

Minutes of the 6th Meeting of the AEWA Technical Committee 9 – 11 May 2005, Flic en Flac, Mauritius

Adopted by TC7, 29 October -1 November 2006, Berne, Switzerland

1. Opening

1. Mr Yousoof Mungroo, Technical Committee Chairman, opened the meeting and welcomed the participants to Mauritius.

2. Welcome addresses

2. Mr Bert Lenten, AEWA Executive Secretary, thanked Mr Mungroo for the invitation to hold this meeting in the only small island state currently Party to the Agreement. He welcomed the participants to this meeting in AEWA's tenth year, and outlined some of the activities planned to mark the anniversary. He also stressed that as the third Meeting of the Parties would be held in October 2005, the agenda included many items requiring submission to the Standing Committee for decision prior to the MOP.

3. In her address, the Senior Chief Executive of the Ministry of Agriculture, Food Technology and Natural Resources, Mrs K. Beegun, welcomed participants on behalf of the Government of Mauritius, which was honoured to host a meeting of a United Nations Agreement. Her country was committed to conserving its natural heritage and proud to have ratified almost all the UN biodiversity-related conventions, including AEWA.

3. Adoption of the Rules of Procedure

4. Bert Lenten introduced document AEWA/TC 6.2. The Rules of Procedure (RoP) for the TC had been amended at the last TC meeting and forwarded to the Standing Committee, which had again made some small amendments, namely to Rule 1 and Rule 8. The TC was now asked to approve the wording proposed in this document.

5. The meeting again considered the RoP and discussed additional modifications. Charles Mlingwa proposed to delete the word "and" in Rule 4a after "West Africa". He also proposed to add in Rule 10, second line the word "members" after "committees".

6. Following a request from Olivier Biber for clarification as to what was meant by "corresponding Meeting of the Parties" in Rule 9, it was decided to replace this with the word "same". Regarding the same Rule, Valentin Serebryakov requested clarification about when the election of the TC members would take place. Bert Lenten agreed that the rule was not clear on this point. Nominations would be made by the regions before the MOP, but the final election would be during the Meeting. Another point raised concerned the election of the Chair and Vice-Chair. Bert Lenten explained that after each MOP the members of the TC were free to choose their own Chair and Vice-Chair. Regarding the other point, he suggested changing the text in lines 2 and 3 of Rule 9 to read "Regions shall nominate their regional representatives for the TC and submit their proposal to the Meeting of the Parties for formal adoption".

7. Emmanuel Severre proposed changing the word “stand” in Rule 7 (line 4) to “step”.
8. Following Ward Hagemeyer’s proposal to delete Rule 17 because it was a duplication of Rule 3, a discussion ensued about the fact that these rules were slightly different.
9. Regarding Rule 24, Yousoof Mungroo pointed out that “insofar” should be replaced by “in so far”.
10. In line 1 of Rule 26, the word “or” should be replaced by “of”.
11. Emmanuel Severre proposed adding the words “and voting” after “members present” in line 2 of Rule 21.
12. Olivier Biber suggested adding at the end of the second line of Rule 30 the words “through the Secretariat”.
13. The Meeting agreed to all the proposals made.

4. Adoption of the agenda and work programme

14. Documents AEWA/TC 6.3 Revision 1 (Agenda) and AEWA/TC 6.4 Revision 1 (Work Programme) were adopted.

5. Admission of Observers

15. The meeting welcomed and agreed to admit as observers Mr Emmanuel Severre (Chairman, AEWA Standing Committee), Dr Petri Nummi (Finland), Mr Mzamulu Kaita (Tanzania), Mr David Stroud (UK), Ms Jasmin Kanza (UNEP/CMS), Mr Robert Pople (UNEP-WCMC), Mr John O'Sullivan (BirdLife International), Mr John Swift (FACE), Mr Guy-Noël Olivier (O.M.P.O.).

6. Adoption of the minutes of the 5th Meeting of the Technical Committee

16. Mr Ward Hagemeyer asked if the Secretariat could report on progress related to paragraph 23. Bert Lenten replied that the UN still considered Iraq too unsafe for activities to be undertaken there.
17. Ward Hagemeyer also enquired about progress on the Internet discussion forum: (paragraph 31), and Bert Lenten reported that UNEP-WCMC were working on a special portal, which he hoped would soon be ready.
18. Responding to Ward Hagemeyer's enquiry regarding progress in the Russian Federation (paragraphs 34 and 35), Bert Lenten reported that discussion was starting with CMS to consider options, and that a proposal would be made to the next TC meeting.
19. On the same subject, Mr Sergey Dereliev reported that at the beginning of October he would be attending a symposium in St Petersburg. This would be an opportunity to meet many of the decision-makers, to discuss any problems with them and promote the idea of the Russian

Federation ratifying AEWA. A member of the TC was welcome to join him, and he would inform the Committee as soon as more information and the agenda were available.

20. Ward Hagemeyer enquired about progress in liaising with MEAs (para. 51). Bert Lenten reported that discussion with CMS had started recently, as this kind of work was not funded by CMS or Ramsar, and Sergey Dereliev would follow this up in the coming weeks. CMS had recently contracted Mrs Paola Deda, a former CBD staff member, to liaise with other conventions, and this was expected to improve contacts with CBD.

