numbering between around 10,000 and around 25,000 individuals.

Category 3: Populations numbering between around 25,000 and around 100,000 individuals and considered to be at risk as a result of:

- (a) Concentration onto a small number of sites at any stage of their annual cycle;
- (b) Dependence on a habitat type, which is under severe threat;
- (c) Showing significant long-term decline; or
- (d) Showing extreme fluctuations in population size or trend.

For species listed in categories 2 and 3 above, see paragraph 2.1.1 of the Action Plan contained in Annex 3 to the Agreement.

Column B

Category 1: Populations numbering between around 25,000 and around 100,000 individuals and which do not fulfil the conditions in respect of column A, as described above.

Category 2: Populations numbering more than around 100,000 individuals and considered to be in need of special attention as a result of:

- (a) Concentration onto a small number of sites at any stage of their annual cycle;
- (b) Dependence on a habitat type, which is under severe threat;
- (c) Showing significant long-term decline; or
- (d) Showing extreme fluctuations in population size or trend.

^{a/} Table 1, "Status of the populations of migratory waterbirds" forms part of the Action Plan contained in Annex 3 to the Agreement.

Column C

Category 1: Populations numbering more than around 100,000 individuals which could significantly benefit from international cooperation and which do not fulfil the conditions in respect of either column A or column B, above.

REVIEW OF TABLE 1

The Table shall be:

- (a) Reviewed regularly by the Technical Committee in accordance with article VII, paragraph 3(b), of the Agreement; and
- (b) Amended as necessary by the Meeting of the Parties, in accordance with article VI, paragraph 9(d) of the Agreement, in light of the conclusions of such reviews.

DEFINITION OF GEOGRAPHICAL TERMS USED IN RANGE DESCRIPTIONS

North Africa	Algeria, Egypt, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Tunisia.
West Africa	Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, the Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo.
Eastern Africa	Burundi, Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Somalia, Sudan, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania.
North-east Africa	Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Somalia, Sudan.
Southern Africa	Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, Swaziland, Zambia, Zimbabwe.
Central Africa	Cameroon, Central African Republic, Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Sao Tome and Principe.
Sub-Saharan Africa	All African states south of the Sahara.
Tropical Africa	Sub-Saharan Africa excluding Lesotho, Namibia, South Africa and Swaziland.
Western Palearctic	As defined in <i>Handbook of the Birds of Europe, the Middle East and North Africa</i> (Cramp & Simmons 1977).
North-west Europe	Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.
Western Europe	North-west Europe with Portugal and Spain.
North-east Europe	The northern part of the Russian Federation west of the Urals.
Eastern Europe	Belarus, the Russian Federation west of the Urals, Ukraine.
Central Europe	Austria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Poland, the Russian Federation around the Gulf of Finland and Kaliningrad, Slovakia, Switzerland.

North Atlantic	Faroes, Greenland, Iceland, Ireland, Norway, the north-west coast of the Russian Federation, Svalbard, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.
East Atlantic	Atlantic seaboard of Europe and North Africa from northern Norway to Morocco.
Western Siberia	The Russian Federation east of the Urals to the Yenisey River and south to the Kazakhstan border.
Central Siberia	The Russian Federation from the Yenisey River to the eastern boundary of the Taimyr Peninsula and south to the Altai Mountains.
West Mediterranean	Algeria, France, Italy, Malta, Monaco, Morocco, Portugal, San Marino, Spain, Tunisia.
East Mediterranean	Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Egypt, Greece, Israel, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Slovenia, the Syrian Arab Republic, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Yugoslavia.
Black Sea	Armenia, Bulgaria, Georgia, Republic of Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation, Turkey, Ukraine.
Caspian	Azerbaijan, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan.
South-west Asia	Bahrain, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the Syrian Arab Republic, eastern Turkey, Turkmenistan, the United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Yemen.
Western Asia	Western parts of the Russian Federation east of the Urals and the Caspian countries.
Central Asia	Afghanistan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan.
Southern Asia	Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka.

KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

bre:	breeding	win:	wintering
N:	Northern	E:	Eastern
S:	Southern	W:	Western
NE:	North-eastern	NW:	North-western
SE:	South-eastern	SW:	South-western

(): Population status unknown. Conservation status estimated.

*: By way of exception for those populations marked by an asterisk, hunting may continue on a sustainable use basis where hunting of such populations is a long-established cultural practice (see paragraph 2.1.1 of Annex 3 to the Agreement).

NOTES

1. The population data used to compile Table 1 as far as possible correspond to the number of individuals in the potential breeding stock in the Agreement area. The status is based on the best available published population estimates.
2. Suffixes (bre) or (win) in population listings are solely aids to population identification. They do not indicate seasonal restrictions to actions in respect of these populations under the Agreement and Action Plan.
3. The brief descriptions used to identify the populations are based on the descriptions used in the third edition of *Waterbird Population Estimates*.
4. Slash signs (/) are used to separate breeding areas from wintering areas.
5. Where a species' population is listed in Table 1 with multiple categorisations, the obligations of the Action Plan relate to the strictest category listed.

	A	B	C
SPHENISCIDAE			
<i>Spheniscus demersus</i>			
- Southern Africa	1b	2a 2c	
GAVIIDAE			
<i>Gavia stellata</i>			
- North-west Europe (win)		2c	
- Caspian, Black Sea & East Mediterranean (win)		(1)	
<i>Gavia arctica arctica</i>			
- Northern Europe & Western Siberia/Europe		2c	
<i>Gavia arctica suschkini</i>			
- Central Siberia/Caspian			(1)
<i>Gavia immer</i>			
- Europe (win)	1c		
<i>Gavia adamsii</i>			
- Northern Europe (win)	1c		
PODICIPEDIDAE			
<i>Tachybaptus ruficollis ruficollis</i>			
- Europe & North-west Africa			1
<i>Podiceps cristatus cristatus</i>			
- North-west & Western Europe			1
- Black Sea & Mediterranean (win)			1
- Caspian & South-west Asia (win)	2		
<i>Podiceps grisegena grisegena</i>			
- North-west Europe (win)		1	
- Black Sea & Mediterranean (win)		(1)	
- Caspian (win)	2		
<i>Podiceps cristatus infuscatus</i>			
- Eastern Africa (Ethiopia to N Zambia)	1c		
- Southern Africa	1c		
<i>Podiceps auritus auritus</i>			
- North-west Europe (large-billed)	1c		
- North-east Europe (small-billed)		1	
- Caspian & South Asia (win)	2		
<i>Podiceps nigricollis nigricollis</i>			
- Europe/South & West Europe & North Africa			1
- Western Asia/South-west & South Asia		1	
<i>Podiceps nigricollis gurneyi</i>			
- Southern Africa	2		
PELECANIDAE			
<i>Pelecanus onocrotalus</i>			
- Southern Africa	2		
- West Africa		1	
- Eastern Africa			1
- Europe & Western Asia (bre)	1a 3c		

	A	B	C
<i>Pelecanus rufescens</i>			
- Tropical Africa & SW Arabia		1	
<i>Pelecanus crispus</i>			
- Black Sea & Mediterranean (win)	1a 1c		
- South-west Asia & South Asia (win)	1a 2		
SULIDAE			
<i>Sula (Morus) capensis</i>			
- Southern Africa	1b	2a 2c	
PHALACROCORACIDAE			
<i>Phalacrocorax coronatus</i>			
- Coastal South-west Africa	1c		
<i>Phalacrocorax pygmeus</i>			
- Black Sea & Mediterranean		1	
- South-west Asia		1	
<i>Phalacrocorax neglectus</i>			
- Coastal South-west Africa	1b 1c		
<i>Phalacrocorax carbo carbo</i>			
- North-west Europe			1
<i>Phalacrocorax carbo sinensis</i>			
- Northern & Central Europe			1
- Black Sea & Mediterranean			1
- West & South-west Asia			(1)
<i>Phalacrocorax carbo lucidus</i>			
- Coastal West Africa		1	
- Central & Eastern Africa			1
- Coastal Southern Africa	2		
<i>Phalacrocorax nigrogularis</i>			
- Gulf & Arabian Sea	1b	2a 2c	
<i>Phalacrocorax capensis</i>			
- Coastal Southern Africa		2a 2c	
ARDEIDAE			
<i>Egretta ardesiaca</i>			
- Sub-Saharan Africa	3c		
<i>Egretta vinaceigula</i>			
- South-central Africa	1b 1c		
<i>Egretta garzetta garzetta</i>			
- Sub-Saharan Africa			(1)
- Europe, Black Sea & Mediterranean/W & C Africa			1
- Western Asia/SW Asia, NE & Eastern Africa		(1)	
<i>Egretta gularis gularis</i>			
- West Africa		(1)	
<i>Egretta gularis schistacea</i>			
- North-east Africa & Red Sea		(1)	
- South-west Asia & South Asia	2		
<i>Egretta dimorpha</i>			
- Coastal Eastern Africa	2		

	A	B	C
<i>Ardea cinerea cinerea</i>			
- Sub-Saharan Africa			1
- Europe & North Africa (bre)			1
- West & South-west Asia (bre)			(1)
<i>Ardea melanocephala</i>			
- Sub-Saharan Africa			(1)
<i>Ardea purpurea purpurea</i>			
- Tropical Africa		1	
- West Europe & West Mediterranean/West Africa	2		
- East Europe & South-west Asia/Sub-Saharan Africa		(2c)	
<i>Casmerodius albus albus</i>			
- W, C & SE Europe/Black Sea & Mediterranean	2		
- Western Asia/South-west Asia		(1)	
<i>Casmerodius albus melanorhynchos</i>			
- Sub-Saharan Africa & Madagascar			(1)
<i>Mesophoyx intermedia brachyrhyncha</i>			
- Sub-Saharan Africa		1	
<i>Bubulcus ibis ibis</i>			
- Southern Africa			1
- Tropical Africa			1
- South-west Europe & North-west Africa			1
- East Mediterranean & South-west Asia	2		
<i>Ardeola ralloides ralloides</i>			
- Medit., Black Sea & N Africa/Sub-Saharan Africa	3c		
- West & South-west Asia/Sub-Saharan Africa		(1)	
<i>Ardeola ralloides paludivaga</i>			
- Sub-Saharan Africa & Madagascar			(1)
<i>Ardeola idea</i>			
- Madagascar & Aldabra/Central & Eastern Africa	1b 1c		
<i>Ardeola rufiventris</i>			
- Tropical Eastern & Southern Africa		(1)	
<i>Nycticorax nycticorax nycticorax</i>			
- Sub-Saharan Africa & Madagascar		(1)	
- Europe & NW Africa/Mediterranean & Africa		2c	
- Western Asia/SW Asia & NE Africa		(1)	
<i>Ixobrychus minutus minutus</i>			
- Europe & North Africa/Sub-Saharan Africa		2c	
- West & South-west Asia/Sub-Saharan Africa		(1)	
<i>Ixobrychus minutus payesii</i>			
- Sub-Saharan Africa		(1)	
<i>Ixobrychus sturmii</i>			
- Sub-Saharan Africa		(1)	
<i>Botaurus stellaris stellaris</i>			
- Europe (bre)	3c		
- South-west Asia (win)	2		
<i>Botaurus stellaris capensis</i>			
- Southern Africa	1c		

	A	B	C
CICONIIDAE			
<i>Mycteria ibis</i>			
- Sub-Saharan Africa (excluding Madagascar)		1	
<i>Anastomus lamelligerus lamelligerus</i>			
- Sub-Saharan Africa			1
<i>Ciconia nigra</i>			
- Southern Africa	1c		
- South-west Europe/West Africa	1c		
- Central & Eastern Europe/Sub-Saharan Africa	2		
<i>Ciconia abdimii</i>			
- Sub-Saharan Africa & SW Arabia		(2c)	
<i>Ciconia episcopus microscelis</i>			
- Sub-Saharan Africa		(1)	
<i>Ciconia ciconia ciconia</i>			
- Southern Africa	1c		
- Iberia & North-west Africa/Sub-Saharan Africa	3b		
- Central & Eastern Europe/Sub-Saharan Africa			1
- Western Asia/South-west Asia	2		
<i>Leptoptilos crumeniferus</i>			
- Sub-Saharan Africa			1
BALAENICIPITIDAE			
<i>Balaeniceps rex</i>			
- Central Tropical Africa	1c		
THRESKIORNITHIDAE			
<i>Plegadis falcinellus falcinellus</i>			
- Sub-Saharan Africa (bre)			1
- Black Sea & Mediterranean/West Africa	3c		
- South-west Asia/Eastern Africa		(1)	
<i>Geronticus eremita</i>			
- Morocco	1a 1b 1c		
- South-west Asia	1a 1b 1c		
<i>Threskiornis aethiopicus aethiopicus</i>			
- Sub-Saharan Africa			1
- Iraq & Iran	1c		
<i>Platalea leucorodia leucorodia</i>			
- West Europe/West Mediterranean & West Africa	1c		
- Cent. & SE Europe/Mediterranean & Tropical Africa	2		
<i>Platalea leucorodia archeri</i>			
- Red Sea & Somalia	1c		
<i>Platalea leucorodia balsaci</i>			
- Coastal West Africa (Mauritania)	1c		
<i>Platalea leucorodia major</i>			
- Western Asia/South-west & South Asia	2		
<i>Platalea alba</i>			
- Sub-Saharan Africa	2*		

	A	B	C
PHOENICOPTERIDAE			
<i>Phoenicopterus ruber roseus</i>			
- West Africa	3a		
- Eastern Africa	3a		
- Southern Africa (to Madagascar)	3a		
- West Mediterranean		2a	
- East Mediterranean, South-west & South Asia		2a	
<i>Phoenicopterus minor</i>			
- West Africa	2		
- Eastern Africa		2a 2c	
- Southern Africa (to Madagascar)	3a		
ANATIDAE			
<i>Dendrocygna bicolor</i>			
- West Africa (Senegal to Chad)			(1)
- Eastern & Southern Africa			(1)
<i>Dendrocygna viduata</i>			
- West Africa (Senegal to Chad)			1
- Eastern & Southern Africa			1
<i>Thalassornis leuconotus leuconotus</i>			
- West Africa	1c		
- Eastern & Southern Africa	2*		
<i>Oxyura leucocephala</i>			
- West Mediterranean (Spain & Morocco)	1a 1b 1c		
- Algeria & Tunisia	1a 1b 1c		
- East Mediterranean, Turkey & South-west Asia	1a 1b 1c		
<i>Oxyura maccoa</i>			
- Eastern Africa	1c		
- Southern Africa	1c		
<i>Cygnus olor</i>			
- North-west Mainland & Central Europe			1
- Black Sea		1	
- West & Central Asia/Caspian		2a 2d	
<i>Cygnus Cygnus</i>			
- Iceland/UK & Ireland	2		
- North-west Mainland Europe		1	
- N Europe & W Siberia/Black Sea & E Mediterranean	2		
- West & Central Siberia/Caspian	2		
<i>Cygnus columbianus bewickii</i>			
- Western Siberia & NE Europe/North-west Europe	3c		
- Northern Siberia/Caspian	1c		
<i>Anser brachyrhynchus</i>			
- East Greenland & Iceland/UK		2a	
- Svalbard/North-west Europe		1	
<i>Anser fabalis fabalis</i>			
- North-east Europe/North-west Europe		1	
<i>Anser fabalis rossicus</i>			
- West & Central Siberia/NE & SW Europe			(1)

	A	B	C
<i>Anser fabalis johanseni</i>			
- West & Central Siberia/Turkmenistan to W China			(1)
<i>Anser albifrons albifrons</i>			
- NW Siberia & NE Europe/North-west Europe			1
- Western Siberia/Central Europe	3c*		
- Western Siberia/Black Sea & Turkey			1
- Northern Siberia/Caspian & Iraq	2		
<i>Anser albifrons flavirostris</i>			
- Greenland/Ireland & UK	3a*		
<i>Anser erythropus</i>			
- N Europe & W Siberia/Black Sea & Caspian	1a 1b 2		
<i>Anser anser anser</i>			
- Iceland/UK & Ireland		1	
- NW Europe/South-west Europe			1
- Central Europe/North Africa		1	
<i>Anser anser rubrirostris</i>			
- Black Sea & Turkey		1	
- Western Siberia/Caspian & Iraq			1
<i>Branta leucopsis</i>			
- East Greenland/Scotland & Ireland		1	
- Svalbard/South-west Scotland	2		
- Russia/Germany & Netherlands			1
<i>Branta bernicla bernicla</i>			
- Western Siberia/Western Europe		2b 2c	
<i>Branta bernicla hrota</i>			
- Svalbard/Denmark & UK	1c		
- Canada & Greenland/Ireland	2		
<i>Branta ruficollis</i>			
- Northern Siberia/Black Sea & Caspian	1a 1b 3a		
<i>Alopochen aegyptiacus</i>			
- West Africa	2		
- Eastern & Southern Africa			1
<i>Tadorna ferruginea</i>			
- North-west Africa	1c		
- East Mediterranean & Black Sea/North-east Africa	2		
- Western Asia & Caspian/Iran & Iraq		1	
<i>Tadorna cana</i>			
- Southern Africa		1	
<i>Tadorna tadorna</i>			
- North-west Europe		2a	
- Black Sea & Mediterranean	3c		
- Western Asia/Caspian & Middle East		1	
<i>Plectropterus gambensis gambensis</i>			
- West Africa			1
- Eastern Africa (Sudan to Zambia)			1
<i>Plectropterus gambensis niger</i>			
- Southern Africa		1	

	A	B	C
<i>Sarkidiornis melanotos melanotos</i>			
- West Africa		1	
- Southern & Eastern Africa			1
<i>Nettapus auritus</i>			
- West Africa	1c		
- Southern & Eastern Africa			(1)
<i>Anas capensis</i>			
- Eastern Africa (Rift Valley)	1c		
- Lake Chad basin	1c		
- Southern Africa (N to Angola & Zambia)			1
<i>Anas strepera strepera</i>			
- North-west Europe		1	
- North-east Europe/Black Sea & Mediterranean		2c	
- Western Siberia/SW Asia & NE Africa			(1)
<i>Anas penelope</i>			
- Western Siberia & NE Europe/NW Europe			1
- W Siberia & NE Europe/Black Sea & Mediterranean		2c	
- Western Siberia/SW Asia & NE Africa		2c	
<i>Anas platyrhynchos platyrhynchos</i>			
- North-west Europe			1
- Northern Europe/West Mediterranean			1
- Eastern Europe/Black Sea & East Mediterranean		2c	
- Western Siberia/South-west Asia			(1)
<i>Anas undulata undulata</i>			
- Southern Africa			1
<i>Anas clypeata</i>			
- North-west & Central Europe (win)		1	
- W Siberia, NE & E Europe/S Europe & West Africa		2c	
- W Siberia/SW Asia, NE & Eastern Africa		2c	
<i>Anas erythrorhyncha</i>			
- Southern Africa			1
- Eastern Africa			1
- Madagascar	2		
<i>Anas acuta</i>			
- North-west Europe		1	
- W Siberia, NE & E Europe/S Europe & West Africa		2c	
- Western Siberia/SW Asia & Eastern Africa			(1)
<i>Anas querquedula</i>			
- Western Siberia & Europe/West Africa		2c	
- Western Siberia/SW Asia, NE & Eastern Africa			(1)
<i>Anas crecca crecca</i>			
- North-west Europe			1
- W Siberia & NE Europe/Black Sea & Mediterranean			1
- Western Siberia/SW Asia & NE Africa		2c	
<i>Anas hottentota</i>			
- Lake Chad Basin	1c		
- Eastern Africa (south to N Zambia)		1	
- Southern Africa (north to S Zambia)		1	

	A	B	C
<i>Marmaronetta angustirostris</i>			
- West Mediterranean/West Medit. & West Africa	1a 1b 1c		
- East Mediterranean	1a 1b 1c		
- South-west Asia	1a 1b 2		
<i>Netta rufina</i>			
- South-west & Central Europe/West Mediterranean		1	
- Black Sea & East Mediterranean	3c		
- Western & Central Asia/South-west Asia			1
<i>Netta erythrophthalma brunnea</i>			
- Southern & Eastern Africa			1
<i>Aythya ferina</i>			
- North-east Europe/North-west Europe			1
- Central & NE Europe/Black Sea & Mediterranean			1
- Western Siberia/South-west Asia		2c	
<i>Aythya nyroca</i>			
- West Mediterranean/North & West Africa	1a 1c		
- Eastern Europe/E Mediterranean & Sahelian Africa	1a 3c		
- Western Asia/SW Asia & NE Africa	1a 3c		
<i>Aythya fuligula</i>			
- North-west Europe (win)			1
- Central Europe, Black Sea & Mediterranean (win)			1
- Western Siberia/SW Asia & NE Africa			(1)
<i>Aythya marila marila</i>			
- Northern Europe/Western Europe			1
- Western Siberia/Black Sea & Caspian			1
<i>Somateria mollissima mollissima</i>			
- Baltic, Denmark & Netherlands			1
- Norway & Russia			1
<i>Somateria mollissima borealis</i>			
- Svalbard & Franz Joseph (bre)		1	
<i>Somateria spectabilis</i>			
- East Greenland, NE Europe & Western Siberia			1
<i>Polysticta stelleri</i>			
- Western Siberia/North-east Europe	1a	1	
<i>Clangula hyemalis</i>			
- Iceland & Greenland			1
- Western Siberia/North Europe			1
<i>Melanitta nigra nigra</i>			
- W Siberia & N Europe/W Europe & NW Africa		2a	
<i>Melanitta fusca fusca</i>			
- Western Siberia & Northern Europe/NW Europe		2a	
- Black Sea & Caspian	1c		
<i>Bucephala clangula clangula</i>			
- North-west & Central Europe (win)			1
- North-east Europe/Adriatic		1	
- Western Siberia & North-east Europe/Black Sea	2		
- Western Siberia/Caspian	2		

	A	B	C
<i>Mergus albellus</i>			
- North-west & Central Europe (win)	3a		
- North-east Europe/Black Sea & East Mediterranean		1	
- Western Siberia/South-west Asia	3c		
<i>Mergus serrator serrator</i>			
- North-west & Central Europe (win)			1
- North-east Europe/Black Sea & Mediterranean		1	
- Western Siberia/South-west & Central Asia	1c		
<i>Mergus merganser merganser</i>			
- North-west & Central Europe (win)			1
- North-east Europe/Black Sea	1c		
- Western Siberia/Caspian	2		
GRUIDAE			
<i>Balearica pavonina pavonina</i>			
- West Africa (Senegal to Chad)	2		
<i>Balearica pavonina ceciliae</i>			
- Eastern Africa (Sudan to Uganda)	3c		
<i>Balearica regulorum regulorum</i>			
- Southern Africa (N to Angola & S Zimbabwe)	1c		
<i>Balearica regulorum gibbericeps</i>			
- Eastern Africa (Kenya to Mozambique)	3c		
<i>Grus leucogeranus</i>			
- Iran (win)	1a 1b 1c		
<i>Grus virgo</i>			
- Black Sea (Ukraine)/North-east Africa	1c		
- Turkey (bre)	1c		
- Kalmykia/North-east Africa		1	
<i>Grus paradisea</i>			
- Extreme Southern Africa	1b 2		
<i>Grus carunculatus</i>			
- Central & Southern Africa	1b 1c		
<i>Grus grus</i>			
- North-west Europe/Iberia & Morocco		1	
- North-east & Central Europe/North Africa		1	
- Eastern Europe/Turkey, Middle East & NE Africa	3c		
- Turkey & Georgia (bre)	1c		
- Western Siberia/South Asia		(1)	
RALLIDAE			
<i>Sarothrura elegans elegans</i>			
- NE, Eastern & Southern Africa			(1)
<i>Sarothrura elegans reichenovi</i>			
- S West Africa to Central Africa			(1)
<i>Sarothrura boehmi</i>			
- Central Africa	1c		
<i>Sarothrura ayresi</i>			
- Ethiopia and Southern Africa	1a 1b 1c		

	A	B	C
<i>Rallus aquaticus aquaticus</i>			
- Europe & North Africa			1
<i>Rallus aquaticus korejewi</i>			
- Western Siberia/South-west Asia			(1)
<i>Rallus caerulescens</i>			
- Southern & Eastern Africa			(1)
<i>Crecoptis egregia</i>			
- Sub-Saharan Africa			(1)
<i>Crex crex</i>			
- Europe & Western Asia/Sub-Saharan Africa	1b	2c	
<i>Amaurornis flavirostris</i>			
- Sub-Saharan Africa			1
<i>Porzana parva parva</i>			
- Western Eurasia/Africa		2c	
<i>Porzana pusilla intermedia</i>			
- Europe (bre)	2		
<i>Porzana porzana</i>			
- Europe/Africa		2c	
<i>Aenigmatolimnas marginalis</i>			
- Sub-Saharan Africa	(2)		
<i>Porphyrio alleni</i>			
- Sub-Saharan Africa			(1)
<i>Gallinula chloropus chloropus</i>			
- Europe & North Africa			1
- West & South-west Asia			(1)
<i>Gallinula angulata</i>			
- Sub-Saharan Africa			(1)
<i>Fulica cristata</i>			
- Sub-Saharan Africa			1
- Spain & Morocco	1c		
<i>Fulica atra atra</i>			
- North-west Europe (win)			1
- Black Sea & Mediterranean (win)			1
- South-west Asia (win)			(1)
DROMADIDAE			
<i>Dromas ardeola</i>			
- North-west Indian Ocean, Red Sea & Gulf	3a		
HAEMATOPODIDAE			
<i>Haematopus ostralegus ostralegus</i>			
- Europe/South & West Europe & NW Africa			1
<i>Haematopus ostralegus longipes</i>			
- SE Eur & W Asia/SW Asia & NE Africa			(1)
<i>Haematopus moquini</i>			
- Coastal Southern Africa	1c		

	A	B	C
RECURVIROSTRIDAE			
<i>Himantopus himantopus himantopus</i>			
- Sub-Saharan Africa (excluding south)			(1)
- Southern Africa ('meridionalis')	2		
- SW Europe & North-west Africa/West Africa		1	
- Central Europe & E Mediterranean/N-Central Africa		1	
- W, C & SW Asia/SW Asia & NE Africa		(1)	
<i>Recurvirostra avosetta</i>			
- Southern Africa	2		
- Eastern Africa		(1)	
- Western Europe & North-west Africa (bre)		1	
- South-east Europe, Black Sea & Turkey (bre)	(3c)		
- West & South-west Asia/Eastern Africa	2		
BURHINIDAE			
<i>Burhinus senegalensis senegalensis</i>			
- West Africa	(2)		
<i>Burhinus senegalensis inornatus</i>			
- North-east & Eastern Africa	(2)		
GLAREOLIDAE			
<i>Pluvianus aegyptius aegyptius</i>			
- West Africa		(1)	
- Eastern Africa	(2)		
<i>Glareola pratincola pratincola</i>			
- Western Europe & NW Africa/West Africa	2		
- Black Sea & E Mediterranean/Eastern Sahel zone	2		
- SW Asia/SW Asia & NE Africa		(1)	
<i>Glareola nordmanni</i>			
- SE Europe & Western Asia/Southern Africa	3b 3c		
<i>Glareola ocularis</i>			
- Madagascar/East Africa	(2)		
<i>Glareola nuchalis nuchalis</i>			
- Eastern & Central Africa		(1)	
<i>Glareola nuchalis liberiae</i>			
- West Africa	(2)		
<i>Glareola cinerea cinerea</i>			
- SE West Africa & Central Africa	(2)		
CHARADRIIDAE			
<i>Pluvialis apricaria apricaria</i>			
- Britain, Ireland, Denmark, Germany & Baltic (bre)	3c*		
<i>Pluvialis apricaria altifrons</i>			
- Iceland & Faroes/East Atlantic coast			1
- Northern Europe/Western Europe & NW Africa			1
- Northern Siberia/Caspian & Asia Minor		(1)	

	A	B	C
<i>Pluvialis fulva</i>			
- North-central Siberia/South & SW Asia, NE Africa		(1)	
<i>Pluvialis squatarola</i>			
- W Siberia & Canada/W Europe & W Africa			1
- C & E Siberia/SW Asia, Eastern & Southern Africa		1	
<i>Charadrius hiaticula hiaticula</i>			
- Northern Europe/Europe & North Africa		1	
<i>Charadrius hiaticula psammodytes</i>			
- Canada, Greenland & Iceland/W & S Africa		(2c)	
<i>Charadrius hiaticula tundræ</i>			
- NE Europe & Siberia/SW Asia, E & S Africa			(1)
<i>Charadrius dubius curonicus</i>			
- Europe & North-west Africa/West Africa			1
- West & South-west Asia/Eastern Africa			(1)
<i>Charadrius pecuarius pecuarius</i>			
- Southern & Eastern Africa			(1)
- West Africa		(1)	
<i>Charadrius tricollaris tricollaris</i>			
- Southern & Eastern Africa			1
<i>Charadrius forbesi</i>			
- Western & Central Africa		(1)	
<i>Charadrius pallidus pallidus</i>			
- Southern Africa	2		
<i>Charadrius pallidus venustus</i>			
- Eastern Africa	1c		
<i>Charadrius alexandrinus alexandrinus</i>			
- West Europe & West Mediterranean/West Africa	3c		
- Black Sea & East Mediterranean/Eastern Sahel	3c		
- SW & Central Asia/SW Asia & NE Africa		(1)	
<i>Charadrius marginatus mechowii</i>			
- Southern & Eastern Africa	2		
- West to West-central Africa	2		
<i>Charadrius mongolus pamirensis</i>			
- West-central Asia/SW Asia & Eastern Africa		(1)	
<i>Charadrius leschenaultii columbinus</i>			
- Turkey & SW Asia/E. Mediterranean & Red Sea	1c		
<i>Charadrius leschenaultii crassirostris</i>			
- Caspian & SW Asia/Arabia & NE Africa		(1)	
<i>Charadrius leschenaultii leschenaultii</i>			
- Central Asia/Eastern & Southern Africa		(1)	
<i>Charadrius asiaticus</i>			
- SE Europe & West Asia/E & South-central Africa	3c		
<i>Eudromias morinellus</i>			
- Europe/North-west Africa	(3c)		
- Asia/Middle East		(1)	
<i>Vanellus vanellus</i>			
- Europe/Europe & North Africa		2c	
- Western Asia/South-west Asia			(1)

	A	B	C
<i>Vanellus spinosus</i>			
- Black Sea & Mediterranean (bre)		1	
<i>Vanellus albiceps</i>			
- West & Central Africa		(1)	
<i>Vanellus senegallus senegallus</i>			
- West Africa		(1)	
<i>Vanellus senegallus solitaneus</i>			
- South-west Africa		(1)	
<i>Vanellus senegallus lateralis</i>			
- Eastern & South-east Africa		1	
<i>Vanellus lugubris</i>			
- Southern West Africa	2		
- Central & Eastern Africa	3c		
<i>Vanellus melanopterus minor</i>			
- Southern Africa	1c		
<i>Vanellus coronatus coronatus</i>			
- Eastern & Southern Africa			1
- Central Africa	(2)		
<i>Vanellus coronatus xerophilus</i>			
- South-west Africa		(1)	
<i>Vanellus superciliosus</i>			
- West & Central Africa	(2)		
<i>Vanellus gregarious</i>			
- SE Europe & Western Asia/North-east Africa	1a 1b 1c		
- Central Asian Republics/NW India	1a 1b 1c		
<i>Vanellus leucurus</i>			
- SW Asia/SW Asia & North-east Africa	2		
- Central Asian Republics/South Asia		(1)	
SCOLOPACIDAE			
<i>Scolopax rusticola</i>			
- Europe/South & West Europe & North Africa			1
- Western Siberia/South-west Asia (Caspian)			(1)
<i>Gallinago stenura</i>			
- Northern Siberia/South Asia & Eastern Africa			(1)
<i>Gallinago media</i>			
- Scandinavia/probably West Africa		1	
- Western Siberia & NE Europe/South-east Africa		2c	
<i>Gallinago gallinago gallinago</i>			
- Europe/South & West Europe & NW Africa		2c	
- Western Siberia/South-west Asia & Africa			1
<i>Gallinago gallinago faeroeensis</i>			
- Iceland, Faroes & Northern Scotland/Ireland			1
<i>Lymnocyptes minimus</i>			
- Northern Europe/S & W Europe & West Africa		2b	
- Western Siberia/SW Asia & NE Africa		(1)	

	A	B	C
<i>Limosa limosa limosa</i>			
- Western Europe/NW & West Africa		2c	
- Eastern Europe/Central & Eastern Africa		2c	
- West-central Asia/SW Asia & Eastern Africa		(1)	
<i>Limosa limosa islandica</i>			
- Iceland/Western Europe	3a*		
<i>Limosa lapponica lapponica</i>			
- Northern Europe/Western Europe		2a	
<i>Limosa lapponica taymyrensis</i>			
- Western Siberia/West & South-west Africa		2a 2c	
<i>Limosa lapponica menzbieri</i>			
- Central Siberia/South & SW Asia & Eastern Africa			(1)
<i>Numenius phaeopus phaeopus</i>			
- Northern Europe/West Africa			(1)
- West Siberia/Southern & Eastern Africa			(1)
<i>Numenius phaeopus islandicus</i>			
- Iceland, Faroes & Scotland/West Africa			1
<i>Numenius phaeopus alboaxillaris</i>			
- South-west Asia/Eastern Africa	1c		
<i>Numenius tenuirostris</i>			
- Central Siberia/Mediterranean & SW Asia	1a 1b 1c		
<i>Numenius arquata arquata</i>			
- Europe/Europe, North & West Africa			1
<i>Numenius arquata orientalis</i>			
- Western Siberia/SW Asia, E & S Africa	3c		
<i>Numenius arquata suschkini</i>			
- South-east Europe & South-west Asia (bre)	2		
<i>Tringa erythropus</i>			
- N Europe/Southern Europe, North & West Africa			(1)
- Western Siberia/SW Asia, NE & Eastern Africa		(1)	
<i>Tringa totanus totanus</i>			
- NW Europe/W Europe, NW & West Africa		2c	
- Central & East Europe/East Mediterranean & Africa		2c	
<i>Tringa totanus Britannica</i>			
- Britain & Ireland/Britain, Ireland, France		2c	
<i>Tringa totanus ussuriensis</i>			
- Western Asia/SW Asia, NE & Eastern Africa			(1)
<i>Tringa totanus robusta</i>			
- Iceland & Faroes/Western Europe			1
<i>Tringa stagnatilis</i>			
- Eastern Europe/West & Central Africa		(1)	
- Western Asia/SW Asia, Eastern & Southern Africa		(1)	
<i>Tringa nebularia</i>			
- Northern Europe/SW Europe, NW & West Africa			1
- Western Siberia/SW Asia, E & S Africa			(1)
<i>Tringa ochropus</i>			
- Northern Europe/S & W Europe, West Africa			1
- Western Siberia/SW Asia, NE & Eastern Africa			(1)

	A	B	C
<i>Tringa glareola</i>			
- North-west Europe/West Africa		2c	
- NE Europe & W Siberia/Eastern & Southern Africa			(1)
<i>Tringa cinerea</i>			
- NE Europe & W Siberia/SW Asia, E & S Africa			1
<i>Tringa hypoleucos</i>			
- West & Central Europe/West Africa			1
- E Europe & W Siberia/Central, E & S Africa			(1)
<i>Arenaria interpres interpres</i>			
- NE Canada & Greenland/W Europe & NW Africa		1	
- Northern Europe/West Africa		1	
- West & Central Siberia/SW Asia, E & S Africa			(1)
<i>Tringa glareola</i>			
<i>Calidris tenuirostris</i>			
- Eastern Siberia/SW Asia & W Southern Asia	1c		
<i>Calidris canutus canutus</i>			
- Northern Siberia/West & Southern Africa		2a 2c	
<i>Calidris canutus islandica</i>			
- NE Canada & Greenland/Western Europe		2a 2c	
<i>Calidris alba</i>			
- East Atlantic Europe, West & Southern Africa (win)			1
- South-west Asia, Eastern & Southern Africa (win)			1
<i>Calidris minuta</i>			
- N Europe/S Europe, North & West Africa		(2c)	
- Western Siberia/SW Asia, E & S Africa			(1)
<i>Calidris temminckii</i>			
- Fennoscandia/North & West Africa		(1)	
- NE Europe & W Siberia/SW Asia & Eastern Africa			(1)
<i>Calidris maritima maritima</i>			
- North & West Europe (excluding Iceland) (win)		1	
<i>Calidris alpina alpina</i>			
- NE Europe & NW Siberia/W Europe & NW Africa			1
<i>Calidris alpina centralis</i>			
- Central Siberia/SW Asia & NE Africa			(1)
<i>Calidris alpina schinzii</i>			
- Iceland & Greenland/NW and West Africa			1
- Britain & Ireland/SW Europe & NW Africa	2		
- Baltic/SW Europe & NW Africa	1c		
<i>Calidris alpina arctica</i>			
- NE Greenland/West Africa	3a		
<i>Calidris ferruginea</i>			
- Western Siberia/West Africa			1
- Central Siberia/SW Asia, E & S Africa			1
<i>Limicola falcinellus falcinellus</i>			
- Northern Europe/SW Asia & Africa	3c		
<i>Philomachus pugnax</i>			
- Northern Europe & Western Siberia/West Africa		2c	
- Northern Siberia/SW Asia, E & S Africa		(2c)	

	A	B	C
<i>Phalaropus lobatus</i>			
- Western Eurasia/Arabian Sea			1
<i>Phalaropus fulicaria</i>			
- Canada & Greenland/Atlantic coast of Africa			(1)
LARIDAE			
<i>Larus leucophthalmus</i>			
- Red Sea & nearby coasts	1a 2		
<i>Larus hemprichii</i>			
- Red Sea, Gulf, Arabia & Eastern Africa		2a	
<i>Larus canus canus</i>			
- NW & Cent. Europe/Atlantic coast & Mediterranean		2c	
<i>Larus canus heinei</i>			
- NE Europe & Western Siberia/Black Sea & Caspian		(1)	
<i>Larus audouinii</i>			
- Mediterranean/N & W coasts of Africa	1a 3a		
<i>Larus marinus</i>			
- North & West Europe			1
<i>Larus dominicanus vetula</i>			
- Coastal Southern Africa		1	
<i>Larus hyperboreus hyperboreus</i>			
- Svalbard & N Russia (bre)			(1)
<i>Larus hyperboreus leuceteres</i>			
- Canada, Greenland & Iceland (bre)			(1)
<i>Larus glaucooides glaucooides</i>			
- Greenland/Iceland & North-west Europe			1
<i>Larus argentatus argentatus</i>			
- North & North-west Europe			1
<i>Larus argentatus argenteus</i>			
- Iceland & Western Europe			1
<i>Larus heuglini</i>			
- NE Europe & W Siberia/SW Asia & NE Africa			(1)
<i>Larus (heuglini) barabensis</i>			
- South-west Siberia/South-west Asia			(1)
<i>Larus armenicus</i>			
- Armenia, Eastern Turkey & NW Iran	3a		
<i>Larus cachinnans cachinnans</i>			
- Black Sea & Western Asia/SW Asia, NE Africa			1
<i>Larus cachinnans michahellis</i>			
- Mediterranean, Iberia & Morocco			1
<i>Larus fuscus fuscus</i>			
- NE Europe/Black Sea, SW Asia & Eastern Africa		(2c)	
<i>Larus fuscus graellsii</i>			
- Western Europe/Mediterranean & West Africa			1
<i>Larus ichthyaetus</i>			
- Black Sea & Caspian/South-west Asia	3a		

	A	B	C
<i>Larus cirrocephalus poiocephalus</i>			
- West Africa		(1)	
- Central & Eastern Africa			(1)
- Coastal Southern Africa (excluding Madagascar)		(1)	
<i>Larus hartlaubii</i>			
- Coastal South-west Africa		1	
<i>Larus ridibundus</i>			
- W Europe/W Europe, W Mediterranean, West Africa			1
- East Europe/Black Sea & East Mediterranean			1
- West Asia/SW Asia & NE Africa			(1)
<i>Larus genei</i>			
- West Africa (bre)	2		
- Black Sea & Mediterranean (bre)		2a	
- West, South-west & South Asia (bre)		2a	
<i>Larus melanocephalus</i>			
- W Europe, Mediterranean & NW Africa		2a	
<i>Larus minutus</i>			
- Central & E Europe/SW Europe & W Mediterranean		1	
- W Asia/E Mediterranean, Black Sea & Caspian		(1)	
<i>Xema sabini sabini</i>			
- Canada & Greenland/SE Atlantic			(1)
<i>Sterna nilotica nilotica</i>			
- Western Europe/West Africa	2		
- Black Sea & East Mediterranean/Eastern Africa	3c		
- West & Central Asia/South-west Asia	2		
<i>Sterna caspia caspia</i>			
- Southern Africa (bre)	1c		
- West Africa (bre)		1	
- Europe (bre)	1c		
- Caspian (bre)	2		
<i>Sterna maxima albidorsalis</i>			
- West Africa (bre)		2a	
<i>Sterna bengalensis bengalensis</i>			
- Gulf/Southern Asia		2a	
<i>Sterna bengalensis par</i>			
- Red Sea/Eastern Africa	3a		
<i>Sterna bengalensis emigrata</i>			
- S Mediterranean/NW & West Africa coasts	1c		
<i>Sterna bergii bergii</i>			
- Southern Africa (Angola – Mozambique)	2		
<i>Sterna bergii enigma</i>			
- Madagascar & Mozambique/Southern Africa	1c		
<i>Sterna bergii thalassina</i>			
- Eastern Africa & Seychelles	1c		
<i>Sterna bergii velox</i>			
- Red Sea & North-east Africa	3a		