21. In addition some editorial modifications to the minutes were requested, discussed and agreed by the meeting. The minutes of the 5th Meeting of the Technical Committee were approved with these changes.

7. Report by the Chairman

22. Mr Mungroo reported that since establishment of the Standing Committee, correspondence between himself and the Secretariat had been less frequent but had continued. He had attended the Global Flyway Conference in Edinburgh in April 2004, immediately following the fifth TC meeting. During the plenary session the first AEWA DVD had been launched. Of course much of his time had been devoted to the preparation of this sixth TC meeting. The Chairman had also attended the second meeting of the Standing Committee in Bonn in November 2004.

8. Report by the Secretariat

23. Bert Lenten presented document AEWA/TC 6.6, an update of the report presented to TC5. One new issue was the move of the Secretariat from their previous offices at the United Nations Premises (Haus Carstanjen) to an annex some distance away. This was, however, only a temporary measure, as the Secretariat would in October 2005 be moving, along with almost all the UN organisations in Bonn, to new premises. Here AEWA would occupy an entire floor, with space for future expansion. The Executive Secretary was very happy about the support being provided by the German government in this respect.

24. Regarding the situation within the Agreements Unit, Nairobi had been asked to provide more financial and administrative support and CMS now had three additional staff members in its administration unit.

25. The AEWA Secretariat also had new staff members: Sergey Dereliev, previously with Ramsar and the Bulgarian partner of BirdLife International, who would be responsible for the Technical Committee and would also ensure more capacity to deal with technical issues. Recruitment was under way for a Junior Professional Officer, funded by the German government, to start in October 2005 on a one-year contract. His or her tasks would include information management and hopefully work on the website, but also dealing with the African-Eurasian Flyways GEF project. Catherine Lehmann had been contracted to prepare the forthcoming MOP, Florian Keil had been working part-time on the website, and was now developing an electronic newsletter. Ayhan Polat was assisting with administration.

26. Bert Lenten also reported on the events taking place in 2005 to mark AEWA's 10th anniversary.

27. A successful workshop on sustainable hunting had been held in 2004 in Senegal, attended by 10 countries. The proceedings would be available in about two months.

28. The government of Luxemburg had offered financial support, which was very much appreciated. This had been used to produce posters and stickers in various languages, and it was also planned to publish an accession guide in English, French, Arabic and Russian.

9. Current status regarding implementation of the International Implementation Priorities 2003-2007

29. Bert Lenten introduced document AEWA/TC 6.7, another report submitted on an annual basis. He apologised for an error in the second paragraph of the introduction; he now had the latest figures: instead of a shortfall of 50,000 USD there was in fact a surplus of 27,000 USD. Although financial support from countries was decreasing, he was pleased that a number of projects outlined in document 6.7. could be implemented. He then went through the document item by item. Where no information was given, this indicated that no funding was available.

30. Mr David Stroud reported that a first draft of the Atlas of Wader Populations (project no. 17) was ready and would soon be on the website for consultation. It was hoped to complete this by December 2005.

31. Regarding the waterbird field guide for Uzbekistan (project no. 30); Dr Elena Kreuzberg thanked AEWA for its support. The guide was now finished and would be published very shortly.

32. David Stroud congratulated the Secretariat for raising voluntary contributions to implement this impressive array of projects, especially considering the current financial problems.

33. Ward Hagemeyer felt that, in addition to this report, an overview of the general status of implementation of the agreement, especially at a national level, was lacking.

34. Bert Lenten agreed that there was a lack of information, with, for example, only nine national reports submitted at the last MOP. Despite pressure, information was hard to obtain. Only when it was available could one begin to analyse it to decide how implementation was progressing.

35. Elena Kreuzburg pointed out that in Uzbekistan, for example, there were no mechanisms for cooperation and communication between executing authorities and implementing agencies, and it was necessary to consider how these could be established at a national level. Anything done was on the initiative of scientists, rather than the ministry wanting to improve its implementation of AEWA.

36. She also reported that her working group was in the process of preparing a national action plan for the White Headed Duck in Uzbekistan, supported by the IUCN Netherlands National Committee. A group of scientists involved with this project had very recently recorded a Slender-billed Curlew in a wetland in Uzbekistan. She felt that promoting such national activities would in the long run improve the implementation of AEWA and other international conventions.

37. Preben Clausen felt that EU funding could be sought for projects related to climatic change, which was currently a "hot issue".

38. John Swift expressed concern at the apparent lack of priority given to projects 27 and 28, particularly regarding climate change. He felt that information about the influence of such changes was vital to further work.

39. Clarifying, Bert Lenten explained that the 41 projects listed should be regarded as a "shopping list". Countries were free to choose which projects to support, and AEWA had limited influence on their decision.

40. On the issue of climate change, Sergey Dereliev reported that UNEP, through CMS, had offered to provide up to 50% of the funding for a project on climate change and migratory species, initiated by the Seabird Working Group of the Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF). A detailed proposal was currently being developed by the US Fish and Wildlife Service in Alaska for submission to UNEP. This would also be sent to TC members for their endorsement as AEWA was being asked to contribute up to 25% of the funding. The study would initially investigate how climate change might affect game species of sea ducks and seabirds in the Arctic and the communities that depended on this harvest, but might later be extended to other taxa.

10. Proposal for International Implementation Priorities 2006-2010

41. Sergey Dereliev introduced document AEWA/TC 6.8. to be discussed together with Draft Resolution 3.X. A draft of the document had been circulated to range states and comments and additional proposals incorporated. As usual, projects not implemented would remain on the list in the hope of finding funding in the next triennium.

42. In a general discussion of this document, the point came up that a strategic plan was lacking as to which IIPs should have priority. It was agreed to recommend to MOP3 through the Standing Committee that a Strategic Plan should be developed for the Agreement. At the same time it was felt that a certain flexibility should be maintained to allow donors to select the projects they favoured, a procedure that had demonstrably worked well so far.

43. Making a general comment, Ward Hagemeyer said he found the wording of item 9 in the document misleading because international priorities often depended on activities taking place at a national level. He suggested adding words to the effect that "Range States will want to develop national implementation priorities that will contribute to and be part of international priorities. However, Range States may have priorities specific to their national situation that are different from international ones", thus emphasising the fact that the Agreement was primarily concerned with the implementation of national priorities; international priorities were important, but were secondary to national ones.

44. Ward Hagemeyer also suggested that two further types of international cooperation could be added under point 9, namely "monitoring" and "transboundary implementation of action plans".

45. David Stroud suggested that under 9b) the development of more action plans for intra-African migrants should be reflected.

46. Emmanuel Severre suggested that as poverty reduction was a current topic, the list should include projects targeted towards sustainable development; he also felt that this should be reflected in the types of international cooperation listed under point 9.

47. In response, Bert Lenten pointed out that it was up to individual countries to submit project proposals, but none of this nature had been submitted so far.

48. It was agreed that a paragraph should be inserted into the document emphasising that sustainable development and poverty alleviation were priorities.

49. The meeting then reviewed the projects as listed in the document and discussed them as follows:

A. Species Conservation

Projects 1 and 2:

50. In general there was agreement that high priority should be given to projects 1 and 2. One of the questions raised was whether it was justifiable to spend money on species that were not globally threatened. It was also suggested that instead of creating action plans for a single species it might be better to focus on groups of species. Furthermore, it was stressed that Range States and Contracting Parties had a main role to play in the implementation of these projects.

Project 3:

51. Olivier Biber considered that this was a step within the development of project 2, and need not be a separate project. The Meeting agreed and the project was removed from the list.

Project 4:

52. Sergey Dereliev stated that this also fell within the implementation of the action plan (project 1) and that this proposal could be removed from the list.

Projects 5 and 6:

53. It was agreed that these proposals, listed on page 4 and 5, could be removed from the list.

B. Habitat Conservation

Project 4 on page 5:

54. It was agreed that this project should be given high priority.

Project 5 on page 5:

55. It was agreed that this was also a major priority and would start soon, being a core part of the GEF project, to which AEWA was contributing a total of 1.2 million USD over five years.

Project 8 on page 7:

56. Olivier Biber suggested that this project could specify sustainable development and poverty alleviation as a focus, and should be given first priority.

57. It was agreed that the text should be modified to include mention of other regions (Asia, small island states etc.) and to reflect the fact that in Africa only demonstration might be needed, which would affect the cost.

Project without number at foot of page 7:

58. It was felt that this very costly project did not appear to fit into the international implementation priorities. Sergey Dereliev would contact the proponents to ask for more specific information and would consult with TC members by e-mail on the outcome. Partial funding might also be a possibility.

59. Considering the remaining proposals in this section it was decided that the Secretariat should request more information from the proponents and to come back to the TC on that.

C. Management of human activities

Project 9 on page 10:

60. It was decided to leave this project on the list as priority 3, and to await information from the EU before a final decision was taken.

61. The meeting decided that the remaining projects in this section should also be kept on the list.

D. Research and monitoring

62. Regarding the projects in this section, it was decided to keep them on the list with the exception of projects 17, 23, 32 and the proposal of Serbia. Project 17 was in its final stage and could therefore be removed. The Meeting agreed to delete project 23 because it would be paid for from the Agreement's core budget. Project 32 was about to be contracted out to Alterra and could therefore also be deleted. It was felt that the projects submitted by Serbia did not meet the criteria laid down for International Implementation Priorities. Furthermore it was decided to merge projects 21 and 22.

63. The Meeting felt that high priority should be given to projects 19 and 27.

E. Education and information

64. The meeting decided to retain projects 33, 34, 36, 37, 39 and 40, and that the Secretariat should develop a new proposal on regional training courses to replace project 35.

65. Projects 38 would be removed as they were to be funded by the core budget. It was also decided to remove the project "Elaboration of an AEWA Manual" from the list.

Draft resolution 3.XX IIP for 2006- 2008

66. Because this draft resolution was more or less identical to Resolution 2.4 adopted by MOP2, the question came up as to whether the text could be shortened by making reference to this. It was decided that the Secretariat would work on this.

11. Proposal for guidance on definition of the term "long-term decline of populations"

67. David Stroud introduced document TC 6.9. It was proposed to recommend this definition to MOP3, together with guidance for its application.

68. There was some discussion of the time-frame chosen, but the meeting concluded that the group's definition of a 25% decline over 25 years was indeed legitimate, with shorter periods being used if data was not available.

69. Ward Hagemeyer commented that it was preferable to take the geometric mean between maximum and minimum of the population ranges rather than the mid point. David Stroud agreed that this should be revised.