	A	B	C
<i>Sterna sandvicensis sandvicensis</i>			
- Western Europe/West Africa		2a	
- Black Sea & Mediterranean (bre)	3a 3c		
- West & Central Asia/South-west & South Asia		2a	
<i>Sterna dougallii dougallii</i>			
- Southern Africa	1c		
- East Africa	3a		
- Europe (bre)	1c		
<i>Sterna dougallii arideensis</i>			
- Madagascar, Seychelles & Mascarenes	2		
<i>Sterna dougallii bangsi</i>			
- North Arabian Sea (Oman)	1c		
<i>Sterna vittata vittata</i>			
- P.Edward, Marion, Crozet & Kerguelen/South Africa	1c		
<i>Sterna vittata tristanensis</i>			
- Tristan da Cunha & Gough/South Africa	1c		
<i>Sterna hirundo hirundo</i>			
- Southern & Western Europe (bre)			1
- Northern & Eastern Europe (bre)			1
- Western Asia (bre)			(1)
<i>Sterna paradisaea</i>			
- Western Eurasia (bre)			1
<i>Sterna albifrons albifrons</i>			
- Eastern Atlantic (bre)	3b		
- Black Sea & East Mediterranean (bre)	3c		
- Caspian (bre)	2		
<i>Sterna albifrons guineae</i>			
- West Africa (bre)	1c		
<i>Sterna saundersi</i>			
- W South Asia, Red Sea, Gulf & Eastern Africa		(1)	
<i>Sterna balaenarum</i>			
- Namibia & South Africa/Atlantic coast to Ghana	2		
<i>Sterna repressa</i>			
- W South Asia, Red Sea, Gulf & Eastern Africa		2c	
<i>Chlidonias hybridus hybridus</i>			
- Western Europe & North-west Africa (bre)	3c		
- Black Sea & East Mediterranean (bre)			(1)
- Caspian (bre)		(1)	
<i>Chlidonias hybridus sclateri</i>			
- Eastern Africa (Kenya & Tanzania)	1c		
- Southern Africa (Malawi & Zambia to South Africa)	(2)		
<i>Chlidonias leucopterus</i>			
- Eastern Europe & Western Asia/Africa			(1)
<i>Chlidonias niger niger</i>			
- Europe & Western Asia/Atlantic coast of Africa		2c	

	A	B	C
<i>RYNCHOPIDAE</i>			
<i>Rynchops flavirostris</i>			
- Coastal West Africa & Central Africa	2		
- Eastern & Southern Africa	2		

Appendix II

Waterbird species to which the agreement applies

SPHENISCIDAE

Spheniscus demersus African Penguin

GAVIIDAE

Gavia stellata Red-throated Diver
Gavia arctica Black-throated Diver
Gavia immer Great Northern Diver
Gavia adamsii White-billed Diver

PODICIPEDIDAE

Tachybaptus ruficollis Little Grebe
Podiceps cristatus Great Crested Grebe
Podiceps grisegena Red-necked Grebe
Podiceps auritus Slavonian Grebe
Podiceps nigricollis Black-necked Grebe

PELECANIDAE

Pelecanus onocrotalus Great White Pelican
Pelecanus rufescens Pink-backed Pelican
Pelecanus crispus Dalmatian Pelican

SULIDAE

Sula (Morus) capensis Cape Gannet

PHALACROCORACIDAE

Phalacrocorax coronatus Crowned Cormorant
Phalacrocorax pygmeus Pygmy Cormorant
Phalacrocorax neglectus Bank Cormorant
Phalacrocorax carbo Great Cormorant
Phalacrocorax nigrogularis Socotra Cormorant
Phalacrocorax capensis Cape Cormorant

ARDEIDAE

Egretta ardesiaca Black Heron
Egretta vinaceigula Slaty Egret
Egretta garzetta Little Egret
Egretta gularis Western Reef Egret
Egretta dimorpha Mascarene Reef Egret
Ardea cinerea Grey Heron
Ardea melanocephala Black-headed Heron
Ardea purpurea Purple Heron

<i>Casmerodius albus</i>	Great Egret
<i>Mesophoyx intermedia</i>	Intermediate Egret
<i>Bubulcus ibis</i>	Cattle Egret
<i>Ardeola ralloides</i>	Squacco Heron
<i>Ardeola idae</i>	Madagascar Pond-Heron
<i>Ardeola rufiventris</i>	Rufous-bellied Heron
<i>Nycticorax nycticorax</i>	Black-crowned Night-Heron
<i>Ixobrychus minutus</i>	Little Bittern
<i>Ixobrychus sturmii</i>	Dwarf Bittern
<i>Botaurus stellaris</i>	Great Bittern

CICONIIDAE

<i>Mycteria ibis</i>	Yellow-billed Stork
<i>Anastomus lamelligerus</i>	African Openbill
<i>Ciconia nigra</i>	Black Stork
<i>Ciconia abdimii</i>	Abdim's Stork
<i>Ciconia episcopus</i>	Woolly-necked Stork
<i>Ciconia ciconia</i>	White Stork
<i>Leptoptilos crumeniferus</i>	Marabou Stork

BALAENICIPITIDAE

<i>Balaeniceps rex</i>	Shoebill
------------------------	----------

THRESKIORNITHIDAE

<i>Plegadis falcinellus</i>	Glossy Ibis
<i>Geronticus eremita</i>	Waldrapp
<i>Threskiornis aethiopicus</i>	Sacred Ibis
<i>Platalea leucorodia</i>	Eurasian Spoonbill
<i>Platalea alba</i>	African Spoonbill

PHOENICOPTERIDAE

<i>Phoenicopterus ruber</i>	Greater Flamingo
<i>Phoenicopterus minor</i>	Lesser Flamingo

ANATIDAE

<i>Dendrocygna bicolor</i>	Fulvous Whistling-Duck
<i>Dendrocygna viduata</i>	White-faced Whistling-Duck
<i>Thalassornis leuconotus</i>	White-backed Duck
<i>Oxyura leucocephala</i>	White-headed Duck
<i>Oxyura maccoa</i>	Maccoa Duck
<i>Cygnus olor</i>	Mute Swan
<i>Cygnus cygnus</i>	Whooper Swan
<i>Cygnus columbianus</i>	Bewick's Swan
<i>Anser brachyrhynchus</i>	Pink-footed Goose
<i>Anser fabalis</i>	Bean Goose
<i>Anser albifrons</i>	Greater White-fronted Goose

<i>Anser erythropus</i>	Lesser White-fronted Goose
<i>Anser anser</i>	Greylag Goose
<i>Branta leucopsis</i>	Barnacle Goose
<i>Branta bernicla</i>	Brent Goose
<i>Branta ruficollis</i>	Red-breasted Goose
<i>Alopochen aegyptiacus</i>	Egyptian Goose
<i>Tadorna ferruginea</i>	Ruddy Shelduck
<i>Tadorna cana</i>	South African Shelduck
<i>Tadorna tadorna</i>	Common Shelduck
<i>Plectropterus gambensis</i>	Spur-winged Goose
<i>Sarkidiornis melanotos</i>	Comb Duck
<i>Nettapus auritus</i>	African Pygmy-goose
<i>Anas penelope</i>	Eurasian Wigeon
<i>Anas strepera</i>	Gadwall
<i>Anas crecca</i>	Common Teal
<i>Anas capensis</i>	Cape Teal
<i>Anas platyrhynchos</i>	Mallard
<i>Anas undulata</i>	Yellow-billed Duck
<i>Anas acuta</i>	Northern Pintail
<i>Anas erythrorhynchos</i>	Red-billed Duck
<i>Anas hottentota</i>	Hottentot Teal
<i>Anas querquedula</i>	Garganey
<i>Anas clypeata</i>	Northern Shoveler
<i>Marmaronetta angustirostris</i>	Marbled Teal
<i>Netta rufina</i>	Red-crested Pochard
<i>Netta erythrophthalma</i>	Southern Pochard
<i>Aythya ferina</i>	Common Pochard
<i>Aythya nyroca</i>	Ferruginous Pochard
<i>Aythya fuligula</i>	Tufted Duck
<i>Aythya marila</i>	Greater Scaup
<i>Somateria mollissima</i>	Common Eider
<i>Somateria spectabilis</i>	King Eider
<i>Polysticta stelleri</i>	Steller's Eider
<i>Clangula hyemalis</i>	Long-tailed Duck
<i>Melanitta nigra</i>	Common Scoter
<i>Melanitta fusca</i>	Velvet Scoter
<i>Bucephala clangula</i>	Common Goldeneye
<i>Mergus albellus</i>	Smew
<i>Mergus serrator</i>	Red-breasted Merganser
<i>Mergus merganser</i>	Goosander

GRUIDAE

<i>Balearica pavonina</i>	Black Crowned Crane
<i>Balearica regulorum</i>	Grey Crowned Crane
<i>Grus leucogeranus</i>	Siberian Crane
<i>Grus virgo</i>	Demoiselle Crane
<i>Grus paradisea</i>	Blue Crane
<i>Grus carunculatus</i>	Wattled Crane
<i>Grus grus</i>	Common Crane

RALLIDAE

<i>Sarothrura elegans</i>	Buff-spotted Flufftail
<i>Sarothrura boehmi</i>	Streaky-breasted Flufftail
<i>Sarothrura ayresi</i>	White-winged Flufftail
<i>Rallus aquaticus</i>	Water Rail
<i>Rallus caerulescens</i>	African Rail
<i>Crecoptis egregia</i>	African Crake
<i>Crex crex</i>	Corncrake
<i>Amaurornis flavirostris</i>	Black Crake
<i>Porzana parva</i>	Little Crake
<i>Porzana pusilla</i>	Baillon's Crake
<i>Porzana porzana</i>	Spotted Crake
<i>Aenigmatolimnas marginalis</i>	Striped Crake
<i>Porphyrio alleni</i>	Allen's Gallinule
<i>Gallinula chloropus</i>	Common Moorhen
<i>Gallinula angulata</i>	Lesser Moorhen
<i>Fulica cristata</i>	Red-knobbed Coot
<i>Fulica atra</i>	Common Coot

DROMADIDAE

<i>Dromas ardeola</i>	Crab Plover
-----------------------	-------------

HAEMATOPODIDAE

<i>Haematopus ostralegus</i>	Eurasian Oystercatcher
<i>Haematopus moquini</i>	African Black Oystercatcher

RECURVIROSTRIDAE

<i>Himantopus himantopus</i>	Black-winged Stilt
<i>Recurvirostra avosetta</i>	Pied Avocet

BURHINIDAE

<i>Burhinus senegalensis</i>	Senegal Thick-knee
------------------------------	--------------------

GLAREOLIDAE

<i>Pluvianus aegyptius</i>	Egyptian Plover
<i>Glareola pratincola</i>	Collared Pratincole
<i>Glareola nordmanni</i>	Black-winged Pratincole
<i>Glareola ocularis</i>	Madagascar Pratincole
<i>Glareola nuchalis</i>	Rock Pratincole
<i>Glareola cinerea</i>	Grey Pratincole

CHARADRIIDAE

<i>Pluvialis apricaria</i>	Eurasian Golden Plover
<i>Pluvialis fulva</i>	Pacific Golden Plover

<i>Pluvialis squatarola</i>	Grey Plover
<i>Charadrius hiaticula</i>	Common Ringed Plover
<i>Charadrius dubius</i>	Little Ringed Plover
<i>Charadrius pecuarius</i>	Kittlitz's Plover
<i>Charadrius tricollaris</i>	Three-banded Plover
<i>Charadrius forbesi</i>	Forbes's Plover
<i>Charadrius pallidus</i>	Chestnut-banded Plover
<i>Charadrius alexandrinus</i>	Kentish Plover
<i>Charadrius marginatus</i>	White-fronted Plover
<i>Charadrius mongolus</i>	Mongolian Plover
<i>Charadrius leschenaultii</i>	Greater Sandplover
<i>Charadrius asiaticus</i>	Caspian Plover
<i>Eudromias morinellus</i>	Eurasian Dotterel
<i>Vanellus vanellus</i>	Northern Lapwing
<i>Vanellus spinosus</i>	Spur-winged Plover
<i>Vanellus albiceps</i>	White-headed Lapwing
<i>Vanellus senegallus</i>	Wattled Lapwing
<i>Vanellus lugubris</i>	Senegal Lapwing
<i>Vanellus melanopterus</i>	Black-winged Lapwing
<i>Vanellus coronatus</i>	Crowned Lapwing
<i>Vanellus superciliosus</i>	Brown-chested Lapwing
<i>Vanellus gregarius</i>	Sociable Plover
<i>Vanellus leucurus</i>	White-tailed Plover

SCOLOPACIDAE

<i>Scolopax rusticola</i>	Eurasian Woodcock
<i>Gallinago stenura</i>	Pintail Snipe
<i>Gallinago media</i>	Great Snipe
<i>Gallinago gallinago</i>	Common Snipe
<i>Lymnocyptes minimus</i>	Jack Snipe
<i>Limosa limosa</i>	Black-tailed Godwit
<i>Limosa lapponica</i>	Bar-tailed Godwit
<i>Numenius phaeopus</i>	Whimbrel
<i>Numenius tenuirostris</i>	Slender-billed Curlew
<i>Numenius arquata</i>	Eurasian Curlew
<i>Tringa erythropus</i>	Spotted Redshank
<i>Tringa totanus</i>	Common Redshank
<i>Tringa stagnatilis</i>	Marsh Sandpiper
<i>Tringa nebularia</i>	Common Greenshank
<i>Tringa ochropus</i>	Green Sandpiper
<i>Tringa glareola</i>	Wood Sandpiper
<i>Tringa cinerea</i>	Terek Sandpiper
<i>Tringa hypoleucos</i>	Common Sandpiper
<i>Arenaria interpres</i>	Ruddy Turnstone
<i>Calidris tenuirostris</i>	Great Knot
<i>Calidris canutus</i>	Red Knot
<i>Calidris alba</i>	Sanderling
<i>Calidris minuta</i>	Little Stint
<i>Calidris temminckii</i>	Temminck's Stint
<i>Calidris maritima</i>	Purple Sandpiper

<i>Calidris alpina</i>	Dunlin
<i>Calidris ferruginea</i>	Curlew Sandpiper
<i>Limicola falcinellus</i>	Broad-billed Sandpiper
<i>Philomachus pugnax</i>	Ruff
<i>Phalaropus lobatus</i>	Red-necked Phalarope
<i>Phalaropus fulicaria</i>	Grey Phalarope

LARIDAE

<i>Larus leucophthalmus</i>	White-eyed Gull
<i>Larus hemprichii</i>	Sooty Gull
<i>Larus canus</i>	Common Gull
<i>Larus audouinii</i>	Audouin's Gull
<i>Larus marinus</i>	Great Black-backed Gull
<i>Larus dominicanus</i>	Kelp Gull
<i>Larus hyperboreus</i>	Glaucous Gull
<i>Larus glaucoides</i>	Iceland Gull
<i>Larus argentatus</i>	Herring Gull
<i>Larus heuglini</i>	Heuglin's Gull
<i>Larus armenicus</i>	Armenian Gull
<i>Larus cachinnans</i>	Yellow-legged Gull
<i>Larus fuscus</i>	Lesser Black-backed Gull
<i>Larus ichthyaetus</i>	Great Black-headed Gull
<i>Larus cirrocephalus</i>	Grey-headed Gull
<i>Larus hartlaubii</i>	Hartlaub's Gull
<i>Larus ridibundus</i>	Common Black-headed Gull
<i>Larus genei</i>	Slender-billed Gull
<i>Larus melanocephalus</i>	Mediterranean Gull
<i>Larus minutus</i>	Little Gull
<i>Xema sabini</i>	Sabine's Gull
<i>Sterna nilotica</i>	Gull-billed Tern
<i>Sterna caspia</i>	Caspian Tern
<i>Sterna maxima</i>	Royal Tern
<i>Sterna bengalensis</i>	Lesser Crested Tern
<i>Sterna bergii</i>	Great Crested Tern
<i>Sterna sandvicensis</i>	Sandwich Tern
<i>Sterna dougallii</i>	Roseate Tern
<i>Sterna vittata</i>	Antarctic Tern
<i>Sterna hirundo</i>	Common Tern
<i>Sterna paradisaea</i>	Arctic Tern
<i>Sterna albifrons</i>	Little Tern
<i>Sterna saundersi</i>	Saunders's Tern
<i>Sterna balaenarum</i>	Damara Tern
<i>Sterna repressa</i>	White-cheeked Tern
<i>Chlidonias hybridus</i>	Whiskered Tern
<i>Chlidonias leucopterus</i>	White-winged Tern
<i>Chlidonias niger</i>	Black Tern

RYNCHOPIDAE

<i>Rynchops flavirostris</i>	African Skimmer
------------------------------	-----------------

RESOLUTION 2.2

PHASING OUT LEAD SHOT FOR HUNTING IN WETLANDS

Recalling paragraph 4.1.4 of the text of the Action Plan to the Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds, stating that Parties shall endeavour to phase out the use of lead shot for hunting in wetlands by the year 2000,

Recognizing that, as outlined in the initial guidelines on sustainable harvest of migratory waterbirds contained in document AEWA/MOP1.8, lead poisoning is an unacceptable waste of the waterbird resource,

Recalling Resolution 1.14 of the first Meeting of the Parties to the Agreement, requesting the Technical Committee to review the developments regarding the phasing out of lead shot and to make recommendations,

Noting that that review shows that implementation of paragraph 4.1.4 of the Action Plan is still highly insufficient in the majority of Range States,

Noting also that experiences of European countries which have phased out the use of lead shot are positive and that the use of alternative shot is proving satisfactory,

Concluding, however, from this review, as also outlined in the initial guidelines on emergency situations contained in document AEWA/MOP1.8, that the main impeding factor to compliance is a lack of information and communication, and that therefore raising public awareness of the dangers of toxic shot and the availability and affordability of alternatives are an important issue,

Acknowledging that some Range States lack the expertise and finances to set up such information and communication networks,

Convinced that further action is needed to improve the situation,

The Meeting of the Parties:

1. *Calls upon* Contracting Parties to enhance their efforts to phase out the use of lead shot in wetlands as soon as possible, in accordance with the recommendations issued by the Technical Committee in its lead poisoning review – namely, to promote communication between, and awareness within, authorities and the hunting community; to allocate resources for the enforcement of relevant laws; and to stimulate and facilitate the production and availability of non-toxic shot - and to actively inform themselves on the issue and its solutions;
2. *Calls upon* Contracting Parties to report to each ordinary session of the Meeting of the Parties on progress made to phase out lead shot in accordance with self-imposed and published timetables, and specify how they plan to overcome any problems encountered;
3. *Urges* Contracting Parties which have already phased out the use of lead shot in wetlands, or which are in the process of doing so, actively to contribute their experiences to the international hunting community and to the Agreement Secretariat;

4. *Requests* the Agreement Secretariat to gather and disseminate knowledge and expertise at the international level by making information materials (such as articles in hunters' magazines and brochures) available to those countries which have shown a need of this, and furthermore by organizing additional theoretical and practical workshops for hunters in different regions as appropriate;
5. *Requests* the Agreement Secretariat to assist countries, especially developing countries and those in economic transition, to achieve the phasing out of lead shot;
6. *Invites* the European Commission, through the Sustainable Hunting Initiative, to allocate, in consultation with the Agreement Secretariat, financial support to carry out awareness-raising activities leading to the development and implementation of national legislation concerning the use of non-toxic shot;
7. *Invites* the international federations of hunting associations to encourage training and to distribute the necessary information to hunters;
8. *Encourages* all ammunition manufacturers actively to promote the use of non-toxic shot and to provide the appropriate information on its use;
9. *Requests* the Technical Committee to review the experiences of those countries that have phased out, or are endeavouring to phase out, the use of lead shot for hunting in wetlands, in consultation with hunting organizations, gun and ammunition manufacturers and traders, and to map the situation in all the Range States, and accordingly bring elaborate guidance to the Meeting of the Parties at its third session.

RESOLUTION 2.3

CONSERVATION GUIDELINES

Recalling Resolution 1.10 adopted by the Meeting of the Parties at its first session, which took place in South Africa in 1999, regarding the initial guidelines in the sense of article IV of the Agreement, as guidance for the Contracting Parties in the implementation of the Agreement and its Action Plan;

Appreciating that the Technical Committee, in accordance with paragraph 2 of Resolution 1.10, has sought further input to the initial guidelines which, together with the comments received from the participants at the first Meeting of the Parties, have been taken into consideration during the revision of the guidelines,

Aware of Decision VI/23 of the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity on alien species that threaten ecosystems, habitats and species, including Guiding Principles on Invasive Alien Species,

Further recalling the international implementation priorities 2000-2004 as adopted by the first Meeting of the Parties, which contains, inter alia, proposals for drafting additional conservation guidelines on specific topics;

Convinced of the necessity that all Parties and Range States of the Agreement shall implement the Agreement in a similar and coherent way,

Noting that these conservation guidelines provide a common framework for action but have no legally binding effect,

The Meeting of Parties:

1. *Takes note of* the conservation guidelines on national legislation for migratory waterbirds as contained in AEW/MOP2.12 and of the conservation guideline on avoidance of introductions of non-native migratory waterbird species as contained in AEW/MOP2.13, in the sense of article IV of the Agreement, and accepts them as interim guidance for Contracting Parties in the implementation of its Action Plan;
2. *Calls upon* Contracting Parties to utilize the interim guidelines in a practical way that leads to a minimum of additional bureaucracy and that recognizes the different social, economic and environmental conditions within the Agreement area;
3. *Urges* the bilateral and multilateral donor agencies involved directly or indirectly in waterbird conservation, to take into consideration document AEW/MOP2.12 and AEW/MOP2.13 and the priorities for action at national and international level identified therein;
4. *Invites* multilateral environmental agreements, for example, the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Convention on the Conservation of Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat, to take note of the interim guidelines as a basis for the development of guidelines related to the control of non-native waterbirds at the global level;

5. *Instructs* the Secretariat and the Technical Committee, within available resources and in consultation with Parties and appropriate organizations, to review all the existing AEWA guidelines regularly, in particular taking account of the additional comments provided by participants to the Meeting of the Parties;

6. *Further instructs* the Secretariat to disseminate the interim conservation guidelines (AEWA/MOP2.12 and AEWA/ MOP2.13) widely and to monitor if the interim guidelines are being used to implement the Agreement.

RESOLUTION 2.4

INTERNATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION PRIORITIES FOR 2003 – 2007

Aware that resources for the implementation of the Agreement (information, expertise and funds) are unequally distributed throughout the Agreement area, and that an effective implementation of the Agreement will require strong international cooperation,

Considering that Contracting Parties, particularly developing countries and countries with economies in transition, require a clear prioritization of activities in order to apply their limited resources most effectively,

Further considering that bilateral and multilateral donors will be greatly assisted in their allocation of funds for international cooperation by a clear prioritization of needs,

Recalling that article V, paragraph 4 of the Agreement encourages Parties to provide training and technical and financial support to other Parties on a multilateral and bilateral basis to assist them in implementing the provisions of the Agreement,

Appreciating the support provided by the Global Environment Facility to develop a project proposal for “Enhancing Conservation of the Critical Network of Wetlands required by Migratory Waterbirds on the African-Eurasian Flyways”,

Further appreciating the support provided by Contracting Parties and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations for the implementation of the international implementation priorities 2000-2004,

Noting the rapid increase in the number of Parties to AEWA and the need to provide support for the establishment of national waterbird censuses as a contribution to the International Waterbird Census and other monitoring programmes,

The Meeting of the Parties:

1. *Adopts* the international implementation priorities for 2003-2007, as contained in document, AEWA/MOP2.19/Rev.1 and appended to the present resolution, which is updated and amended on the basis of the implementation priorities for 2000-2004, approved by the Meeting of the Parties at its first session in Resolution 1.9, as the medium-term priorities for international cooperation activities for implementation of the Agreement;
2. *Requests* the support of the Global Environment Facility to approve the full African-Eurasian Flyways project, which could substantially assist eligible countries with the joint implementation of priority actions of the Agreement and the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Wildfowl Habitat for the network of critical wetlands used by migratory waterbirds in Africa and Eurasia;
3. *Notes* the particular importance of:
 - (a) How migratory waterbird and habitat conservation on the ground can contribute to sustainable development, particularly in developing countries and countries with economies in transition;

(b) Identifying the key sites network and migration patterns of the species covered by the Agreement;

(c) Supporting the further development of the International Waterbird Census in Africa, the Middle East and Central Asia;

4. *Urges* Contracting Parties and specialized international organizations to develop new international cooperation projects for the implementation of the Agreement, according to the priorities outlined in document AEWA/MOP2.19/Rev.1, and to keep the Agreement Secretariat fully informed of progress;

5. *Further urges* Contracting Parties, the Agreement Secretariat and specialized international organizations to seek innovative mechanisms and partnerships to enable implementation of the priorities listed in AEWA/ MOP 2.19/Rev.1, in particular by providing matching funds to the full African-Eurasian Flyways project under development, including joint ventures, twinning arrangements, secondments and exchange programmes, corporate-sector sponsorships and species adoption programmes;

6. *Requests* bilateral and multilateral donors to provide financial assistance to developing countries and countries with economies in transition for the implementation of the Agreement, by supporting implementation of the priorities listed in document AEWA/MOP2.19/Rev.1;

7. *Instructs* the Agreement Secretariat to disseminate the international implementation priorities for 2004-2007 (AEWA/MOP2.19/Rev.1), to coordinate closely with related conventions and international organizations for their implementation, to seek appropriate donors, and, following the recommendations of the Technical Committee, to bring to each future session of the Meeting of the Parties reports on progress with implementation and an updated list of priorities;

8. *Requests* bilateral and multilateral donors to provide financial assistance to maintain and strengthen the International Waterbird Census as a tool to provide information and empirical data for the management and conservation of migratory waterbirds within the AEWA area and as a contribution to the AEWA Conservation Status report and the global waterbird population estimates, in synergy with existing programmes.

PROPOSAL FOR IMPLEMENTATION PRIORITIES FOR 2003-2007

Introduction

1. The following list of priority activities has been established to assist Contracting Parties, donors and other stakeholders to further the implementation of the Action Plan of the Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds during the period 2003-2007.
2. At the first session of the Meeting of the Parties to the Agreement, which took place from 6 to 9 November 1999 in Cape Town (South Africa), the international implementation priorities for 2000-2004 were adopted in Resolution 1.4. Wetlands International was asked by the AEWA Secretariat to update the list and to present the priorities for the period 2003-2007.

Implementation Priorities 2000-2004 as the basis

3. In a separate document (AEWA/MOP2.10) the implementation status of the priorities over the period 2000-2004 is presented, focussing on actions undertaken or in progress within the AEWA framework (more may have been undertaken by individual countries or other agencies in a different context). Document AEWA/MOP2.10 shows that, although there was considerable progress, many priorities have not yet been implemented, mainly because of a lack of funding. Priorities that have been or are currently implemented do not re-appear in the present list of 2003-2007 priorities.

Consultation

4. In order to identify the most important changes and additions that were needed to the existing implementation priorities, the AEWA Secretariat and Wetlands International set up a wide consultation. The updated list is based on an extensive consultation with the Range States and a large expert network, including research institutes, conservation non-governmental organizations, specialist groups and others. Comments were received from 3 Range States and a number of coordinators from Wetlands International specialist groups and other experts. The consultation made clear that, although quite a few of the activities from the list as adopted in 1999 have been implemented, the remaining list of activities is still valid.

Nature of suggested changes

5. The external consultation network has proposed a limited number of suggestions to change existing priorities. Most of the suggestions for changes could easily be included in the existing formulation of the priority activities. Several of the suggestions dealt with a more practical or logical way the activities could be organized.

6. Important suggestions for change of existing priorities that have been included are climate change aspect in no.9; by-catch problems in no.24; better use of ringing data in no. 19; and aerial surveys in developing countries in no. 29.
7. Suggestions for additional priority activities are more numerous. They are presented in **Bold** and *Italics* for discussion purposes. In some cases, what was proposed to be an additional priority appeared, on closer examination, to be an extension to existing priorities. These new components have then been included within the existing priority, printed in *italics*.

Order and format of presentation

8. As in the 2000-2004 version, the presentation of the priorities in the present document follows the headings of the Action Plan to the Agreement. The number(s) in parentheses after each priority title refer(s) to the relevant paragraph of the Agreement's Action Plan. The order of presentation does not reflect any order of priority.
9. For each priority, an indicative budget and timescale is presented for guidance, along with the types of activity involved. It should be noted that the budgets are only indicative. Detailed project proposals and budgets to meet each priority will be required at a later stage and should be the basis for the final fund-raising.

Discussion

10. In the consultation, many of the comments included a remark that during the second Meeting of the Parties to the Agreement a discussion on priorities should take place and that the Parties should establish a list of priorities. This document is providing the basis for that discussion.
11. The priorities include only those requiring international cooperation, and are not intended to reflect national implementation priorities, which must be determined by each Contracting Party and could include more on-the-ground conservation activities. A number of the comments underlined the importance of such activities. Four types of international cooperation will be appropriate in addressing these priorities:
 - (a) Exchange/transfer of information;
 - (b) Cooperative research;
 - (c) Exchange/transfer of expertise;
 - (d) Financial assistance.

IMPLEMENTATION PRIORITIES FOR 2004-2007

A. SPECIES CONSERVATION

1. Implement existing international single species action plans (AP 2.2.1)
Prior to the entry into force of the Agreement, a number of international single species action plans relevant to Paragraph 2.2.1 of the Agreement's Action Plan had already been developed (by BirdLife International, Wetlands International and the International Crane Foundation). These include action plans for: *Phalacrocorax pygmeus*, *Pelecanus crispus*, *Botaurus stellaris*, *Anser erythropus*, *Branta ruficollis*, *Marmaronetta angustirostris*, *Oxyura leucocephala*, *Aythya nyroca*, *Polysticta stellerii*, *Grus leucogeranus*, *Crex crex*, *Fulica cristata*, *Numenius tenuirostris*, *Larus audouinii*, and *Sterna dougallii*. (NB. Several of these action plans cover the European part of the range of the species only, and a priority is to extend them to cover their full range within the Agreement area (see next item)). Whilst many of the actions identified for these species will have to be undertaken and financed at national or local level, a budget is required for international coordination and promotion, and to provide small grants for national and local initiatives.

Indicative budget: US \$ 50,000 min. /species / year (for coordination / grants)
Duration: Annual, ongoing
Activities: Coordination, small grants, evaluation, reporting

2. Develop new international single species action plans (AP 2.2.1, 7.4)
New international single species action plans need to be developed for the populations listed in category 1 of column A of Table 1 to the Agreement Action Plan as a priority, and for those species listed with an asterisk in column A of Table 1. Production and format of the action plans should follow the recommendations given in the relevant conservation guidelines. As soon as the new action plans are prepared for each species, implementation should begin. In view of the large number of action plans to be prepared, it is strongly recommended that the most urgent attention be given to globally threatened species. Furthermore, it is recommended that individual Range States agree to take the lead on development of individual action plans (as an in-kind contribution to the Agreement), in close cooperation with the other Range States for each species (coordination of plan development including workshops, drafting, consultation and publication of each plan). Plans should be submitted to the Technical Committee in draft form before final approval, to ensure harmonization and quality control.

Indicative budget: US \$ 40,000 per species for action plan preparation
Duration: 12 months per plan
Activities: Coordination, workshop, planning, publication

B. HABITAT CONSERVATION

3. Identify all sites of international importance for AEWA species (AP 3.1.2, 7.4)
A vital piece of information for the conservation of any migratory species is an understanding of the network of key sites required to sustain their populations throughout the year. A large body of information already exists concerning key sites for migratory waterbirds (that is, sites which meet the Ramsar criteria of international

importance for waterbirds and Important Bird Areas). This information has largely been collected through the International Waterbird Census of Wetlands International, but also through BirdLife International's Important Bird Areas programme and Endemic Bird Areas programme, wetland inventories (particularly the Directory of Wetlands of the Middle East) and one-off surveys of remote areas. It is proposed to compile from these various existing sources a "matrix" of key sites by Species, which will show all known internationally important sites for each species covered by the Agreement. This matrix will be made available in database form through the World Wide Web as a planning, conservation and awareness tool. The successful presentation of the results of this activity depends on the completion of implementation priority number 4.

Indicative budget: US \$ 125,000
Duration: 2 years
Activities: Desk study, review, database, web site

Being proposed for matching funding as an activity in the full project proposal of the GEF AEWA/Ramsar flyways project that will be submitted at the end of 2002.

4. *Creating an interactive tool that presents information on important sites for migratory waterbirds (AP 3.1.2, 7.4)*

Currently large amounts of data exist in databases on migratory waterbirds (International Waterbird Census) and the sites they depend upon in the AEWA region (Important Bird Areas, Ramsar database). These data reside with the custodians and are not inter-operable at the moment. This hampers the interactive application of these data for flyway conservation purposes. Development of a web-based portal that can integrate data on sites of critical importance to migratory waterbirds from these dispersed sources and that provides the option of interactive data submission through the web, is a priority.

A condition for increasing the 'inter-operability' of essential databases like the International Waterbird Census database and the Important Bird Areas database, but also the Ramsar database, is that they have common geographic references, in the form of digitized boundaries. These do not currently exist to a significant extent and considerable work will need to be done to create these, especially for the International Waterbird Census database. This will be a key activity in creating the tool.

Indicative budget: US \$ 215,000
Duration: 4 years
Activities: Gathering of reliable map data, coordination, data input (digitization of boundaries); database adaptation, portal development, data management, maintenance

Being proposed for matching funding as an activity in the full project proposal of the GEF AEWA/Ramsar flyways project that will be submitted at the end of 2002.

5. Identify priority areas for further survey work (AP 3.1, 7.4)

Based on the study undertaken in Implementation priority number 3 above, a gap analysis should be undertaken to identify sites/regions where migratory waterbirds

would particularly benefit from further surveys. This would be achieved by asking species experts and national focal points to comment on maps based on existing knowledge, and to identify areas of potential importance for migratory waterbirds, but for which survey data are lacking. This would also include identification of areas important for dispersed species (e.g., waders and Anatidae during their breeding season) or very large, complex or composite sites. The results will be used both to stimulate “expedition” work in remote areas, as well as to identify countries which would most benefit from a national wetlands inventory programme.

Indicative budget: US \$ 50,000
Duration: 2 years
Activities: Desk study, consultation, review, publication, survey proposals

Being proposed for matching funding as an activity in the full project proposal of the GEF AEWA/Ramsar flyways project that will be submitted at the end of 2002.

6. Identify priority areas for better protection (AP 3.2, 7.4)

Based on the study undertaken in implementation priority number 3 above, the key sites matrix will be examined to ascertain the degree of existing protection of each site under both international and national legislation. At the international level, this will be achieved by comparison with existing databases on protected areas (e.g. the Ramsar sites database (maintained by Wetlands International), the Natura 2000/Special Programme of Action databases of the European Commission, and the protected areas database (maintained by the World Conservation Monitoring Centre). At national level, information will also be requested from national focal points for the Agreement. The results will be used to assess whether adequate site protection measures are in place to maintain each species under the Agreement in a favourable conservation status. Specific recommendations will be made for species where the network of key sites is thought to be inadequately protected. The study will also list those key sites which are shared between two or more countries, and which require special cooperation measures for effective management.

Indicative budget: US \$ 70,000
Duration: 2 years
Activities: Desk study, review, publication, and recommendations

Being proposed for matching funding as an activity in the full project proposal of the GEF AEWA/Ramsar flyways project that will be submitted at the end of 2002.

7. Habitat Priorities for Waterbirds, particularly in Africa and South-west Asia (AP 3.2, 3.3)

The BirdLife International project Habitat Action Plans for Birds in Europe, has made an important contribution to defining habitat conservation priorities for birds in Europe. This now needs to be made much more specific to waterbird habitats and, particularly, to be extended to Africa and South-west Asia, where habitat requirements are much less well known. The project should result in a series of habitat action plans containing prioritised recommendations and costed projects for each key habitat type. Severely threatened habitats, and habitats of importance to globally threatened species, should be given priority.

Indicative budget: US \$ 200,000
Duration: 3 years
Activities: Desk study, review, workshops, publication, project proposals

8. Restoration and rehabilitation techniques for waterbird habitats, particularly in Africa (AP 3.3)

There has been significant loss and degradation of waterbird habitats throughout the Agreement area. Techniques are relatively well developed for the restoration and rehabilitation of wetlands in temperate regions, but are poorly developed or known for wetlands in the tropics. It is therefore proposed to draw together the available information to produce two manuals (one for temperate and one for tropical areas), including information on the sources of available expertise. Close coordination will be necessary with existing work under the Ramsar Convention. Because of the paucity of information on restoration of tropical waterbird habitats, a special project will be launched to undertake demonstration restoration measures for a small number of African wetlands. These will also be used as a focus for training activities. Restoration techniques will focus on low-cost, low technology management options.

Indicative budget: US \$ 60,000 per manual
US \$ 80,000 minimum for each demonstration project
Duration: 18 months for the manuals
Activities: Manuals, demonstration projects, training courses

C. MANAGEMENT OF HUMAN ACTIVITIES

9. Evaluation of waterbird harvests in the Agreement area (AP 4.1, 5.7)

Waterbirds are harvested widely throughout the Agreement area for sport, trade and subsistence (including by indigenous people). However, little is known of the scale of such harvesting, particularly in Africa and South-west Asia, nor of the impacts that such harvesting has on waterbird populations. The effects of wounding of waterbirds by hunters remain little known and would be a valuable subject for study. It is therefore proposed to examine the location, scale (by species), methods and impacts of waterbird harvest throughout the Agreement area, but with a particular focus on poorly known regions. The project will identify areas, methods or species where harvest may be unsustainable and require intervention, and will feed into the development of future monitoring programmes. The taking of live waterbirds for collections and zoos should be included in this work.

Indicative budget: US \$ 200,000 (can be split into 4-5 sub-projects)
Duration: 3 years
Activities: Reviews, research, survey, publications

10. *Review of the use of non-toxic shot for waterbird hunting (AP 4.1.4)*
The International Waterfowl and Wetlands Research Bureau (now Wetlands International) workshop on Lead Poisoning in Waterfowl (Brussels, 1991), was a landmark event for actions which have subsequently taken place to reduce the impact of lead poisoning in waterbirds. A follow-up international workshop was organised in

2001 in Central Europe, in close cooperation between the AEWA Secretariat, international hunting organisations and others, to share the most up-to-date information on this subject. Wetlands International published an updated report on the implementation of the ban of lead shot. A further workshop is needed in Southern Europe and the update review/reports undertaken by Wetlands International should be continued.

Indicative budget: US \$ 50,000 (workshop); US \$ 50,000 for each review report
Duration: 18 months (workshop); review reports still to be planned 2003
Activities: Workshop, proceedings, 2 triennial review reports

11. Evaluation of socio-economic impacts of waterbird hunting (AP 4.2.2)

Sport, market and subsistence hunting of waterbirds have the potential to contribute substantially to sustainable rural development throughout the Agreement area. Yet, very little is known of the socio-economic benefits of such forms of hunting in different regions and its potential contribution to species and habitat conservation. This project will build on implementation priority number 10 above, and will research the socio-economic benefits of different types of waterbird hunting in different parts of the Agreement area (e.g. subsistence hunting in arctic / sub-arctic areas (including by indigenous populations), tourist or market hunting in Africa, and sport hunting in Europe). Significant work has been undertaken on this subject in North America, and should provide a useful background to the study. The results of the case studies will be presented to a workshop and published to advise future sustainable rural development initiatives.

Indicative budget: US \$ 150,000
Duration: 2.5 years
Activities: Research, socio-economic surveys, workshop, publication

12. Evaluation of waterbirds as agricultural pests in Africa (AP 4.3.2, 4.3.3)

A number of migratory waterbird species covered by the Agreement are known to consume and potentially damage agricultural crops or commercial fish stocks (including those at fish-farms). Although the subject is relatively well studied in Europe, where geese, cormorants and herons are implicated, the situation in Africa is less well known. Here, populations of ducks and waders are reported as pests of rice and other crops. This project will work with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations to review the extent, species involved and location of this problem. The project will involve review of existing knowledge, and a workshop of experts, culminating in a review publication and recommendations on crop protection measures. The need to develop specific action plans for any of the species concerned will also be considered.

Indicative budget: US \$ 100,000
Duration: 2 years
Activities: Review, workshop, publication

13. Guideline on minimizing/mitigating the impacts of infrastructural (and disturbance-related) developments affecting waterbirds (AP 4.3.5, 4.3.6)
Because many waterbirds occur in dense concentrations on individual sites, their conservation status can easily be threatened or impaired by point infrastructure developments (road or bridge-building, factories, oil terminals, tourist developments) or by the associated disturbance. This project will produce new conservation guidelines, recommending the steps to be taken to minimize or mitigate the impacts of such activities.

Indicative budget: US \$ 25,000
Duration: 12 months
Activities: Review, consultation, guidelines

D. RESEARCH AND MONITORING

14. Improving survey and monitoring capacity for migratory waterbirds
Enhancing survey and monitoring capacity for migratory waterbirds and the sites they use through training and by providing equipment. Analysis of the geographic coverage and the quality of the network for data gathering on waterbirds and the sites they use (implementation priority number 6) will show that subregions within the AEWA region can be identified where capacity is lacking or limiting the data quality. Depending on the need of the specific subregion, capacity-building and field survey work will be performed to enhance the quality of the data. Twinning is a potential implementation mechanism whereby countries with higher capacity adopt countries with less well-developed schemes. In addition, in areas where the economic conditions prevent observers buying their own essential optical equipment, technical resources to support the network of volunteers will be provided.

Indicative budget: Based on implementation by experts from the region per country: US \$ 32,500 in the first year, US \$ 20,000 in the second year
Duration: 5 years in total, 2-3 years per country, depending on the needs
Activities: Fieldwork, training, supply of equipment (first year)

Being proposed for matching funding as an activity in the full project proposal of the GEF AEWA/Ramsar flyways project that will be submitted at the end of 2002.

15. Survey work in poorly-known areas (AP 5.1)
There remain many gaps in knowledge of the importance and utilization of even some very large wetlands by migratory waterbirds, particularly in Africa and South-West Asia. Based on existing knowledge of gaps, and also the systematic gap analysis to be undertaken in implementation priority number 6 above, it is recommended that grants (and expertise, if necessary) be made available for locally organized surveys or expeditions, to assess the importance of lesser known areas. Such surveys, if conducted by visiting teams of experts, should involve a high component of training (and equipping) of local experts, and should result in a summary publication. These activities will be closely linked to those required for the next priority (16).

Indicative budget: US \$ 15,000 per survey (average)
Duration: Ongoing
Activities: Field survey, training, publication.

Being proposed for matching funding as an activity in the full project proposal of the GEF AEWA/Ramsar flyways project that will be submitted at the end of 2002.

16. International Waterbird Census – special gap-filling survey (AP 5.2, 5.3, 7.4)
The International Waterbird Census, organized by Wetlands International, and conducted in most countries within the Agreement area, is the primary tool for monitoring the conservation status of the populations covered by AEWA. It is based on annual non-breeding season surveys at a sample of sites, by an extensive network of mainly volunteer counters. As the census is conducted on a sample of sites only, it is necessary to try periodically to achieve a maximum coverage through a full census of as many sites as possible. This will enable better coverage of poorly known species and sites, better population estimates and calibration of population indices.

Wetlands International conducted a pilot project on prioritizing and costing the work for such a gap-filling census. The actual gap-filling has not yet been planned because it depends on the availability of (substantial) funds. This approach will currently only apply to the Western Palearctic and South-West Asia, since the census networks in Africa are insufficiently developed to enable the additional effort required for this extra survey work. Extended coverage in some countries may best be achieved through international field surveys as under implementation priority number 15 above. The project will provide the additional coordination, support, small grants and awareness materials necessary to ensure a successful outcome.

Indicative budget: US \$ 560,000 (including 6 regional workshops (@\$20,000 each), planning/coordination (\$240,000), analysis/report writing (\$200,000))
Plus 20-50 surveys @ US \$10-15,000 each.
Duration: 5 years including planning and report writing
Activities: Planning, regional workshops, coordination, field surveys, publication

Being proposed for matching funding as an activity in the full project proposal of the GEF AEWA/Ramsar flyways project that will be submitted at the end of 2002.

17. Publication of an Atlas of Wader Populations (AP 5.4, 7.4)
A knowledge of the migration patterns of each species covered by the Agreement and the networks of sites visited is critical to establishing effective conservation programmes for migratory waterbirds. This project will follow the model of the very successful Atlas of Anatidae Populations, prepared by Wetlands International, to develop a similar overview for the wader species in the Agreement area. The work is currently under implementation, but part of the funds for finalizing it are still lacking. The work is being led by the Wader Study Group and will result in an important review publication. The results will include recommendations for new international site designations, research and surveys. Because of the scale of the project, it will be addressed in a number of phases.

Indicative budget: An additional US \$ 40,000 (excluding the integration of ringing recovery data) is needed (over US \$ 200,000 already secured)
Duration: 3 years
Activities: Coordination, review, data analysis, publication

18. **Publication of flyway atlases for gulls, terns, herons, ibises, storks and rallidae (AP 5.4, 7.4)**

A first flyway atlas has been produced for Anatidae (1996). The Wader Flyway Atlas is under development (see priority 17). These initiatives have been received with great enthusiasm. They lay the basis for the flyway approach in the conservation of these species. The Anatidae atlas needs a second edition. Similarly, the conservation of other species groups of migratory waterbirds would benefit from flyway atlases being produced for them. This can be done species group by group or in an integrated publication. Ideally the use of ringing recoveries should be integrated into these flyway population atlases (see priority 20).

Indicative budget: Depending on the number of species in the species group up to US \$ 250,000 (excluding the integration of ringing recovery data) per species group atlas.
Duration: 3 years
Activities: Coordination, review, data analysis, drafting and editing text, production of graphics, publication

19. **Pilot study/review of potential from waterbird ringing recovery analyses for the Agreement area (AP 5.4)**

Ringling schemes covering migratory waterbirds exist in many of the countries of the Agreement area, particularly in Europe. Over the last half-century, these schemes have amassed hundreds of thousands of recoveries of ringed birds, yielding potential new information on migration and life histories of the species concerned. Although the European Union for Bird Ringing has made progress in coordinating access to some of these data, there remains a great potential to exploit this information for conservation science. Syntheses have only been undertaken for a few species or countries. However, the task and potential is so great, that in order to prioritize actions, a pilot study should first be undertaken to review the availability of data and the most promising avenues for future research. Thus a desk study should be undertaken, with the input of an advisory group, to summarize the availability of ringing recovery information for waterbirds, and to make recommendations for future projects and analyses, and how ringing programmes can best contribute to the development of AEWA in the future. The study should include possibilities for integrating breeding productivity and survival data derived from ringing studies into waterbird monitoring activity at national and international levels.

Indicative budget: US \$ 50,000
Duration: 18 months
Activities: Desk study, review, expert advisory group, publication

20. Ringling recoveries in atlases (AP 5.4)

Ringling recoveries provide the physical evidence for an individual bird to have traveled from one point to another. Since in many cases the flyway population to which an individual belongs is known, this contributes greatly to visualizing and understanding the concept and delimitation of flyway populations. Mapping ringling recoveries and providing background statistics with them, are a very valuable addition to census information presented in flyway atlases. Ideally therefore, the publication of these data should be combined. For gulls, terns, herons, ibises, storks and rallidae (the species mentioned in implementation priority 18) the integration of these data into one publication is still feasible. For Anatidae another solution will have to be found. For waders, when finalizing the atlas (see priority 17) it will be worthwhile making an effort to include these data into the work that has already been done.

Indicative budget: US \$ 100,000 (aiming at inclusion in flyway atlases (see priority 18), therefore excluding stand alone publication)
Duration: 18 months
Activities: Coordination, data analysis, review, wide consultation, graphical presentation, text drafting, editing

21. Coordination of waterbird ringling schemes, particularly in Africa. (AP 5.4)

Ringling studies have contributed greatly to our current understanding of waterbird migration and ecology. Whilst in Europe, the European Union for Bird Ringling has provided international coordination between the various national ringling schemes, no homologue exists for Africa or South-west Asia. It is proposed to support the development of an African ringling scheme (AFRING), specifically for studies of migratory waterbirds. This will initially be through a coordinated study of intra-African migratory waterbirds. The project will have fixed goals and a five-year timetable.

Indicative budget: US \$ 50,000 per annum
Duration: 5 years
Activities: Coordination, ringling programmes, review, publication

22. Guideline on the use of satellite tracking for migratory waterbirds (AP 5.4)

The development of satellite tracking technology for studying animal migrations has advanced substantially in recent years, and has revolutionized our understanding of the migration ecology of some species. The technique has revealed that certain types of information can be gathered with substantially higher quality and cost-effectiveness than from traditional ringling schemes. However, the technique has only been successfully applied to larger species, and there remain important questions regarding animal welfare. The Scientific Council of CMS is coordinating work on this subject as a whole, but it is proposed to produce conservation guidelines specifically on the use of satellite tracking for migratory waterbirds. In addition, case studies showing the advantages and drawbacks of the technique should be listed, and an assessment of its value in studying globally threatened species should be made.

Indicative budget: US \$ 25,000
Duration: 1 year
Activities: Review, consultation, guidelines

23. **Telemetry in migratory waterbirds**
Besides guidelines on the use of telemetry, a short review of results of tracking methods (other than ringing) would provide essential information for the better understanding of how the technology can be used to provide information on migratory routes, the use of sites by birds during migration and the relation between those and environmental variables – including practical and technical limitations of current technologies, and identification of which groups of birds could or could not be used as a focus for telemetry studies at present. Having this knowledge in hand – a listing of high priority species and/or populations with unknown or uncertain migratory routes, breeding, staging and/or wintering areas – could guide future implementation of telemetry studies towards answering questions of higher conservation importance. Compilation of an overview (e.g., into a web-journal) is necessary.

Indicative budget: US \$ 50,000
Duration: 1 year
Activities: Desk study, consultation, guidelines

24. **Report on the status and trends of populations for the Meeting of the Parties at its third session** (AP 7.4, 5.2)

The Action Plan to the Agreement calls for a report on the status and trends of populations covered by the Agreement to be prepared at intervals of not more than three years. Such information provides the basic material for operation, updating and evaluation of the Agreement. The report should highlight changes in the population status, range or long-term trend of each species, with recommendations on any changes to Table 1 of the Agreement's Action Plan. The review should also assess whether any changes should be made to the species included in Annex 2 to the Agreement, on the basis of a negative or positive change in their conservation status. This project is very closely linked to the regular updating and publication of waterbird population estimates, which provides the basic data for the AEWA report. Therefore, this publication (and an associated web site facility) is also included here as a priority

Indicative budget: US \$ 100,000 for Waterbird Population Estimates;
US \$25,000 for update report to the third Meeting of the Parties
Duration: 3 years
Activities: Review, analysis, consultation, publications

25. **Actions for the conservation of colonial waterbirds** (AP 3.1.2, 3.2, 4.2, 5)

A large proportion of the migratory waterbird species covered by the Agreement nest in colonies (particularly of the families: Pelecanidae, Phalacrocoracidae, Ardeidae, Ciconiidae, Threskiornithidae, Phoenicopteridae, Laridae). For different species, coloniality may be an adaptation for avoidance of predators and for efficient exploitation of food resources. One result of this behaviour is that a very significant proportion of the population of a species may be breeding at one or a few localities at one time. This makes the species particularly vulnerable to habitat change, taking (of eggs, young or adults), disturbance or emergency situations at such sites. On the

positive side, waterbird colonies provide excellent opportunities for ecotourism, research and monitoring, and can be relatively easily protected.

In order to provide guidance to Contracting Parties, it is recommended that two activities be undertaken: i) (a) preparation of conservation guidelines on national actions to be undertaken for colonial waterbirds (establishment of a sites register, protection, monitoring, ecotourism and avoidance of disturbance, restoration and creation of breeding sites etc.); (b) a desk study to explore options, priorities and costings for coordinated international monitoring of colonial waterbirds during the breeding season, since many of these species are not adequately covered by the existing International Waterbird Census, which is based on non-breeding season surveys.

Indicative budget: US \$ 25,000 (guidelines), US \$15,000 (monitoring study)

Duration: 18 months

Activities: Review, analysis, consultation, publications

26. **Population Trends in migratory waterbirds**

Waterbird population data have been gathered for many years now in the International Waterbird Census and some of the data have been used in 1999 to calculate trends for migratory waterbird species (up to 1996). A lot of new census information has been gathered since and techniques for calculating trends have been further improved. It is therefore timely to perform a new trend analysis, for waterbird species group-wide, including data up to at least the year 2000.

Indicative budget: US \$ 75,000

Duration: 1 year

Activities: Data analysis, presentation, drafting text, publication

27. **Causes of population changes in migratory waterbirds**

In order to address effectively the conservation of migratory waterbirds, we need to know more about the major threats and mechanisms that drive changes in their population sizes. Many of the species action plans identify these, species by species. By compiling the information from sources such as these into a comprehensive overview of “causes of population change”, it will become more feasible to address some of these causes horizontally, rather than on a species by species basis.

Indicative budget: US \$ 30,000

Duration: 1 year

Activities: Desk study, consultation, drafting text, publication

28. **Migratory waterbirds and climatic change**

One of the major topics on the environmental agenda is climate change. This will also have a major influence on migratory waterbirds. The way and the extent to which changes in global climate will interact with waterbirds have not been systematically described. A desk study describing these relationships should be undertaken.

Indicative budget: US \$ 25,000

Duration: 1 year

Activities: Desk study, consultation, publication

29. **Flyway population catalogue (or register)**
For countries, regions or sites to be able to assess which flyway populations of migratory waterbirds occur in their area, a register or catalogue of flyway populations against countries is a crucial tool. A call for this tool has been heard on several occasions. This will help to identify which populations estimate and 1 per cent-criterion to use to assess the importance of sites and to assess which flyway populations with unfavourable conservation status occur. This is not in overlap with the flyway atlas initiatives, but it is qualitatively producing a matrix of regions of countries against flyway populations.

*Indicative budget: US \$ 10,000
Duration: 6 months
Activities: Desk study*

30. **Field guide for Central Asia and adjacent countries**
For building sustainable monitoring capacity, the availability of a good field identification guide is essential. For Central Asia and adjacent areas like Siberia and other Range States of the Central Asian-South Asian Flyway such a guide, in the appropriate language (Russian) and targeted at the relevant species is not currently available. The knowledge, the capacity and even the artwork exist to make such a guide, and a guide can be realized in a relatively short time span, if financial resources become available for editing and publishing.

*Indicative budget: US \$ 50,000
Duration: 1 year
Activities: Text drafting, publication (in Russian)*

Being proposed for matching funding as an activity in the full project proposal of the GEF AEWA/Ramsar flyways project that will be submitted at the end of 2002.

31. **Compiling flyway information (in digital format) for use in conjunction with existing waterbird count data and site information**
For Anatidae, an atlas has been produced compiling available flyway information. For waders this is under way, but needs further work. For other migratory waterbird species this needs to still be taken up (see priority 18). The information from sources like these needs to be stored in databases (including GIS representation of flyway delimitations), for use in conjunction with census and site information. This will involve expert use of the databases and consultation of expert groups (specialist groups). This should also result in project proposals for further research to fill gaps in existing knowledge.

*Indicative budget: US \$ 125,000
Duration: 2 years
Activities: Database analysis, information compilation, desk study, review, expert consultation, coordination*

Being proposed for matching funding as an activity in the full project proposal of the GEF AEWA/Ramsar flyways project that will be submitted at the end of 2002.

32. The use of wetland sites by migratory waterbirds

Throughout their annual cycle, migratory waterbirds depend on a variety of wetland sites. Given the concentration of so many individual waterbirds in these sites, they are of vital importance for their survival. We therefore look at these places as a network of critical sites. But can the role of any of these sites be taken over by another site in case something goes wrong? And what if such a change happens in the far north of the “network”, how will this affect the role of the sites further down along the migratory route? In order to be able to assess this, we need to gather more knowledge about the way birds use these sites, in relation to environmental parameters, and about the flexibility in site use by individual birds. What are the basic ecological requirements of the migratory waterbird species with respect to these sites. This may again differ between the different life-cycle stages (e.g., breeding, moulting, migration, wintering, displaying). The understanding of the importance of sites for the survival and conservation of species should be strongly improved by a study into these factors. There is a strong link to priority 8.

Indicative budget: US \$ 30,000

Duration: 1 year

Activities: Desk study, consultation, publication

Being proposed for matching funding as an activity in the full project proposal of the GEF AEWA/Ramsar flyways project that will be submitted at the end of 2002.

33. Migratory waterbirds as indicators

Migratory waterbirds react to parameters in and around wetland sites in a way that opens the possibility to use them as indicators of the status of these wetlands and the pressures on them. This is highly relevant to policy makers. By constructing powerful indicators, decisions about measures to be taken (affecting nature conservation) can be facilitated. Currently many of the causal links between numbers of migratory waterbirds and wetland parameters are insufficiently known, and the state of knowledge needs to be improved.

Indicative budget: US \$ 30,000

Duration: 1 year

Activities: Desk study, consultation, publication

34. Development of a density-dependent population model for the Dark-bellied Brent Goose

The development of a population model as required in the Dark-bellied Brent Goose Action Plan to estimate the impact of hunting and other management options on the population level of this sub-species, based on actual survival estimates from resighted marked individuals (using the programme MARK), reproduction estimates, age of first-breeding, maximum life-span, predation levels on the arctic breeding grounds, and old data on hunting bag statistics from Denmark from the period before 1972 when the species could still be hunted there. A model will be developed and tested with the above-mentioned real data by an international consortium of modellers, statisticians and biologists. The model itself will also be a very useful tool for other migratory waterbird species.

Indicative budget: US \$ 400,000 (inclusive of value added tax)
Duration: 1 year (22 person-months)
Activities: Model development and testing, desk study, publication, 2 workshops with members of the AEWA Dark-bellied Brent Goose Working Group

E. EDUCATION AND INFORMATION

35. Analysis of training needs for migratory waterbird conservation (AP 6.1, 6.2)
The levels of know-how in practical techniques for migratory waterbird conservation vary substantially throughout the Agreement area. Sharing such expertise through training materials and programmes, is an important aspect of international cooperation for the implementation of the Agreement. Using a questionnaire approach, it is proposed to develop an analysis of training needs by subregion, and also to compile information on appropriate international training institutions and existing materials. The project should focus on subregions outside North-West Europe, where training opportunities are already adequate.

Indicative budget: US \$ 30,000 (approximately 50 per cent already available)
Duration: 1 year
Activities: Questionnaire, review, consultation, publication

Study done in GEF preparation and development facility (category B) Flyways project. Further analysis, development of subregional programmes and their implementation in the full GEF AEWA/Ramsar flyways project that will be submitted at the end of 2002.

36. Regional training programmes in Africa for implementation of the Agreement (AP 6.1, 6.2)
Training has been identified at numerous forums as one of the key elements for advancing the implementation of the Agreement, particularly in Africa. Access to modern planning, assessment and management techniques, relevant to local situations, will greatly help under-resourced agencies use their resources most effectively. The regional training programmes in West Africa, currently organized by Wetlands International and the Office National de la Chasse et de la Faune Sauvage (France) provide a useful model from which new programmes can be developed. It is strongly recommended that this type of training programme be extended throughout Africa. Cost-effectiveness will be greatest if courses are based on groups of neighbouring countries, and if local expertise can be used for the majority of the training. Courses should target specific groups of professionals and include the following subjects, as appropriate: a general introduction to the work of the Agreement; waterbird identification, assessment and monitoring; waterbird ecology; habitat management for waterbirds; managing human activities; and public awareness.

Indicative budget: US \$ 150,000 per year, per regional programme
Duration: 5 years
Activities: Coordination, training courses, materials, follow-up

Being proposed for matching funding as an activity in the full project proposal of the GEF AEWA/Ramsar flyways project that will be submitted at the end of 2002.

37. Publication of waterbird monitoring manuals (AP 6.2)

Effective monitoring of migratory waterbirds is essential for the functioning of the Agreement, and it is vital that comparable data are collected between sites, regions and years. The production of manuals to help train coordinators and counters will be an important tool for continuous improvement of the monitoring networks. The manuals will be particularly valuable for the relatively new counting networks in Africa and South-West Asia, but will also benefit European counters. It will be necessary to publish the manual(s) in a number of languages. Furthermore, it may be necessary to have versions appropriate to the situation in different parts of the Agreement area. Aerial survey methods for remote, inaccessible and offshore areas throughout the Agreement area should not be neglected. Preliminary proposals are for one manual for the Western Palearctic and South-West Asia, and one for Africa.

Indicative budget: US \$ 40,000 per manual in one language
US \$ 20,000 for translation/printing/mailling other languages
Duration: 18 months
Activities: Drafting, consultation, publication, free distribution

Being proposed for matching funding as an activity in the full project proposal of the GEF AEWA/Ramsar flyways project that will be submitted at the end of 2002.

38. Establish a clearing house for training materials for the Agreement (AP 6. 2)

A wealth of training materials relevant to the implementation of the Agreement already exists both within the Agreement area, and also in other parts of the world. The establishment of an internet-based clearing house for such training materials will greatly assist Parties in meeting the obligations of the Agreement. It is suggested that the Agreement Secretariat should establish a contract with an appropriate international organization to establish and maintain this clearing house.

Indicative budget: US \$ 30,000 to establish clearing house
US \$ 10,000 per annum for maintenance
Duration: 5 years
Activities: Collection of materials, web site development, dissemination

39. Develop and implement a communications strategy for the Agreement (AP 6.3, 6.4)

A communications strategy for the Agreement should be developed as a priority. This should plan to communicate the objectives and requirements of the Agreement to appropriate target audiences (decision makers, conservation professionals, those living around or using key sites, and donors). The strategy will be most effective if it can facilitate communications activities at national and local levels. Particular attention will need to be given to disseminating materials in appropriate local languages, and at the appropriate level. A top priority will be to translate and disseminate the conservation guidelines in Arabic and Russian language versions. The strategy should result in a clear set of costed actions.

Indicative budget: US \$ 10,000 to prepare communications strategy
US \$ 75,000 to implement first trench of actions
Duration: 5 years
Activities: Preparation of strategy, start of implementation

40. Regional workshops for the promotion of the Agreement (AP 6.3)

In order to give the development of the Agreement a strong start throughout the Agreement area, a number of promotional workshops should be arranged for specific subregions. The priority regions identified so far would be, in order: (i) the Central Asian Republics; (ii) the Arab states. These workshops should aim to gather appropriate decision makers, research biologists, conservation professionals and donors, in order to raise awareness of the Agreement, promote membership, debate regional priorities, stimulate international cooperation and develop project initiatives. Where possible, the workshops should be linked with those of other relevant CMS or partner-Convention/organization activities, so as to increase synergy and maximize cost-effectiveness.

Indicative budget: US \$ 50,000 per regional workshop
Duration: 1 per year
Activities: Regional workshop and follow-up

Being proposed for matching funding as an activity in the full project proposal of the GEF AEWA/Ramsar flyways project that will be submitted at the end of 2002.

41. Communicating the importance of a network of critical sites for migratory waterbirds

The network of critical sites that will be developed as an interactive and dynamic tool via a web portal, will gain enormously in power and practical applicability if it is published as a convincing booklet. It will serve additional audiences to what the web portal will achieve, such as policy makers, who are unlikely to have the time to access the information in the web, and people in areas where internet access is underdeveloped. Having a booklet to browse through will be an effective means of communicating the network of critical sites. In addition, awareness raising is needed, using the network of critical site information to make brochures, posters, flyers and to undertake other public relations activities, including organization of a session at the Global Flyway Conference in 2004.

Indicative budget: US \$ 100,000
Duration: 1 year
Activities: Editing, layout, printing, publishing, distribution, coordination, public relations activities

Being proposed for matching funding as an activity in the full project proposal of the GEF AEWA/Ramsar flyways project that will be submitted at the end of 2002.

RESOLUTION 2.5

INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS: TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Recalling that pursuant to article VII of the Agreement, the first session of the Meeting of the Parties, through Resolution 1.8, established and determined the composition of the Technical Committee,

Further recalling the decision of the first session of the Meeting of the Parties, as laid down in Resolution 1.8, that Parties are entitled to attend the meetings of the Technical Committee as observers,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Meeting of the Parties:

1. *Agrees* that the Technical Committee should concentrate on providing scientific and technical advice;
2. *Instructs* the Technical Committee, through regional representatives and in close cooperation with the Agreement Secretariat, to improve the communication with all Range States and in particular with the Contracting Parties;
3. *Decides* that Contracting Parties can, at their own expenses, be represented at meetings of the Technical Committee by one observer;
4. *Adopts* the revised rules of procedure for the meetings of the Technical Committee, as attached hereto in appendix I;
5. *Instructs* the Secretariat to provide the necessary support to the Technical Committee in accordance with article VII of the Agreement, as well as the provisions in the budget for the Agreement and the activities of the Technical Committee or the Agreement Secretariat, as adopted under Resolution 2.7;
6. *Appoints* to the Technical Committee, taking into account terms of office in accordance with rule 7 of the rules of procedure for meetings of the Technical Committee, the members and alternates named in appendix II to the present Resolution;
7. *Requests* each Contracting Party to appoint, before 1 January 2003, a suitably qualified technical expert in that country to act as a focal point for Technical Committee matters, and, as appropriate, to provide input into work of the Technical Committee either directly or through liaison with other suitably qualified technical experts, and to disseminate the work of the Committee in their country.

Appendix I

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

General functions

Rule 1

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

Rule 2

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

Rule 3

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

Representation and attendance

Rule 4

1. In accordance with Article VII paragraph 1, the Committee membership shall comprise:

(a) nine experts representing the different regions of the Agreement Area (north & south west Europe, central Europe, eastern Europe, south western Asia, north Africa, central Africa, west Africa, east and south Africa) elected among all the Parties on the recommendation of the Parties of the region in question;

(b) one representative appointed by each of the following organisations: the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN), Wetlands International, the International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC); and

(c) one expert from each of the following fields: rural economics, game management, and environmental law; elected by the Parties.

1. Any Party has the right to recommend an expert in the fields of rural economics, game management and environmental law for nomination by the Meeting of the Parties.

2. With exception of the experts in the field of rural economics, game management and environmental law all the above-mentioned representatives, shall name an Alternate Member for each position to be approved by the Meeting of the Parties.

Rule 5

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

Rule 6

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

Rule 7

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

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

Rule 8

1. The Chairperson may invite observers of non-contracting Parties and invite or admit a maximum of four observers from specialized international inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations.

2. In addition, at each meeting of the Technical Committee, the Chairperson may invite guests to contribute to specific agenda items.

Officers

Rule 9

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

Rule 10

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

Rule 11

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

Rule 12

The Agreement Secretariat shall serve the meetings of the Committee.

Elections

Rule 13

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

Rule 14

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

Rule 15

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

Meetings

Rule 16

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

Rule 17

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

Rule 18

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

Rule 19

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

Rule 20

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

Rule 21

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

Rule 22

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

Working groups

Rule 23

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

Rule 24

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

Rule 25

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

Communication procedure

Rule 26

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

Rule 27

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

Rule 28

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

Rule 29

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

Rule 30

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

Other functions

Rule 31

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

Final provisions

Rule 32

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

Appendix II

REPRESENTATIVES/ALTERNATES OF THE REGIONS

NORTH AND SOUTH WESTERN EUROPE

REPRESENTATIVE

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

ALTERNATE

Petri Nummi Ph.D., Docent
University of Helsinki
Department of Applied Biology
Wildlife Management
P.O Box 27
FIN-00014 University of Helsinki
Finland
Tel. +358 9 191 58366
Fax +358 9 191 58633
E-mail: petri.nummi@helsinki.fi

CENTRAL EUROPE

REPRESENTATIVE

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

ALTERNATE

Prof. Dr. Branco Micevski
President Study and Protection Society
Faculty of Sciences, Gazi Baba b.b.
1000 Skopje
FYR MACEDONIA
Tel: (+38) 22 432 071
Fax: (+38) 92 432 071
E-mail: brankom@ukim.edu.mk

EASTERN EUROPE

REPRESENTATIVE

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

ALTERNATE

Dr. Ion Bejenaru
Environmental Impact Settlements and
Nature Conservation
Bd Stefan cel Mare 73
277001 Chisenu
MOLDOVA
Tel: (+373) 2 265271
Fax: (+373) 2 277486
E-mail: margaret@dpmi.moldova.su

SOUTHWESTERN ASIA

REPRESENTATIVE

Mr. Eng. Khalaf Aloklah
General Corporation for the Environment
Protection (GCEP)
P.O. Box 1408
Amman
JORDAN
Tel: (+962) 65350149
Fax: (+962) 6535 0084/5332938
E-mail: aloklah@yahoo.com

ALTERNATE

Dr. E. Kreuzberg-Mukhina
Senior Researcher, Nature Conservation
Institute of Zoology, Uzbek A.S.
Nyazov Street 1
700095, Tashkent
UZBEKISTAN
Tel: (+998 71) 121 61 85
Fax: (+998 71) 1442603/1206791
E-mail: iucn_uz@mail.ru

NORTH AFRICA

REPRESENTATIVE

M. Sherif M. Baha el Din
Egyptian Environment Affairs Agency
14 Shagaret El Dur
Zamalek-Cairo
EGYPT
Tel: (+20) 2 360 8160
Fax: (+20) 2 360 8160

ALTERNATE

Mr. Mohammed Haffane
Ministere Charge des Eaux et Forets
B.P 605
Rabat/Chellah
MOROCCO
Tel: (+212) 37 67 00 87
Fax: (+212) 37 67 00 87
E-Mail: haffane@athena.online.co.ma

CENTRAL AFRICA

REPRESENTATIVE

Mr. Ikonga Jérôme Mokoko
Coordonnateur Programme
WCS.Congo/ Aires Protegees
B.P. 14537
Brazzaville
CONGO
Tel: (+242) 511785
Fax: (+242) 811921/813393
E-mail: wcscongo@yahoo.fr

ALTERNATE

M. Kasula Seya Makonga
Secretaire Exécutif Adjoint
Ministère de l'Environnement,
Conservation de la Nature Peche et Forets
B.P. 16137
Kinshasa I
CONGO
Tel: (+243 88) 34 390
Fax: (+243 88)43 675
E-mail: ipalaka@ic.cd

WESTERN AFRICA

REPRESENTATIVE

Mr. Momodou Lamin Kassama
Department of Parks and Wildlife Management
P.O. Box 1881
Banjul
GAMBIA
Tel: (+220) 37 5888/ 903511
Fax: (+220) 39 2179
E-mail: wildlife@gamtel.gm

ALTERNATE

Mr. Mohamed Abdoulaye
Ministère du Développement Rural
B.P. 393
Cotonou
BENIN
Tel: (+229) 330662
Fax: (+229) 300326
E-mail: cenatel@bow.intnet.bj

EASTERN AFRICA

REPRESENTATIVE

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

ALTERNATE

Mr. Oliver Nasirwa
Darwin Project Officer
Wildfowl & Wetland Trust
Gloucestershire GL2 7BT
UNITED KINGDOM
Tel: (+44) 1453 891900
Fax: (+44) 1453 890827
E-mail: oliver.nasirwa@wwt.org.uk

SOUTHERN AFRICA

REPRESENTATIVE

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

ALTERNATE

Prof. Les G. Underhill
Avian Demography Unit
Ronde Bosch 7700
Cape Town
SOUTH AFRICA
Tel: (+27) 21 650 3227
Fax: (+27) 21 650 3434
E-mail: lgu@adu.uct.ac.za

REPRESENTATIVES/ALTERNATES OF ORGANIZATIONS

IUCN

REPRESENTATIVE

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

ALTERNATE

Dr. Susan A. Mainka
Head, IUCN Species Programme
28, rue Mauverney
1196 Gland
SWITZERLAND
Tel: (+41) 22 9990152
Fax: (+41) 22 9990015
E-mail: sue.mainka@iucn.org

WETLANDS INTERNATIONAL

REPRESENTATIVE

Mr. Ward Hagemeyer
P.O. Box 471
6700 AL Wageningen
NETHERLANDS
Tel: (+31) 317 478867
Fax: (+31) 317 478850
E-mail: hagemeyer@wetlands.agro.nl

ALTERNATE

Mr. Simon Delany
P.O. Box 417
6700 AL Wageningen
NETHERLANDS
Tel: +31 317 478863
Fax: +31 317 478885
E-mail: delany@wetlands.agro.nl

CIC

REPRESENTATIVE

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

ALTERNATE

Dr. Christian Krogell
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
Hallituskatu 3 A
00170 Helsinki
FINLAND
Tel: (+358 9) 160 3373
Fax: (+358 9) 160 3373

EXPERTS

RURAL ECONOMICS

Mr Elijah Yaw Danso
Forest Sector Development Project
P. O. Box 1457
Kumasi
GHANA
Tel: (+233) 51 22 37 67
Fax: (+233) 51 35 659
E-mail: elijah@forestry-ksi.org

ENVIRONMENTAL LAW

Mrs. Rachelle Adam
Ministry of the Environment
P.O. Box 5
95464 Jerusalem
ISRAEL
Tel: (+972) 2 6553735
Fax: (+972) 2 6553744
E-mail: RachelA@environment.gov.il

GAME MANAGEMENT

Dr. Preben Clausen
National Environmental Research Institute
Department of Coastal Zone Ecology
Grenaavej 12
8410 Roende
Denmark
Tel: (+45) 8920 1519
Fax: (+45) 8920 1515
E-mail: pc@dmu.dk

RESOLUTION 2.6

INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS: STANDING COMMITTEE

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

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

Recognizing that the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme is responsible for the administration of the Secretariat,

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

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

The Meeting of the Parties:

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

(a) Carry out between sessions of the Meeting of the Parties, such interim activity on behalf of the Meeting as may be necessary;

(b) Make recommendations for consideration at the next session of the Meeting of the Parties;

(c) Oversee, on behalf of the Parties, the development and execution of the Secretariat's budget as derived from the Trust Fund and other sources, and also all aspects of fund-raising undertaken by the Secretariat in order to carry out specific functions authorized by the Meeting of the Parties;

(d) Oversee, as the representative of the Meeting of the Parties, the implementation of policy by the Secretariat and conduct of the Secretariat's programmes;

(e) Provide guidance and advice to the Secretariat on implementation of the Agreement, on the preparation of meetings, and on any other matters relating to the exercise of the Secretariat's functions brought to it by the Secretariat;

(f) Represent the Meeting of the Parties, vis-à-vis the Government of the host country of the Secretariat's headquarters, the United Nations Environment Programme and other international organizations for consideration of matters relating to the Agreement and its Secretariat;

(g) Act as bureau at the sessions of the Meeting of the Parties, in accordance with the rules of procedure of the Meeting of the Parties;

(h) Report to the Meeting of the Parties on the activities that have been carried out between ordinary sessions of the Meeting of the Parties;

(i) Perform any other functions that may be entrusted to it by the Meeting of the Parties;

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

(a) The Committee shall consist of not more than seven Contracting Parties, which shall be appointed by the Meeting of the Parties. For at least five of these members, the appointment shall be based upon the principle of balanced geographical distribution, reflecting two representatives from the Europe and Central Asia region, one representative from the Middle East and Northern Africa region, one representative from the Western and Central Africa region, and one representative from the Eastern and southern Africa region. The remaining two members shall comprise the host country for the next session of the Meeting of the Parties and a representative from the Depositary;

(b) The Meeting of the Parties shall appoint an alternate member for a member described in subparagraph 2 (a) above. Any such alternate shall attend at meetings as a regional member only in the absence of a representative of the member for which it is the alternate;

(c) If an extraordinary session of the Meeting of the Parties is held between two ordinary sessions, the host Party of that extraordinary session shall participate as an observer in the work of the Committee on matters related to the organization of the extraordinary session;

(d) Contracting Parties which are not members of the Standing Committee shall be entitled to be represented at meetings of the Committee by an observer who will have the right to participate at their own expense but not to vote;

(e) The Chairman may invite any person or representative of any other country or organization and the Chairman of the Technical Committee to participate in meetings of the Committee as an observer without the right to vote;

(f) The membership of the Committee shall be reviewed at each ordinary session of the Meeting of the Parties, in accordance with the rules of procedure of the meeting. The term of office of the members nominated on a geographical basis shall expire at the close of the second ordinary session of the Meeting of the Parties following that at which they have been nominated;

(g) The Committee should meet at least once between the Meetings of the Parties, normally at the seat of the Secretariat;

(h) The Secretary for the Committee shall be provided by the Secretariat of the Agreement;

- (i) The Secretariat shall inform all Parties of the date and venue of the Standing Committee meetings;
 - (j) The Committee shall draw up and adopt its own rules of procedure.
3. *Requests* the Secretariat to make provision in future budgets for the payment, upon request, of reasonable and justifiable travel expenses of appointed Standing Committee members from developing countries and countries with economies in transition, within the policy agreed by the Meeting of the Parties. In this regard:
- (a) Members should make every effort to pay their own travel expenses;
 - (b) The Secretariat may refund to the Chairman of the Standing Committee all reasonable and justifiable travel expenses for travel undertaken on behalf of the Meeting of the Parties or on behalf of the Secretariat;
 - (c) Travel arrangements for sponsored Standing Committee members will be made by the Secretariat in accordance with the rules and regulations of the United Nations and, where applicable, claims for refund must be supported by receipts, and submitted to the Secretariat within 30 days after completion of travel;
4. *Requests* Contracting Parties to provide financial assistance to developing countries and countries with economies in transition that are Parties to the Agreement to be represented at meetings of the Standing Committee by an observer.

RESOLUTION 2.7

FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Recalling article V, paragraph 2 (a) and (b), of the Agreement, which states that Parties shall contribute to the budget of the Agreement in accordance to the United Nations scale of assessment,

Acknowledging with appreciation the financial and other support provided by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany for the co-location of the Agreement Secretariat with the Secretariat of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals in Bonn,

Recognizing the importance of all Parties being able to participate in the implementation of the Agreement and related activities,

Appreciating the additional support given by various Parties and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations on a voluntary basis to implement the Agreement,

Furthermore appreciating the support of the Global Environment Facility for the development of the African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbird Flyways project,

Recognizing the need to strengthen the capacity of the Secretariat of the Agreement to enable it better to serve all Parties in the Agreement area,

Aware that many Parties, particularly developing countries or countries with economies in transition, may not have the financial means to send representatives to meetings of bodies established under the Agreement,

Noting the considerable number of Contracting and non-Contracting Parties as well as organizations attending the second session of the Meeting of the Parties, and the resulting additional expenditures to Parties so incurred,

The Meeting of the Parties:

1. *Confirms* that Parties shall contribute to the budget adopted at the scale agreed upon by the Meeting of the Parties in accordance with article V, paragraph 2 (a) and (b), of the Agreement;
2. *Adopts* the budget for 2003-2005 attached as appendix I to the present resolution;
3. *Agrees* to the scale of contributions of Parties to the Agreement as listed in appendix II to the present resolution and to the application of that scale pro rata to new Parties;
4. *Agrees* that the minimum contribution shall be not less than 100 United States dollars per annum;
5. *Requests* Parties, in particular those that have to pay the minimum contribution, to consider paying for the whole triennium in one instalment;

6. *Further requests* Parties to pay their contribution promptly as far as possible but in any case not later than the end of June of the year to which they relate;
7. *Takes note* of Resolution 2.4 of the Meeting of the Parties on the international implementation priorities for the period 2003-2007 and its related appendices;
8. *Urges* all Parties to make voluntary contributions to the Trust Fund to support requests from developing countries and countries with economies in transition to participate in and implement the Agreement throughout the triennium;
9. *Invites* States not Party to the Agreement, governmental, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and other sources to consider contributing to the implementation of the Agreement on a voluntary basis;
10. *Approves* the establishment and upgrading of the following posts, in accordance with classification of the posts by the United Nations:

P-4/P-5: Executive Secretary (as of 1 January 2003)
P-2: Technical Officer (as of mid-2004);
11. *Notes* that for administrative purposes, the post of Assistant/ Secretary is subject to reclassification during the 2003-2005 triennium;
12. *Invites* Contracting Parties as well as the United Nations Environment Programme to consider the feasibility of providing gratis personnel and/or junior professional officers, in accordance with the United Nations rules and regulations, to strengthen the capacity of the Agreement Secretariat;
13. *Requests* the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme to extend the duration of the Trust Fund to 31 December 2005
14. *Approves* the terms of reference for the administration of the Agreement budget as set out in appendix III to the present resolution for the period 2003-2005.