70. The paper was approved, and Yusoof Mungroo thanked David Stroud and his team for their work.

71. David Stroud reminded the meeting that if the AEWA Action Plan was to be modified at MOP3, the new information gained here would have to be taken into account when working on the modification.

12. Proposal for guidance on defining bio-geographical populations of waterbirds

72. David Stroud introduced document TC 6.10, which had also been drafted by a working group, and was intended as an information document for MOP3. He considered that the document was not yet complete, and invited TC members to comment on the conclusions and recommendations immediately, and to provide additional feedback after the meeting.

73. As no substantive comments were put forward, the meeting discussed how to proceed. David Stroud suggested that the document (i.e. Annex 2) could be submitted to MOP3 as a general information paper; in addition the shaded bullet points, worded more proactively, could be included in the TC's report to MOP3 as recommendations from this work.

74. An addition suggested by David Stroud was to include a table summarising population limits by waterbird groups, using up-to-date information and indicating priority groups. He would circulate a modified version of the document to the TC, for later submission to MOP3.

13. Report on the status and trends of bird populations within the Agreement area

75. Sergey Dereliev introduced document TC Inf. 6.1, explaining that this was one of seven reports to be presented to each MOP. The TC had been asked to develop a new concise format and a working group had made a proposal, which had been approved by the Standing Committee. Three subcontractors had been asked to submit quotations for the work of preparing this report. One quotation had been submitted by Wetlands International, which had previously been charged with this work. Other quotations had not been forthcoming, as the potential contractor needed access to the Wetlands International database. The Secretariat now requested guidance as to how to proceed.

76. Ward Hagemeyer continued by explaining that the quote submitted by Wetlands International had been much higher than for the report in its previous format. This was because it had included part of the cost of assessing waterbird status, which had not been funded previously. However, as the other contractors would also need this information their costs would be equally high. Funding was needed for the waterbird population estimates, which must be done first.

77. Bert Lenten pointed out that the new format had been expected to be cheaper because it was more concise. He felt this was too expensive a task to be done every three years.

78. Ward Hagemeyer reminded the meeting that AEWA had previously profited from the fact that regular population estimates were being done. Wetlands International had begun this work and made considerable investment, but no longer had funds to continue. The information gathered was being used by Ramsar and many other institutions, but none of these had so far contributed to the cost. The only reliable funds were coming from the United Kingdom government.

79. Preben Clausen suggested asking the MOP to bind Parties to contributing to this work, which was obviously necessary before they could be informed adequately.

80. Olivier Biber volunteered to intervene at the forthcoming Ramsar Standing Committee and ask Ramsar to participate in financing the compilation and publication of waterbird population estimates.

81. David Stroud agreed, and suggested that the EU might also share the cost, as this information was important for them too. However, the short-term problem as to what to do for MOP3 still needed to be resolved. Production of this report should not be too expensive.

82. Responding, Ward Hagemeyer said that the European Commission had been approached, but claimed that its rules prohibited funding this type of activity, despite the view that this data would be useful. Ramsar had also been approached, but had no funds available.

83. Bert Lenten stressed that he would like to have such a report for submission to MOP3, but that AEWA was lacking the funds for it.

84. The Meeting decided to establish a small working group to discuss this issue that evening.

85. The following day Sergey Dereliev reported back on the outcome of the discussion in the working group. For the short term the working group had opted for the preparation of a conservation status report, using funds pledged by Switzerland for preparatory work for MOP. In addition Guy-Noël Olivier had also offered financial support from the French hunters; He expected that he could raise approximately €10,000. The rest of the cost would be covered by the AEWA core budget.

86. For the longer term, the Secretariat would submit a draft resolution to MOP3. The resolution would explain the importance of the issue and the steps taken by the Secretariat to liaise with other MEA Secretariats, and urge countries to pay more attention to this important issue, and to direct more voluntary contributions to funding this status report.

14. Proposal for additional species to be included in the AEWA list

87. David Stroud presented document TC 6.11 and invited the meeting to discuss further procedure, as outlined on page 3 of the document.

88. In the ensuing general discussion, various options were proposed. Bert Lenten stressed that MOP3 might expect that some progress had been made by the TC in reviewing the list of species that were possible candidates to be included in AEWA. In general it was felt that a pragmatic approach should be taken. At the same time it was felt that in the light of the development regarding a possible Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Raptors and Owls under CMS, it was not appropriate to include some of these species in AEWA at the moment. Also, regarding inclusion of passerines, the Meeting felt that due to lack of information on this species it is not clear what the pros and cons would be if these species were included in AEWA. The outcome of the discussion was that work should focus on the seabird species.

89. An *ad hoc* working group was formed to consider this question more closely, and proposed that within the next few weeks the Secretariat should review the seabirds listed in Table 2 of the report and prepare a brief analysis of the available information on populations and threats, noting whether the threat was covered by the current Action Plan. The TC should then be consulted, and would decide which species it would propose to MOP3 for addition to the list.