Appendix I

Budget estimates 2003-2005

Budget line	Estimated costs in US dollars			
	2003	2004	2005	Total
10 Personnel Component				
1100 Professional Staff				
1101 Executive Secretary (P4/ P5) ^{a/}	120,000	121,000	122,000	363,000
1102 Technical Officer (P2)	0	45,000	90,000	135,000
1103 Junior Professional Officer (Information) ^{b/}	0	0	0	0
1104 Administrative and Fund Management Officer (P3) ^{c/} (part time)	0	0	0	0
1199 Total	120,000	166,000	212,000	498,000
1200 Consultants				
1201 English Translators	7,500	7,500	15,000	30,000
1202 French Translators	12,500	12,500	25,000	50,000
1203 Arabic/ Russian Translators	2,500	2,500	2,500	7,500
1204 Report Writers (at MOP and TC)	0	0	12,500	12,500
1205 Interpreters (at MOP and TC)	12,500	12,500	45,000	70,000
1220 Consultancies for MOP	25,000	25,000	50,000	100,000
1221 Consultancies to develop Information materials	15,000	15,000	15,000	45,000
1222 Consultancies regarding research/ surveys.	25,000	0	0	25,000
1299 Total	100,000	75,000	165,000	340,000
1300 Administrative support				
1301 Administrative Assistant (G4/ G6) ^{a/}	41,000	42,500	43,500	127,000
1399 Total	41,000	42,500	43,500	127,000
1600 Travel on official business				
1601 General	30,000	35,000	40,000	105,000
1602 Travel of Staff to the MOP	0	0	18,000	18,000
1603 Travel of unspecified experts	4,000	5,000	6,000	15,000
1699 Total	34,000	40,000	64,000	138,000
1999 Component Total	295,000	323,500	484,500	1,103,000
20 Subcontract Component				
2200 Subcontract component				
2201 Organization of MOP	0	0	75,000	75,000
2202 Projects (support to implementation of GEF project)	0	0	0	0
2203 Development of International Species Action Plans	0	0	0	0
2299 Total	0	0	75,000	75,000
2999 Component Total	0	0	75,000	75,000

30 Training and Meetings Component				
3200 Training				
3201 Training of Staff	2,300	3,000	3,600	8,900
3299 Total	2,300	3,000	3,600	8,900
3300 Meetings				
3301 Meetings of the Parties (30 part. x 3 days)	0	0	90,000	90,000
3302 Meeting of the Technical Committee (15 part x 2 days)	30,000	30,000	30,000	90,000
3303 Meetings of the Standing Committee (6 part x 1 day)	15,000	15,000	15,000	45,000
3304 Regional Meetings	0	0	0	0
3399 Total	45,000	45,000	135,000	225,000
3999 Component Total	47,300	48,000	138,600	233,900
40 Equipment and Premises Component				
4100 Expendable equipment				
4101 Miscellaneous office supplies	2,500	2,500	2,500	7,500
4199 Total	2,500	2,500	2,500	7,500
4200 Non-expendable equipment				
4201 Office equipment	5,000	5,000	5,000	15,000
4299 Total	5,000	5,000	5,000	15,000
4300 Premises				
4301 Rent and maintenance costs ^{d/}	0	0	0	0
4399 Total	0	0	0	0
4999 Component Total	7,500	7,500	7,500	22,500
50 Miscellaneous Component				
5100 Operation and Maintenance				
5101 Operation/maintenance of computers	1,000	1,000	1,000	3,000
5102 Operation/maintenance of photocopiers	500	500	500	1,500
5103 Operation/ maintenance -other	500	500	500	1,500
5199 Total	2,000	2,000	2,000	6,000
5200 Reporting Costs				
5201 Document production (external)	15,000	15,000	20,000	50,000
5202 Information material	10,000	15,000	15,000	40,000
5203 Reference material	500	500	500	1,500
5299 Total	25,500	30,500	35,500	91,500

5300 Sundry				
5301 Telephone, Fax	2,500	2,500	2,500	7,500
5302 Postage and miscellaneous	10,000	10,000	15,000	35,000
5303 Bank charges	1,000	1,000	1,000	3,000
5399 Total	13,500	13,500	18,500	45,500
5400 hospitality	2,500	2,500	2,500	7,500
5499 Total	2,500	2,500	2,500	7,500
5999 Component Total	43,500	48,500	58,500	150,500
SUBTOTAL	393,300	427,500	764,100	1,584,900
6000 UNEP overhead costs 13 %	51129	55575	99333	206037
GRAND TOTAL	444,429	483,075	863,433	1,790,937
Less withdrawal from Trust Fund reserve to reduce contributions	50,000	75,000	75,000	200,000
Budget to be shared by the Contracting Parties	394,429	408,075	788,433	1,590,937
Budget for 2000/2002 (for comparison)	383,635	385,330	700,318	1,469,283
Increase in comparison to 2000/2002	10,794	22,745	88,115	121,654
Increase in comparison to 2000/2002 (%)	2.8	5.9	12.6	8.3
^{a/} Post Grade pending re-classification by UNEP in 2003				
^{b/} Post provided for free by one of the Range States via UNEP				
^{c/} Provided by UNEP for free for the Agreement's Unit and CMS.				
^{d/} Provided for free by the Government of Germany.				
Voluntary contributions of Germany	25,000	25,000	25,000	75,000
Projects to be funded by extra income from contributions of New Parties that accede to the Agreement after 1 January 2003				
1222 Consultancies regarding research/ surveys	0	25,000	25,000	50000
2202 Project (support to implementation of GEF project)	50,000	50,000	50,000	150,000
2203 Development of International Species Action Plans (matching funds)	15,000	15,000	15,000	45,000

3304 Regional meetings	30,000	30,000	30,000	90,000
5202 Information material	10,000	10,000	10,000	30,000
Subtotal	105,000	130,000	130,000	365,000
UNEP overhead 13 %	13,650	16,900	16,900	47,450
Grand Total	118,650	146,900	146,900	412,450
Income/ contributions of New Parties	118,650	146,900	146,900	412,450
Remaining cost to be shared by the Parties	0	0	0	0

Appendix II

AEWA CONTRIBUTIONS FOR THE YEAR 2003-2005 IN US DOLLARS

Party	UN Scale (%)	AEWA in %	2003	2004	2005
Albania	0.0030	0.0187	74	76	147
Benin	0.0020	0.0125	49	51	99
Bulgaria	0.0130	0.0812	320	331	640
Congo	0.0010	0.0062	24	25	49
Croatia	0.0390	0.2437	961	994	1,921
Denmark	0.7490	4.6799	18,459	19,098	36,898
Egypt	0.0810	0.5061	1,996	2,065	3,990
Finland	0.5220	3.2616	12,865	13,310	25,716
Gambia	0.0010	0.0062	24	25	49
Georgia	0.0050	0.0312	123	127	246
Germany	9.7690	22.0000	86,774	89,777	173,455
Guinea	0.0030	0.0187	74	76	147
Israel	0.4150	2.5930	10,228	10,581	20,444
Jordan	0.0080	0.0500	197	204	394
Kenya	0.0080	0.0500	197	204	394
Mali	0.0020	0.0125	49	51	99
Mauritius	0.0110	0.0687	271	280	542
Monaco	0.0040	0.0250	99	102	197
Netherlands	1.7380	10.8593	42,832	44,314	85,618
Niger	0.0010	0.0062	24	25	49
Republic of Moldova	0.0020	0.0125	49	51	99
Romania	0.0580	0.3624	1,429	1,479	2,857
Senegal	0.0050	0.0312	123	127	246
Slovakia	0.0430	0.2687	1,060	1,096	2,119
South Africa	0.4080	2.5493	10,055	10,403	20,100
Spain	2.5188	15.7379	62,075	64,222	124,083
Sudan	0.0060	0.0375	148	153	296
Sweden	1.0268	6.4156	25,305	26,180	50,583
Switzerland	1.2740	7.9602	31,397	32,484	62,761
FYR Macedonia	0.0060	0.0375	148	153	296
Togo	0.0010	0.0062	24	25	49
Uganda	0.0040	0.0250	99	102	197
United Kingdom	5.5360	22.0000	86,774	89,777	173,455
United Republic of Tanzania	0.0040	0.0250	99	102	197
Total	24.2676	100,00	394,429	408,075	788,433
1) Any Annual Contribution less than US \$ 100 will attract an invoice of US \$ 100.					

Appendix III

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE TRUST FUND FOR THE AGREEMENT ON THE CONSERVATION OF AFRICAN-EURASIAN MIGRATORY WATERBIRDS

1. The terms of reference for the Trust Fund of the Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds (AEWA) shall refer to the financial years beginning 1 January 2003 and ending 31 December 2005.
2. The Trust Fund shall be administered by the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) subject to the approval of the Governing Council of UNEP and the consent of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.
3. The administration of the Trust Fund shall be governed by the financial regulations and rules of the United Nations, the staff regulations and rules of the United Nations and other administrative policies or procedures, promulgated by the Secretary-General of the United Nations.
4. In accordance with United Nations rules, UNEP shall deduct from the income an administrative charge equal to 13 per cent of the expenditure charged to the AEWA Trust Fund in respect of activities financed under AEWA.
5. The financial resources of the Trust Fund for 2003-2005 shall be derived from:
 - (a) Contributions made by Parties by reference to appendix II of Resolution 2.7, including contributions from any new Party; and
 - (b) Further contributions from Parties and contributions from States not Parties to the Agreement, other governmental, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and other sources.
6. All contributions to the Trust Fund shall be paid in fully convertible United States dollars. For contributions from States that become Parties after the beginning of the financial period, the initial contribution (from the first day of the third month after deposit of the instrument of ratification, acceptance or accession until the end of the financial period) shall be determined pro rata based on the contribution of other States Parties on the same level of the United Nations scale of assessments, as it applies from time to time. However, if the contribution of a new Party determined on this basis would be more than 22 per cent of the budget, the contribution of that Party shall be 22 per cent of the budget for the financial year of joining (or pro rata for a part year). The contribution of each Party as laid down in appendix II of Resolution 2.7 shall be fixed until the next ordinary session of the Meeting of the Parties. Contributions of new Parties shall flow into the Trust Fund of the Agreement. Contributions shall be paid in annual installments. The contributions shall be due on 1 January 2003, 2004 and 2005. Contributions shall be paid into the following account:

UNEP Trust Funds Account
Account No. 485-000326
JP Morgan Chase
International Agencies Banking
1166 Avenue of the Americas, 17th Floor
New York, NY 10036-2708
United States of America

7. For the convenience of the Parties, for each of the years of the financial period the Executive Director of UNEP shall as soon as possible notify the Parties to the Agreement of their assessed contributions.
8. Contributions received into the Trust Fund that are not immediately required to finance activities shall be invested at the discretion of the United Nations, and any income shall be credited to the Trust Fund.
9. The Trust Fund shall be subject to audit by the United Nations Board of Auditors.
10. The budget estimates covering income and expenditures for each of the three calendar years constituting the financial period to which they relate, prepared in United States dollars, shall be submitted to the Meeting of the Parties to the Agreement.
11. The estimates of each of the calendar years covered by the financial period shall be divided into sections and objects of expenditure, shall be specified according to budget lines, shall include references to the programmes of work to which they relate, and shall be accompanied by such information as may be required by or on behalf of the contributors, and such further information as the Executive Director of UNEP may deem useful and advisable. In particular, estimates shall also be prepared for each programme of work for each of the calendar years, with expenditure itemized for each programme so as to correspond to the sections, objects of expenditure, and budget lines described in the first sentence of this paragraph.
12. In addition to the budget estimates for the financial period described in the preceding paragraphs, the Secretariat of the Agreement, in consultation with the Standing Committee of the Agreement and the Executive Director of UNEP, shall prepare a medium-term plan as envisaged in chapter III of the Legislative and Financial Texts Regarding the United Nations Environment Programme and Environment Fund. The medium-term plan will cover the years 2006-2012, inclusive, and shall incorporate the budget for the financial period 2006-2009.
13. The proposed budget and medium-term plan, including all the necessary information, shall be dispatched by the Secretariat to all Parties at least 90 days before the date fixed for the opening of the Meeting of the Parties.
14. The budget and medium-term plan shall be adopted by unanimous vote of the Parties present and voting at the Meeting of the Parties.
15. In the event that the Executive Director of UNEP anticipates that there might be a shortfall in resources over the financial period as a whole, the Executive Director shall consult with the Secretariat, which shall seek the advice of the Standing Committee as to its priorities for expenditure.

16. Commitments against the resources of the Trust Fund may be made only if they are covered by the necessary income of the Agreement. No commitments shall be made in advance of the receipt of contributions.
17. Upon the request of the Secretariat of the Agreement, after seeking the advice of the Standing Committee, the Executive Director of UNEP should, to the extent consistent with the financial regulations and rules of the United Nations, make transfers from one budget line to another. At the end of the first or second calendar year of the financial period, the Executive Director of UNEP may proceed to transfer any uncommitted balance of appropriations to the second or third calendar year respectively, provided that the total budget approved by the Parties shall not exceed, unless this is specifically sanctioned in writing by the Standing Committee.
18. At the end of each calendar year of the financial period¹, the Executive Director of UNEP shall submit to the Parties, through the Agreement Secretariat, the accounts for the year. The Executive Director shall also submit, as soon as practicable, the audited accounts for the financial period. These shall include full details of actual expenditure compared to the original provisions for each budget line.
19. Those financial reports required to be submitted to the Executive Director of UNEP shall be transmitted simultaneously by the Secretariat of the Agreement to the members of the Standing Committee.
20. The Secretariat of the Agreement shall provide the Standing Committee with an estimate of proposed expenditures over the coming year simultaneously with, or as soon as possible after, distribution of the accounts and reports referred to in the preceding paragraphs.
21. The present terms of reference shall be effective from 1 January 2003 to 31 December 2005.

¹ The calendar year 1 January to 31 December is the accounting and financial year, but the accounts official closure date is 31 March of the following year. Thus, on 31 March the accounts of the previous year have to be closed, and it is only then that the Executive Director can submit the accounts of the previous calendar year.

RESOLUTION 2.8

GUIDELINES FOR THE ACCEPTANCE OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE BUDGET OF THE AGREEMENT IN KIND IN LIEU OF CASH

Recalling the Final Act of the Negotiation Meeting on the Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds held in The Hague, in June 1995 which “invited the Meeting of the Parties to consider at its first session the possibility of accepting from a given Party contributions in kind in lieu of contributions in cash to the budget of the Agreement, with the understanding that such contributions in kind from a given Party should be permitted only in exceptional circumstances and that the nature of the contribution must correspond to the needs and objectives of the Agreement”,

Further recalling Resolution 1.6 of the first session of the Meeting of the Parties to the Agreement held in Cape Town in 1999, which instructed the Secretariat of the Agreement to examine, in close cooperation with the Technical Committee, the United Nations Environment Programme and the Convention Secretariat of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals, the feasibility of countries making their contributions to the Agreement in kind instead of in cash, to develop criteria to establish a preliminary list of Range States to which this decision might apply and to report to the next Meeting of the Parties,

Aware of the need to create such circumstances that all Range States can contribute to the functioning and implementation of the Agreement,

Referring to the guidelines for acceptance of contributions in kind in lieu of cash, adopted by the Technical Committee at its 3rd meeting,

Appreciating that the Technical Committee has invited the Meeting of the Parties to endorse the Committee’s recommendation,

The Meeting of the Parties:

1. *Decides* that contributions to the budget of the Agreement in accordance with article V paragraph 2 (a) may be accepted in kind in lieu of cash when the following criteria are met;
 - (a) The given Party is a country with an economy in transition or is a developing country; and
 - (b) Exceptional circumstances are demonstrated; and
 - (c) The nature of the contribution in kind is consistent with the needs and objectives of the Agreement;
2. *Determines* that Governments of Parties wishing to make contributions in kind in lieu of cash shall submit an official request to the Agreement Secretariat explaining the reason for their request and the nature of the contribution in kind;
3. *Instructs* the Secretariat to forward such requests to the Standing Committee;

4. *Authorizes* the Standing Committee to decide, in accordance with the criteria set out in paragraph 1 of the present resolution and in close cooperation with the Agreement Secretariat and with the United Nations Environment Programme, whether such a request shall be approved;

5. *Further determines* that any approval of contributions in kind instead of cash for a given Party will expire at the ordinary session of the Meeting of the Parties following the date of the approval.

RESOLUTION 2.9

FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SMALL CONSERVATION GRANTS FUND FOR THE AGREEMENT

Taking into account article V, paragraph 4, of the Agreement, which encourages Parties to provide inter alia, financial support to other Parties on a multilateral and bilateral basis to assist them to implement the provisions of the Agreement,

Recalling Resolution 1.7, adopted by the Meeting of the Parties at its first session (South Africa, 1999), regarding the establishment of a Small Grants Fund to become operational as of the second session of the Meeting of the Parties,

Recalling further paragraph 2 of Resolution 1.7, which instructed the Agreement Secretariat, taking into account the advice of the Technical Committee and learning from the experience of the Ramsar Small Grants Fund for Wetlands Conservation and Wise Use, to submit to the second session of the Meeting of the Parties proposals for the operation of the Fund, including administration, eligibility criteria, submission and evaluation of proposals, allocation of funds and fund-raising,

Concerned that since the first session of the Meeting of the Parties no voluntary contributions have been made by Contracting Parties and other donors for the purpose of providing small grants for the implementation of the Agreement intersessionally,

Noting the value of the Ramsar Small Grants Fund for Wetlands Conservation and Wise Use in facilitating the implementation in developing countries and countries with economies in transition of the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Wildfowl Habitats,

Noting further the concerns of the Ramsar Convention regarding the operation of the Ramsar Small Grants Fund and in particular the proposal from the Ramsar Standing Committee Subgroup on Finance for a resolution of the Conference of the Parties regarding establishment of an endowment fund to resource the Small Grants Fund for Wetland Conservation and Wise Use,

Aware of the fact that in the African-Eurasian region there might be an overlap in activities under the Ramsar Small Grants Fund and the AEWA Small Grants Fund;

The Meeting of the Parties:

1. *Reiterates* its conviction that an AEWA Small Grants Fund could become an extremely useful tool to facilitate the implementation of the Agreement by developing countries and countries with economies in transition;
2. *Urges* Contracting Parties and other donors to make voluntary contributions to the Agreement budget, for the purpose of providing small grants for the implementation of the Agreement in eligible countries;
3. *Decides* that the following conditions shall apply to the award of grants from the Small Grants Fund:

- (a) Only developing countries and countries with economies in transition shall be eligible for funding;
- (b) The proposed activities should clearly contribute to the implementation of the Agreement;
- (c) The proposed activities should be a response to emergencies affecting a population of AEWA species and/ or sites used by AEWA species;
- (d) The award for any single project will not exceed US \$15,000;

4. *Authorizes* the Standing Committee, in consultation with the Technical Committee, to review and decide upon applications received for small grants taking into account the conditions in paragraph 3 above and the budget available;

5. *Instructs* the Agreement Secretariat with the assistance of the Standing Committee to consult with Parties and potential sponsors concerning sponsorship;

6. *Further instructs* the Agreement Secretariat to develop, in close consultation with the Ramsar Convention, a procedure for consideration of applications to the Small Grants Fund to avoid duplication of efforts;

7. *Invites* the Ramsar Convention to consider establishing a common Wetlands and Waterbirds Endowment Fund, which could resource both the Ramsar and Agreement Small Grants Funds and requests the Agreement Secretariat to discuss this further with the Ramsar Bureau and to report back to the Meeting of the Parties at its third session;

8. *Requests* the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme to channel the 13 per cent overheads charge levied on voluntary contributions to the Small Grants Fund back into the Fund.

RESOLUTION 2.10

DATE, VENUE AND FUNDING OF THE THIRD SESSION OF THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES

Recalling article VI, paragraph 2, of the Agreement, which states that the Agreement Secretariat shall convene, in consultation with the Secretariat of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals, ordinary sessions of the Meeting of the Parties at intervals of not more than three years, unless the Meeting of the Parties decides otherwise,

Noting that the second session of the Meeting of the Parties was hosted by the Federal Government of Germany, in conjunction with the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, held in Bonn, from 18 to 25 September 2002,

Appreciating the benefits that may accrue to the Agreement and to Parties, particularly those with developing economies, to host sessions of the Meeting of the Parties in different regions in the Agreement area,

The Meeting of the Parties:

1. *Decides* that the third session of the Meeting of the Parties shall take place before the end of 2005 or early 2006 at the latest, ideally after the ninth Conference of the Parties to the Ramsar Convention;
2. *Agrees* to welcome and accepts with great appreciation any future suitable offer to host the third session of the Meeting of the Parties to the Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds.

RESOLUTION 2.11

HEADQUARTERS AGREEMENT FOR AND JURIDICAL PERSONALITY OF THE AGREEMENT SECRETARIAT

Recalling article VI, paragraph 7 (a), of the Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds and Resolution 1.1 adopted by the Meeting of the Parties at its first session (Cape Town, 1999) to establish a permanent Secretariat for the Agreement co-located with the Secretariat of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals under the administration of the United Nations Environment Programme,

Aware that the co-location of the Agreement's Secretariat with the Convention Secretariat under the administration of the UNEP has come into effect as of 17 July 2000,

Further aware that for functioning of the Agreement's Secretariat a similar legal status as granted by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany to other United Nations bodies in the Federal Republic of Germany would be desirable,

Acknowledging the efforts made by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Nations and the Convention Secretariat to conclude a headquarters agreement, which will provide a legal status to the Convention Secretariat,

Aware that the headquarters agreement between the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Nations and the Convention Secretariat has been concluded and signed on 18 September 2002 in Bonn,

Appreciating that a provision has been made in article 2, paragraph 2, of the headquarters agreement, subject to the consent of the competent bodies of Agreements concluded under article IV of the Convention, to apply the headquarters agreement *mutatis mutandis* to the secretariats of such Agreements, which have been co-located with the Convention Secretariat and are institutionally linked to the United Nations,

The Meeting of the Parties:

1. *Welcomes and endorses* the agreement between the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Nations and the Secretariat of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals concerning the headquarters of the Convention Secretariat;
2. *Endorses* that, in accordance to article 2, paragraph 2, of the headquarters agreement, the agreement shall apply *mutatis mutandis* to the Secretariat of the Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds;
3. *Expresses* its sincere gratitude to the Federal Republic of Germany for the financial and other support to the Agreement Secretariat.

RESOLUTION 2.12

TRIBUTE TO THE ORGANIZERS

Recalling Resolution 1.11, in which the offer of the Federal Republic of Germany to host the second session of the Meeting of Parties was accepted by the Meeting of the Parties with great appreciation,

Aware of the significant effort undertaken in the organization of the current session of the Meeting of the Parties by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, along with the Secretariat of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals,

Appreciating the financial support provided by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Secretariat of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals to facilitate participation by as many Range States as possible,

The Meeting of the Parties:

1. *Expresses* its gratitude to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany on the arrangements made to provide an excellent venue and facilities for the second session of the Meeting of the Parties;
2. *Congratulates* the Agreement Secretariat on the excellent preparation of the current second session of the Meeting of the Parties to the Agreement;
3. *Expresses* its gratitude to the Secretariat of the Convention for the support provided to the Agreement Secretariat in organizing the current meeting;
4. *Expresses also* its appreciation to the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for their support in facilitating participation by many Range States.

RESOLUTION 2.13

INTERNATIONAL ACTION PLANS ON THE SOCIABLE PLOVER, THE BLACKWINGED PRATINCOLE AND THE GREAT SNIPE

Recalling that paragraph 2.2.1 of the Action Plan of the Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Waterbirds states that the Parties shall cooperate with a view to developing and implementing international single species action plans,

The Meeting of the Parties:

1. *Adopts* the International Action Plans on each of the following species:
Chettusia gregaria, Glareola nordmanni and Gallinago media;
2. *Invites* the Range States to implement the Action Plans.

RECOMMENDATION 2.1

INTERNATIONAL ACTION PLAN ON THE DARK-BELLIED BRENT GOOSE

Recognizing that *Branta bernicla bernicla* has B2b status in the Action Plan of the Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Waterbirds, which indicates that it needs special attention as it is dependent on habitat types which are under severe threat,

Recalling that the first Meeting of the Parties, in November 1999 in Cape Town, took note of an earlier draft of the International Action Plan for *Branta bernicla bernicla*,

Recalling that paragraph 2.2.1 of the AEWA Action Plan states that the Parties shall cooperate with a view to developing and implementing international single species action plans,

Recognizing the progress in the work and efforts of the Working Group on *Branta bernicla bernicla* to further develop the draft action plan, and *recalling* the need to develop a population model for *Branta bernicla bernicla*,

The Meeting of Parties:

1. *Encourages* the Working Group to prepare the final draft of the action plan to be sent to the Range States for consultation and endorsement, taking account of the additional comments provided by the participants at the second Meeting of the Parties;
2. *Calls upon* the Contracting Parties and Range States to endorse the final draft of the action plan;
3. *Invites* the Contracting Parties and Range States to implement the action plan as appropriate;
4. *Requests* the Contracting Parties, Range States and organizations concerned to provide financial assistance to develop a population model for *Branta bernicla bernicla* as appropriate;
5. *Authorizes* the Standing Committee, in close cooperation and consultation with the Technical Committee, to adopt the Action Plan on an interim basis so as to allow the Dark-bellied Brent Goose Working Group to continue its activities;
6. *Requests* that the final plan should be brought to the third Meeting of the Parties for formal adoption.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS / LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS

Chairman / Président

Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature
Conservation and Nuclear Safety
Attn. Dr. Michael von Websky, MinDir
(Head of Delegation)
Postfach 12 06 29
53048 Bonn
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 228) 305 2605
Fax: (+49 228) 305 2694

Vice-Chairman / Vice-Président

M. Mbareck Diop
Technical Advisor to the President
Presidence de la Republique du Senegal
Avenue Léopold Sédar Senghor
P.O. Box 4026
Dakar
SENEGAL/Sénégal

Tel.: (+221) 633 3412
Fax: (+221) 823 2840
E-mail: mbareck@yahoo.com, mbareck@hotmail.com

Official Delegations / Delegations Officielles

BENIN

M. Mohamed Abdoulaye
Chef du Service
Direction des Forêts et des Ressources Naturelles
Ministère du Developpement Rural
B.P. 393
Cotonou
BENIN/Bénin

Tel.: (+229) 33 06 62 / 30 04 10 / 30 04 96
Fax: (+229) 30 03 26 / 33 04 21 / 33 21 92
E-mail: cenatel@bow.intnet.bj

BULGARIA

Dr. Hristo Bojinov
Director
National Nature Protection Service
Ministry of Environment and Water
ulan W. Gladstone 67
1000 Sofia
BULGARIA/Bulgarie

Tel.: (+ 359 2) 940 6541
Fax: (+ 359 2) 980 9641
E-mail: bojinov@moew.government.bg

CONGO

M. Jérôme Mokoko Ikonga
Directeur Adjoint Projet Parc Nationale Nouabale'-
Ndoki
WCS Congo
Ministère de l'Economie Forestière
B.P. 14537
Brazzaville
CONGO/Congo

Tel.: (+242) 810346 / 511785
Fax: (+242) 813 393
E-mail: wcscongo@yahoo.fr

CROATIA

Dr. Jelena Kralj
Institute for Ornithology
Ilirski Trg 9/II
10000 Zagreb
CROATIA/Croatie

Tel.: (+385 1) 485 1322
Fax: (+385 1) 485 1322
E-mail: zzo@hazu.hr

DENMARK

Dr. Sten Asbirk
Head of Section
Ministry of Environment
National Forest and Nature Agency
Haraldsgade 53
2100 Copenhagen O
DENMARK/Danemark

Tel.: (+45) 39 49 29 26
Fax: (+45) 39 27 98 99
E-mail: sta@sns.dk

Ms. Anette Bjerge
Executive Officer
National Forest and Nature Agency
Haraldsgade 53
2100 Copenhagen O
DENMARK/Danemark

Tel.: (+45 39) 27 20 00
Fax: (+45 39) 27 98 99
E-mail: abj@sns.dk

Mr. Preben Clausen
National Environmental Research Agency Department
of Coastal Zone Ecology
Grenavej 12, Kalo
8410 Ronde
DENMARK/Danemark

Tel.: +45 8920 1519
Fax: +45 8920 1515
E-mail: pc@dmu.dk, preben_clausen@hotmail.com

Mr. Palle Uhd Jepsen (Head of Delegation)
Head of Section
Forest and Nature Agency
Ministry of Environment
Haraldsgade 53
2100 Copenhagen O
DENMARK/Danemark

Tel.: (+45) 39 47 24 00
Fax: (+45) 39 27 98 99
E-mail: puj@sns.dk

Mr. Carsten Lund
Head of Section
Forest and Nature Agency
Ministry of Environment
Haraldsgade 53
2100 Copenhagen O
DENMARK/Danemark

Tel.: (+45) 39 47 26 67
Fax: (+45) 39 27 98 99
E-mail: clu@sns.dk

Ms Pernille Månsson
Head of Section
Forest and Nature Agency
Ministry of Environment
Haraldsgade 53
2100 Copenhagen O
DENMARK/Danemark

Tel.: (+45) 39 47 28 30
Fax: (+45) 39 27 98 99
E-mail: pem@sns.dk

EGYPT

Mr. Mohamed Ibrahim
Director General
Nature Conservation Sector
Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency

30 Mas Helwan El Zyrae Road
Cairo, Maadi
EGYPT/Egypte

Tel.: (+202) 524 8792 / 527 3191
Fax: (+202) 525 6490
E-mail: eaaa4@idsc.gov.eg

FINLAND

Mr. Tommy Blomberg
Ålands Landskapsstyrelse
P.O. Box 60
22101 Mariehamn
FINLAND/Finlande

Tel.: (+358 18) 25313
Fax: (+358 18) 19240
E-mail: tommy.blomberg@ls.aland.fi

Mr. Sami Niemi (Head of Delegation)
Senior Officer
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
Department of Fisheries and Game
Mariankatu 23
P.O. Box 30
00023 Helsinki
FINLAND/Finlande

Tel.: (+358 9) 16 05 33 74
Fax: (+358 9) 16 05 22 84
E-mail: sami.niemi@mmm.fi

Mr. Matti K. Osara
Senior Adviser
Ministry of Environment
P.O. Box 35
Kasarmikatu 25
00023 Helsinki
FINLAND/Finlande

Tel.: (+358 9) 16 03 93 34
Fax: (+358 9) 16 03 93 64
E-mail: matti.osara@ymparisto.fi

GAMBIA

Mr. Momodou L. Kassama
Gambian Wildlife Service
Dept. of Parks and Wildlife Management
c/o State Dept. for the Presidency
State House
Box 1882
Banjul
GAMBIA/Gambie

Tel.: (+220) 375888 / 903511
Fax: (+220) 392179 / 22 89 98
E-mail: wildlife@gamtel.gm

GEORGIA

Mr. Zurab Gurielidze
Chairman of the Board
Noah's Ark Centre for the Recovery of
Endangered Species (NACRES)
P.O. Box 20
380079 Tbilissi
GEORGIA/Géorgie

Tel.: (+995 32) 53 71 25
Fax: (+995 32) 53 71 24
E-mail: zurab.gurielidze@nacres.org

GERMANY

Mr. Gerhard Adams, CMS Focal Point
Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation
and Nuclear Safety
Division N I 3
P.O. Box 12 06 29
53048 Bonn
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 228) 305 2631
Fax: (+49 228) 305 2684
E-mail: gerhard.adams.@bmu.bund.de

Mr. Peter Boye
Bundesamt für Naturschutz
FG I 1.2
Konstantinstr. 110
53179 Bonn
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 228) 849 1113
Fax: (+49 228) 849 1119
E-mail: boyep@bfm.de

Ms Hatice Demircan
Interpreter (ORR'n)
Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature
Conservation and Nuclear Safety
Division Z I 4
Postfach 12 06 29
53048 Bonn
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 228) 305 2276
Fax: (+49 228) 305 2289
E-mail: hatice.demircan@bmu.bund.de

Mr. Stefan Dombrowsky
Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature
Conservation and Nuclear Safety
Division AG N I 2
Postfach 12 06 29
53084 Bonn
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 228) 305 2627
Fax: (+49 228) 305 2697
E-mail:

Dr. Gerhard Emonds (Deputy Head of Delegation)
Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature
Conservation and Nuclear Safety
Division N I 3
Postfach 12 06 29
53048 Bonn
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 228) 305 2630
Fax: (+49 228) 305 2684
E-mail: gerhard.emonds@bmu.bund.de

Mrs. Mechthilde Föhr
Interpreter (ORR'n)
Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature
Conservation and Nuclear Safety
Division Z I 4
Postfach 12 06 29
53048 Bonn
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 228) 305 2272
Fax: (+49 228) 305 2289
E-mail: mechthilde.foehr@bmu.bund.de

Mr. Heiko Haupt
Bundesamt für Naturschutz
FG I 1.2
Konstantinstr. 110
53179 Bonn
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 228) 849 1104
Fax: (+49 228) 849 1119
E-mail: haupt@bfm.de

Mrs. Simone Irsfeld
Interpreter (ORR'n)
Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature
Conservation and Nuclear Safety
Division Z I 4
Postfach 12 06 29
53048 Bonn
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 228) 305 2276
Fax: (+49 228) 305 2289
E-mail: simone.irsfeld@bmu.bund.de

Mr. Harald Martens
Head of CITES Scientific Authority
Federal Agency for Nature Conservation
FG I 1.2
Konstantinstr. 110
53179 Bonn
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 228) 849 1103
Fax: (+49 228) 849 1119
E-mail: martensh@bfn.de

Mr. Erik Schmidt-Wergifosse
Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature
Conservation and Nuclear Safety
Division N I 3
Postfach 12 06 29
53084 Bonn
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 228) 305 2638
Fax: (+49 228) 305 2684
E-mail: erik.schmidt-wergifosse@bmu.bund.de

Mr. Joachim Schmitz
Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature
Conservation and Nuclear Safety
Division N I 3
P.O. Box 12 06 29
53048 Bonn
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 228) 305 2634
Fax: (+49 228) 305 2684
E-mail: schmitz.joachim@bmu.de

Dr. Barbara Schuster
Director General
Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature
Conservation and Nuclear Safety
Directorate General N
Postfach 12 06 29
53084 Bonn
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 228) 305 2601
Fax: (+49 228) 305 2694
E-mail: barbara.schuster@bmu.bund.de

Ms. Dorothee Schwolgin
Interpreter (ORR'n)
Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature
Conservation and Nuclear Safety
Division Z I 4
Postfach 12 06 29
53048 Bonn
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 228) 305 2284
Fax: (+49 228) 305 2289
E-mail: dorothee.schwolgin@bmu.bund.de

Dr. Martin Stock
Landesamt für den Nationalpark Schleswig-
Holsteinisches Wattenmeer
Schloßgarten 1
25832 Tönning
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 4861) 61647
Fax:
E-mail: stock@nationalparkamt.de

Mr. Peter Südbeck
Nds. Landesamt für Ökologie
Fachbehörde Naturschutz Staatliche Vogelschutzwarte
Göttinger Str. 14
30449 Hannover
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 511) 444 6203
Fax: (+49 511) 444 6203
E-mail: peter.suedbeck@nlloe.niedersachsen.de

Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature
Conservation and Nuclear Safety
Division N I 3
Attn. Ms Edith Völker
Postfach 12 06 29
53084 Bonn
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 228) 305 2637
Fax: (+49 228) 305 2684
E-mail: edith.voelker@bmu.bund.de

GUINEA

Mme. Christine Sagno Kourouma
Chef Division Faune et Protection de la Nature
Direction Nationale des Eaux et Forêts
Ministère de l'Agriculture, de l'Elevage et des Forêts
B.P. 624
Conakry
GUINEA/Guinée

Tel.: (+224) 463248 / 431099
Fax: (+224) 41 48 73
E-mail: dfpn@sotelgui.net.gn

JORDAN

Mr. Khalaf Al-Oklah
Director
Nature and Lands Conservation Dept.
General Corporation for Environment Protection
(GCEP)
P.O. Box 1408
Amman 11941
JORDAN/Jordanie

Tel.: (+962 6) 535 0149
Fax: (+962 6) 535 0084 / 533 2938
E-mail: aloklah@yahoo.com

KENYA

H.E. Mr. Nehemiah K. Rotich
Ambassador
Permanent Mission of the Republic of Kenya to UNEP
P.O.Box 41395 Harambee Avenue
Nairobi
KENYA/Kenya

Tel.: (+254 2) 33 72 90
Fax: (+254 2) 31 51 05
E-mail: kmunep@swiftkenya.com

MALI

M. Alfousseini Semega
Direction National de la Conservation de la Nature
Ministère de l'Equippement, de l'Aménagement du
Territoire, de l'Environnement et de l'Urbanisme
B.P. 275
Bamako
MALI/Mali

Tel.: (+223) 23 36 95/7
Fax: (+223) 233 696
E-mail: conservationnature@datatech.net.ml

MAURITIUS

Mr. Yousoof Mungroo
Director
National Parks and Conservation Service
Ministry of Agriculture, Food Technology and Natural
Resources
Reduit
Mauritius/Maurice

Tel.: (+230) 464 2993
Fax: (+230) 465 1184
E-mail: npcsagr@intnet.mu

MONACO

M. Patrick van Klaveren
Conseiller technique du Ministre Plénipotentiaire
Chargé de la Coopération
Internationale pour l'Environnement et le
Développement
Villa Girasole
16, boulevard de Suisse
98000 Monaco
MONACO/Monaco

Tel.: (+377) 93 15 81 48 / 93 15 89 63
Fax: (+377) 93 15 42 08
E-mail: pvanklaveren@gouv.mc

NETHERLANDS

Mr. Barwolt S. Ebbinge
ALTERRA
Postbus 47
6700 AA Wageningen
NETHERLANDS/Pays-Bas

Tel.: (+31 317) 47 87 29
Fax: (+31 317) 42 49 88
E-mail: b.s.ebbinge@alterra.wag-ur.nl

Dr. Jan-Willem Sneep (Head of Delegation)
Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management
and Fisheries
Directorate for Nature Management
Division of Policy Instruments
P.O. Box 20401
2500 EK Den Haag
NETHERLANDS/Pays-Bas

Tel.: (+31 70) 378 5255
Fax: (+31 70) 378 6144
E-mail: j.w.sneep@n.agro.nl

NIGER

M. Abdou Malam Issa
Ingénieur des Eaux et Forêts
Direction de la faune, pêche et pisciculture
Ministère Hydraulique Environnement
B.P. 721
Niamey
NIGER/Niger

Tel.: (+227) 73 33 29 / 73 40 69
Fax: (+227) 73 27 84 / 73 60 12 / 73 55 91
E-mail: ucnpmedp@intnet.ne

REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA

Ms Marcela Vatamaniuc
Senior Officer
International Relations Division
Ministry of Ecology, Construction and Territorial
Development
9, Cosmonautilor str.
2005 Chisinau
MOLDOVA, REPUBLIC OF/Moldova

Tel.: (+373 2) 22 68 53
Fax: (+373 2) 22 07 48
E-mail: natura@mediu.moldova.md

ROMANIA

Ms. Adriana Baz
Director for the Conservation and Protection of
Biodiversity, Protected Areas and Nature
Ministry of Water and Environmental Protection
Blvd. Libertatii No. 12, Sector 5
76106 Bucharest
ROMANIA/Roumanie

Tel.: (+ 40 21) 410 0531
Fax: (+ 40 21) 410 0531
E-mail: biodiv@mappm.ro

SENEGAL

M. Demba Mamadou Ba
Directeur des Parcs nationaux
Ministère de la Jeunesse de l'Environnement et de
l'Hygiène Publique
Direction des Parcs Nationaux
B.P. 5135
Hann Zoological and Forestry Parks
Dakar Fann
SENEGAL/Sénégal

Tel.: (+221) 832 2309
Fax: (+221) 832 2311
E-mail: dpn@sentoosn

S.E. M. Paul Badji (Head of Delegation)
Ambassadeur
Ambassade de la République du Sénégal
Argelanderstr. 3
53115 Bonn

Tel.: (+49 228) 21 80 08
Fax: (+49 228) 21 78 15
E-mail:

M. Félix Oudiane
Premier Conseiller
Ambassade de la République du Sénégal
Argelanderstr. 3
53115 Bonn

Tel.: (+49 228) 21 80 08
Fax: (+49 228) 21 78 15
E-mail:

SLOVAKIA

Mr. Peter Pilinsky
Ministry for the Environment
Dept. of Nature and Landscape Protection
Nám. L. Stúra 1
812 35 Bratislava 1
SLOVAKIA/Slovakie

Tel.: (+421 2) 59 56 21 89
Fax: (+421 2) 59 56 25 33
E-mail: pilinsky.peter@enviro.gov.sk

SPAIN

Sr. Juan Jose Areces Maqueda
Ministerio de Medio Ambiente
Dirección General de Conservación de la Naturaleza
Gran Vía de San Francisco 4
28005 Madrid
SPAIN/Espagne

Tel.: (+34 91) 597 5594
Fax: (+34 91) 597 5510
E-mail:

Sr. Fran Hernandez
Ministerio de Medio Ambiente
Dirección General de Conservación de la Naturaleza
Gran Vía de San Francisco 4
28005 Madrid
SPAIN/Espagne

Tel.: (+34 91) 597 5677
Fax: (+34 91) 597 5566
E-mail: oficina.anillas@dgcnmma.es

Sr. Cosme Morillo Fernández (Head of Delegation)
Ministerio de Medio Ambiente
Dirección General de Conservación de la Naturaleza
Gran Vía de San Francisco 4
28005 Madrid
SPAIN/Espagne

Tel.: (+34 91) 597 5594
Fax: (+34 91) 597 5510
E-mail: cosme.morillo@dgcn.mma.es

SUDAN

Mr. Khamis Adieng Ding
Wildlife Conservation General Administration
P.O. Box 336
Khartoum
Sudan/Soudan

Tel.: (+249 13) 34 46 20
Fax: (+249 13) 34 46 21
E-mail: khamis_adieng@hotmail.com

SWEDEN

Mr. Torsten Larsson
Environmental Protection Agency
Blekhölmsterrassen 36
10648 Stockholm
SWEDEN/Suède

Tel.: (+46 8) 698 1391
Fax: (+46 8) 698 1042
E-mail: torsten.larsson@naturvardsverket.se