15. Further development of AEWA

a. Central Asian Flyway

90. Bert Lenten introduced document TC Inf. 6.2, and referred to the CAF workshop being organised by CMS and Wetlands International from 10 - 13 June 2005 in New Delhi, in which AEWA was participating under the CMS umbrella. There was considerable geographical and species overlap, e.g. 16 of the 30 countries involved in CAF are AEWA Range States and of 274 populations identified for CAF 145 are already covered by the AEWA Action Plan. It was for the countries to decide which option to choose, but if the workshop recommended extending the AEWA area, this proposal would go to MOP3 for its decision. If this was the decision he intended asking MOP for additional funds to be kept outside the budget to ensure that the current AEWA activities were not adversely affected

91. The meeting felt that an extension of the AEWA area would not be a problem, and it would await the outcome of the workshop.

92. Ms Jasmin Kanza stated that while the position of the TC and Standing Committee was clear, it was important to consider the institutional arrangements between the mother convention and the daughter agreement, so that any decisions followed established procedures in informing, advising and obtaining support within the mother convention.

93. Rachel Adam pointed out that AEWA was an independent MEA and there was no legal obligation for AEWA to request approval of CMS before amending the Agreement and/or its Annexes. In accordance to the Agreement, Parties can propose amendments to the Agreement and/or Annexes until 150 days before the opening of the MOP.

b. Migratory Raptor Agreement

94. Bert Lenten introduced document TC Inf. 6.3. He reported that it was not yet clear if raptors were endangered and there was justification for such an agreement. No decision was needed now as the outcome of consultations would go first to the CMS Meeting of the Parties, before a possible decision at AEWA MOP4.

95. David Stroud added that Nature Bureau had established a website that included a consultation document, status report and a short questionnaire on the subject, which people were encouraged to complete before the set deadline (www.naturebureau.co.uk/cmsraptors).

16. AEWA Budget 2006-2008

a. Proposal for reducing costs linked to meetings of the Technical Committee

96. Although this was a subject for the Standing Committee, Bert Lenten considered that the TC should be given an insight into the current financial situation. It was still being revised, but as it now stood, the budget covered only the running of the Secretariat and information material, and included no allocation for activities. It was made up of a core budget from existing Parties, plus the contributions from new parties to fund additional projects.

97. All the Bonn-based agencies were suffering losses of 25% of their budgets because of the dollar exchange rate. The budget for the coming triennium included a proposal to reduce the number of TC meetings per triennium to two. This would result in considerable savings, but

would require more contact by e-mail etc. intersessionally, and a special forum on the website to facilitate this.

98. In addition it was planned to refer to the UN Scale of Assessment when assessing delegates' entitlement to funding to attend meetings. Already for this meeting documents had been produced only in English, and there was again no French interpretation. It was not clear if this could remain so because it depended on the future TC members, but he considered it an important signal to the Standing Committee that the TC was trying to make savings.

99. Bert Lenten estimated this would be 70,000 USD for the triennium. He was trying to make savings without reducing activities, and to keep the burden for the Parties as low as possible.

100. Asked to make a decision on these questions, the meeting concluded that the number of meetings could be reduced, but that these should be longer, e.g. five days, to allow for issues to be completed.

101. It was also suggested that funds should be made available for a very small workshop or workshops between the TC meetings, preferably back to back with other meetings, and that communication between meetings must be improved.

102. The regional representatives were asked to check within their regions if French language documents were required and to report back to the Secretariat before a final decision was made on this.

103. There was also agreement on the proposal no. 4 regarding funding of delegates.

104. Bert Lenten would include in his report to the MOP a statement that due to lack of funding, not all the international reviews required by the Agreement could be undertaken.

17. Progress and Final reports:

a. AFRING final report for 2004

105. Sergey Dereliev presented document TC Inf. 6.6, and reported that good progress had been made on this project so far. Training courses were an important part of this project and trainers from several European ringing schemes had been assisting. It was hoped to secure 50,000 Euros to continue the project in 2005, and to develop an AFRING database.

b. Progress report on the pilot study/review of potential from waterbird ringing recovery analyses

106. Sergey Dereliev referred to document TC Inf. 6.7 and to a letter dated 3 May 2005 from EURING addressed to the Executive Secretary. There had been no progress on the project for more than a year, and the Secretariat requested advice on how to proceed with what it considered a very important project. After some discussion it was agreed that the Executive Secretary would contact EURING and attempt to resolve the tensions that appeared to have arisen, and would report back to the TC as soon as possible.

c. Rehabilitation of important migratory waterbird sites that have been degraded by invasive aquatic weeds in Africa

107. Sergey Dereliev reported that the final report (document TC Inf. 6.8) had been received and would be published on the AEWA website, and possibly also as a CD-Rom for wider distribution in Africa.

108. It was agreed that conservation guidelines should be extracted from the document for presentation to the Meeting of Parties, and that future contracts of this nature should specify this as a requirement.

d. AEWA communication strategy

109. Bert Lenten presented document TC Inf. 6.9, which had been discussed last year by the Standing Committee, where it had been agreed to send it to MOP3 for adoption. It would be the task of the JPO to implement the strategy, which was important not only for the Secretariat and Standing Committee, but should also improve communication for the TC.

e. Review of the guidelines on national legislation

110. Bert Lenten reported that a consultant had been contracted in 2004 to finalise these, which were considered too long and not sufficiently user-friendly, but that no progress had been made as the IUCN counterpart had been ill. The Secretariat currently had a consultant with a law background, who would continue this work once preparation for MOP3 was completed, and would publish this by the end of 2005, when the consultant's contract expired.

f. GROMS

111. Bert Lenten gave an update on progress on this ongoing question. A CMS consultant was currently reviewing the feasibility of the system, and was also consulting regional sponsors and the German government on how it could be optimised and implemented. His report would be passed to the Standing Committee as soon as it was available.