SWITZERLAND

Dr. Olivier Biber (Head of Delegation)
Chef des Questions internationales Nature et Paysage
Office fédéral de l'environnement, des forêts, et du
paysage (OFEFP)
3003 Berne
SWITZERLAND/Suisse

Tel.: (+41 31) 323 0663
Fax: (+41 31) 324 7579
E-mail: olivier.biber@buwal.admin.ch

M. Raymond Pierre Lebeau
Office fédéral de l'environnement, des forêts, et du
paysage (OFEFP)
Division Nature et Paysage
3003 Berne
SWITZERLAND/Suisse

Tel.: (+41 31) 322 8064 / 322 9389
Fax: (+41 31) 324 7579
E-mail: raymond-pierre.lebeau@buwal.admin.ch

THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

Mr. Aleksandar Nastov
Environment Protection Service
Ministry of the Environment and Physical Planning
Dresdenska 52
91000 Skopje
MACEDONIA, THE FORMER YUGOSLAV
REPUBLIC OF/l'ex-République yougoslave de
Macédoine

Tel.: (+389 2) 36 69 30 ext 122
Fax: (+389 2) 36 69 31
E-mail: anastov@moepp.gov.mk,
infoeko@moe.gov.mk

TOGO

M. Kotchikpa Okoumassou
Chef, Protection et Gestion
Direction de la Faune et de la Chasse
Ministère de l'Environnement et des Ressources
Forestière
B.P. 355
Lomé
TOGO/Togo

Tel.: (+228) 2214029
Fax: (+228) 2214029
E-mail: direfaune@caramail.com

UGANDA

Mr. Justus Tindigarukayo-Kashagire
Asst. Commissioner Wildlife
Wildlife Division
Ministry of Tourism, Trade & Industry
P.O. Box 4241
Kampala
UGANDA/Ouganda

Tel.: (+256 41) 34 39 47 / 25 12 94
Fax: (+256 41) 34 12 47 / 25 12 94
E-mail: wildlife.justus@wildlifeug.org

UNITED KINGDOM

Mr. Steve Lee-Bapty (Head of Delegation)
Zoos and International Species Conservation
Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
Temple Quay House
2 The Square, Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6EB
UNITED KINGDOM/Royaume-Uni

Tel.: (+44 117) 372 8295
Fax: (+44 117) 372 8317
E-mail: steve.lee-bapty@defra.gsi.gov.uk

Mr. David A. Stroud
Senior Ornithologist
Joint Nature Conservation Committee
Monkstone House, City Road
Peterborough PE1 1JY
UNITED KINGDOM/Royaume-Uni

Tel.: (+44 1733) 56 26 26
Fax: (+44 1733) 55 59 48
E-mail: david.stroud@jncc.gov.uk

Mr. Robert Vagg
International Conservation Policy Adviser
Zoos and International Species Conservation
Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
Temple Quay House
2 The Square, Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6EB
UNITED KINGDOM/Royaume-Uni

Tel.: (+44 117) 372 8110
Fax: (+44 117) 372 8317
E-mail: robert.vagg@defra.gsi.gov.uk

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA

Mr. Mzamillu Kaita
Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism
Wildlife Division
Ivory Room, Nyerere Road
P.O. Box 1994
Dar es Salaam
UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA/République-
Unie de Tanzanie

Tel.: (+255 22) 286 6408 / 6375
Fax: (+255 22) 286 3496 / 5836
E-mail: wildlife-division@twiga.com

Mr. Josiah M. Katondo
National Environment Management Council
Lake Victoria Environment Project
P.O. Box 63154
Mwanza
UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA/République-
Unie de Tanzanie

Tel.: (+255 28) 250 0806
Fax: (+255 28) 250 0806
E-mail: lvemp-wetlands@raha.com,
lakevic.tan@sukumanet.com

Ms. Nipanema Mdoe
Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism
Wildlife Division
Ivory Room, Nyerere Road
P.O. Box 1994
Dar es Salaam
TANZANIA, UNITED REPUBLIC OF/Tanzanie,
République-Unie de

Tel.: (+255 22) 286 6408 / 375
Fax: (+255 22) 286 5836
E-mail: wildlife-division@twiga.com

Mr. Charles Mdoe
Asst. Director
Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism
Wildlife Division
Ivory Room, Nyerere Road
P.O. Box 1994
Dar es Salaam
UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA/République-
Unie de Tanzanie

Tel.: (+255 22) 286 6408 / 375
Fax: (+255 22) 286 5836
E-mail: wildlife-division@twiga.com

Mr. Emmanuel L. M. Severre (Head of Delegation)
Director of Wildlife Division
Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism
P.O. Box 1994
Dar es Salaam
UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA/République-
Unie de Tanzanie

Tel.: (+255 22) 286 6408
Fax: (+255 22) 286 5836 / 286 3496
E-mail: wildlife-division@twiga.com

Ms. Miriam Zacharia
Principle Game Officer
Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism
Wildlife Division
Ivory Room, Nyerere Road
P.O. Box 1994
Dar es Salaam
TANZANIA, UNITED REPUBLIC OF/Tanzanie,
République-Unie de

Tel.: (+255 22) 286 6408 / 6375
Fax: (+255 22) 286 3496 / 5836
E-mail: wildlife-division@twiga.com

Other Official Delegations / Autres Delegations Officielles

ALGERIA

M. Abdelghani Belouad
Directeur
Ministère de l'Agriculture
Direction Générale des Forêts
Chemin Doudou Mokhtar-Ben Aknoun
16000 Alger
Algeria/Algérie

Tel.: (+213 21) 91 53 14
Fax: (+213 21) 91 53 14
E-mail: dgf.dpff@wissal.dz

ARMENIA

Mr. Georgi Arzumanyan (Head of Delegation)
Head of the International Cooperation Department
Ministry of the Nature Protection
ul. Moscovyana 35
375002 Yerevan
Armenia/Arménie

Tel.: (+374 1) 53 18 61
Fax: (+374 1) 53 18 61 / 53 81 87
E-mail: interdpt@rambler.ru

Mr. Karén Jenderedjian
Leading Specialist
Ministry of Nature Protection
ul. Moscovyana 35
375002 Yerevan
Armenia/Arménie

Tel.: (+374 1) 53 18 41
Fax: (+374 1) 53 18 61 / 53 81 87
E-mail: jender@nature.am

AUSTRIA

Dr. Heimo Metz
Amt der Burgenländischen Landesregierung Abteilung
IV Burgenländisches Landesmuseum
Hartlsteig 2
7001 Eisenstadt
Austria/Autriche

Tel.: (+43 2682) 600 2813/82
Fax: (+43 2682) 600 2817
E-mail: heimo.metz@bgld.gv.at

AZERBAIJAN

Mr. Farig Farzaliyev
Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources
B. Aghayev Street 100-A
370073 Baku
Azerbaijan/Azerbaï djan

Tel.: (+944 12) 38 74 19
Fax: (+997 12) 92 59 07
E-mail: valeh@eko.baku.az

BANGLADESH

H.E. Hon. Mr. Jafrul Islam Chowdhury
(Head of Delegation)
State Minister for Environment and Forest
Building #6, Room #1322
Bangladesh Secretariat
Dhaka 1000
Bangladesh/Bangladesh

Tel.: (+880 2) 861 0587 / 861 7916
Fax: (+880 2) 861 0166
E-mail: moefmin@sdnbd.org

Mr. Md. Osman Gani
Conservator
Forest Department
Ministry of Environment and Forests
Building #6, Room #1322
Bangladesh Secretariat
Dhaka 1000
Bangladesh/Bangladesh

Tel.: (+880 2) 861 0587 / 861 7916
Fax: (+880 2) 861 0166
E-mail: moefmin@sdnbd.org

BELGIUM

Ms Catherine Debruyne
Ministère de la Région Wallonne
Direction Générale des Ressources Naturelles et de
l'Environnement
7, avenue Prince de Liège
5100 Jambes
BELGIUM/Belgique

Tel.: (+32 81) 33 58 04
Fax: (+32 81) 33 58 22
E-mail: c.debruyne@mrw.wallonie.be

BURKINA FASO

Mme. Mariam Douamba
Chef Service Suivi Exploitation
Ministère de l'Environnement et du Cadre de Vie
Direction de la Faune et des Chasses
B.P. 7044
Ouagadougou 03
BURKINA FASO/Burkina Faso

Tel.: (+226) 363021 / 305437 / 268924 / 256314
Fax: (+226) 36 74 58
E-mail: dgef@cenatrin.bf

BURUNDI

Mr. Jean-Marie Bukuru
Correspondant national de CMS, AEWA et Ramsar
Ministère de l'Aménagement du Territoire et de
l'Environnement
B.P. 241
Gitega
Burundi/Burundi

Tel.: (+257) 40 23 03
Fax: (+257) 402625/ 402617 / 228902
E-mail: igebu@cbinf.com

CAMEROON

M. Koutou Denis Koulagna
Directeur de la faune et des aires protégées
Ministère de l'environnement et des forêts
B.P. 2705
Yaoundé
CAMEROON/Cameroun

Tel.: (+237) 223 9228
Fax: (+237) 223 9228
E-mail: dfap.minef@camnet.cm

CANADA

Dr. J.S. Wendt
Canadian Wildlife Service - Environment Canada
Conservation Branch
351 St-Joseph Boulevard 3rd floor
Place Vincent Massey
Hull, Quebec K1A 0H3
Canada/Canada

Tel.: (+1 819) 953 1422
Fax: (+1 819) 994 4445
E-mail: steve.wendt@ec.gc.ca

CAPE VERDE

Sr. Emilio Gomes Sanches
Regional Director
National Institute for Fisheries Development
P.O. Box 545
Praia
Cape Verde/Cap-Vert

Tel.: (+238) 61 28 65
Fax: (+238) 61 25 02
E-mail: esanches@caramail.com,
egsanches@hotmail.com

CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

M. Dominique Ngongba-Ngouadakpa
Directeur de la Faune
Ministère de l'Environnement des Eaux- Forêts-
Chasse-Pêche
B.P. 830
Bangui
Central African Republic/République Centrafricaine

Tel.: (+236) 50 37 49
Fax: (+236) 61 57 41
E-mail: liabastre@intnet.cf, liabastre@ifrance.com

CHAD

M. Mahamat Hassane Idriss
Chef de Service de Sensibilisation, Information et de
Formation
Direction de protection de la faune et des parcs
nationaux
Ministère de l'Environnement et de l'Eau
B.P. 2115 N'Djamena
CHAD/Tchad

Tel.: (+235) 52 23 05
Fax: (+235) 523214 / 523839 / 524470
E-mail: mhthassan@hotmail.com, cnar@intnet.td

COMOROS

M. Ismael Bachirou
Directeur-Générale Adjoint
Direction Générale de l'Environnement
Ministère de la Production et de l'Environnement
B.P. 41
Moroni
Comoros/Comores

Tel.: (+269) 73 63 88
Fax: (+269) 73 68 49
E-mail: ismael_269@yahoo.com

COTE D'IVOIRE

M. Eric Beugre
Ministère de l'Environnement et du Cadre de Vie
Direction de la Protection de la Nature
Cite Administrative, Tour C, 7EE
B.P. V 178
Abidjan
Côte d'Ivoire/Côte d'Ivoire

Tel.: (+225 20) 21 91 41 / 21 03 42
Fax: (+225 20) 210342 / 22 53 66
E-mail: ericbeugre@hotmail.com, ahounze@yahoo.fr

M. Tano Sombo (Head of Delegation)
Directeur de la Protection de la Nature
Ministère de l'Environnement et du Cadre de Vie
Cite Administrative, Tour C, 7EE
B.P. V 178
Abidjan
Côte d'Ivoire/Côte d'Ivoire

Tel.: (+225 20) 21 91 41 / 21 03 42
Fax: (+225 20) 210342 / 22 53 66
E-mail:

CZECH REPUBLIC

Ms Libuse Vlasáková (Head of Delegation)
Nature Conservation Department
Ministry of the Environment
Vrsovicá 65
100 10 Praha 10
CZECH REPUBLIC/République Tchèque

Tel.: (+420 2) 6712 2372
Fax: (+420 2) 6731 1096
E-mail: libuse_vlasakova@env.cz

Dr. Jiri Pykal
Agency for Nature Conservation and Landscape
Protection
NA'M Premysla, Otakara II., 34
37001 Ceske Budeyovice
CZECH REPUBLIC/République Tchèque

Tel.: (+420 38) 635 9388
Fax: (+420 38) 731 2811 / 635 1008
E-mail: cb@nature.cz

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO

M. Muembo Kabemba
Directeur des Domaines et Réserves
l'Institut Congolais pour la Conservation de la Nature
ICCN
13, avenue des Cliniques
Gombé Kinshasa 1
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE
CONGO/République Démocratique du Congo

Tel.: (+243 88) 33401 / 34390 / 6065
Fax: (+243 88) 03208
E-mail: pdg.iccn@ic.cd, iccn-infor@ic.cd,
muembo@hotmail.com

Mme. Landu Nina
Directeur de la Recherche Scientifique
l'Institut Congolais pour la Conservation de la Nature
ICCN
13, avenue des Cliniques
Gombé Kinshasa 1
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE
CONGO/République Démocratique du Congo

Tel.: (+243 88) 33401 / 34390 / 6065
Fax: (+243 88) 03208
E-mail: pdg.iccn@ic.cd, iccn-infor@ic.cd

DJIBOUTI

M. Houssein Abdillahi Rayaleh
Assistant du secrétaire Général / Point focal de Ramsar
Ministère de l'Habitat, de L'Urbanisme, de
l'Environnement et de l'Aménagement du Territoire
B.P. 11
Djibouti
Djibouti/Djibouti

Tel.: (+253) 35 00 06 / 35 26 67
Fax: (+235) 35 16 18
E-mail: assamo@caramail.com

EQUATORIAL GUINEA

Sr. Santiago Francisco Engonga Osono
Punto Focal de CMS
Ministerio de Bosque, Pesca y Medio Ambiente
Malabo
Equatorial Guinea/Guinée équatoriale

Tel.: (+240 9) 1305
Fax: (+240 9) 2905
E-mail: proegq@intnet.gq

ERITREA

Mr. Hagos Yohannes
Head of Wildlife Conservation
Land Resource and Crop Production Dept.
Ministry of Agriculture
P.O. Box 1048
Asmara
Eritrea/Erythrée

Tel.: (+291 1) 181077
Fax: (+291 1) 181415
E-mail: estbein@eol.com.er

ESTONIA

Mr. Andres Kruus
Ministry of the Environment
Toompuiestee 24
15172 Tallinn
Estonia/Estonie

Tel.: (+372) 62 62 870 / 51 24 244
Fax: (+372) 62 62 901
E-mail: andres.kruus@ekm.envir.ee

ETHIOPIA

Mr. Yeneneh Teka Leta
Head of Conservation Education, Training and Public
Relations
Ministry of Agriculture
Wildlife Conservation Organization
P.O. Box 386
Addis Ababa
Ethiopia/Ethiopie

Tel.: (+251 1) 51 43 89
Fax: (+251 1) 51 41 90
E-mail: ewco@telecom.net.et, yenenehl@yahoo.com

FRANCE

M. Alain Auve (Head of Delegation)
Ministère de l'Ecologie et du Développement Durable
20, avenue de Ségur
75302 Paris 07 SP
FRANCE/France

Tel.: (+33 1) 42 19 19 59
Fax: (+33 1) 42 19 19 79
E-mail: alain.auve@environnement.gouv.fr

M. Gilles De Planque
Association Nationale des Chasseurs de Gibiers d'Eau
ANCGE
5, avenue des Chasseurs
75017 Paris
FRANCE/France

Tel.: (+33 1) 47 64 64 90
Fax: (+33 1) 44 01 05 11
E-mail: gillesdeplanque@nornet.fr

M. Olivier Dehorter
Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle
55, rue Buffon
75005 Paris
FRANCE/France

Tel.: (+33 1) 40 79 30 83
Fax: (+33 1) 40 79 38 85
E-mail: dehorter@mnhn.fr

M. François Lamarque
Office National de la Chasse et Faune Sauvage
85 bis avenue de Wagram
B.P. 236
75822 Paris Cedex 17
FRANCE/France

Tel.: (+33 1) 44 15 17 20
Fax: (+33 1) 44 15 17 04
E-mail: f.lamarque@oncfs.gouv.fr

M. Michel Métais
Ligue française pour la Protection des Oiseaux
La Corderie Royale
B.P. 263
17305 Rochefort Cedex
FRANCE/France

Tel.: (+33 5) 46 82 12 34
Fax: (+33 5) 46 83 95 86
E-mail: michel.metais@lpo-birdlife.asso.fr

M. Jean-Yves Mondain-Monval
Office nationale de la Chasse
Le Sambuc
13200 Arles
FRANCE/France

Tel.: (+33 4) 90 97 27 90
Fax: (+33 4) 90 97 27 88
E-mail: j.y.mondain@oncfs.gouv.fr

Dr. Vincent Schricke
Office National de la Chasse et Faune Sauvage
53, rue Russeil
44000 Nantes
FRANCE/France

Tel.: (+33 2) 51 25 03 90
Fax: (+33 2) 40 48 14 01
E-mail: v.schricke@oncfs.gouv.fr

GABON

M. Jean-Hilaire Moudziegou Ibinga
Directeur des Etudes
Ministère de l'Economie Forestière, des Eaux et de la
Pêche
Direction Générale de l'Environnement
B.P. 3903
Libreville
Gabon/Gabon

Tel.: (+241) 72 27 00
Fax: (+241) 76 55 48
E-mail: dfc@internetgabon.com

GUINEA-BISSAU

Mr. Sa Joaoziniio
Bureau de l'UICN en Guinée-Bissau
Gabinete de Planificacao Costeira
B.P. 23
1031 Bissau Codex
GUINEA-BISSAU/Guinée-Bissau

Tel.: (+245) 20 12 30 / 25 18 67
Fax: (+245) 20 11 68 / 20 15 67
E-mail: uicn@sol.gtelecom.gw

HUNGARY

Mr. Zoltán Czirák
Nature Conservation Officer/Ministry for Environment
Költő utca 21
1121 Budapest
HUNGARY/Hongrie

Tel.: (+36 1) 175 1093
Fax: (+36 1) 175 7457
E-mail: czirak@mail2.ktm.hu

ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN

Mr. Jafar Barmaki
2nd Secretary
Department of International Affairs
Foreign Ministry
Koshke Mesri Str.
Teheran
Iran, Islamic Republic of/Iran
(République islamique d')

Tel.: (+98 21) 321 2671
Fax: (+98 21) 670 4176
E-mail: jbarmaki@yahoo.com

Mr. Sadegh Sadeghi Zadegan
Department of Environment
Ostad Nejatollahi Av. 187
P.O. Box 5181
Teheran 15875
Iran, Islamic Republic of/Iran
(République islamique d')

Tel.: (+98 21) 826 9293
Fax: (+98 21) 826 7993
E-mail: sadeghizadegan@abedi.net

IRELAND

Mr. Graham McCulloch
Dept. of Zoology, Trinity College
University of Dublin
Dublin 2
IRELAND/Irlande

Tel.: (+353 1) 608 1366
Fax:
E-mail: mccullg@tcd.ie

Mr. Oscar James Merne
Head of Bird Research
Department of Environment and Local Government
Dúchas the Heritage Service, National Parks &
Wildlife
7 Ely Place
Dublin 2
IRELAND/Irlande

Tel.: (+353 1) 64 72 389
Fax: (+353 1) 66 20 283
E-mail: omerne@ealga.ie

KAZAKHSTAN

Dr. Sergey Yerekhov
Senior Research Fellow
Laboratory of Ornithology
Academy of Sciences
Academgorodog
Almaty 480032
Kazakhstan/Kazakhstan

Tel.: (+7 3272) 481 890 / 481 786
Fax: (+7 3272) 481 958
E-mail: instzoo@nursat.kz

LATVIA

Mr. Vilnis Bernards
Ministry of the Environment and Regional
Development
Peldu iela 25
1494 Riga
LATVIA/Lettonie

Tel.: (+371 7) 02 65 24
Fax: (+371 7) 82 04 42
E-mail: mopsis@varam.gov.lv

LEBANON

Ms Lamia Chamas
Chief of Service
Conservation of Nature
Ministry of Environment
B.P. 70-1091
Antelias, Beirut
Lebanon/Liban

Tel.: (+961 4) 522 222
Fax: (+961 4) 525 080
E-mail: lchamas@moe.gov.lb

LIBERIA

Hon. Mr. Abraham B. Kroma
Deputy Minister
Ministry of Planning and Economic Affairs
P.O. Box 10/9016
1000 Monrovia 10
Liberia/Libéria

Tel.: (+231) 22 77 02
Fax: (+231) 22 74 35
E-mail: akroma@hotmail.com

LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA

Prof. A. Almahaishi
Environment General Authority EGA
P.O. Box 83618
El-Gheran
Tripoli
LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA/Jamahiriya arabe
libyenne

Tel.: (+218 21) 483 9991 / 484 0045
Fax: (+218 21) 333 8098 / 483 9991
E-mail: ega@egalibya.org, almahaishi@yahoo.com

LITHUANIA

Ms Kristina Klovaité
Chief Officer
Ministry of Environment
Nature Protection Department
A. Jaksto 4/9
2694 Vilnius
LITHUANIA/Lituanie

Tel.: (+370 2) 61 75 58
Fax: (+370 2) 22 08 47
E-mail: k.klovaite@aplinkuma.lt

MAURITANIA

M. Mohamed Ould Hamza
Chef du Service Protection des Ressources
Ministère de Développement rural et de
l'Environnement
Direction de l'Environnement et de l'Aménagement
rural
B.P. 170
Nouakchott
MAURITANIA/Mauritanie

Tel.: (+222 2) 644 2934 /525 2834
Fax: (+222 2) 525 0741
E-mail: hamza@toptechnology.mr, dear@opt.mr

MOROCCO

M. Mohamed Ankouz
Directeur de la Conservation des Ressources
Forestières
Ministère Chargé des Eaux et Forêts
B.P. 605
Rabat-Chellah
MOROCCO/Maroc

Tel.: (+212 37) 76 54 29
Fax: (+212 37) 66 08 26
E-mail:

M. Mohamed Haffane (Head of Delegation)
Chargé de la Division de la Chasse, de la Pêche et de la
Protection de la Nature
Ministère des Eaux et forêts
B.P. 605
Rabat-Chellah
MOROCCO/Maroc

Tel.: (+212 37) 67 00 87
Fax: (+212 37) 67 00 87
E-mail: haffane@athena.online.co.ma

NIGERIA

H.E. Chief (Dr.) Imeh Okopido (Head of Delegation)
Honourable Minister of State for Environment
Federal Ministry of Environment
7th Floor, Federal Secretariat
Shehu Shagari Way, PMB 468
Garki, Abuja
NIGERIA/Nigéria

Tel.: (+234 9) 523 4931
Fax: (+234 9) 523 4931
E-mail: imet.okopido@hyperia.com

Mr. John H. Mshelbwala
Chief Environmental Scientist
Federal Ministry of Environment
Environment House, Rm 321
Independence Way/opp. National Hospital
P.M.B. 265
Garki, Abuja, F.C.T.
NIGERIA/Nigéria

Tel.: (+234 9) 234 2807 / 670 6652
Fax: (+234 9) 523 4014 / 4119 / 4932
E-mail: fmenv@hyperia.com,
johnmshelbwala2@yahoo.com

Mrs. B.B Adetoma
Embassy of the Federal Republic of Nigeria
Platanenstr. 98A
13156 Berlin
GERMANY/Allemande

Tel.: (+49 30) 477 23 00/01
Fax: (+49 30) 477 2555
E-mail: NigeriaEmbassy@compuserve.com

NORWAY

Mr. Olav Bakken Jensen
Ministry of Environment
Box 8013 Dep.
0030 Oslo
NORWAY/Norvège

Tel.: (+47 22) 24 58 72
Fax: (+47 22) 24 27 56
E-mail: olav.bakken.jensen@md.dep.no

Mr. Oystein Storkersen (Head of Delegation)
Senior Advisor
Directorate of Nature Management
Tungasletta 2
7485 Trondheim
NORWAY/Norvège

Tel.: (+47) 7358 0500
Fax: (+47) 7358 0501
E-mail: oystein.storkersen@dirnat.no

POLAND

Dr. Zygmunt Krzeminski (Head of Delegation)
Adviser to the Minister
Department of Nature Conservation
Ministry of Environment
Wawelska 52/54
00-922 Warszawa
POLAND/Pologne

Tel.: (+48 22) 579 2673
Fax: (+48 22) 579 2555
E-mail: zygmunt.krzeminski@mos.gov.pl

Mr. Andrzej Langowski
Specialist
Department of Nature Conservation
Ministry of Environment
Wawelska 52/54
00-922 Warszawa
POLAND/Pologne

Tel.: (+48 22) 579 2456
Fax: (+48 22) 579 2555
E-mail: andrzej.langowski@mos.gov.pl

PORTUGAL

Dra. Claudia Franco
Instituto da Conservação da Natureza
Ministério das Cidades do Ordenamento do
Território e do Ambiente
Rua Filipe Folque 46, 1E
1050 114 Lisboa
PORTUGAL/Portugal

Tel.: (+351 21) 351 0440
Fax: (+351 21) 357 4771
E-mail: francoc@icn.pt

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Dr. Anna Belousova
Head of Department
All-Russian Institute for Nature Conservation &
Reserves
Znamenskoye-Sadki
VNII Priroda
113628 Moscow
Russian Federation/Fédération de Russie

Tel.: (+7 095) 423 0311
Fax: (+7 095) 423 2322
E-mail: anbelous@online.ru

Mr. Vladimir Morozov
Zoological Museum, Moscow State University
Institute of Nature Protection Research
Bolshaya Nikitskaya St.,6
Moscow 103009
Russian Federation/Fédération de Russie

Tel.: (+7 095) 203 4366
Fax: (+7 095) 203 2717
E-mail: morozov@l.zoomus.bio.msu.ru

RWANDA

Ms Corneille Kagara
Division Politique, Programme et Sensibilisation
Ministère des Terres, de la Réinstallation et de la
Protection de l'Environnement
B.P. 3502
Kigali
Rwanda/Rwanda

Tel.: (+250) 82628 / 517563
Fax: (+250) 82629
E-mail: kagarac2001@yahoo.fr

SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE

Dr. Carlos Baia Dê
Chef du Service de Suivi-Evaluation
Direction de l'Elevage
Ministère de l'Agriculture, Développement Rural et
Pêche
Avenida Marginal 12 de Julho
Caixa Postal 718
Sao Tomé
SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE/Sao Tomé-et-Principe

Tel.: (+239 12) 22 386
Fax: (+239 12) 24 454 / 22 347
E-mail: pecuaria@cstome.net

SAUDI ARABIA

Prof. Abdulaziz H. Abuzinada (Head of Delegation)
Secretary General
National Commission for Wildlife Conservation and
Development (NCWCD)
P.O. Box 61681
Riyadh 11575
SAUDI ARABIA/Arabie saoudite

Tel.: (+966 1) 441 8700 / 0369
Fax: (+966 1) 441 0797
E-mail: ncwcd@zajil.net, tatwany@naseej.com.sa

Dr. Mohammed Y. Shobrak
National Commission for Wildlife Conservation
and Development (NCWCD)
National Wildlife Research Center (NWRC)
P.O. Box 1086
Taif
SAUDI ARABIA/Arabie saoudite

Tel.: (+966 2) 745 5188
Fax: (+966 2) 745 5176
E-mail: shobrak@nwrc-sa.org

SIERRA LEONE

Mr. Emmanuel Keifala Alieu
Director
Ministry of Forests, Agriculture and Marine Resources
Room M206, Youyi Building, Brookfields
Freetown
Sierra Leone/Sierra Leone

Tel.: (+232 22) 242036 / 223445
Fax: (+232 22) 222945 / 241613 / 242128
E-mail: ealieu@hotmail.com, lucy_alieu@yahoo.co.uk

SLOVENIA

Mr. Robert Boljesic (Head of Delegation)
Counsellor to the Director
Administration for the Protection of Nature
Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning
Vojkova 1b
1000 Ljubljana
SLOVENIA/Slovénie

Tel.: (+386 1) 478 4501
Fax: (+386 1) 478 4051
E-mail: robert.boljesic@gov.si

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

Dr. Akram Issa Darwish
Director of Biodiversity and Protected Areas
Management
Ministry of State for Environmental Affairs
P.O. Box 3773
Tolyani Str.
Damascus
Syrian Arab Republic/République arabe syrienne

Tel.: (+963 11) 444 7608 / 223 4309 / 333 0510
Fax: (+963 11) 444 7608 / 333 5645
E-mail: akramisa@scs-net.org

TURKEY

Ms Safak Kemaloglu
Chief of Section
Department of Animal Protection
Ministry of Environment
Eskisehir Yolu 8. km
Ankara
Turkey/Turquie

Tel.: (+90 312) 287 9963/2416
Fax: (+90 312) 286 2271
E-mail: safakkemaloglu@yahoo.com

TURKMENISTAN

Prof. Eldar Rustamov
Wetlands Expert
Ministry of Environmental Protection
ul. Kemine 102
744000 Ashgabad
Turkmenistan/Turkménistan

Tel.: (+993 12) 39 85 86
Fax: (+993 12) 39 31 84
E-mail: rustamov@ngotm.org,
makhtum@nature.untuk.org, mamedova@ngotm.org

UKRAINE

Dr. Volodymyr Domashlinets
Head of Fauna Division
Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources
ul. Khreshchatyk 5
01601 Kyiv
UKRAINE/Ukraine

Tel.: (+38 044) 224 2239 / 1113
Fax: (+38 044) 224 2239 / 228 2067
E-mail: vgd@land.freenet.kiev.ua

Mr. Olexandr Volodin
Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources
ul. Khreshchatyk 5
01001 Kyiv 1
UKRAINE/Ukraine

Tel.: (+38 044) 224 2239
Fax: (+38 044) 224 2239
E-mail: dvg@mbox.com.ua, vladdy@uct.kiev.ua

UZBEKISTAN

Ms Irina Bekmirzayeva
Senior Specialist
Department of International Cooperation
State Committee for Nature Protection
ul. Abdulla Kadiry 7
700128 Tashkent
UZBEKISTAN/Ouzbékistan

Tel.: (+998 712) 413080 / 410442
Fax: (+998 712) 415633 / 413990
E-mail: halmat@ecoinf.org.uz, irina77@online.ru

YEMEN

Mr. Abdul Hakim A.R. Aulaiah
Director General of Natural Resources and
Biodiversity
Environmental Protection Authority
P.O. Box 19719
Sana'a
Yemen/Yémen

Tel.: (+967 1) 206611 / 202019 / 322713
Fax: (+967 1) 207817 / 207327 / 401828
E-mail: epa@y.net.ye

YUGOSLAVIA

Ms Daliborka Barjaktarov
Federal Secretariat for Labour, Health and Social Care,
Department for Environment
Palata Federacije I
Bulevar Mihajla Pupina 2
11070 Belgrad
Yugoslavia/Yougoslavie

Tel.: (+381 11) 311 1781
Fax: (+381 11) 14 25 64
E-mail: minja@hera.smrnz.sv.gov.yu,
daliborka@beotel.yu

ZAMBIA

Mr. Hopeson Isaac Simwanza
Zambia Wildlife Authority
Private Bag 1
Chilanga
Zambia/Zambie

Tel.: (+260 1) 27 83 23
Fax: (+260 1) 27 84 39
E-mail: zawares@coppernet.zm

ZIMBABWE

Dr. Peter J. Mundy
Department of National Parks and Wildlife
Management
P.O. Box 2283
Bulawayo
Zimbabwe/Zimbabwe

Tel.: (+263 9) 74000
Fax: (+263 9) 74000
E-mail: bfa@gatorzw.com

Intergovernmental Organisations / Organisations Intergouvernementales

ASCOBANS

Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans of the Baltic and North Seas

Mr. Rüdiger Stempel
Executive Secretary
ASCOBANS Secretariat
Martin-Luther-King-Str. 8
53175 Bonn
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2416/18
Fax: (+49 228) 815 2440
E-mail: ascobans@ascobans.org

Ramsar Convention

Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat

Mr. Syed Najam Khurshid
Regional Coordinator Asia
Ramsar Convention Bureau
28, rue Mauverney
1196 Gland
SWITZERLAND/Suisse

Tel.: (+41 22) 999 0177
Fax: (+41 22) 999 0169
E-mail: khurshid@ramsar.org

EUROBATS

Agreement on the Conservation of Populations of European Bats

Mr. A. Streit
Executive Secretary
EUROBATS Secretariat
Martin-Luther-King-Str. 8
53175 Bonn
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2420/1
Fax: (+49 228) 815 2445
E-mail: eurobats@eurobats.org

UNEP/CMS

Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals

Mr. Marco Barbieri
Technical Officer
UNEP/CMS Secretariat
Martin-Luther-King-Str. 8
53175 Bonn
GERMANY/Allemagne

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

PERSGA

The Regional Organization for the Conservation of the Environment of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden

Mr. Mohammed Younis
The Regional Organization for the Conservation of the Environment of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden
P.O. Box 53662
Jeddah 21583
SAUDI ARABIA/Arabie saoudite

Tel.: (+966 2) 657 3244/16
Fax: (+966 2) 651 901
E-mail: mohammed.younis@persga.org

Mr. Lyle Glowka
Agreements Officer
UNEP/CMS Secretariat
Martin-Luther-King-Str. 8
53175 Bonn
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2422
Fax: (+49 228) 815 2449
E-mail: lglowka@cms.unep.de

Mr. Douglas J. Hykle
Deputy Executive Secretary
UNEP/CMS Secretariat
Martin-Luther-King-Str. 8
53175 Bonn
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2407
Fax: (+49 228) 815 2449
E-mail: dhykle@unep.de

Ms. Jasmin Kanza
Fund Management and Administrative Officer
UNEP/CMS Secretariat
Martin-Luther-King-Str. 8
53175 Bonn
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2404
Fax: (+49 228) 815 2449
E-mail: jkanza@cms.unep.de

Mr. Arnulf Müller-Helmbrecht
Executive Secretary
UNEP/CMS Secretariat
Martin-Luther-King-Str. 8
53175 Bonn
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2410
Fax: (+49 228) 815 2449
E-mail: ulfm-h@cms.unep.de

UNEP MAP

Mediterranean Action Plan
Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea
against Pollution and its related Protocols

Mr. Lucien Chabason
Co-ordinator
Secretariat to the Barcelona Convention
UNEP Mediterranean Action Plan
48, Vassileos Konstantinou Avenue
11635 Athens
GREECE/Grèce

Tel.: (+30 1) 0727 3100
Fax: (+30 1) 0725 3196/7
E-mail: unepmedu@unepmap.gr

UNEP
United Nations Environment Programme

Mr. Robert Hepworth
Deputy Director
Division of Environmental Conventions
United Nations Environment Programme
P.O. Box 30552
Nairobi
KENYA/Kenya

Tel.: (+ 254 2) 62 32 60 / 58
Fax: (+ 254 2) 62 39 26
E-mail: robert.hepworth@unep.org

UNEP-WCMC

World Conservation Monitoring Centre

Mr. Christoph Zöckler
UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre
(UNEP/WCMC)
219 Huntingdon Road
Cambridge CB3 0DL
UNITED KINGDOM/Royaume-Uni

Tel.: (+44 1223) 27 73 14
Fax: (+44 1 223) 27 71 36
E-mail: chrisz@unep-wcmc.org, info@unep-wcmc.org

International Non-Governmental Organisations / Organisations Internationales Non-Gouvernementales

Bird Life International

Dr. Robert P. Clay
BirdLife International
Wellbrook Court Girton Road
Cambridge CB3 0NA
UNITED KINGDOM/Royaume-Uni

Tel.: (+44 1 223) 279 801
Fax: (+44 1 223) 27 72 00
E-mail: mike.rands@birdlife.org.uk

Mr. John O'Sullivan
International Treaties Adviser
BirdLife International
c/o RSPB The Lodge
Sandy, Bedfordshire SG19 2DL
UNITED KINGDOM/Royaume-Uni

Tel.: (+44 1 767) 680 551
Fax: (+44 1 767) 683 211
E-mail: john.osullivan@rspb.org.uk

Mr. David E. Pritchard
International Treaties Adviser
BirdLife International
c/o RSPB The Lodge
Sandy, Bedfordshire SG19 2DL
UNITED KINGDOM/Royaume-Uni

Tel.: (+44 1 767) 68 05 51
Fax: (+44 1 767) 68 32 11
E-mail: dave.pritchard@rspb.org.uk

Mr. John Cooper
Avian Demography Unit
Department of Statistical Sciences
University of Cape Town
Rondebosch 7701
SOUTH AFRICA/Afrique du Sud

Tel.: (+27 21) 650 34 26
Fax: (+27 21) 650 34 34
E-mail: jcooper@botzoo.uct.ac.za

Mr. Steven W. Evans
Important Bird Areas Programme Manager
BirdLife South Africa
P.O. Box 515
Randburg 2125
SOUTH AFRICA/Afrique du Sud

Tel.: (+27 11) 789 1122
Fax: (+27 11) 789 5188
E-mail: iba@birdlife.org.za

Dr. Umberto Gallo-Orsi
Conservation Project Officer
BirdLife International
European Division Office
Droevendaalsesteeg 3a,
P.O. Box 127
6700 AC Wageningen
NETHERLANDS/Pays-Bas

Tel.: (+31 317) 47 88 31/3
Fax: (+31 317) 47 88 44
E-mail: u.galloorsi@birdlife.agro.nl

CIC

International Council for Game and Wildlife
Conservation

Mr. Kai-Uwe Wollscheid
CEO Director General
International Council for Game and Wildlife
Conservation (CIC)
Budapest Executive Office
P.O. Box 82
2092 Budakeszi
HUNGARY/Hongrie

Tel.: (+36 23) 453 830
Fax: (+36 23) 453 832
E-mail: k.wollscheid@cic-wildlife.org

Mr. Niels Kaastrup
CIC Migratory Bird Commission
Molsvej 34
8410 Ronde
DENMARK/Danemark

Tel.: (+45) 87 91 06 00
Fax: (+45) 86 37 23 65
E-mail: nk@jaegerne.dk

Prof. Dr. Herby Kalchreuter
CIC - Migratory Bird Commission
c/o European Wildlife Research Institute (EWI)
79848 Bonndorf-Glashütte
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 7653) 1891
Fax: (+49 7653) 9269
E-mail: wildlife.ewi@t-online.de

FACE

Federation of Associations for Hunting and Conservation of the E.U.

Dr. Yves Lecocq
Secrétaire Général
Federation of Associations for Hunting and Conservation of the E.U.
82, rue F. Pelletier
1030 Bruxelles
BELGIUM/Belgique

Tel.: (+32 2) 732 6900
Fax: (+32 2) 732 7072
E-mail: ylecocq@face-europe.org

Dr. Ralf Eisenbeiss
Deputy Secrétaire Général
Federation of Associations for Hunting and Conservation of the E.U.
82, rue F. Pelletier
1030 Bruxelles
BELGIUM/Belgique

Tel.: (+32 2) 732 6900
Fax: (+32 2) 732 7072
E-mail: administration@face-europe.org

Sr. Manuel Andrade Cristobal
Federation of Associations for Hunting and Conservation of the E.U.
Gran Via 216
Coruna
SPAIN/Espagne

Tel.: (+34 981) 70 13 15
Fax:
E-mail: manuelandrade@terra.es

IFAW Germany

International Fund for Animal Welfare

Dr. Stefan Bräger
International Fund for Animal Welfare IFAW
Postfach 10 46 23
20032 Hamburg
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 40) 866 500 28
Fax: (+49 40) 866 500 26
E-mail: info-de@ifaw.org, sbraeger@ifaw.org

IUCN

World Conservation Union

Mr. Mariano Gimenez
Programme Officer - Species
World Conservation Union IUCN
28, rue Mauverney
1196 Gland
SWITZERLAND/Suisse

Tel.: (+41 22) 999 0155
Fax: (+41 22) 999 0015
E-mail: mgd@iucn.org

Ms Tomme Rosanne Young
IUCN Environmental Law Centre
Godesberger Allee 108-112
53175 Bonn
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 228) 269 2231
Fax: (+49 228) 269 2250
E-mail: tyoung@elc.iucn.org

Just Ecology

Dr. Myrfyn Owen
Just Ecology Environmental Consultancy
The Old Wheelwrights
Ham, Berkeley GL13 9SE
UNITED KINGDOM/Royaume-Uni

Tel.: (+44 1 453) 811 780
Fax: (+44 1 453) 811 880
E-mail: just.ecology@btinternet.com

OMPO

M. Guy-Noël Olivier
OMPO
5, avenue des Chasseurs
75017 Paris
FRANCE/France

Tel.: (+33 1) 44 01 05 10
Fax: (+33 1) 44 01 05 11
E-mail: ompo@ompo.org

Wetlands International

Dr. Chris Baker
GEF-coordinator
Wetlands International
P.O. Box 471
6700 CA Wageningen
NETHERLANDS/Pays-Bas

Tel.: (+31 317) 47 88 86
Fax: (+31 317) 47 88 85
E-mail: baker@wetlands.agro.nl

Dr. Gerard C. Boere
International Programme Co-ordinator
Wetlands International
Postbus 471
6700 AL Wageningen
NETHERLANDS/Pays-Bas

Tel.: (+31 317) 47 88 87
Fax: (+31 317) 47 88 50
E-mail: boere@wetlands.agro.nl

Mr. Simon Delaney
Senior Waterbird Conservation Officer
Wetlands International
Postbus 471
6700 AL Wageningen
NETHERLANDS/Pays-Bas

Tel.: (+31 317) 47 88 63
Fax: (+31 317) 47 88 50
E-mail: delaney@wetlands.agro.nl

Mr. Niels Gilissen
Wetlands International
Postbus 471
6700 AL Wageningen
NETHERLANDS/Pays-Bas

Tel.: (+31 317) 47 88 60
Fax: (+31 317) 47 88 50
E-mail: gilissen@wetlands.agro.nl

Mr. Lieuwe Haanstra
Wetlands International
Postbus 471
6700 AL Wageningen
NETHERLANDS/Pays-Bas

Tel.: (+31 317) 47 88 90
Fax: (+31 317) 47 88 85
E-mail: l.haanstra@alterra.wag.ur.nl

Mr. E.J.M. Hagemeyer
Senior Species Conservation Officer
Wetlands International
Postbus 471
6700 AL Wageningen
NETHERLANDS/Pays-Bas

Tel.: (+31 317) 47 88 67
Fax: (+31 317) 47 88 50
E-mail: hagemeyer@wetlands.agro.nl

Dr. Derek A. Scott
Consultant
Wetlands International
c/o Castletownbere Post Office
Co. Cork
IRELAND/Irlande

Tel.: (+353 27) 73 31 27
Fax:
E-mail: derekscott@eircom.net

Dr. Taej Mundkur
Technical Director and Interim Exec Director
Wetlands International - Asia Pacific
3A39, Block A
Kelana Centre Point, SS7/19 Petaling Jaya
47301 Selangor
MALAYSIA/Malaisie

Tel.: (+60) 3 704 67 70
Fax.: (+60) 3 704 67 72
E-mail: taej@wiap.nasionet.net

WWF Germany World Wide Fund for Nature

Dr. Hans-Ulrich Rösner
Head of Wadden Sea Office
WWF Projektbüro Wattenmeer
Norderstr. 3
25813 Husum
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 4841) 620 73
Fax: (+49 4841) 4736
E-mail: roesner@wwf.de

National Non-Governmental Organisations / Organisations Nationales Non-Gouvernementales

BASC UK

The British Association for Shooting and Conservation

Dr. John Harradine
The British Association for Shooting and Conservation
Marford Mill
Rossett
Wrexham, LL12 0HL
UNITED KINGDOM/Royaume-Uni

Tel.: (+44 1244) 57 30 00
Fax: (+44 1244) 573 013
E-mail: johnh@basc.demon.co.uk

Mr. Tim Russell
The British Association for Shooting and Conservation
Marford Mill
Rossett
Wrexham, LL12 0HL
UNITED KINGDOM/Royaume-Uni

Tel.: (+44 1244) 57 30 00
Fax: (+44 1244) 573 013
E-mail: con.enq@basc.org.uk

Mr. John Swift
The British Association for Shooting and Conservation
Marford Mill
Rossett
Wrexham, LL12 0HL
UNITED KINGDOM/Royaume-Uni

Tel.: (+44 1244) 57 30 00
Fax: (+44 1244) 573 013
E-mail: john.swift@basc.org.uk

FNC FRANCE

M. Jean-Pierre Arnauduc
Fédération nationale des Chasseurs
48, rue d'Alésia
75014 Paris
FRANCE/France

Tel.: (+33 1) 43 27 85 76
Fax: (+33 1) 43 21 36 97
E-mail: jparnauduc@chasseurdefrance.com

NABU Germany

Mr. Michael Brombacher
Country Programmes Officer for Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan
NABU International Project Office
Invalidenstr. 112
11015 Berlin
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 30) 284 984 50
Fax: (+49 30) 284 984 84
E-mail: michael.brombacher@nabu.de

Mr. Robert Schneider
Naturschutzbund Deutschland (NABU) e.V.
Vogelschutzzentrum
Ziegelhütte 21
72116 Mossingen
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 7473) 1022
Fax: (+49 7473) 21181
E-mail:

RSPB UK

Dr. Norbert Schäffer
Head, European Programmes
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
The Lodge
Sandy, Bedfordshire SG19 2DL
UNITED KINGDOM/Royaume-Uni

Tel.: (+44 1 767) 68 05 51
Fax: (+44 1 767) 68 32 11
E-mail: norbert.schaffer@rspb.org.uk

Society for the Lesser White-fronted Goose

Dr. Wolfgang Scholze
Society for the Lesser White-fronted Goose
Kirchhalde 13
71083 Herrenberg
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 7032) 287 670
Fax: (+49 7032) 287 671
E-mail: w.scholze@zweroggans.de

Mr. Mario Wolff
Society for the Lesser White-fronted Goose
Kirchhalde 13
71083 Herrenberg
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 7032) 287 670
Fax: (+49 7032) 287 671
E-mail: w.scholze@zweroggans.de

Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust

Mr. Oliver Nasirwa Odbwor
Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust
Slimbridge, Gloucester GL2 7BT
UNITED KINGDOM/Royaume-Uni

Tel.: (+44 1 453) 891900 / 890333 ext. 290
Fax: (+44 1 453) 89 08 27
E-mail: oliver.nasirwa@wwt.org.uk

UNEP/AEWA Secretariat / Secretariat PNUE/AEWA

Mr. Bert Lenten
Executive Secretary
AEWA Secretariat
Martin-Luther-King-Str. 8
53175 Bonn
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2413/4
Fax: (+49 228) 815 2450
E-mail: aewa@unep.de

Ms. Mirna Maya
Assistant to the Executive Secretary
AEWA Secretariat
Martin-Luther-King-Str. 8
53175 Bonn
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2413
Fax: (+49 228) 815 2450
E-mail: aewa@unep.de

Ms. Heike Grelka
Assistant to the Executive Secretary
AEWA Secretariat
Martin-Luther-King-Str. 8
53175 Bonn
GERMANY/Allemagne

Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2412
Fax: (+49 228) 815 2450
E-mail: aewa@unep.de

PART II a

Opening Statements made during the joint Opening Ceremony of COP 7 CMS and MOP 2 AEWA

**Seventh Session of the Conference of the Parties
to the Convention on Migratory Species**

and

**Second Session of the Conference of the Parties
to the Agreement on the Conservation of
African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds**

Speech delivered by

**Federal Minister for the Environment,
Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety**

Jürgen Trittin

18 September 2002, Bonn

Check against Delivery

Mr Kakakhel,
Ms Dieckmann,
Mr Müller-Helmbrecht,
Mr Lenten (Executive Secretary of the AEWA Secretariat),
Mr Ignacio (President of the Permanent Committee),
Mr Mungroo (President of the Technical Committee AEWA),
Mr Martin (WWF),
Ladies and gentlemen,

Migrants and visitors are treated with hospitality in all cultures, as they - unlike those who have settled - do not have the same traditional entitlements. Visitors are dependent on the locals to provide food and shelter for a while. The needs of those who do not 'belong' are most liable to be overlooked. But this is a very short-sighted way of thinking: if everywhere were to be occupied by those who have settled, if hotels, residential and industrial areas or monocultures were to arise along the coasts and in meadows, visitors such as our feathered friends would eventually stay away.

For this reason, 38 countries adopted the international **Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals** in Bonn in 1979. **The Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds (AEWA)** was elaborated within this framework, targeting the protection of waterbirds, storks, ducks and geese migrating to the West and Eastern Atlantic. The Secretariats of both Conventions are in Bonn. It is a great pleasure for me to welcome you here today to the Conferences of the Parties of both Conventions.

The seasonal migration of animals, in particular birds, has captivated us humans for centuries. How do turtles find their way back to where they were born to lay their eggs? How can a tiny bird weighing two grams fly 800km? How can the Ruppell's vulture fly at heights of 11,500 m when man needs an oxygen mask to climb Mount Everest? How does the Arctic gull reach its breeding ground 30,000 kilometres away? Without a compass, without a map, and, of course, without a global positioning system, without Galileo, without any sustenance other than tiny fat reserves in their small bodies.

We know, and we are researching into how complicated bird migrations are, and how many conditions have to be right in our country and in many other countries for these beautiful birds to survive the winter and migration and for us to have the opportunity to admire them. Even the smallest changes disturb bird migration. **The migration routes across the oceans remain - like the oceans themselves - a neglected area of research.**

The habitats of animals are changing as a result of climate change. Here in central Europe, temperatures are rising and rainfall is increasing. In other countries, droughts are occurring more frequently and lasting longer. Migratory species are losing the security of clearly defined seasons. This directly affects their migratory patterns and the species distribution. For example, the cold, rainy summer has led to massive mortality among the Schreiber's bent-winged bat in southern Europe. These animals died of starvation because they found too little food, too few beetles, moths and insects. Researchers also trace the increased Kuhl's pipistrelle bat population in southern Germany back to climate change. Previously, the Kuhl's pipistrelle was only found in the Mediterranean.

Will fewer species fly South in winter in future, and will more species be subjected to risk of a sudden cold front in the North? Will others relocate their habitats further north? Or will they have to - and will they be able to? - fly further because snow is no longer a rare occurrence in the Mediterranean? How will climate change affect their feeding and breeding grounds located on the coast? Will some animals settle?

Climate change is a huge threat to migratory species. We must do every possible to limit this change. To this aim, the German Government has adopted an ambitious climate protection programme. But we need a new direction in energy policy all over the world, not just in Germany.

To counteract climate change, our primary goal must be to increase the market share of solar and wind power. We must also launch and develop off-shore wind power. To ensure that the fauna remains unharmed, we have designated zones for economic use as well as protected areas in our new Federal Nature

Conservation Act. The German Government plans to install 2000 to 3000 MW in the North and Baltic Seas by 2010 in a step-by-step process. We are starting with small wind parks, and from the very start we will investigate the impacts on birds, marine mammals and fish to limit these impacts as much as possible. This will enable us to gain experience that can be drawn on when considering the construction of further wind parks.

Animals also require improved protection against oil tanker accidents. We need adequate monitoring and warning systems. We must make our contribution to keeping the damage resulting from the leaked oil as low as possible with effective technology, equipment and training. I am delighted that 66 countries have now acceded to the International Convention on preparedness, response and cooperation in the area of oil pollution.

We have set up a sensitivity register for the German Wadden Sea coast to define ecologically oriented criteria and priorities to be applied in emergencies. **But such registers are needed even more urgently for coasts in the tropics that take much longer to recover from oil spills than coasts in the North.**

These two examples - climate change and oil spills - illustrate the *fundamental* need to globally coordinate nature conservation. This is even more crucial for the protection of migratory species such as red knots and common cranes, antelopes and gazelles, and particularly for migratory species in our oceans, such as whales, turtles, seals, penguins and dolphins.

There is little benefit if these animals are only protected by the country in or off the coast of which they rear their young or winter. All transit countries and the wintering roosting sites must also be actively involved. If, for example, we ban common cockle fishing in the East-Friesian Wadden Sea, we can provide the Northern red knot with the food supplies it needs on its journey to Africa. This illustrates how bird protection measures in East Frisia can contribute to bird conservation in Siberia and Africa.

Without this contribution, the measures taken in Siberia and West Africa would probably be doomed to fail. And vice versa.

I am very pleased that further migratory species are to be included in Annexes I and II of the Bonn Convention. Australia has proposed, among others, six large whale species.

South Africa wishes to include several bird species in the AEWA. I welcome the fact that all migratory water bird species are now to be covered by the AEWA - no longer, as was previously the case, the particularly vulnerable species only. We should also consider the possibility of extending the AEWA to Central Asia.

We must cooperate even more closely at international level. I am therefore very grateful for your commitment, Mr Müller-Helmbrecht, to signing up further contracting parties to the Bonn Convention.

Many migratory species are dependent on the poor countries in the South also providing enough land and food for them to shelter. However, if nature is the only reliable resource for survival for a large majority of the population of a country there is a justified conflict of interests and conflicting goals for the country's government. Starving people cannot be expected to leave food for animals in the fields, nor can they be expected to comply with a hunting ban.

Those who wish to protect migratory species in the Sahel zone or in other very poor regions must free the people there from poverty. We must live up to our commitment from Johannesburg to halve the number of poor people by 2015. This is also a prerequisite for successful species and nature conservation projects.

Many measures have been financed by funds from the Global Environment Facility (GEF). I am pleased that it has been possible to provide the **GEF** with a budget of \$ 2.92 billion for the next four years (2002-2006). I would have liked this amount to be greater, but as you know we could not find a majority for this proposal. Germany, together with several other EU countries, will therefore provide additional funding. This will enable the GEF budget to reach \$ 3 billion. **The share of these funds earmarked for nature and species conservation should at least remain the same.**

Such decisions are, of course, very dependent on how much potential the submitted projects have. One project that is very likely to be accepted by the GEF is the project for setting up a network of habitats for African-Eurasian waterbirds. The AEWA Secretariat has developed this project in cooperation with the Ramsar Office and Wetlands International. It provides for capacity-building measures in Eastern Europe, the Orient and on the African continent. One goal of this project is to create and maintain sources of income for the local population that are linked to the species populations. For example eco-tourism.

The level of funding envisaged for this project is \$ 6 million. The same amount must be raised as complementary funding. I am willing to provide a total of € 1 million from my budget for this project in the period 2004 to 2008 (*main duration of the project*). I will also strive to ensure that the necessary budgetary prerequisites are created. I hope that other contracting parties to the Bonn Convention and the Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds will follow my example.

This leads me to addressing the measures Germany has taken for nature and species protection, and for migratory species in particular, by highlighting a few examples.

The German Environment Ministry, in cooperation with the Federal Agency for Nature Conservation and the Federal Länder, has comprehensively documented the populations of migratory species **in Germany**. According to this information, **these populations are stable, and in some cases, particularly waterbirds, there is even a very welcome slight increase.**

The Federal Länder were successful in their efforts to protect the white-tailed eagle: 380 pairs now live in Germany. A further success story is that ferruginous pochards have been breeding here once again since 1995, even if in very small numbers. In contrast, the aquatic warbler is sadly only rearing its young in the Lower Oder valley in Brandenburg. The Länder of Brandenburg and Saxony-Anhalt were only able to maintain the populations of great bustards with a great deal of effort and

commitment. I am delighted that the Memorandum on the protection of the great bustard can finally be signed during this Conference.

Since 1998, the German Government has been supporting 32 major nature conservation projects with more than € 80 million. A further 220,000 hectares of land in eastern Germany were also designated new nature conservation areas. North-Rhine Westphalia, the most densely populated Federal Land, is currently working on the designation of a new Kermeter/Vogelsang national park.

In spring this year, the German Government implemented an amendment to the Federal Nature Conservation Act, despite considerable opposition. It ensures nature conservation in a densely populated industrialised country whose population makes extensive use of nature in its leisure time. **Nature conservation cannot succeed in the 21 century on the sidelines - it can only succeed if a balance of interests can be achieved between all groups of users.**

The new Federal Nature Conservation Act commits the Länder to creating a biotope network on at least 10% of the surface area of the respective Land. It also commits the agriculture, forestry and fishery sectors to a code of practice. It provides for the retrofitting of power lines - a lifesaving provision for large migratory birds such as storks and cranes. This will protect young birds in particular from being killed by electricity. I would recommend such bird-protection measures on power lines to all countries, and therefore submit a proposal for a recommendation.

Finally, I am happy that we have been able to sign the Headquarters Agreement for the CMS Secretariat today. It replaces the previous agreement which existed since the CMS Secretariat located to Bonn in 1984. The new regulations make some improvements in the legal position both for Secretariat staff and for those participating in events under the Convention. It gives the same status as that accorded to the Secretariats for the Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Convention to Combat Desertification. The new agreement is also open to the Secretariats of regional agreements located in Bonn. Due to the extensive concessions with regard to immunity regulations, this agreement must be brought

into force in Germany with a legal Act. I consider it realistic for the Act sanctioning the Agreement to enter into force in about one year's time.

I now wish both Conferences every success, and wish you all a pleasant stay here in Bonn in the former governmental quarter, which we intend to transform into a German centre for the United Nations over the coming years.

Thank you.

Welcome address of the Lady Mayor of Bonn
Mrs. Bärbel Dieckmann

on the occasion of the Opening Ceremony of the
7th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties
(COP 7) of the Convention on the Conservation
of Migratory Species of Wild Animals

on Wednesday, September 18, 2002, at 9.30 am
in the International Congress Centre Bundeshaus Bonn

- check against delivery –

Federal Minister Trittin
Chairman of the CMS Standing Committee
Chairman of the AEWA Technical Committee
Deputy Executive Director of UNEP
Excellencies
Distinguished Delegates
Executive Secretary
Dear Guests

The two meetings of CMS and AEWA are the first
Conferences of the Parties which take place after
the Johannesburg-Summit.

**We are particularly proud that they take place in Bonn, where all the
“Rio-Secretariats“ of the United Nations have their headquarters, except one.**

In this sense as Mayor of the City of Bonn I most warmly welcome you to Bonn.

The worldwide protection of migratory wild animals and my city are closely linked.
Here in Bonn your Convention was founded and signed 23 years ago. This is why it
is also called the Bonn Convention.

For more than a hundred years, Bonn has been the home to the Zoological Museum
Alexander Koenig. It is at present being refurbished and rearranged according to a
completely new concept. I am particularly happy that scientists of this Museum and

of the newly founded Center for Development Research of our University with the support of the Ministry for the Environment have developed a global register of migratory species of wild animals. It will be handed over to the Secretariat on the occasion of this conference. This has been an excellent example for networking in our city.

Bonn as an United Nations seat has the right size for networking and it is one of our aims to encourage networking between the numerous international institutions in Bonn. Many of them work in the field of environment and development.

Your conference takes place in the Plenary Hall of the former German Bundestag building, where the Parliament of the Federal Republic of Germany met and worked for many years.

Now it functions as a Congress Centre, especially as a Centre for international dialogue. A second even much larger congress hall which will meet the requests of the United Nations and of world conferences will soon be erected. And in the immediate vicinity the United Nations Campus will be set up.

All this has been laid down in an agreement signed in the presence of the Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. Kofi Annan, and the President of the Federal Republic of Germany, Mr. Johannes Rau, in February this year.

With about 500 UN-staff members, Bonn still ranks as a small UN-city. However, it is growing all the time. The organizations which at the moment have their headquarters in House Carstanjen will all move to the new UN-Campus within the next few years.

This Conference is one of a series of important events that have been held here in Bonn:

- Conferences of the Parties of the Climate
- Convention of the Desertification Convention
- Conferences on Food Security, Biological Diversity, Fresh Water, Media, Peace and Conflict,

just to name a few, and not to forget the UN-talks on Afghanistan.

And immediately after this migratory species meetings Germany and Bonn will host the INC 9 PIC-meeting here in the same building.

Since 1991, Berlin is the German Federal Capital again. And as the capital, Berlin is the main stage for German politics. The City of Bonn, however, has developed into a place of global dialogue, a centre of international cooperation and science. Here in this city, the issues that determine our future are discussed and decided.

Many partners contribute to this process:

- six German Ministries that have remained in Bonn
- twelve United Nations Organizations located here
- the German Development Agencies
- a series of non governmental organizations, scientific organizations, and the Media, to mention only a few.

And a number of embassies are still in Bonn while other countries have established outposted offices or consulates.

In addition, Germany's international broadcaster, Deutsche Welle, will also soon be relocating to Bonn.

Bonn is also a city of international culture. I would like to bring to your attention the International Beethoven Festival which at the moment takes place in Bonn. Just have a look into the event's guide which the City of Bonn has prepared for you and which you can collect at the Bonn information desk.

I only hope that you will have a little spare time to make use of the offer. We will meet again on Friday evening, when the Federal Parliamentary State Secretary of the Ministry for the Environment and I have the pleasure to invite you to a boat trip on the Rhine.

I wish you a good and successful conference here in Bonn. Let me welcome you once more with all my heart here in the UN-city on the banks of the Rhine

Welcome address of the Chairman of the Technical Committee of AEWA

Your Excellency, the Federal Minister for Environment

Lady Mayor of Bonn,
Distinguished delegates,
Dear Colleagues,
Ladies and Gentleman,

It is a pleasure and honour for me as Chairman of the Technical Committee of the Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds to address this august assembly today.

It is evident that through the years the important role of the CMS as well as the AEWA has been recognised by the Range States. The growing number of Parties to the Convention and the Agreement is clear evidence of this. The number of Parties to AEWA has doubled since MOP1 in 1999 to reach 34 at present. It is foreseen that in coming years this number will grow steadily as the Secretariat is actively working on getting the remaining countries of the AEWA migratory flyway to join the Agreement.

My own home country Mauritius signed and ratified the AEWA in 1999. Just before this meeting the Ambassador of Mauritius in Germany signed the MOU on Marine Turtles for the Indian Ocean and South East Asia. Currently the accession of Mauritius to CMS is in an advance stage. This shows the commitment of my country, which is convinced of the important role the CMS and its Agreements play in the conservation of part of our biodiversity.

As Chairman of the Technical Committee of the AEWA, I would like to urge all Range States to the CMS and the AEWA to join the Multilateral Agreements as soon as possible. Over the last few years the AEWA Secretariat did its utmost to implement the decisions taken by the previous MOP.

The Secretariat will give a full report on its activities during the MOP. At this stage I will just mention the implementation of many projects foreseen in the AEWA International Implementation Priorities 2000–2004.

This was possible mainly due to the generous financial support from several Contracting Parties and some organisations.

On behalf of the Secretariat, I would like to express our gratitude to these benefactors. Another substantial project developed during the last three years is the African-Eurasian GEF project. Just after MOP1, Wetlands International received a grant to develop a full size

project proposal. Currently this project proposal is being finalized and will be submitted to the GEF Secretariat in early 2003. If everything goes as we expected, an amount of up to US \$ 12 million for the full size project will be approved by mid 2003. This would mean a huge step forward regarding the implementation of the RAMSAR Convention and the AEWA.

With very limited human and financial resources and in spite of its relatively young the Agreement Secretariat has done an excellent job over the last three years. The AEWA Secretariat has become an interesting Party for example the Ramsar Bureau and Wetlands International. Joint Programmes are under preparation between the Secretariat and these organisations.

Many other activities are under way, unfortunately the limited time allocated to me to address you prevents me to go in more detail on these activities.

At the last AEWA Technical Committee Meeting held earlier this year in Tanzania, the representative of Germany, Mr. Gerhard Adams, made a presentation of the proposal arrangements for the COP7 and MOP2 to the members of the Technical Committee. The Technical Committee was impressed by the effort made by the German Government to make the necessary logistical arrangements available.

Right from the beginning, the Secretariat has had the full collaboration and cooperation of the representatives of the German Government and as indicated by the Executive Secretary everything was organised 'grundlich', which means perfect. All of us can witness it in the excellent venue and facilities. Therefore, also on behalf of the Agreement Secretariat, I would like to sincerely thank the Government of Germany for all the efforts made to host this meeting.

I would like to thank the Agreement Secretariat for the incredible amount of work they put in over the last few months. The efforts made by the Government of Germany and the Secretariat form the basis for a good meeting; it is now up to us the participants to give our input and to set the priorities for the Agreement for the next triennium.

Finally, I wish you all a nice and fruitful meeting and a pleasant stay in Bonn.

CHAIRMAN, STANDING COMMITTEE

OPENING REMARKS CMS-COP, Sept. 17, 2002

Amenities:

Distinguished delegates, our honoured guests and partners in conservation, Ladies and Gentlemen.

First of all, I would like to thank the Government of Germany for the excellent facilities and arrangements provided to this meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

It is only fitting that we hold COP7 in this beautiful city of Bonn where the Convention of Migratory Species of Wild Animals was born 20 years ago, in 1979. I would also like to commend the Government of Germany for all the support that it has given the CMS all through these years. The Headquarters Agreement just signed this morning with Germany will further strengthen the Secretariat to provide more and even better support to the CMS. Germany has also been consistent through its assessed and voluntary contributions and has initiated a number of proposed resolutions, which will be discussed during this conference.

The past two decades of CMS:

The Convention on Migratory Species has evolved substantially over the past two decades, especially during the last three years. Nearly 100 countries are now involved in CMS activities through the parent convention or its related agreements for birds, marine species and terrestrial mammals.

The extent of the issues covered by the CMS scientific council over the past four days demonstrated the maturity of the Convention as it tackled the fundamental threats to migratory species posed by unsustainable exploitation, by-catch and habitat loss. I also understand that the discussions during the meeting of the Council the past four days have been very progressive and the participants very enthusiastic.

The CMS has been recognized by the Convention on Biodiversity COP6 to be its lead partner in conserving and sustainably using migratory species. A comprehensive CBD-CMS joint work programme is now and evolving cornerstone of the CBD-CMS partnership. We have also witnessed a number of very important agreements recently on albatross and petrels, marine turtles, great bustards and bukhara deer. Many more agreements are in process.

But while we have done much, there are still more to do. The figures on migratory species are still worrying. The number of pacific leatherback turtles has been reduced to about 5,000 from 90,000 just two decades ago. The Birdlife International has estimated about 1,186 bird species at risk worldwide.

The Philippines experience:

We, in the Philippines, in our little corner of the Southeast Asia, we have actively initiated and collaborated with our neighbours in protecting and conserving our biodiversity. The Philippines ranks number 8 in the world in total diversity. The Philippines is also an important passageway of migratory marine species like humpback whales, whale sharks, dolphins and several species of turtles and migratory birds like spoon bill and Chinese crested tern.

We have established a network of 85 protected areas. Many of which are passageways of migratory species. It may be noted that these passageway areas are among our successful protected areas.

We are also concentrating now on what we call the rainforest of the sea... the coral reefs and the marine ecosystem. We have just delineated an area of 15 kilometres from shoreline in all of our 7,105 islands, during high tide, where commercial fishing are now banned. We expect this result in increased income of our small fishermen and, at the same time, allow recovery of our marine ecosystem to support the food supply for migrating mammals, reptiles and birds.

We are proud of our agreement and active collaboration with Malaysia to save migrating marine turtles in a border area where we jointly established assistance of WWF. We found out that these same turtles migrate across the Indian Ocean. Last year therefore, we hosted the signing of the Indian Ocean-Southeast Asia Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation of Marine Turtles attended by 21 countries. During the Conference, a Memorandum of Understanding, under the framework of the CMS, was drawn up.

We are achieving little victories in our conservation efforts, as we know that our colleagues in this conference are also achieving theirs. Many little victories amount to a big victory for our migratory species and, eventually, for our people.

The road ahead:

In the course of our meeting the next few days, we will be discussing many issues, which, we expect, will lead to even bigger victories. And a bigger part of these victories will be based on our ability to follow through existing and initiate new partnerships with our neighbours, our NGO partners and the various multilateral environment agreements.

The challenge before us is to enhance and strengthen our conservation efforts amidst the challenge posed by the agreement in the world summit on sustainable development in Johannesburg to significantly reduce the loss of biodiversity by 2010.

With this challenge, I would like to welcome you all to this seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties and I know that we will be more enthusiastic and progressive than our colleagues in the Scientific Council.

Thank you very much.

**Key Note Address of
UNEP Deputy Executive Director S. Kakakhel
at the Joint Opening Ceremony for the
Seventh Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the
Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of
Wild Animals and
the Second Meeting of the Parties to the African-Eurasian
Waterbird Agreement,
International Congress Centre, Bundeshaus Bonn,
Germany, 18 September 2002**

I. Salutations

Excellencies, Distinguished Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen,

1. I am honoured to represent Dr. Klaus Töpfer, Executive Director of UNEP, this morning at the joint official opening ceremony of the CMS COP-7 and the AEWa MOP-2 being held here in Bonn.
2. Your Excellency, Honourable Minister, Mr. Jürgen Trittin - we are grateful for your personal involvement in hosting this conference.

And through you we extend to your Government and the people of the Federal Republic of Germany our thanks for the warm welcome and generous hospitality accorded us since our arrival in this beautiful city, Bonn, and for the excellent arrangements made for our deliberations here in this historic building.

I wish to thank you as well, Honourable, Minister, for your personal attention in bringing about the conclusion of the Headquarters Agreement for the CMS Secretariat reaffirming Germany's support for the Bonn Convention on Migratory Species.

Just this morning, You [and I] signed the Agreement along with Mr Müller-Helmbrecht, the Executive Secretary. The Agreement formally places the Convention and the Secretariat on equal legal footing with the other UN-based conventions located in Bonn.

II. Migratory Species After WSSD

Ladies and Gentlemen,

5. The seventh CMS COP and the second AEWA MOP are significant events on the global biodiversity agenda, as these are the first United Nations conferences since the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) concluded, exactly a fortnight ago.

The international community has its first opportunity to seize on the momentum generated at Johannesburg where the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity figured prominently.

6. At the WSSD, Governments agreed to achieve by 2010 a significant reduction in the current rate of loss of biological diversity. Obviously, conserving the variety of life on earth means caring for biodiversity's constituent parts, **in the case of CMS, this means migratory species, a unique global component of biodiversity.**

We need to consider how exactly CMS will contribute to achieving the 2010 target, and what measures we will put in place to materialize that contribution.

7. One of the important outcomes of the WSSD was a renewed awareness of and commitment to fostering partnerships for achieving the goals of Agenda 21 and now the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation.

The message from Johannesburg is clear: No one individual, community, organisation, government or State can effectively “go it alone” on sustainable development issues. The global community must all work together towards this common goal.

8. In the biodiversity conservation arena this simple truth is well epitomised in the objective to conserve and sustainably use migratory species. Migratory species connect ecosystems, communities, regions and of course States thereof.

Simply put: if a country wants to better assure the survival of an endangered migratory animal it must work across that animal’s migratory range along with other Range States or risk seeing its uncoordinated efforts severely undercut or totally negated.

Financial and technical resources are simply too scarce these days to allow jeopardizing success by not working together.

9. The CMS family of instruments is an example of how international Agreements can catalyze partnerships, in this case between States that share migratory species as a common natural heritage. CMS provides the international legal framework for countries to take individual actions on endangered species. But uniquely this Convention combines this with the opportunity for individual actions on endangered and other migratory species to be coordinated through specialized Agreements and action plans.

Furthermore, CMS is the only global UN-based mechanism addressing comprehensively all migratory species - whether they are marine or terrestrial

mammals, reptiles, insects, fish or birds.

10. Despite CMS's small size, the international community is clearly and increasingly paying more attention to the possibilities that the CMS framework provides. For example, since 1999 when the COP last met the number of CMS Parties has increased to eighty. May I congratulate and welcome the new Parties to the CMS.

I wish to stress that the CMS family is actually significantly bigger. Altogether approximately 100 countries in total - both Parties and non-Parties - cooperate in CMS through the main convention and associated Memoranda of Understanding.

The African-Eurasian Water Bird Agreement (AEWA) is a great example of the value the international community places on CMS Agreements.

It is practically a mini-Biodiversity Convention for African-Eurasian Waterbirds. AEWA came into force in 1999 with 14 ratifications and three short years later it has tripled and grown to 42 Parties.

11. With such growth, clearly CMS and its family of instruments have something to offer the international community. Perhaps the best example of how CMS is "ahead of the curve" on a major WSSD outcome is in respect of Africa's sustainable development. African migratory species have always figured prominently in CMS's work.

12. Six of CMS's thirteen instruments comprise African Range States as Parties

or State signatories.

CMS Instruments address 6 species of Sahelo-Saharan Antelopes in Africa through an Action Plan; 7 species of marine turtles on the western and eastern coasts through two MoU; 10 species of cetaceans off the North African coast through ACCOBAMS; and through AEWA over 200 species of migratory waterbirds moving within Africa and between Africa and Eurasia.

Future work to develop additional CMS Instruments will include the African elephant and the Monk Seal.

CMS is also actively participating in the UNEP's conservation and development initiative GRASP for the great apes of Africa and the communities in the range states.

With the possible exception of the Monk Seal, the balance of these animals contribute to or have considerable potential to contribute to socio-economic development through direct and indirect uses such as subsistence and alternative livelihoods such as eco-tourism.

And all of these CMS Instruments were concluded during the decade since the Rio Summit.

13. A second important WSSD outcome was a new political consensus that significantly reducing the loss of biodiversity “is a priority to achieve sustainable livelihoods for all”.

When he last spoke to this forum in 1999, Dr. Klaus Töpfer stressed that CMS and AEWA must concern themselves deeply with the human dimensions of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, because biodiversity is closely correlated with both cultural and spiritual values.

He also noted that species conservation and the conservation of their habitats/ecosystems must be linked to poverty eradication, which he described as the “most poisonous commodity in the world.”

Poverty, with its insidious direct and indirect impacts on migratory species, both from habitat loss and over-exploitation, leads impoverished communities to resort to unsustainable, and sometimes illegal, practices of hunting, fishing and trade simply to ensure their short-term survival.

14. It is gratifying that CMS is working globally to make the link and act upon it.

It has sought and is still seeking stronger cooperation with CITES on the trade dimension of the Saiga Antelope Conservation to build synergies between the work of the two Conventions. The Saiga Antelope will be discussed at CITES COP-12 in November in Chile.

For example, the CMS WSSD publication “*Biodiversity in Motion*” (HOLD UP) describes how poaching, illegal trade in the horns of Saiga antelope and uncontrolled hunting, have contributed to its recent decline.

Economic hardship, impoverishment of local communities and poor land use planning are root causes that need to be addressed to conserve and

sustainably use this once abundant antelope of the Eurasian steppe.

CMS is developing a Memorandum of Understanding and comprehensive Action Plan between the Range States to reverse the situation and restore the vast herds of the Saiga to the Central Asian steppe.

15. Another example is the CMS Action Plan for the Conservation and Restoration of Sahelo-Saharan Antelopes. The French GEF has recently contributed financially to this Action Plan which will help **7 of the** 14 Range States organise their collective and individual activities to restore the range and numbers of 6 highly endangered antelopes.

I wish to express UNEP's **and CMS's** deep appreciation to the French Government for the contribution.

This Action Plan will not only benefit the species, the ecosystems where they are found but most importantly also benefit the people that coexist with these animals in some of the most extreme conditions on the planet through improved rangeland, the supply of meat and possibly eco-tourism dollars.

In short, CMS demonstrates that migratory species conservation and sustainable use can make tangible contributions to poverty eradication.

16. Programmes which provide alternative livelihoods as well as reduce short-term pressures on over-exploited wildlife populations can yield long-term benefits for communities that are inextricably linked to the natural resource base.

Such efforts would ensure that the animals don't become extinct in the wild.

And CMS work is to achieve just that.

17. A third a major WSSD outcome was the renewed political recognition that the world's marine fisheries are unsustainably exploited. There is a new political commitment to achieve sustainable fisheries, especially the restoration of depleted stocks by 2015. Gauging the sustainability of a fishery must be based not only on the direct impacts on the fish themselves, but also the impacts the fishery has on other animals.

18. It is gratifying to note that since the Capetown COP in 1999, CMS has been at the forefront of efforts to minimise by-catch of seabirds and marine turtles, both within a coastal State's maritime zones and on the high seas.

For example, the MoUs and the comprehensive Conservation and Management Plans addressing by-catch have been finalised for Turtles of the West African Coast and in the Indian Ocean as well as Southeast Asia.

The first MoU has been signed by 17 countries and the second meeting of Range States took place in Nairobi in May 2002.

The second MOU has been signed by 11 countries and the Range States are expected to hold their first formal meeting later this year or in early 2003.

19. What's more, since Capetown, the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP) was concluded to protect these magnificent birds in the Southern Hemisphere.

III. CMS Then and Now:

An ever Growing Convention with a Clear Focus on Implementation

Distinguished Ladies and gentlemen,

20. The picture of CMS that emerges is that of an evergrowing Convention with a clear focus on, and **a steady** resolve towards implementation.

It may be recalled that in 1992, when the international community met in Rio, CMS was seven years old. Only three Agreements had been concluded under its auspices by then: Wadden Seals, EUROBATS and ASCOBANS.

And only the Wadden Seals Agreement was actually in force at the time.

Today, ten years later, and two weeks after Johannesburg, there are six formal CMS Agreements, and six (less formal) Memoranda of Understanding and one Action Plan.

This suite of CMS Instruments comprehensively addresses seals, bats, cetaceans, birds, marine turtles and large herbivores.

21. These are important stand-alone achievements. But CMS cannot and does

not work alone. For example, a CMS study in 2000 indicated that the CMS Instruments cut across **almost** all of the CBD thematic programmes and cross-cutting themes with a high level of complementarity. This analysis led to the comprehensive draft joint CBD/CMS work programme before you for consideration at this meeting.

And at The Hague last April, the CBD COP-6 recognised CMS as “lead partner” on migratory species conservation and sustainable use.

22. Since 1999, CMS has been working hard to “formalise” relationships with other instruments such as the International Whaling Commission. MoUs with CITES and UNESCO will be signed this evening.

In all cases, CMS brings to these other fora a comprehensive approach for migratory species conservation and sustainable use.

23. The CMS Instruments make the important link between individual migratory species and groups of migratory species, their habitat needs, the other components of biodiversity they depend upon and interact with, as well as the various threats facing these species.

In essence, CMS’s broad-based, yet focussed approach takes over where other instruments may be too general to be specific-enough for migratory species, or focus on a single threat or habitat type.

24. The CMS has been hard at work to better link information technologies and management to its activities to support implementation. In this regard,

UNEP/WCMC has played a key role in realising the potential of information management for CMS's work, working closely with the Secretariat to develop and implement a new information management plan, develop a new, more streamlined national report format and, for the first time ever, synthesise the information from the national reports. **The concrete evidence of all this work is before you at this meeting.**

25. Honourable Minister, I am very happy to acknowledge that your government is lead role in the research and development phase of the Global Register of Migratory Species (GROMS).

GROMS is well-placed to serve as:

- (i) a specialised CMS database;
- (ii) a publicly accessible information platform;
- (iii) a tool for any research work on migratory species and
- (iv) specialised database for other international instruments and programmes.

CMS has also been a strong proponent of harmonization of reporting and information management for the global biodiversity-related treaties, and continues to work closely with UNEP and other convention secretariats towards this.

IV. Moving Beyond the WSSD

Distinguished Delegates,

26. Before and during the WSSD, the press was filled with all shades of views about the achievements or redemption of promises of governments since Rio.

Of course, there have been achievements, frustrations and even failures.

But a closer examination would have found that Rio catalysed a wealth of

awareness and action globally.

It is my belief that in the final analysis, it may well be stated with due justification that the CMS has led the charge for global action on migratory species.

I wish all of you a most productive and intellectually stimulating conference.

Thank you very much.

CMS COP7 – Opening Ceremony Address, 18 September 2002, Bonn
Dr. Claude Martin
Director General
WWF International

Excellencies,
Distinguished Delegates,
Ladies and Gentlemen.

The CMS recognizes the role and contribution of NGOs in the fulfilment of its Mission, as well as in the AEWA and other agreements explicitly. I am thus addressing you on behalf of a wider community of civil society organizations active in the relevant fields. More specifically I am today representing the:

- World Conservation Union (IUCN)
- Birdlife International
- Wetlands International
- and of course my own organization WWF–The World Wide Fund For Nature

However, I am aware that the Convention has established a fruitful cooperation with a number of other specialized NGOs such as:

- International Crane Foundation
- Whale & Dolphin Conservation Society
- European Natural Heritage Foundation (EURONATUR)
- Global Nature Fund
- Gesellschaft zum Schutz der Meeressäugetiery
- Gesellschaft zur Rettung der Dolphine

and a number of others.

Today, it is exactly two weeks since the WSSD in Johannesburg came to a close with a Plan of Implementation, which many NGOs criticized as disappointing, and even government representatives questioned whether we had reached the limits of the multilateral system. On the positive side of the Summit, however, we witnessed an unseen number of forward-looking partnerships between governments, intergovernmental institutions, corporations and NGOs addressing sustainable development and poverty reduction needs in practice, and where the negotiated text fell short of expectations. Johannesburg will primarily be remembered for these new alliances.

A number of these initiatives specifically addressed transfrontier conservation issues – the European Water Initiative or the Congo Basin Partnership are but two examples of such cross-sectoral and transfrontier initiatives. Somewhere, there was this spirit of "let's do it despite all" – in addition to a fairly ambiguous part in the official text referring to halting the degradation of biodiversity. We have yet to see what comes out of that, but what is increasingly clear, biodiversity loss cannot be stopped without looking at the wider geographic context, the ecoregions, river basins, the global commons and the transfrontier migration of species. If the world community is to become serious about the declarations made in Johannesburg, it has to invest in cross-border cooperation, support UNEP, the Biodiversity Convention, CITES, Ramsar, the Bonn and Bern Conventions. We all talk of the advantages and downsides of a globalized economy, but environmental thinking and understanding globalized much earlier, when these vitally important multilateral instruments were created. The time has come when governments have to become serious and provide them with the financial means to fulfil their missions, as Germany has demonstrated this morning, to mitigate the negative effects of a globalized economy – and "walk the talk" of Rio and Johannesburg. I am sure the replenishment of the GEF, for which we have been fighting, will help with project funding, e.g. for the AEWA

proposal, but the Parties to the Conventions must not use this as an excuse for not providing adequate core budgets.