112. Ward Hagemeyer reminded the meeting that the TC had already given its opinion, and enquired what would happen to that decision if the consultant's view was positive.

113. Bert Lenten confirmed that the opinion of the TC had been communicated to the expert, but remarked that there would be no funds available for this project in the coming triennium.

114. Sergey Dereliev reported that there would be a working group meeting before the final report was drafted, and that he had proposed that the TC should be invited to appoint a member to attend this meeting, probably by teleconference. Preben Clausen volunteered.

g. Progress on phasing out of lead shot

115. Bert Lenten reported that although Parties were obliged to report, only Sweden had so far done so. The others would be reminded to submit their progress reports before MOP3.

h. Update on the African-Eurasian Flyway GEF project

116. Ward Hagemeyer reported, as he had at previous meetings, that preparatory work on this project continued, and that it had meanwhile been formally approved by the GEF Council. UNEP had now asked Wetlands International to convert it into UNEP-compatible format, which was proving a problem as UNOPS, which was running the project, had provided no extra funding for this work. Despite the fact that the partners were impatient for it to begin, and that co-funding had been waiting in many countries since 2003, progress was very slow, and details of the project itself had still to be discussed. He feared that the project, which would make an important contribution to waterbirds, could lose momentum if this situation continued.

i. Developing criteria for inclusion of projects into the IIP

117. The TC decided to adjourn discussion of this item in view of its decision the previous day that a strategic plan was required before additional criteria could be developed.

118. The Secretariat agreed to ensure that this would be done between MOP3 and MOP4, to ensure that the plan could be implemented in 2008.

18. Project proposals to be submitted to the European Commission

119. Introducing document TC 6.17, Bert Lenten recalled that the last TC meeting had decided to ask the EU, which was in the process of acceding to the Agreement, for a voluntary contribution, and 50,000 Euros would be donated in 2005. This contribution might be doubled in the following year.

120. The working group had compiled a list of possible projects to be undertaken with this funding, and the TC was now being asked to prioritise these.

121. After some discussion the meeting decided to propose giving priority to the report on status and trends for MOP4 (Action 3.3), to be followed by improving survey and monitoring capacity for migratory waterbirds with a focus on Africa (Action 3.3).

19. Proposal for guidance on determining priorities for AEWA financial support

122. Introducing document TC 6.18, David Stroud explained that the last TC meeting had agreed that a working group should develop a framework of criteria to guide the Secretariat in judging projects for funding. The paper was a draft for discussion.

123. The meeting made various suggestions for modifications, and it was agreed that David Stroud would present a revised draft of the document the next day.

20. Proposal for development of an online format for National Reporting to MOP

124. Robert Pople gave a presentation on the online reporting system developed for IOSEA (www.ioseaturtles.org/report). There was no loss of information compared to previous reporting formats. He explained that the use of checkboxes not only made submitting the report easier, but also allowed analysis of the information by means of various queries.

125. He described the secure system protected by user name and password, which could be shared with other contributors as required. In addition to the "editor" option for submitting reports, there was also a "viewer" function open to anyone, as well as the possibility to download complete reports as PDF files.

126. A function could be included to notify the Secretariat or monitoring body of updates, allowing them to be approved before going online. An additional advantage was that after the first submission the data could be edited, thus simplifying reporting in later years.

127. Asked about the feedback so far, he replied that IOSEA had an extremely high reporting rate, in excess of 90%, and that this was at least partially thanks to the easier process.

128. Bert Lenten remarked that the harmonisation of reporting systems was a recurring topic within CMS and AEWA, which was considering a project on a system whereby, for example, AEWA data entered would automatically be included in the report to CMS. He felt that in addition to simplifying reporting, this was a good tool to disseminate information about ongoing projects.

129. The cost should not be too high, as the system was already running and it might be possible to purchase the rights to adapt it for CMS and AEWA. It should also not be difficult to add French as a second language.

130. Ward Hagemeyer reported that UNEP-WCMC would be building on this system for the GEF project, so adapting it for national reports should not be difficult.

131. David Stroud remarked that the UK rapporteur under the turtles MoU had been very positive about the ease of input and production of summaries.

132. The TC agreed to recommend to the Standing Committee that this system should be developed further.

National reports for MOP3

133. It was agreed that the National Reports contain a wealth of information and are an important tool in measuring the progress made in implementation of the Agreement. The Meeting felt that these reports should be analysed and this information should be fed back to MOP3.

134. Rachel Adam offered to draft a resolution to ensure that those countries that failed to deliver their National Reports before MOP3 did so before the end of the year. This draft was later circulated. The meeting approved the text, and agreed that the resolution would be recommended for adoption by MOP3.

21. Proposal for changes in the modus operandi of the TC

135. Bert Lenten introduced document TC 6.19, which had been drafted by a small working group following discussion at the last TC meeting. The proposed changes reflected various developments that had already taken place or might do so in the near future, e.g. the possible inclusion of the CAF countries into AEWA.

136. The text of the Agreement specifies that the TC should be made up of not more than nine regional representatives, so it was recommended that the regions be redefined rather than amending the Agreement. Moreover, it would be possible to review and change the composition of these regions again at any future time.