There are many things the Secretariats of the Convention, or CMS in this case, can do to more effectively address international cooperation and communications, e.g. through the joint Workplan with Ramsar, through the implementation of the recommendations of the Performance Working Group, or the improvement of the evaluation of project proposals – but Secretariats are as effective as they are given the means and are supported by the Parties – not just with words.

The CMS provides a sound basis for transboundary cooperation not least with NGOs, which since Rio alone have invested many hundreds of millions of USD in biodiversity conservation, through its instruments of regional agreements, such as the ones on albatross and petrels, sea turtles and cetaceans. It seems to me that the AEWA in particular, in which Birdlife and Wetlands International have invested with scientific input, offers a real chance in this period after Johannesburg. There remain a number of structural issues to be resolved, such as the International Implementation Priorities and Register of Projects. This is the time to get it right.

According to WWF's Living Planet Report, we have lost one third of the Earth's natural wealth in the last 30 years and the ecological footprint may rise to twice the regenerative capacity of the biosphere in the next 50 years. We don't have much time left to save the bulk of this planet's biodiversity.

Thank you.

Part II b

Opening Statements made during the Opening Ceremony of MOP 2 AEWA

STATEMENTS OF CONTRACTING PARTIES

**REPUBLIC OF CROATIA
GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF CROATIA**

STATEMENT

**at the Seventh Meeting of the parties to the Convention on the
Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals**

Bonn, Germany, 18-24 September 2002

September, 2002

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Ministers, Distinguished Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen,

Allow me to extend the gratitude on behalf of the Government of Republic of Croatia to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, for hosting the Seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (*Bonn Convention*).

Migratory species of wild animals, more than any other group of species, represent a common natural heritage of all mankind. These species cross vast areas that extend over national jurisdictional borders and depend entirely on specific routes and habitats. It is this fact that makes them so valuable and sensitive to the threats of rapid human development. Recognizing the importance of conservation of migratory species of wild animals and the need for strong international cooperation in all protection efforts, the world community adopted the Bonn Convention more than 20 years ago, followed by the conclusion of several regional Agreements and Memoranda of Understanding.

Following the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Republic of Croatia developed and adopted the *National Strategy and Action Plan on the Protection of the Biological and Landscape Diversity (NSAP)* in 1999. This is the first document by which the Republic of Croatia has tried to chart systematically and to plan comprehensively the nature protection activities. The analysis carried out during the development of this document showed the great diversity of migratory fauna in Croatia and pointed out the threats. As a result, the NSAP laid down elaboration of a number of action plans concerning the protection of migratory wild animals and their habitats. The activities that have been undertaken so far mostly include inventorying of the parts of biological diversity and threat assessment, as a basis for formulation of action plans for the protection of certain migratory species of wild animals. In this regard, Croatia recognized the significance of the Bonn Convention, its Agreements and Memoranda of Understanding for the implementation of the NSAP and joined the Convention as a full party in October 2000.

I would like to express the commitment of the Republic of Croatia to continue its work and to contribute to the further implementation of the Bonn Convention. We believe that the new Nature Protection Law, that is in the official enactment procedure, will improve the regulation of this problem area, in accordance with the provisions of the Bonn convention, as well as other international agreements covering protection of biological diversity.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen,

Once again, I would like to stress that the Republic of Croatia will continue to put all its efforts to preserve migratory species of wild animals as an irreplaceable part of biological diversity. This exceptional natural value requires utmost attention of all countries that share it and benefit from it.

I would also like to point out the work of all bodies that contribute to the enforcement of the Convention. In this regard, let me once again extend our gratitude to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany that kindly agreed to host the Meeting and United Nations Environmental Programme that provide the Secretariat of the Bonn convention, and the excellent work in the organization of the Meeting.

Let me finish by saying that the Bonn Convention gives the opportunity for effective protection of migratory species and obliges us to put joint efforts and cooperate in reaching this common goal.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA

OPENING STATEMENT AT THE 3RD AFRICAN-EURASIAN WATER BIRDS AGREEMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE PARTIES MEETING 25th – 27th SEPTEMBER 2002, BONN

The United Republic of Tanzania (URT) is honored to make a statement at this 3rd Meeting of Members of The Party to The African-Eurasian Water Birds Agreement. Tanzania government is devoted to wildlife conservation. It has 28% of her country total surface area devoted to wildlife protection under different management regimes. 10% of Tanzania's total surface area is covered by wetlands. Tanzania has ratified a number of environmental protection Conventions/Treaties including: CBD, UNCCD, UNCFCC, CITES, the Ramsar Convention, the Bonn Convention, the Lusaka Agreement and AEWA.

The URT has 13 identified Important Bird Areas (IBA) out of which 25% are wetland areas. This signifies the importance of wetland areas in biodiversity conservation, in particular water birds in our country. Tanzania has 58 migratory water bird species under AEWA, for which action plans need be developed. Considering the importance of Tanzania in the conservation of these water bird species, the government took part in all the stages in the negotiations, development and conclusion of the AEWA, and it was among the few States to sign the Agreement in 1995 and later ratified it in 1999. The URT is committed to uphold its commitment to international obligations in the conservation of migratory water birds and has taken the following measures since its ratification to the Agreement:

- To include species and habitat conservation actions to the Ministerial Medium Term Strategic Plan (2001-2006). By doing so, the government has committed itself to allocating funds annually to implement such actions. Such actions include but not limited to water bird surveys and development of species action plans;
- To conduct flamingo counts under the eastern and southern Africa flamingo monitoring program;
- To undertake water bird surveys in those areas earmarked for designation as Ramsar Sites;
- To establish AEWA Sub-Committee under the informal wetlands working group, whose role is to advise the government on the conservation of water birds, including those outside the AEWA list, and to prepare plans and programs for the same;
- To review the wildlife laws, among other things, to operationalize the wildlife policy, which has specific strategies focused on wildlife species and habitat conservation, and international cooperation and obligations. In this regard the revised wildlife laws will take on board related regional and international Conventions and Treaties that URT is a party to;
- To promptly pay contributions to the AEWA Trust Fund;
- To link up the Secretariat of the Agreement to the SADC Wildlife Technical Committee in order to sensitize the SADC member States to join the Agreement;

The URT endeavors to continue with the tasks of working towards meeting the objectives of the Agreement as it has done before. In the last triennium the URT was representing the Eastern African countries in the Technical Committee and has been one of the few countries to benefit from the GEF-Flyway demonstrations projects. These along with many other obligations, URT will continue to work closely with the AEWA Secretariat to meet its obligations under the Agreement.

OPENING STATEMENT BY THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

**TO THE SECOND SESSION OF THE MEETING OF PARTIES TO THE
AGREEMENT ON THE CONSERVATION OF AFRICAN-EURASIAN
MIGRATORY WATERBIRDS, BONN, GERMANY, SEPTEMBER 2002**

Introduction

The Republic of South Africa wishes to thank the Federal Republic of Germany as the host country for the 2nd Meeting of Parties to the African-Eurasian Waterbird Agreement (AEWA), as well as the Agreement's Secretariat, for the warm welcome and excellent facilities afforded to the conference. As the host of the 1st Meeting of Parties, South Africa is well aware of the large amount of work that needs to be undertaken to hold such an international meeting.

Amendments to the Agreement and Action Plan

South Africa has proposed 11 species of coastal seabirds for addition to the Annex 2 of the Agreement at the 2nd MoP. The in-progress report of the Conservation Assessment and Management Plan Workshop for Southern African Coastal Seabirds held in Cape Town in February 2002 sets out why the original plan for an African Penguin Memorandum of Understanding within the Bonn Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) evolved to a proposed regional working group for 20 coastal seabird species under the auspices of AEWA. It is to be noted that nine species (mainly terns *Sterna* spp.) proposed for coverage are already listed within Annex 2 of AEWA. The workshop was run jointly by the IUCN-SSC Conservation Breeding Specialist Group and the Avian Demography Unit, University of Cape Town, with funding and expert advice from AEWA and the Dutch Government via Wetlands International.

South Africa proposes that a Southern African Regional Working Group for Coastal Seabirds be set up by the AEWA Technical Committee to enhance collaboration between Angola, Namibia and South Africa. South Africa offers to take the lead in setting up this regional working group, noting that neither Angola nor Namibia are currently Parties to AEWA.

South Africa supports the amendment of AEWA to allow for multi-species action plans, and offers to take the lead in drafting a multi-species action plan for the 20 species of southern African coastal seabirds it wishes to see covered by a regional working group.

International Implementation Priorities AEWA 2000-2004

The Avian Demography Unit, University of Cape Town currently holds a contract with AEWA to prepare a detailed report on the potential impacts of commercial fisheries on migratory marine in the Afrotropical Region (AEWA Implementation Priorities 2000-2004, Study No. 24). The study, which is desk-top one, is confined to the Afrotropical region and to those birds listed within AEWA as well as those being nominated by South Africa at the 2nd MoP. A report has been submitted to the AEWA Secretariat in September 2002, listing the species to be covered and progress achieved to date.

International Single Species Action Plans

South Africa is a range state for two action plans proposed for adoption by AEWA, the Great Snipe (a rare summer visitor) and Black-winged Pratincole (a locally common summer visitor).

The Avian Demography Unit's Coordinated Waterbird Counts Project (CWAC) is collating the available (but probably very limited) information relating to recommendations of the two species' action plans. The report of these reviews will be submitted to the Great Snipe and Black-winged Pratincole Working Groups once they are established under the AEWA Technical Committee.

Activities by BirdLife South Africa

- BirdLife South Africa is a collaborating NGO for implementation of the GEF PDF-B Project "Enhancing Conservation of the Critical Network of Wetlands required by Migratory Waterbirds on the African-Eurasian Flyway". This site-demonstration project focuses on conserving wetlands by ensuring equity and by enhancing benefits to local communities.
- BirdLife South Africa contributes the South African component to BirdLife International's Important Birds Areas Programme. The contributions include monitoring, research, advocacy and conservation of South African wetland IBAs.
- BirdLife South Africa currently chairs the BirdLife African Partnership's Species Working Group. A major project of this working group is "Action Plans for the Conservation of Globally Threatened Species". Three training workshops on species action planning have been held to date.

Other relevant activities

- CWAC coordinates regular waterbird censuses at a many localities throughout South Africa. These data are submitted to the African Waterbird Census (AfrWC) programme of Wetlands International on an annual basis.
- SAFRING (South African Bird Ringing Unit) housed at the University of Cape Town coordinates waterbird ringing within southern Africa and is working to expand its scope to include the whole continent, as AFRING.
- The Avian Demography Unit along with other bodies is collecting data on the Ramsar Convention eligibility of southern African marine islands, preparatory to recommending a list to government for such status.
- South Africa continues to undertake conservation-based research on waterbirds within the AEWA region in various parts of South Africa, including at its sub-Antarctic Prince Edward Islands, in Namibia, and in Siberian Russia. Taxa being studied include charadriid waders (shorebirds) and seabirds of the orders Sphenisciformes, Procellariiformes, Pelecaniformes and Charadriiformes. Research is conducted by the Marine & Coastal Management Branch of the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism, as well as at universities and by provincial nature authorities.

South Africa intends pursuing the above and other activities promoted by AEWA during the next intersessional period.

STATEMENTS OF NON-CONTRACTING PARTIES

Statement of the Delegation of the Republic of Armenia to the 2nd Meeting of the Parties to AEWA

Distinguished Chair, Executive Secretary, guests, ladies and gentlemen,

The Delegation of the Republic of Armenia is very pleased to have this opportunity to address the 2nd Meeting of the Parties to African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds Agreement (UNEP/AEWA).

After the Soviet economic policy, the environmental problems has been further deteriorated by the transitional period hardship, energy and economy crisis. Despite the difficulties, the Government facilitates the socio-economic reforms, putting more stress on environmental issues. A new environmental policy is actually being formulated on the basis of reorganization of management structure, improvement of legislation and international cooperation. Regretfully, unfavorable economic conditions and lack of funds from national sources restrict largely practical implementation of environmental conservation activities.

Armenia sees as a main strategy goal the developing and broadening of international cooperation, directed to the integration into the world community. Armenia is ready for collaboration with all countries on the issues representing mutual interest through the bilateral contacts as well as through the multilateral treaties.

After the Rio Armenia is actively involved into international cooperation process and already has ratified 11 international environmental conventions. First environmental treaty that Armenia joined is Convention on Wetlands. First Armenia became a Contracting Party to the Ramsar Convention. And there is no doubt that the AEWA has close links with the Ramsar Convention.

Armenia ratified Convention on Biodiversity and Convention on Climate Change in 1993, Convention on Combat Desertification in 1997.

Armenia is located at the turn of Europe and Asia, on the crossroad of main inland migratory routes Europe - West Asia - Africa and Europe - India and in spite of small size supports more than 100 species of migratory water birds.

No wonder of course, that among many CMS agreements Armenia pays great attention first of all to the AEWA. Armenia was represented by an Observer at the 1st Meeting, Armenian representative also attended the Indian-European Flyway Meeting held in Uzbekistan in 2000.

I have to inform you that the process of joining the CMS and AEWA currently is under the consideration of the Ministry of Nature Protection. After this conference the Ministry will provide additional information to the Cabinet of Ministers for further consideration. During 2003 the Government of the Republic of Armenia will inform the CMS and AEWA Secretariats about official position.

The Delegation of the Republic of Armenia

Déclarations Liminaire du Burundi

Monsieur le Président,

La délégation du Burundi saisit cette opportunité pour remercier le secretariat de la CMS et d'AEWA ainsi que le gouvernement de la République Fédérale d'Allemagne qui ont bien voulu assurer la participation des délégués des états non parties à ces instruments.

En effet, la participation des pays considérés comme observateurs à cette conférence des parties est l'un des moyens efficaces pour promouvoir la CMS et AEWA en témoigne le nombre de pays qui ont adhéré à la CMS et AEWA depuis la dernière conférence de Cape, Afrique du Sud (1989).

Etant déjà partie de la famille des pays qui ont signé les instruments internationaux sur le développement et la gestion durable des ressources naturelles dans le but de préserver l'environnement, à savoir:

La convention sur la diversité biologique, la convention CITES, la convention de RAMSAR, la convention cadre sur les changements climatiques, la convention sur les polluants organo-persistants et la convention sur la lutte contre la désertification.

S'agissant de la CMS et AEWA, le Burundi a déjà entrepris les démarches pour que les instruments soient signés dans les meilleurs délais après le premier atelier national au Burundi sur les convention CMS et AEWA prévu au début de l'année 2002.

Pur conclure, le Burundi garde donc sa volonté d'adhérer à ces instruments qu'il juge très importants pour la gestion éclairée des espèces migratrice et la protection de leurs habitats pour les générations présentes et futures.

Ir. Jean-Marie Bukuru

La délégation du Burundi

7th Meeting of the conference of the parties to CMS
2nd Meeting of the parties to AEWA
Bonn, Germany, 18-27 September 2002

COMMUNICATION DU CAP VERT

Je remercie le Secrétariat de la CMS pour avoir invité le Cap Vert à participer à la COP 7.

Le Cap Vert se situe à 350 km de la côte d'Afrique dans l'océan Atlantique, possède une vaste ZEE avec certaines espèces migratrices. Parmi les espèces migratrices on trouve au Cap Vert les tortues marines comme les Caouannes. Selon un projet de recherche financé par l'Union Européenne, environ 2000 femelles de cette espèce ont été enregistrées au Cap Vert. Pour cela, le Cap Vert se trouve en troisième place au niveau mondial après les Etats Unis et l'île de Massirah à Oman et en deuxième en Atlantique après les Etats Unies.

Les tortues marines se trouvent en danger. Au Cap Vert plusieurs facteurs contribuent pour cela notamment la pêche accidentelle, la dégradation des habitats, la capture intentionnelle, etc.

Autres espèces migratrices sont observées au Cap Vert comme les baleines (Humpback whale) et les dauphins.

Le Cap Vert partage et appuie l'idée de la CMS pour la conservation et préservation des espèces migratrices. Certaines mesures ont été prises au niveau national pour protéger ces espèces.

La réglementation nationale interdit la capture des tortues marines et des mammifères marins. Au niveau de certaines municipalités il existe des projets pour la protection et la conservation des tortues marines. En plus, le Cap Vert participe au niveau régional dans les travaux concernant la conservation des tortues marines. En Juin 2002, le pays a participé à l'atelier sous-régional à Dakar (Sénégal) pour élaborer le Plan d'action pour la conservation des tortues marines de l'Afrique de l'Ouest.

Le Cap Vert ne fait pas partie de la CMS, mais le Gouvernement est en train de travailler sur les instruments juridiques nécessaires pour pouvoir dans un avenir proche signer la Convention et participer activement dans les activités de la CMS.

Je vous remercie.

Union des Comores

Unité - Solidarité - Développement

Ministère des Relations Extérieures, de la Coopération de la Francophonie, de l'Environnement et des Comoriens de l'Étranger

Direction Générale de l'Environnement

B.P. 41 Moroni - Comores

Tel: (269) 73 63 88

Fax: (269) 73 68 49

Déclaration de l'Union des Comores

Mr. Le Secrétaire Exécutif de la Convention sur les espèces migratrices appartenant à la faune sauvage, (CMS)

Mr. Le Secrétaire Exécutif de l'accord sur la conservation des oiseaux d'eau migrateurs d'Afrique-Eurasie (AEWA)

Je voudrais, tout d'abord, au nom de la délégation de mon pays, l'Union des Comores, joindre ma voie à celles des autres délégations ici-présents pour présenter mes sincères félicitations pour l'accueil très chaleureux et très fraternelle qui a été réservé à la délégation de mon pays depuis notre arrivée dans ce beau pays.

Comme vous le savez, les Comores se réjouissent de la tenue d'une telle conférence, lui qui fait ses premiers pas dans l'expérience d'une nouvelle architecture institutionnelle qui pose comme une grande priorité la reconstruction nationale. Il faut rappeler que la crise séparatiste qui a éclaté en 1997 dans mon pays a ébranlé le tissu politique, institutionnel et socio-économique et c'est pourquoi l'ensemble de la communauté internationale et des forces vives comoriennes n'ont ménagé aucun effort pour parvenir à un règlement juste et équitable de la crise. A l'heure actuelle, le gouvernement de l'Union des Comores et ses partenaires de la communauté internationale poursuivent leurs concentrations en vue d'un parachèvement rapide des nouvelles institutions.

C'est ainsi que, des dispositions sont d'ores et déjà prises pour que d'ici la fin de cette année, la nouvelle Assemblée Nationale soit élue afin qu'elle puisse légiférer. La mise en place de cette institution permettra aux Comores de parachever ses démarches déjà amorcées il y a un bon moment, sur la ratification de la CMS et l'AEWA.

Nous tenons à dire que l'Union des Comores, reconnaît le rôle prépondérant joué par la CMS et l'AEWA quant à la conservation des espèces migratrices et à la protection de leurs habitats dans l'optique d'une gestion rationnelle et durable.

C'est pourquoi mon pays souhaiterait rejoindre les Pays Parties pour participer activement à la conservation des espèces migratrices et des oiseaux d'eau migrateurs.

Dans cette perspective, les Comores souhaiteraient avoir le soutien financier et l'appui technique des deux secrétariats CMS/AEWA, pour la formulation d'une stratégie nationale en matière de conservation des espèces migratrices et de leurs habitats.

Cette démarche permettra à mon pays de renforcer ses capacités institutionnelles, en matière scientifique, professionnelle et pédagogique et lui permettra de devenir un partenaire à part entière dans l'effort global de conservation des espèces migratrices.

Position de la Republique Centrafricaine sur la Ratification de la Convention.

La delegation de la Republique Centrafricaine remercie la CMS pour l'invitation qu'elle a bien voulu lui adressee et le Gouvernement Allemand pour son accueil.

La Republique Centrafricaine a ratifie bon nombre de conventions et d'accords relatifs a l'environnement notamment sur la diversite biologique, sur la desertification, les zones humides etc.

Il y a deux mesures en vigueur en RCA pour la ratification de ces conventions et accords.

- 1) par l'Assemblee Nationale (qui est la procedure la plus longue)
- 2) par le biais du Ministere des affaires etrangeres.

Le processus a ete declanche et c'est la procedure la plus rapide qui a ete retenue, a savoir par le biais du Ministere des Affaires Etrangeres.

En effet, c'est aussitôt apres la 6ieme Conference des parties a la CMS qui s'est tenue au Cap en Afrique du Sud que nous avons initie une correspondance a la signature du Ministre de l'Environnement et des Eaux et Forets pour inviter le Ministre des Affaires Etrangeres a donner mandat a notre Ambassadeur a Bonn a signer la Convention.

Cela a traine car le Ministre des Affaires Etrangeres a transmis ce dossier a ses conseillers juridiques pour etudes. Toutefois, une note a ete preparee a la signature du Ministre des Affaires Etrangeres pour saisir l'Ambassadeur de la RCA a Bonn pour des instructions necessaires.

Il s'agit maintenant pour nous de verifier aupres de l'Ambassadeur ici a Bonn si cette correspondance est bien parvenue a destination.

The Czech Republic's statement
Second Session of the Meeting of Parties to the Agreement on the Conservation of
African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds

The Government of the Czech Republic would like to thank the Government of Germany for its wonderful welcome to the Meeting of Parties to the AEW A.

The Czech Republic realizes importance and necessity of the international cooperation in the field of the conservation of migratory species. In accordance to this fact, the Czech Republic signed the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals as well as the Agreement on the Conservation of Population of European Bats, and is going to sign the Agreement on the Conservation African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds.

Inter-department negotiations are being entered, and based on their resolutions we are sure that the Czech Republic will be a Contracting Party before the Third Session of the Meeting of Parties to the AEWA.

RÉPUBLIQUE DÉMOCRATIQUE DU CONGO
MINISTÈRE DES AFFAIRES FONCIÈRES ENVIRONNEMENT ET
TOURISME

SEPTIÈME SESSION DE LA CONFÉRENCE DES PARTIES A LA
CONVENTION SUR LES ESPÈCES MIGRATRICES APPARTENANT A LA
FAUNE SAUVAGE

ET

DEUXIÈME RÉUNION DES PARTIES A L'ACCORD SUR LES OISEAUX
MIGRATEURS D'AFRIQUE-EURASIE
Bonn (Allemagne), du 18 au 27 Septembre 2002

COMMUNICATION DE LA RÉPUBLIQUE DÉMOCRATIQUE DU CONGO
RELATIVE A LA MISE EN OEUVRE DE LA CMS ET DE L'AEWA

par

MUEMBO KABEMBA
Directeur Scientifique à l'Institut Congolais pour la Conservation de la Nature

Bonn, Septembre 2002

I. INTRODUCTION

Monsieur le Président,

Au nom du Gouvernement de la République Démocratique du Congo dont nous avons reçu le mandat de représenter notre pays aux présentes assises de la COPA de la CMS et de la 2ème réunion de l'AEWA, je voudrais sincèrement remercier le Gouvernement de la République d'Allemagne, d'une part, et les Secrétariats respectifs de la Convention de Bonn et de l'Accord sur les Oiseaux d'eau migrateur, d'Afrique-Eurasie, d'autre part, pour nous avoir invité à cette importante rencontre. Cela nous permettra de réfléchir ensemble aux problèmes pertinents de conservation des espèces migratrices dans le monde en vue d'y trouver des solutions concertées et durables.

La République Démocratique du Congo est un pays immense (2.345.000 km²), riche en espèces de flore et de faune, en écosystèmes de différents types et en habitats naturels. Ceux-ci abritent des espèces migratrices de mammifères, d'oiseaux, de tortues, de reptiles, etc. La République Démocratique de Congo dispose d'un potentiel élevé en ressources en eau et partage plus de 6500 km de frontières naturelles avec les pays voisins. C'est également un énorme territoire couvert de vastes étendues forestières et de zones humides d'intérêt indéniable dans le maintien des processus écologiques.

La population humaine est nombreuse et elle atteint un taux d'accroissement annuel de 3,1 %. Elle recourt quotidiennement aux ressources naturelles pour sa subsistance, mais en mettant surtout en œuvre des modes de consommation incompatibles avec les principes de gestion durable du patrimoine naturel.

En République Démocratique du Congo (RDC), la conservation et l'utilisation durable des ressources naturelles demeure une importante mission comme le montrent à titre indicatif l'existence de nombreux parcs nationaux, domaines de chasse et réserves apparentées, lesquels représentent 8% du territoire national. Plusieurs espèces migratrices sont aussi protégées par la loi en la matière dans ces sites et en dehors. Les structures de gestion appropriées (Ministère des Affaires Foncières Environnement et Tourisme avec ses Services et Institutions publiques spécialisées placés sous sa tutelle entre autre comme L'Institut Congolais pour la Conservation de la Nature assurent cette tâche.

S'agissant en particulier des espèces migratrices, la République Démocratique du Congo a fait beaucoup d'efforts pour la protection du gorille de montagne (*Gorilla gorilla beringei* (Parc National des Virunga), des oiseaux migrateurs et d'eau (Parc National des Virunga, Parc Marin des Mongroves, Parc National de l'Upemba, Parc National de Kundelungu y compris le bassin de la Lufira et le Parc Pshangolele au Katanga, Parc National de la Salonga dans le Bassin du Congo, etc.); pour la protection des tortues marines au Parc Marin des Mongroves (Réserve Naturelle) au littoral atlantique, à l'estuaire du fleuve Congo; pour la protection de l'éléphant, des crocodiles, des certaines espèces d'antilopes ou de primates, etc.

Par ailleurs, la République Démocratique du Congo a signé diverses Conventions Internationales pour renforcer la protection des espèces menacées et de leurs habitats, ce qui lui permet de s'impliquer judicieusement dans les synergies de conservation en répondant aux objectifs de la CMS et de l'AEWA en particulier pour sauver les espèces migratrices et les oiseaux d'eau au profit des communautés.

En ce sens, il s'agit notamment de:

- La Convention CITES
- La Convention sur la Diversité Biologique
- La Convention sur la Désertification
- La Convention sur les Changements climatiques
- La Convention de Bonn
- La Convention de Ramsar
- La Convention du Patrimoine Mondial.

Bien entendu, la RD-Congo s'est également inscrit dans le processus de l'AEWA pour la réalisation de ses objectifs. Elle a participé aux différentes sessions antérieures de la CMS y compris celles du Conseil Scientifique et d'autres. Elle a aussi participé à la réunion sur le Mémoire d'Accord sur les tortues marines qui s'est tenue à Nairobi cette année. Elle poursuit les activités sur le terrain en impliquant les partenaires locaux et internationaux.

Outre ces mesures, la RDC a déjà adopté son Plan National d'Action Environnemental (CNAE) et sa stratégie Nationale et Plan d'Action de la Biodiversité dans lesquels la Conservation de la Diversité Biologique, en l'occurrence les espèces migratrices et les oiseaux sont pris en compte.

II. LES PROBLÈMES RENCONTRES

La RDC, constitue une importante voie de migration traditionnelle d'oiseaux migrateurs d'Afrique et des migrateurs paléartiques hivernant en Afrique.

Cependant, les espèces et leurs habitats sont considérablement menacés suite aux pressions accrues de braconnage de déforestation et d'occupation anarchique des aires de répartition des espèces. Les pillages des équipements et des infrastructures suite aux guerres ont beaucoup dépouillé les sites de conservation de leurs moyens stratégiques dont ils étaient dotés.

D'autre part, les inventaires des espèces migratrices ne sont pas effectués. Les atouts des espèces et des habitats ne sont donc pas évalués. Les systèmes d'information géographique relatives aux espèces ne sont pas établis. Les Communautés locales vivant dans les aires de répartition des espèces visées ne bénéficient pas de projets d'appui qui devraient permettre leur intégration dans la dynamique de conservation et de développement durable. Les supports éducatifs indispensables pour leur encadrement font défaut. En effet, le manque de moyens matériels financiers ainsi que l'insuffisance de personnel handicapent les activités.

III. RECOMMANDATIONS

Au cours des réunions antérieures, la RDC a maintes fois sollicité l'appui de la CMS pour sauver le gorille de montagne, les tortues marines et les oiseaux migrateurs et d'eau. Mais, elle n'a encore rien eu jusqu'à ce jour.

Vu la nécessité, nous recommandons que le Secrétariat de la CMS et celui de l'AEWA puissent intervenir rapidement pour appuyer les actions prioritaires suivantes:

- Renforcer les capacités de gestion des Services du Ministère des Affaires Foncières Environnement et Tourisme (Institut Congolais pour la Conservation de la Nature et autre);
- Réaliser les inventaires des espèces dans leurs aires de distribution et leur cartographie;

- Mettre en place un système information géographique sur les espèces et leurs habitats;
- Assurer les équipements nécessaires pour la protection, la recherche et le monitoring dans les site concernés;
- Réhabiliter les infrastructures dans les sites;
- Mener des études d'impact sur les espèces et leurs habitats;
- Promouvoir l'éducation et la sensibilisation des communautés locales, réaliser des projets de développement en leur faveur et encourager l'écotourisme.

Je vous remercie Monsieur le Président.

REPUBLIQUE DE COTE D'IVOIRE

Union-Discipline-Travail

MINISTERE DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT ET DU CADRE DE VIE

DIRECTION DE LA PROTECTION DE LA NATURE

**COMMUNICATION RELATIVE A LA L'ADHESION DE LA
COTE D'IVOIRE A LA CONVENTION SUR LA
CONSERVATION DES ESPECES MIGRATRICES (CMS)**

**Septième Conférence des Parties contractantes de la Convention sur les espèces migratrices, à
Bonn en Allemagne, du 18 au 24 Septembre 2002**

Préparé par :

BEUGRE Eric

Coordonnateur national CMS

Septembre 2002

COMMUNICATION RELATIVE A LA L'ADHESION DE LA COTE D'IVOIRE A LA CONVENTION SUR LA CONSERVATION DES ESPECES MIGRATRICES (CMS)

Bonn, 18 Septembre 2002

I- EXPOSE DES MOTIFS

La politique de la Côte d'Ivoire en matière de protection de la faune, suivant la loi n° 65-255 du 04 août 1965, tend à assurer la conservation et l'enrichissement qualitatif et quantitatif d'animaux d'espèces sauvages vivant naturellement dans le pays, tant sur les surfaces relevant du domaine de l'Etat que sur les terrains des particuliers. Les principes fondamentaux énoncés dans cette loi sont les suivants:

- Constitution et entretien de réserves totales ou partielles de faune établie, soit pour toute la faune, soit pour certaines espèces seulement ou dans certaines conditions;
- Education globale de la population, tant par l'enseignement à différents niveaux que par des moyens audiovisuels, en vue de susciter une prise de conscience nationale de la notion de protection de la nature;
- Protection intégrale ou partielle des espèces animales rare ou menacées d'extinction, ou présentant un intérêt scientifique, ou nécessaires à l'équilibre biologique, ou particulièrement utiles à l'homme, ou dont l'exploitation, pour le tourisme cynégétique ou visuel, comporte un intérêt économique ou éducatif.

La convention des espèces migratrices appartenant à la faune sauvage, dite Convention de Bonn, s'inscrit dans les deux derniers principes de la loi ivoirienne en matière de protection de la faune. Elle fournit un cadre dans lequel les pays participent à la conservation des espèces migratrices et de leurs habitats en effectuant des travaux de recherche, de surveillance et de formation.

Il convient de noter, à cet égard, que la Côte d'Ivoire dispose d'une variété d'espèces migratrices appartenant à la faune sauvage, notamment les oiseaux migrateurs, les tortues marines et les petits cétacés des eaux côtières ivoiriennes, qui ne font pas actuellement l'objet d'études scientifiques appropriées pour leur conservation et le maintien de leur habitat. Ces espèces pourraient bénéficier des actions de la convention en ce qui concerne les études suivantes:

- Description de l'aire de répartition et de l'itinéraire de migration de chaque espèce migratrice;
- Examen périodique de l'état de conservation de l'espèce migratrice concernée et identification des facteurs susceptibles de nuire à cet état de conservation;

- Elaboration de plans de conservation et de gestion coordonnés;
- Réalisation de travaux de recherche sur l'écologie et la dynamique des populations de chaque espèce migratrice;
- Echange d'informations relatives aux résultats de la recherche scientifique, ainsi que statistique relatives à cette espèce.
- Adoption et mise en œuvre mesures s'appuyant sur les principes écologiques bien fondés visant à exercer un contrôle et une gestion des prélèvements effectués sur l'espèce migratrice concernée...

De ce fait, la Convention sur les espèces migratrices appartenant à la faune sauvage contribuerait, de façon considérable, à la conservation et à la bonne gestion des espèces migratrices ivoiriennes, essentiellement en ce qui concerne les oiseaux d'eau migrateurs et les tortues marines qui font déjà l'objet d'un accord au niveau de la CMS et petites cétacés des eaux côtières ivoiriennes.

La Convention sur la conservation des espèces migratrices appartenant à la faune sauvage apparaît, dès lors, comme un complément parfait de la CITES et de la convention Ramsar.

De plus, la CMS peut être considérée comme un outil spécialisé permettant d'appliquer les dispositions de la convention sur la diversité biologique.

En conclusion, deux (2) motifs ont justifié la ratification de la convention sur la conservation des espèces migratrices appartenant à la faune sauvage (CMS) par la Côte d'Ivoire:

- **La CMS, grâce à ses principes et ses objectifs, fournirait à la Côte d'Ivoire des moyens adéquats pour une conservation et une gestion durable de ses espèces migratrices, à savoir: Les oiseaux, les tortues marines et les petits cétacés des eaux côtières ivoiriennes...**
- **La CMS permettrait à la Côte d'Ivoire, de renforcer sa législation en matière de protection de la faune sauvage en ce sens qu'elle renforcerait de façon considérable l'application de certaines dispositions des conventions déjà ratifiées par notre pays (Convention Ramsar, CITES, convention sur la Biodiversité).**

II- ACTIVITES ANTERIEURES

2-1 Processus de ratification et d'adhésion

Le Processus, débuté en 1999, avec l'adoption, avec avis favorable, de la Convention en Conseil des Ministres et devant la Cour Constitutionnelle a pris fin en 2000 après la prise

d'un décret portant ratification de la CMS signé et publié au Journal Officiel de la République de Côte d'Ivoire (voir copie du journal en annexe).

2-2 Participation aux activités de la Convention

Mai 1999: Organisation de la Conférence Internationale sur les tortues marines de la côte atlantique de l'Afrique avec l'élaboration d'un mémorandum d'accord sur les tortues marines

Novembre 1999: Participation de deux délégués ivoiriens à la 6^{ème} Conférence des Parties à Cape Town, en Afrique du Sud

III- PERSPECTIVES

3-1 Adhésion

Les instruments de ratification sont à la signature du Président de la République.

Renseignements pris auprès des Affaires Etrangères, le traitement du dossier ne devrait pas excéder deux mois.

Personne contact au Ministère des Affaires Etrangères :

Monsieur Fiogolo au 00 225 20 32 50 01/ services des Affaires juridiques et consulaires

3-2 Projets

mise en place du réseau dans les aires protégées

formation des personnes ressources sur les oiseaux et tortues marines

**REPUBLIQUE DE DJIBOUTI
UNITE – EGALITE- PAIX**

**CONVENTION SUR LA CONSERVATION DES ESPECES MIGRATRICES
APPARTENANT A LA FAUNE SAUVAGE (C MS)**

**ACCORD SUR LA CONSERVATION DES OISEAUX D'EAU MIGRATEURS
D'AFRIQUE – EURASIE (AEWA)**

(7^{ème} Conférence et 2^{ème} Réunion des Parties, Bonn, République fédérale d'Allemagne, 18-28 septembre 2002)

**Ministère de l'Habitat, de l'Urbanisme,
De l'Environnement et de l'Aménagement du Territoire
BP : 11 –Djibouti, République de Djibouti
Tel :+253 35 00 06
Fax :+253 35 16 18**

DECLARATION DE LA REPUBLIQUE DE DJIBOUTI

Monsieur le Secrétaire Exécutif de la Convention sur la conservation des espèces migratrices appartenant à la faune sauvage,

Monsieur le Secrétaire Exécutif de l'Accord sur la conservation des oiseaux d'eau migrateurs d'Afrique –Eurasie,

Chers participants, Mesdames et Messieurs,

La délégation Djiboutienne voudrait saisir l'occasion qui lui est offerte pour s'acquitter d'un agréable devoir, celui bien sûr de présenter ses vifs remerciements d'une part à la République fédérale d'Allemagne pour son accueil combien chaleureux depuis notre arrivée dans cette merveilleuse ville de Bonn et d'autre part aux organisateurs, plus particulièrement les secrétariats PNUE/C MS/AEWA qui ont bien voulu inviter notre pays pour prendre part pour la première fois aux travaux de la présente session qui revêt une importance capitale pour la conservation des espèces migratrices appartenant à la faune sauvage en général et aux oiseaux d'eau migrateurs d'Afrique –Eurasie en particulier.

Comme vous le savez, la République de Djibouti est un de plus petits Etats d'Afrique avec une superficie de 23 200 km² et une population à peine supérieure à un demi million. Elle est située dans une zone biogéographique très importante dans l'embouchure nord du Rift Valley africain. Elle abrite une variété d'écosystèmes et d'espèces uniques, rares et spécifiques des zones arides de la Corne d'Afrique. Aussi, elle est reconnue pour une multitude d'espèces de faune et de flore sur lesquelles s'exercent d'énormes pressions humaines mettant en péril la pérennité de ces espèces.

Egalement, Djibouti souhaite par le biais de ma présence ici aujourd'hui, d'attirer votre attention sur le fait que son territoire sert de terre d'accueil ou d'escale à des milliers d'oiseaux couverts par la CMS et l'AEWA de par sa position géographique trait d'union entre l'Europe, l'Afrique et l'Asie.

Etant déjà Partie à un certain nombre d'instruments internationaux ou régionaux garantissant la préservation des ressources biologiques comme la Convention sur la Diversité Biologique, la Convention de CITES, la Convention sur la lutte contre la Désertification, la Convention – Cadre sur le Changement Climatiques, le Programme d'Action Stratégique pour la conservation de la mer Rouge et du golfe d'Aden, la République de Djibouti est en phase finale de ratification de plusieurs autres conventions.

Aussi et avec l'appui technique et financier du Bureau Ramsar, nous avons organisé le mois d'août dernier avec beaucoup de succès, un atelier de vulgarisation et de sensibilisation sur le concept de la Convention de Ramsar et j'ai l'heureuse nouvelle à vous annoncer que mon pays vient de ratifier le 9 septembre dernier la Convention de Ramsar.

Nous avons déjà entrepris les procédures nécessaires et préparatoires pour adhérer à la CMS et à l'AEWA comme en témoigne notre présence ici et les contacts permanents entretenus avec les deux secrétariats depuis plusieurs mois. Nous tenons à dire et à répéter aujourd'hui que notre pays reconnaît le rôle prépondérant joué par la CMS et l'AEWA quant à la conservation des espèces migratrices et à la protection de leurs habitats dans l'optique d'une gestion rationnelle et durable. C'est la raison pour laquelle la République de Djibouti souhaite rejoindre très prochainement les pays Parties pour participer activement et effectivement à la conservation des espèces migratrices et des oiseaux d'eau migrateurs.

Dans l'optique de se joindre aux efforts entrepris dans ce domaine par les pays Parties, la République de Djibouti voudrait initier très rapidement, avec le concours et l'expérience de la CMS et de l'AEWA, une étude complémentaire sur l'inventaire national des sites d'importance pour la conservation des espèces migratrices en général et des oiseaux d'eau en particulier. Nous lançons un appel à votre appui pour nous assister à la formulation d'une stratégie nationale en matière de conservation des espèces migratrices et de leurs habitats car comme un certain nombre de pays en développement, Djibouti ne dispose ni d'études scientifiques suffisantes ni de rapports écologiques sur les espèces couvertes par la CMS et l'AEWA, ni non plus des ressources humaines adéquates avec les connaissances scientifiques requises, ni même des équipements appropriés pour évaluer ou assurer un suivi régulier des oiseaux ou des espèces migratrices transistant ou hivernant sur notre territoire.

Les financements d'infrastructures, d'équipements de recherche, de formation et de sensibilisation sont inexistantes actuellement. Notre pays n'a jamais sollicité ni bénéficié spécifiques pour la réalisation des programmes axés sur les oiseaux ni sur les zones importantes pour leur conservation.

Voilà pourquoi aujourd'hui, je profite au nom de mon pays de l'occasion qui m'est offerte devant cette honorable assemblée, pour solliciter un appui financier, matériel et scientifique pour réaliser des études scientifiques suffisantes sur les espèces migratrices en général et sur les oiseaux d'eau d'Afrique –Eurasie ainsi que leurs habitats en particulier afin de combler le vide d'éléments scientifiques de base.

En outre, pour anticiper et faire face à certains des problèmes sus mentionnés, mon pays compte réaliser dans les limites de ses moyens ainsi qu'avec le concours de la communauté internationale en général et des secrétariats CMS/AEWA en particulier, les actions suivantes.

- Inventorier sur l'ensemble du territoire, les espèces couvertes par la CMS et par l'AEWA.
- Inventorier et réaliser des études approfondies des sites d'importances pour les espèces migratrices et pour les oiseaux d'eau.