137. Despite some reservations as to the suggested divisions, the meeting agreed to recommend the changes outlined in the document to the Standing Committee for submission to MOP3.

138. The meeting also established that while it was up to the regions to nominate their regional representatives, for the sake of continuity, the TC recommended the re-election of some regional representatives and some experts for another period of three years.

139. Moving on to consider Annex IV to document TC 6.19, Bert Lenten proposed that the work plan was an internal document for the TC, and need not be presented to the Meeting of the Parties, except perhaps as an information document.

140. Ward Hagemeyer felt that the work plan was a valuable tool that should be more easily accessible. It should be kept up to date and posted on the website for information.

141. Bert Lenten agreed and confirmed that it would be available on the internet and kept up to date as soon as the new forum was running.

142. Bert Lenten then referred to the draft resolution concerning future institutional arrangements for the TC, and invited final comments on this.

143. It was agreed to delete the passage on adoption of the work programme of the TC.

144. After some debate as to whether alternates should also be appointed for experts, the Meeting agreed to bring this question up at the Standing Committee meeting. Bert Lenten stressed that the system of alternates had not really worked for the TC and that often the people are not aware that they had been nominated as alternates for a representative.

22. AEWA contribution to 2010 target

145. Bert Lenten raised the question of the 2010 biodiversity target, and whether AEWA's activities were contributing to meeting this.

146. There was agreement that implementing the priorities already outlined would contribute to this, but that it was difficult to demonstrate achievements without clear indicators.

147. Olivier Biber suggested that these should be in the form of precise figures, years and percentages of improvement to be achieved, and could be part of the strategic plan to be developed in the next triennium.

148. However, others felt that there was not sufficient baseline information available, and that there was insufficient time for this approach.

149. It was suggested that a baseline year should be agreed upon, and Articles 3 and 4 reviewed and assessed with regard to success or failure as a measure of their contribution to the 2010 target.

150. The meeting agreed that MOP3 should be asked to endorse this activity, giving details of baseline, indicators etc. and thus making clear that the TC was working on the issue.

151. It was suggested by Olivier Biber that this might be part of the recommendation on the Strategic Plan, as a clear strategy was also needed here. Ward Hagemeyer agreed with the potential of using and developing process indicators in and for the Strategic Plan, but stressed that there would be a need to also develop output indicators (e.g. numbers of waterbirds).

152. It was decided that a small intersessional working group, consisting of Robert Pople, David Stroud, Ward Hagemeyer, Olivier Biber and Charles Mlingwa would start work on this and on the Strategic Plan as soon as MOP gave its go-ahead.

23. Register of international projects

153. Sergey Dereliev invited discussion on this register, which had been established by MOP1 with the intention of disseminating information about projects within the Agreement area. The register was published on the website, and the TC had been instructed to update it regularly. However, this has not been done, and the list was now considerably out of date.

154. The meeting considered that a system whereby information for the register could be submitted regularly though the AEWA website would be preferable to the current system and it was therefore agreed to close the register temporarily, and re-establish it once online reporting was in place.

24. TC Work Plan

155. The meeting reviewed the Work Plan by section, and made comments as follows:

Establishing national TC focal points

156. Sergey Dereliev reported that ten countries, i.e. 20% of Parties, had responded and nominated focal points. The Secretariat would continue to press Parties until focal points had been named in all countries.

TC Report to MOP3

157. Preben Clausen remarked that some of the issues listed here had not been finalised and were not on the agenda for this meeting, i.e. the status of mallard, eider and pintail populations. Work was currently being done on these and information would be submitted for the Chairman's report shortly.

MOP2 tasks for TC

158. David Stroud asked if the small grants fund had meanwhile been established. Sergey Dereliev replied that this was not the case, and it was proving difficult to implement Resolution 2.9.

International status reviews

159. Sergey Dereliev reminded the meeting that many of the reviews listed were based on national reports, but as these were not available there was no information for this meeting. The deadline for submission was 26 June 2005, so the Secretariat hoped to receive all reports and would keep the TC posted on progress.

160. David Stroud highlighted the fact that the action plan required seven reviews to be presented to each MOP, five of which had never been done. He stressed that these reviews were fundamental to the ability of the Agreement to assess its own effectiveness. He also noted that the language of the Agreement indicated the "mandatory" rather than "optional" nature of these reviews, and as such he felt there was a strong case for their funding to be a separate line within the core budget.

25. Implementation of previously adopted International Single Species Action Plans

161. Sergey Dereliev reported that only three of the AEWA action plans had been adopted to date. These had been published in paper versions at the end of 2004 and were also available as PDF files on the website. There was nothing to report on implementation of the Great Snipe and Black-winged Pratincole plans but the Secretariat had co-funded a pilot study by Birdlife International on breeding success of the Sociable Lapwing in Kazakhstan, which to his knowledge was the only activity so far.

162. Rachel Adam pointed out that according to Section 2.2.1 of the Action Plan, the Secretariat "shall coordinate the development, harmonisation and implementation" of International Single

Species Action Plans, but could delegate this task to a working group or groups. Sergey Dereliev reported that this had been proving difficult as it depended on finding specialists for each species prepared to lead such a group, and that this might have financial implications.

163. It was concluded that the Secretariat should make greater efforts to ensure that working groups were established to implement each action plan.