- **Promouvoir et assurer la formation et la détection des écologistes, particulièrement des ornithologues au niveau national.**
- **Identifier et désigner des ZICO.**

Considérant l'importance de son patrimoine naturel spécifique en matière de Diversité Biologique et face aux multiples pressions qui pèsent sur les ressources biologiques déjà insuffisantes, mon pays ne manque pas de volonté. Mais sans l'expérience et le concours des communautés internationales, tous nos efforts resteraient aléatoires et sans résultats probants.

La République de Djibouti, en tant qu'Etat escale, corridor et terre d'accueil d'un nombre considérable d'espèces d'oiseaux migrateurs, des tortues marines et autres mammifères marins et terrestres, souhaite aujourd'hui exprimer sa volonté d'adhérer à la CMS et à l'AEWA en vue d'apporter sa contribution aussi peu soit-elle, à la sauvegarde des espèces migratrices appartenant à la faune sauvage.

Pour finir, je voudrais réitérer mes remerciements personnels et celui de mon autorité de tutelle en l'occurrence le Ministre de l'Habitat, de l'Urbanisme, de l'Environnement et de l'Aménagement du Territoire, au Gouvernement allemand qui a hébergé ces deux grandes rencontres et aux secrétariats respectifs CMS/AEWA qui n'ont ménagé aucun effort pour assurer la participation effective de mon pays à l'instar des nombreux délégués des Etats non Parties à ces instruments.

Je vous remercie.

Délégation de la République de Djibouti

Houssein Abdillahi Rayaleh
Assistant du Secrétaire Général
Point focal national de la Convention de Ramsar
Correspondant national de la CMS/AEWA
Tel : +253 35 26 67
Tel : +253 35 16 18
Email : assamo@caramail.com

**Ministère de l'Économie Forestière, des Eaux, de la Pêche,
Chargé de l'Environnement et de la Protection de la Nature de la République
Gabonaise**

Convention sur la Conservation des Espèces Migratrices appartenant à la Faune Sauvage
(CMS)

Accord sur les Oiseaux d'Eau d'Afrique-Eurasie (AEWA)

Etat des Lieux du Gabon face à la CMS et à l'AEWA

La délégation Gabonaise saisit de l'opportunité qui lui est offerte pour remercier d'une part la République Fédérale d'Allemagne pour l'accueil aussi bien chaleureux qu'elle a été l'objet, et d'autre part les deux secrétariats exécutifs de cette grande rencontre ainsi que les organisateurs desdits travaux pour avoir invité encore une fois le Gabon aux présentes assises en qualité d'observateur.

Le Gabon profite par la même occasion pour éclairer rapidement l'assistance sur les efforts déployés par le Gabon en matière de gestion de ses ressources naturelles conformément à l'esprit de ces deux protocoles d'accord.

Le Gabon, de par sa situation géographique au coeur du centre d'endémisme régional Guinéo-Congolais et du massif forestier du bassin du Congo, s'ouvre largement à l'Océan Atlantique sur 800 km de côtes, bénéficiant ainsi d'un capital naturel riche et diversifié.

Son potentiel forestier est considérable et abrite plusieurs espèces animales (primates, éléphants, félins, gazelles, oiseaux, reptiles et insectes) il va de même pour son vaste espace maritime et fluvial riches en mammifères marins et en espèces halieutiques (baleines, dauphins, lamantins, tortues marines, sardinelles, thonides, crustacés etc.)

Cette situation fait du Gabon un véritable couloir et un site par excellence de beaucoup d'espèces migratrices aussi bien au niveau terrestre qu'aux niveaux marin et aquatique.

Quoique riche et varié le patrimoine Gabonais souffre des menaces dues aux exactions des activités extractives basées sur la capacité de la nature à fournir de plus en plus de la viande de brousse, des produits halieutiques, des oeufs de tortues etc.

Ces profondes mutations sociales et économiques ont beaucoup affecté les populations en favorisant un affaiblissement des comportements respectueux de l'environnement, lequel s'accompagne des actes irresponsables dans l'utilisation des ressources naturelles et des écosystèmes fragiles.

Conscient des menaces qui pèsent sur ces différents milieux naturels aux conséquences parfois irréversibles, le Gabon a entrepris depuis plus d'une décennie des activités de recherche et de gestion durable grâce à la participation effective des départements publics concernés, des instituts de recherche et des organisations non gouvernementales internationales et locales (WWF, ECOFAC, MICS, Carpe, ADIE et ASF etc.)

Toujours au niveau national, des mesures législatives ont été adoptées aussi bien dans le code de l'environnement que dans les nouveaux codes forestier et minier, afin de rendre pérennes nos différents écosystèmes avec tout ce qui les compose.

Bien que ce faire peu, le Gabon à lui seul ne peut venir à bout des maux qui affectent ses ressources naturelles. C'est pourquoi soucieux de mieux gérer ce patrimoine exceptionnel, il a renforcé sa coopération en matière d'environnement en adhérant tour à tour à :

- la convention sur le commerce international des espèces de faune et de flore sauvages menacées d'extinction
- la convention sur les zones humides

- la convention sur les changements climatiques
- la convention sur la désertification
- la convention sur la diversité biologique.

Ouvrant sans relâche dans les missions qu'il s'est assigné et conscient du rôle salubre et indispensable que jouent la CMS et l'AEWA dans la sauvegarde de toutes ces espèces menacées, le Ministère de l'Économie forestière, de la Pêche, Chargé de l'Environnement et de la protection de la Nature s'attelle à faire aboutir dans un très proche avenir à la signature de la convention des espèces migratrices appartenant à la faune sauvage et à l'accord sur les oiseaux d'eau d'Afrique-Eurasie.

Je vous remercie.

La Délégation Gabonaise

Jean Hilaire Moudziegou, Directeur des Études

**STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE
REPUBLIC OF GHANA IN RESPECT OF THE STATUS OF
RATIFICATION OF THE AFRICAN-EURASIAN WATERBIRD
AGREEMENT (AEWA)**

Ghana signed the Final Act of the AEW A when the representatives of the Range State Governments and one regional economic integration organization met at The Hague, the Netherlands, from 12 -16 June 1995 for the purpose of negotiating and adopting the Agreement under the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS).

Ghana has since then been making conscientious efforts to ratify the Agreement but without the necessary finishing administrative support for one reason or the other.

Presently, however, Ghana's Cabinet has since 27th June 2002 given approval for the ratification of the Agreement by Parliament. The Minister of Lands and Forestry responsible for CMS/AEWA issues is currently seriously working on the parliamentary ratification process

It is hoped that Parliament, on resumption from its current recess, will not hesitate to give approval and the Agreement ratified by the end of 2002.

“Preparations for Accession to the CMS”

Seventh Meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP7) of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals Bonn, Germany, 18-24 September 2002

Introduction

The Islamic Republic of Iran is located in southwest Asia, bordering in the south with Persian Gulf and Oman Sea and from the north with the Caspian Sea. Iran possesses an extremely diverse fauna and flora, partly because of its great range of habitats from permanent snows to deep deserts and from lush deciduous forests in the north to palm groves and mangroves in the south - and partly because of its position at a crossroads between three major faunal regions. The greater part of the country is situated in the Palearctic Region, with typically Western Palearctic species predominating throughout the northwest, west and central parts of the country and some typically Eastern Palearctic species extending into northeastern Iran in the highlands of Khorasan. In southern Iran, two other faunal regions have a pronounced influence: the Indo-malayan Region in the southeast, and the Afro-tropical Region in the extreme southwest. About 125 species of mammals and 500 species of birds have been recorded, while at least 270 species of fish (including 33 endemic species) are known from the Persian Gulf and Caspian Sea. A recent checklist records over 1,000 species of fish as being known to occur or potentially occurring in Iranian fresh and salt waters.

The Islamic Republic of Iran has constantly played a significant role in regional and international activities in order to protect the environment. Iran hosted an international conference in the city of Ramsar in 1971, which adopted an important, environmental instrument on wetlands so called: “Ramsar Convention on Wetlands.” By the end of 2001, a total of 21 wetlands with an area about 1.5 million hectares were included in the Ramsar List. Iran participates in the UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Program, and in 1976 had designated nine Biosphere Reserves covering a total of 2,775,096 hectares. Four of these Biosphere Reserves namely: Arjan, Hara, Uromiyeh and Miankaleh are of international importance. The Islamic Republic of Iran has also acceded to the Regional Convention for Cooperation on the Protection of the Marine Environment so called ROPME in the Persian Gulf, and accepted its Action Plan for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment and the Coastal Areas. Iran also signed an agreement with the Caspian Sea littoral states (CEP) to combat pollution in the Caspian Sea in 1992. The Iranian government is happy to announce that during the 7th meeting of the littoral states of the Caspian Sea, held in July 2002 Tehran, the text of Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Caspian Sea was finalized and the coastal states prepare themselves to hold signing ceremony in the near future.

The environmental protection law enacted in 1974 is the major legal instrument for environmental conservation in Iran. According to this act four categories of natural protected areas have been established in Iran, which are managed by the Department of Environment. By August 2002, the system of protected areas in Iran included 16 National Parks, 31 Wildlife Refuges, 89 Protected Areas, 13 National Nature Monuments and five Protected Rivers, totaling at least 11,717,195 hectares covered over 6.8% of the country. In addition, until now there are 88 Non-Hunting areas under management of DoE, with a total area of 5,205,212 hectares.

Iran is a country home to 3 migratory species currently listed on CMS Appendix I, about 150 species listed on Appendix II and 13 species listed on Appendix I & II. Of particular interest to CMS, Iranian coasts constitute an important nesting ground for the Sea turtles. Iran also has important staging, breeding and wintering sites for a considerable number of bird species migrating across between Eurasia and Africa. These include the Siberian Crane *Grus leucogeranus*, Lesser Kestrel *Falco naumanni* and the Ferruginous Duck *Aythya nyroca*, both listed in Appendix I and II

Animal Groups	Appendix I	Appendix II	Appendix I/II	Total
<i>Aves</i>		128	15	143
Mamala	3	19		22
Aquatic		2	4	6
Grand Total	3	149	19	171

In March 1997, the Islamic Republic of Iran began to formulate a National Biodiversity strategy and Action Plan. Iranian government policy formulation and implementation has been guided by a series of Five-year Development Plans. The current Five-year National Socio-Economic Development Plan was initiated in March 2000 and gives more prominence to environmental issues than the previous plans.

Iran has joined, a *Memorandum of Understanding concerning Conservation Measures for the Siberian Crane* (MoU) in 1993 and another MoU for Slender-billed Curlew, both, under the auspices of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS) to help further protect and conserve these important endangered species. Under the CMS MoU (updated in 1998), the participating Range States have committed to identify and conserve wetland habitats essential to the survival of Siberian Cranes, to co-operate with international organizations and other Range States and to develop a long-term Conservation Plan (updated at the Fourth Meeting of the Parties to the MoU in May 2001). Since the MoU entered into force, the CMS Secretariat has convened four fruitful meetings of experts from the Range States in Russia (May 1995), India (November 1996), Iran (December 1998) and USA (May 2001) respectively. The Governments requested CMS and ICF to co-ordinate implementation of the Conservation Plan, and to undertake the necessary preparatory work for a study of the environmental situation in the ecosystems inhabited by this migratory species. To date, resources allocated for implementation of the Conservation Plan have been inadequate to include the broader aspects of wetland ecosystem management, a shortfall that this project seeks to address.

GEF project on Wetlands for Siberian Cranes

Following a period of intensive preparation led by the International Crane Foundation (ICF), a Global Environment Facility (GEF) project on the Conservation of the Globally Significant Wetlands and Migratory Corridors required by Siberian Cranes and other Globally Significant Migratory Water birds began in March 2000. Project proposal discussed at the third Siberian Crane range country meeting held at Ramsar, I.R. Iran in December 1998, and a preliminary draft of work plan approved by the meeting and appended to the proposal. The PDF B phase of the project, which covers China, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kazakhstan and the Russian Federation, completed in March 2001 with the submission of a comprehensive six-year Full Project proposal. The project is being implemented through UNEP, and is being coordinated by ICF and the Convention on Migratory Species. The Project aims at conserving the critical sites that are used by Siberian Cranes for breeding (in

Russia), staging during migration (all four countries), and the main wintering grounds (in China and Iran). Plans will be developed to conserve the overall biodiversity at selected wetlands, most of which are of international importance for a variety of reasons. The project will focus on specific management activities at these sites, and will also strengthen coordination of the flyway site networks used by the Siberian Cranes in Eastern and Central Asia, in cooperation with existing initiatives including the CMS MoU concerning Conservation Measures for the Siberian Crane, North East Asia Crane Site Network, and the Asia Pacific Migratory Waterbird Strategy.

Activities towards Accession to the CMS:

In order to pave the way for accession to the CMS and related agreements such as AEWA, The Iranian government has rendered several endeavors, which are as follows:

1. According to the constitution, accession to any multilateral agreement requires adequate justifications and needs legal proceedings, such as signing the instrument by a high-level governmental official and ratification by the parliament. To this end, the Department of Environment and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs have prepared and presented necessary reports to the cabinet for its approval. It is hoped that in 2003 the Convention on Migratory species will be ratified by the Parliament and therefore Iran joins the other parties to the CMS.
2. Two years ago, a new national project namely, National Project on Wetlands have been launched in Iran with the financial assistance of the GEF and cooperation of Ramsar Convention on Wetlands and UNDP. The document project is at the stage of finalization. It covers 4 sites so called: Orumyeh, Miankaleh, Arjan and Parishan, and Khour-e-Khouran which will be managed in 2 phases.
3. A project under the title of “Wetlands’ Inventory” was initiated last year in Iran, which was financed completely by the government and supported by several national NGOs. In this project all pieces of information on the wetlands across the country will be collected and kept in a database.
4. Recently a project has been drafted with the cooperation of UNDP in order to recover Hamoon Wetlands, which was dried up in recent years due to drought and damming in Afghanistan. It is worthy of attention that Hamoon wetlands are surrounded by large desert areas and recognized as a major waterfowl habitat of international importance. It is hoped that with the assistance of the International environmental bodies, donor communities and finally with the cooperation of the neighboring country, we would be able to recover these wetlands.

In conclusion, the Iranian government makes every effort to accede to the convention. However, like every other commitment there is a need for enabling activities and enhancing the national capacity to meet the expectations arising from the joining the Convention. Therefore, we welcome any contribution from the international community particularly the CMS secretariat and the donor community for the better implementation of the provisions of the Convention. We really believe that cooperation and coordination among the parties to the Convention is the only way to conserve our endangered natural resources.

Mr. Bert Lenten
Executive Secretary AEWA

Dear Mr. Executive Secretary,

On behalf of Hungarian Delegation for COP 7 of Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals I am happily inform you that Hungarian Parliament made a decision on joining AEW A on 12 of September 2002.

Our Ministry of Foreign Affairs will make the necessary steps in the near future.

Hungary wishes to express her accentuated support the work will be done at Second Session at the Meeting of the Parties of AEWA.

We hope that our participation in this Agreement will be very fruitful and will help to protect effectively our waterbirds.

Sincerely yours

Dr. Katalina Rodics
Head of Hungarian Delegation

LATVIA

Dear Sir/Madame,

Latvia is contracting party of CMS. Latvia will join relevant agreements under CMS (EUROBATS, AEWA, ASCOBANS) in future. First step is already done. We hope that draft law on EUROBATS agreement will be adopted by parliament at the end this year or during first months of next year. Next one in our agenda is AEWA agreement.

Sincerely yours

Vilnis Bernards

LITHUANIA

Dear Sir/Madame,

Lithuania ratified CMS in 2001. EUROBATS was ratified in 2002.

As number of bird species on their migration way have their resting sites in Lithuania, especially in the Baltic Sea coastal areas, and as Lithuania is the range state of AEWA, the agreement is prioritized and Lithuania intends to start ratification process in the next few years.

STATEMENT FROM NORWAY

Wetland birds is a group of birds that has for a long time attracted much interest and fascination among the public. Their value for human beings is one aspect, including leisure activities as hunting and nature watching. As such this group of birds is a powerful tool in promoting nature protection in general and sustainable use of these resources for present and coming generations. As such, wetland birds as indicators of nature, have been used for a long time in Norway to identify areas for protection, for species management problems. Considerable funds are used in regulating the sustainable use of these resources.

Norway salute the progress made by the AEWA in the field of conservation and sustainable use of these resources that belong not only to one country, but is a shared natural heritage for many countries. We note that 33 countries have become Parties to the Agreement so far, we expect that many more will join in the years to come. Norway has earlier expressed its intention to ratify the Agreement, but alas the bureaucratic process has not been swift in this respect.

On the positive side we feel confident that we share many of the proposed actions as set forward by the Strategic Plan. We are actively integrating AEWA objectives in our conservation efforts in Norway. As such we are proud to state that although we are not member of the AEWA, we have made great progress in implementing the Strategic Plan.

The national plan for protection of wetlands of national or international value has recently been completed. However, we continue our work to identify and expand the existing network of protected areas. As such the area under protection according to the Nature Conservation Act is now slightly above 9% of the total surface of Norway (excluding marine areas) and our aim is to reach 12%. We are also proud to inform you that we have recently expanded our Ramsar sites from 24 to 37, constituting an increase of almost 50% in area.

After much debate the Government finally in 2002 proclaimed the nationwide ban on the use of lead shot pellets. Within 2005 all such use will be phased out. Decisive information for this move was the problem of pollution and the unnatural mortality as the result of ingestion of lead pellets among i.a. anatids.

The national hunting regulations are being revised every five years, and were revised again this year. A major change this time was the initiative to combat alien species posing a threat to native species. This applies to species like Canada Goose and the Mink. In Norway all species of birds are protected, and it is strictly prohibited to capture or keep these species. Exceptions are made for hunting of some species deemed to be of interest for hunting, and that can support a sustainable hunt. The introduction of new species is also strictly regulated, and applications for species that pose a risk (cf. the pre-cautionary principle), are routinely refused. As of the year 2000, all hunted species must be reported to a central registry. This will much enhance the correctness of hunting statistics and the information value, i.a. when reviewing hunting legislation. A high fine is now regularly issued to those hunters that do not report on their activities.

Norway has for many years worked on species action plans. Of particular interest is the highly profiled work with the globally threatened Lesser White-fronted Goose. This is also a good example of how international cooperation can work. The project now involves countries like Kazakhstan and China in a major effort to reverse the negative trend for this species. As it turns out the work will also imply good news for a number of other species as well as stronger protection of important areas for breeding, staging and wintering in many countries.

Still, in many respects there is a long way to go before we can be satisfied, but we are committed in that respect. Other species that we have conducted research on for many years is the Great Snipe. Through careful studies and monitoring for the last decades we today know much more about this species and its requirements on the breeding grounds.

A Nordic study on the protection of wetlands (to be published in the fall of 2002) have concluded that good national inventories of wetlands still is lacking in Norway. However, we do have baseline information on mires and the shallow coastline. Thus we will have to review the situation and recommend further action in this field.

Impacts on natural habitats in Norway are increasing as a result of increasing tourism, both by national citizens and tourists. Probably this will be an issue that the authorities will have to examine more closely, and possibly recommend mitigating action. Impact assessments are now becoming a more regular feature of those projects that threaten natural habitats or species of concern. Probably we will see some major changes in the use of EIAs in this respect, also as a consequence of national implementation of the Convention on Biodiversity.

The Government runs a national monitoring programme for terrestrial species. There are plans to significantly expand this programme to include all major natural habitats, including the marine environment. This plan is envisaged for initiation by 2005.

We are also pleased to inform you that Norway is an active donor in many countries around the world. As an example we are now in the process of financing an inventory of wetlands in South Africa. Another example is a bilateral agreement with Russia, where we have developed a good cooperation, and with whom several new projects concerning waterbirds have been initiated and completed.

We will follow the second meeting of the Parties with much interest, and most important of all we shall bear in mind the results achieved and do our best to implement these when relevant. We look forward to a continued international cooperation and we will do our best to become full members of the AEWA prior to when we meet again at the next MOP!

Øystein Størkersen
Head of Delegation

Directorate for Nature Management,
NO-7485 Trondheim

**Opening Statement
Of the Representative of the Republic of Uzbekistan at the second Meeting
of the Parties to the African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbird Agreement
25-27 September, Bonn Germany.**

First of all I'd like to thank the Secretariats of the AEWA and Bonn Convention for the kind invitation to participate in their Meetings. I'll inform the Meeting very briefly about the progress made by the Republic of Uzbekistan regarding the accession of the African-Eurasian Migratory Agreement.

The situation is the following:

Uzbekistan is not a Party to AEWA yet. Uzbekistan recognizes the importance of AEWA and has an intention to join it. Last year the State Committee for nature Protection prepared all necessary documents, gathered the positive opinions of all interested organizations and submitted the package of documents to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Uzbekistan.

Nowadays the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is considering these documents and I hope that during the next year Uzbekistan will become a Party to AEWA. Uzbekistan is ready to cooperate with AEWA, although it is not a Party to it. Thus, our fruitful cooperation can be clearly illustrated using the example of the last year August Meeting of Range States experts and specialized NGO's in Tashkent, which was organized by AEWA Secretariat in cooperation with Bonn Convention Secretariat and Wetlands International, government of the Netherlands and the State Committee for nature Protection of the Republic of Uzbekistan.

We look forward to our further cooperation.

Delegation from Uzbekistan

subject : Opening Statements for MOP2

To: AEWA Secretariat

Portugal is in an advanced stage concerning the ratification of AEWA. As you know all the process had already been approached and analysed by the Ministry of Environment and sent for evaluation and approval by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs. The Minister for Foreign Affairs is now waiting for the pronunciation by the Ministry of Finance, that is now analysing the budgetary implications of the AEWA contribution proposed for the 2003 Budget, that will be discussed and approved by the Parliament up to the end of 2002.

Yours sincerely

Claudia Franco

Focal point of AEWA for Portugal

Statement of Syrian Arab Republic to the AEWA

Syrian Arab Republic has ratified the most Conventions and Agreements related to Biodiversity components conservation:

- Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).
- RAMSAR Convention.
- Desertification Combat (WCCD).
- ACCOBAMS Agreement.
- Barcelona Convention.
- AEWA recently (On 14 / 9 / 2002).

Syrian Arab Republic has finished:

- National Country Study on Biodiversity.
- National Strategy and Action Plan on Biodiversity, which had been ratified by the High Council for Environment Protection on 13 / 5 / 2002.

In the way to implement the Strategy and Action Plan:

Syrian Arab Republic has declared 16 natural reserves, which represent different ecosystems and have high regional and global importance for Migratory Water-birds.

More than 5 medium and big projects had been begun in these protected areas.

Re-habitation of Arabian Oryx and Arabian Gazelle happened in 3 protected areas.

Many procedures, activities and projects have been implemented to conserve and protect the forests, steppe, freshwater and marine Biodiversity.

Legislation laws had been declared related to conservation of Biodiversity.

Many public awareness campaigns related to the importance of the Biodiversity components have been implemented.

Syrian Arab Republic and AEWA:

With pleasure we would like to inform you that Syrian Arab Republic ratified the AEWA on 14 / 9 / 2002, and will submit to the secretariat of AEWA the official credentials documents through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, during Oct. 2002.

MINISTERE DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT ET DE L'EAU

DIRECTION DE PROTECTION DE LA FAUNE
ET DES PARCS NATIONAUX

***CONVENTION SUR LA CONSERVATION DES ESPECES
MIGRATRICES APPARTENANT A LA FAUNE SAUVAGE
&
ACCORD SUR LA CONSERVATION DES OISEAUX D'EAU
MIGRATEURS D'AFRIQUE-EURASIE***

COP7 de CMS du 18 au 24 septembre 2002
MOP2 de l'AEWA du 25 au 27 septembre 2002

BONN (Allemagne)

MAHAMAT HASSANE IDRIS

Point Focal de CMS

Représentant de l'AEWA

Tel 235 52 23 05

Fax 235 52 32 14 ou 52 38 39

Phone portable : 235 843 74 20

E-mail : mhthassan@hotmail.com

DECLARATION LIMINAIRE

Monsieur le Secrétaire Exécutif de la Convention sur la Conservation des
Espèces Migratrices appartenant à la Faune Sauvage

**Monsieur le Secrétaire Exécutif de l'Accord sur la Conservation des Oiseaux d'Eau
Migrateurs d'Afrique-Eurasie**

Chers invités, Mesdames et Messieurs

Je prends la parole au nom du gouvernement de la République du Tchad et saisit cette occasion pour remercier vivement le Secrétaire de la CMS, le Secrétaire de l'AEWA et les autres organisateurs qui ont bien voulu assurer la participation des délégués des Etats non parties à ces deux grandes rencontres que Bonn a accepté d'accueillir.

La Convention sur la Conservation des espèces Migratrices appartenant à la Faune Sauvage, le Tchad l'a ratifié le 21 novembre 1996 et l'Accord sur la Conservation des Oiseaux d'Eau Migrateurs d'Afrique-Eurasie fut adopté le texte de l'accord et la signature d'un acte final le 16 juin 1995.

A l'échelle nationale, les mesures institutionnelles et législatives en place sont des outils qui ont permis de satisfaire aux principes fondamentaux de ces traités.

Etant déjà partie à un certain nombre d'instruments internationaux (Convention sur la Diversité Biologique, Convention Cadre des Nations Unies sur les Changements Climatiques, Convention sur la Lutte contre la Désertification, Convention de Ramsar, Convention sur la Conservation des Espèces Migratrices appartenant à la Faune Sauvage..).Garantissant la présentation des ressources biologiques, le Tchad a déjà entrepris les procédures nécessaires pour la ratification de l'AEWA étant que cet accord est intimement lié à l'article IV paragraphe 3 de la CMS ou Convention de Bonn signée par notre pays le 23 juin 1979.

La Direction de Protection de la Faune et des Parcs Nationaux sous la tutelle du Ministère de l'Environnement et de l'Eau, organe responsable de mise en œuvre de la CMS, CDB, Ramsar et (AEWA en instance de ratification) doit de renforcer ses interventions au niveau des habitats identifiés pour cette fin en vue de soutenir davantage la conservation des espèces migratrices et la protection de leurs habitats. Et c'est la raison pour la quelle le tchad a participé activement aux travaux de négociation de l'accord AEWA.

Pendant les neufs (9) derniers mois, le Secrétariat de la CMS et le Secrétariat de l'AEWA ont beaucoup échangé de communication avec les représentants des parties contractantes et des Etats Non- Parties, ce qui a permis le déplacement à Bonn de nous tous ici présents, qu'ils trouvent ici les félicitations de la Délégation Tchadienne pour la qualité des documents et les efforts fournis pour les rendre disponible la plus part en français et en anglais.

Pour conclure, le Tchad garde sa volonté d'ici fin decembre 2002 ou a partir 2003, de la ratification d'AEWA, qu'il considère comme important pour la préservation des espèces migratrices.

Je vous remercie.

Opening Statement

of Ukraine to the 7th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals and 2nd Session of the Meeting of the Parties to the Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds, Bonn, Germany, 18–27 September 2002

Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals, its particular regional agreements and Memoranda of Understanding have been more and more recognized as the most effective international tools for the conservation of migratory species worldwide.

Ukraine, as a country that supports quite a number of habitats for migratory species, has made a substantial progress towards the conservation of this group of animals.

Conservation of biodiversity is formally declared as a priority of the national ecological policy and the Government of Ukraine takes efforts to develop and adopt relevant legislative acts enabling to enhance and improve nature conservation system and wildlife management in the country.

Law of Ukraine “On the All-State Programme on Establishment of Ecological Network for the period 2001–2015” has been adopted by the Parliament in the year 2000. One of the main functions of the ecological network to be established is the conservation of habitats for migratory species and promoting their migration. In December of the year 2001 Ukrainian Parliament had adopted a largely amended Law of Fauna where individual provisions and articles touch upon the migratory animals. In the year 2002 Law of Ukraine “On the Red Data Book of Ukraine” has been adopted thus enhancing the conservation status of endangered species at the national levels and quite a number of migratory species among them. On the 4th of July 2002 the Parliament of Ukraine adopted a Law on Ratification of African-Eurasian Waterbird Agreement (AEWA) thus taking commitments for improvement of the conservation of more than 100 species of migratory birds, which are in the Appendix to that Agreement and occur in Ukraine.

In the margins of the 6th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity held in the Hague, The Netherlands, in April 2002, Ukraine had signed the Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation Measures of the Middle-European Population of the Great Bustard.

From 28 February to 2 March 2002 the First Session of the Meeting of the Parties to the Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans of the Black Sea, Mediterranean and Contiguous Atlantic Area (ACCOBAMS) was held in Monaco and Ukraine actively participated in preparation of that meeting. The Government of Ukraine is now taking efforts in finalizing accession procedure to ACCOBAMS and Ukraine’s formal accession to the Agreement is expected to be in the first half of the year 2003.

Being a Member-State to EUROBATS much work have been done in Ukraine in cooperation with neighboring countries aimed at clarification of the current status of bat species in Ukraine. A lot of new data have been obtained on biology and migratory patterns of bats in Ukraine which are intended to be used by decision-makers for adoption of appropriate measures for the conservation of that group of animals.

Ukraine has essential scientific potential and well-developed environmental legislation to effectively implement Bonn Convention, its particular agreements, and Memoranda of

Understanding. Ukraine is open for fruitful and mutual cooperation on that matter and appreciates proposals for joint initiatives, programmes, activities and action plans that contribute to the conservation and rehabilitation of migratory species of wild animals.

We thank very much the Secretariats of the CMS and regional agreements and all involved Parties and organizations for their efforts in promoting conservation of the migratory species that are our common natural heritage. We are also thankful to Germany, host country of the CMS COP7 and AEWA MOP2, for excellent arrangement of the conferences and making them successful.

Ukrainian Delegation

Statements of Observer Organizations

(Reproduced in the form submitted to the Secretariat)



African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbird Agreement (AEWA)
2nd Meeting of the Parties
Bonn, Germany, September 2002

Agenda item: ~~xxxxx~~
Cooperation with other Bodies

Najam Khurshid
Regional Coordinator for Asia
Convention on Wetlands (Ramsar, Iran, 1971)

Concerning cooperation between the Ramsar Convention, the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) and the African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds Agreement (AEWA)

Mr Chairman,

As you will know, the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands owes its origins to rising concerns about the impacts of the continuing loss and degradation of wetlands on migratory waterbirds and other wetland-dependent biological diversity. Hence the common ground between Ramsar, the Convention on Migratory Species has long been clear. Indeed, it is striking to note the high proportion of migratory species on Appendices I and II of CMS which are wetland-dependent. Recognition of the importance and need for international collaborative action on migratory waterbirds has led to the development of the AEWA, and we have recognised the significant opportunities that this brings for our two instruments to work together in securing the future conservation of these remarkable species through the wise use of the habitats upon which they depend.

In its 30 years of existence, Ramsar has developed into a comprehensive instrument for the conservation and sustainable use of wetland ecosystems. The Convention's 134 Contracting Parties recognize the vital role that wetlands play in providing goods and services, values and functions for sustaining human life through food and water security, and that to achieve the conservation of wetland biological diversity, including migratory waterbirds, it is essential to recognize the role of people and their dependence on wetlands, and to involve them in securing wetland sustainable management.

Like the AEWA, the Ramsar Convention is a practical convention that seeks to support its Contracting Parties in achieving the 'wise use' of all their wetlands, with particular attention to those recognised as internationally important. The Convention has developed a range of mechanisms and a wide range of practical supporting guidance to help its Parties, and has made these available in its 'toolkit' of Wise Use Handbooks.

We recognize that this 'toolkit' can be of significant assistance to those implementing AEWA. A key mechanism is the designation by each of Ramsar's Contracting Parties of Wetlands of International Importance ("Ramsar sites"). In 1999 Convention adopted a *Strategic Framework and guidelines for the further development of the List of Wetlands of International Importance*. This guides Ramsar Parties on the identification, designation and sustainable management of a coherent and global

network of Ramsar sites, which specifically includes flyway and range networks for migratory waterbirds.

However, the Ramsar 'toolkit' contains much more than just site designation guidance which is of value to AEWA Range States, concerning both *in situ* and *ex situ* conservation and wise use. It also includes guidance on, for example, inventory, assessment and monitoring, site management planning, development of national policies, reviews of legislation, river basin and coastal zone management. A substantial number of additional guidance's will be considered by our 8th meeting of Contracting Parties in November this year.

The Ramsar and CMS secretariats signed a Memorandum of Understanding in 1997 outlining areas of cooperation. Since then we have been identifying and developing mechanisms for our closer collaboration. We are now formalizing this into a Joint Work Plan, which the secretariats are now close to finalizing. An early working draft of this Plan was included in the papers for this MOP, and a substantially revised and updated draft has been tabled for your consideration, as AEWA/MOP2/Inf. 2.4.

In recognition of the importance of the Agreements developed through the CMS, this Joint Work Plan is actually two plans for the price of one, since it also includes joint work between Ramsar and the African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds Agreement (AEWA). Not only will this provide a strong framework for implementing collaborative action between AEWA and Ramsar, but it also provides a model for the subsequent development of appropriate joint actions with other CMS Agreements concerning wetland-dependent species.

An important early action of the Ramsar-AEWA Joint Work Plan will be to develop guidance for Parties and Range States on how to best capitalize on the complementarity of our respective mechanisms and tools, and to work together at national and international scales to enhance our capacity to deliver ecosystem and migratory species conservation and sustainable use.

The Joint Work Plan also particularly recognizes the role of Ramsar's International Organisation Partners (IOPs), and particularly BirdLife International, Wetlands International and IUCN in providing both global technical support and information to both our instruments, and also 'on-the-ground' assistance and capacity-building to our respective Parties. Through the actions of the Plan, we have a priority for working with these organisations so as to secure (and enhance) continued access by our Parties to the important information products they prepare, for example through Wetlands International's International Waterbird Census (IWC) and BirdLife's Important Bird Areas (IBA) programme.

A powerful demonstration of the added benefits of our working together will be the implementation of the African-Eurasian Flyway GEF project. The full project brief for this important initiative is being developed by Wetlands International on behalf of AEWA and Ramsar, and as you have heard here is now nearing completion. This project will bring much needed training and capacity building for wetland site management and the transfer of knowledge across the flyways in this region.

Our Joint Work Plan also includes a range of other practical actions, including strengthening the collaborative work of our respective scientific subsidiary bodies and their Chairs, actions on harmonizing national reporting, and data collecting and storage.

We regard the finalisation of this Joint Work Plan as a significant step forwards in cooperation between Ramsar and AEWA, and I commend it to you. Finally I should note that Ramsar Contracting Parties will be considering the Plan for endorsement at our COP8 in November this year.

Thank you.



Together for birds and people

WELCOMING STATEMENT

by

BirdLife International

BirdLife International welcomes all delegates to this significant meeting of the African-Eurasian Waterbird Agreement. At the first MOP three years ago, the necessary institutional structures and conservation agendas were formally put in place to give the Agreement fully-fledged life. This meeting is the key opportunity to do two things: to fine-tune these frameworks in the light of operating experience; and to look for visible delivery of action – to see the Agreement making a real difference.

It is a time to look outward as well as inward, to make AEWA's activities as policy-relevant as they should be. All multilateral environmental agreements are under a spotlight now to prove themselves, in the "post-Johannesburg Summit" political climate of the 21st Century. In this, AEWA's focused waterbird conservation goals are strength.

We urge Parties at this MOP to approve an adequate budget for the crucial work the Agreement must do. We look for improvements in the system of international priority-setting and project registers, to give a coherent and responsive method of catalysing and funding worthwhile work on the ground.

We urge Parties to support the specific proposals in front of this meeting for addition of bird species to Annex II, adoption of species action plans and the format for future action plans prepared by BirdLife, continued efforts to phase out lead shot, cooperation with the Ramsar Convention, and intersessional Technical and Standing Committee arrangements.

BirdLife is a central partner in the work of AEWA, providing expert advice and data resource services at international level, but also involvement in on-the-ground implementation by Contracting Parties and others at national and local level. This benefits from our network of member organisations, volunteers and civil society throughout the Agreement area.

We look forward to working with you this week, and in the coming triennium, to making a visible difference to the fortunes of migratory waterbirds.

African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbird Agreement
2nd Meeting of the Parties

25-27 September 2002 - Bonn, Germany

Opening Statement by FACE

Founded in 1977, FACE is a non-profit-making, non-governmental, international association with its Headquarters in Brussels (Belgium). Through its 29 members, the national hunters' associations of the Member States of the E.U. and other Council of Europe countries, FACE represents the interests of some 7 million European hunters. It promotes hunting and wildlife management, in accordance with the principle of *sustainable use*, as a tool for conservation and rural development.

FACE considers the *African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbird Agreement* (AEWA) as a pragmatic and workable international legal instrument for the conservation, management and sustainable use of migratory waterbirds and their habitats. Waterbirds are indeed an important renewable natural resource, whose conservation requires international co-ordination and co-operation, but also the involvement of local stakeholders, such as landowners, farmers, hunters, and wildlife managers.

FACE and its members have therefore supported and endorsed AEWA from its very beginning, namely already before the 1995 *Negotiation Meeting* in The Hague, Netherlands. FACE further tries to play an active role in the implementation of AEWA, *inter alia* through its participation at the *Meetings of the Parties* and the meetings of its *Technical Committee* and ad hoc Working Groups or initiatives.

FACE has so organised for AEWA a technical workshop in Romania (October 2001) to raise awareness among hunting representatives and officials of Central and Eastern Europe for the phasing out of lead shot cartridges for hunting in wetlands. Its expertise and experience are available for other events of that nature. FACE participates in the drafting of an international Action Plan for the Dark-bellied Brent Goose *Branta bernicla bernicla* and contributes to the drafting and implementation of appropriate *Conservation Guidelines*.

Through its *European Habitat Conservation Stamp Programme* - a joint venture with *Wetlands International* and *Ducks Unlimited Inc.* - FACE has contributed financially to wetland conservation and management projects in East- and Central Europe, and in North Africa.

FACE and its member-associations undertake, support or initiate a considerable number of research, conservation and education projects (e.g. for the protection of Slender-billed curlew *Numenius tenuirostris*), all highly relevant to the effective implementation of AEWA.

FACE intends to continue playing a constructive role in the promotion and implementation of AEWA. It offers its network of contacts, technical expertise and political support to the AEWA Secretariat and contracting parties.



SECOND SESSION OF THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE AGREEMENT ON THE
CONSERVATION OF AFRICAN-EURASIAN MIGRATORY WATERBIRDS (AEWA)
GERMANY, 25-27 SEPTEMBER 2002

Opening Statement made by Robert Hepworth, Deputy Director, Divisions of Environmental Conventions and Policy Implementation, United Nations Environmental Programme.

On behalf of the Executive Director of UNEP

Through me, the Executive Director sends his very best wishes to all the Parties, NGOs and other bodies as you begin this second meeting of Parties to the African-Eurasian Water Bird Agreement. He would have liked to be here, in his native land, but is taking an overdue holiday with his family after the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg. However, he takes a special interest in the Convention on Migratory Species and all the 'Article IV' Agreements such as AEWA and I shall be giving him a special report on the outcome of the two conferences next week.

There are two points, which the Executive Director has asked me to make this morning, which will be brief, as we have already held a joint opening ceremony.

The first is to commend AEWA as a living example of collaboration between international environmental agreements. When we are pursuing an agenda to promote synergies and interlinkages between UN bodies and conventions, it is always encouraging to have real examples of the process: in this case 4 secretariats – for CMS, AEWA, ASCOBANS and EUROBATS – co-located in the offices which have so generously been provided by the Government of Germany. I believe we can do more to strengthen these arrangements and make them even more beneficial for Parties and hence for conservation. Nevertheless we should acknowledge the success, and indeed the pioneering role, which these four agreements have taken in sharing not only offices but administrative and technical support. The second point is to say to all delegates that they have a special duty as part of these two back-to-back Conferences by CMS and AEWA, because it is the first major intergovernmental meeting in the environmental field since the decisions taken at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg, less than a month ago. The WSSD Plan of Implementation

gives major emphasis to biodiversity, indeed more so than many people had expected only a few months ago, perhaps partly as a result of the UN Secretary General's "WEHAB" initiative. This provides a major challenge – and opportunity – for the biodiversity-related conventions, including both CMS and AEWA.

There is an overall target set by WSSD – to achieve a significant reduction in the current rate of loss of biological biodiversity by 2010. Moreover here are several more specific targets and proposed actions from the Summit, which are relevant to CMS and AEWA. I would particularly draw your attention to paragraphs 42 (f) and (g). These require international support for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity including ecosystems and for the protection of endangered species, in particular through channelling financial resources and technology to developing countries and countries with economies in transition. The WSSD Plan of Implementation goes on to require action at all levels “to effectively conserve and sustainably use biodiversity, promote and support initiatives for hot spot areas and other areas essential for biodiversity, and promote the development of national and regional ecological networks and **corridors.**” Thus you see that it will repay us all to become aware of the detailed requirements of the Plan for biodiversity and its links to the alleviation of poverty, because this will be a clear beacon and guide for our work in the various conventions over the next decade.

The Executive Secretary of CMS has already described to you the excellent start made by the CMS Conference this week in meeting some of the specific challenges for migratory species as a whole. I give you the best wishes of the Executive Secretary in now turning your attention to the challenges for migratory water birds in three continents.

Thank you

25 September 2002