26. New and outstanding international single species action plans

164. The meeting expressed the hope that as many of these action plans would be ready for adoption in time for MOP3. A general request made was that where amended drafts were to be circulated again to the TC, this would be done by a link from which the files could be downloaded, rather than as e-mail attachments.

Corncrake

165. The meeting discussed various amendments, and the TC approved the plan with these changes.

White-headed Duck

166. The meeting approved the plan with the amendments as discussed. More information should be obtained from the South Asian region.

Ferruginous Duck

167. Amendments to this plan were also discussed and noted. However, as the deadline for comments (15 May) had not yet expired, the Secretariat would circulate the plan to the TC after that date for final approval.

Light-bellied Brent Goose

168. Several amendments were noted. However, as the deadline for comments on this draft was 31 May, it would also be circulated to the TC again for final review. The document possibly required more in-depth revision, so it might not be finished in time for MOP3.

Northern Bald Ibis

169. The Secretariat noted various comments, and the meeting decided that the plan would be dealt with in the same way as that for the Ferruginous Duck.

170. Sergey Dereliev also reported that an action plan for the **Maccoa Duck** was being drafted in South Africa, and would be circulated to the TC in the near future for comments prior to consultation with the range states.

171. The situation regarding the action plan for the **Lesser White-fronted Goose** was more complicated. An action plan was first prepared in 1996, before AEWA came into force. The Secretariat had obtained voluntary contributions from Germany, Sweden and Norway. Finland had organised a workshop to start the procedure to update the action plan. The workshop had been held at the beginning of April, and a first draft of the plan was expected shortly. The final draft was scheduled to be circulated to the TC at the end of July, and hopefully it could be presented at MOP3.

172. The action plan for the **Dark-bellied Brent Goose** had been in the pipeline for many years, and was still not close to completion. New comments on the latest draft had been received from Germany, but were still not forthcoming from France or Denmark. The UK was providing some

funding for a scientific study on population survival rates and impact of hunting. A research proposal from Dr. Bart Ebbinge of Alterra was presented to the TC. The Committee agreed on the proposal and on the requested co-funding from AEWA. The project is to be contracted out by the Secretariat to Alterra (the Netherlands), which will make the research together with NERI (Denmark).

Draft resolution 3.XX: Adoption of single species action plans

173. Sergey Dereliev gave a brief presentation of the draft resolution.

174. David Stroud stressed that the resolution should also refer to the implementation of the plans at international and national level. He suggested a new paragraph strongly urging contracting parties to implement these plans, and a further paragraph urging the Secretariat to establish a mechanism for international coordination of the plans.

175. Rachel Adam asked whether the Technical Committee or the Standing Committee should be instructed by the MOP to adopt single species action plans intersessionally between two MOPs.

176. David Stroud recalled that Recommendation 2.1 on the Dark-bellied Brent Goose action plan laid down a process. The Meeting of the Parties had to sign off action plans, but the Standing Committee could be asked to adopt them on an interim basis. He considered that any new resolution should be consistent with those previously adopted. Olivier Biber requested that this be checked and rectified if necessary. Otherwise it would be quicker to have the MOP instruct the Technical Committee to finalise and adopt the action plans intersessionally. If this was not covered by the Rules of Procedure, then the most efficient procedure should be chosen.

27. Other reports

Report on the EU bag statistics workshop

177. Guy-Noël Olivier, who had attended the workshop held in Tour du Valat in March 2005 on behalf of AEWA, referred to document TC Inf. 6.11 and gave an oral report of his view of the proceedings. He considered that hunting bag statistics would become as important as ringing had been in the past.

178. The meeting has been organised by the European Commission and many organisations working within the EU had been represented. The meeting had discussed the future development of a standardized EU bag statistics scheme. FACE, as the legitimate representative of hunters in the EU, had been approached concerning taking over the coordination of the European network that would implement the monitoring of hunting bags. This network would include experts from institutions and international organisations (still to be specified), brought together in a sub-group of the Ornithological Committee, FACE and BirdLife International under the aegis of the European Commission.

28. Draft report of the Chair of the TC to MOP3

179. Yousoof Mungroo presented in a first rough draft, an overview of activities of the TC Chair for presentation to the MOP, and asked for the TC's comments.

180. Ward Hagemeyer suggested that the report should be presented orally, accompanied by the current work plan in tabular format.

181. Olivier Biber agreed, and felt the table should summarise the outcome of all TC meetings and intersessional activities, rather than listing them chronologically. He also suggested highlighting the most important achievements in some way.

182. Yousoof Mungroo requested the committee members to send him their comments on the content by e-mail in due course. Points that had arisen during TC6 would of course be included.

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

183. Valentin Serebryakov informed the meeting that the Ukraine intended to host the next meeting of the TC, in the Crimea. Because a new government had come to power in January, the formal decision had not yet been taken, but was expected soon.

184. On behalf of the Executive Secretary, Sergey Dereliev thanked the Ukraine for this generous offer. The Secretariat would remain in close contact with the Ukraine, especially regarding the date of the next meeting, which should be decided after MOP3.

30. Any other business

AEWA funding guidelines

185. David Stroud circulated a further draft of these guidelines, and recommended that they should be made publicly available on the AEWA website.

186. The committee requested that in the first paragraph of the conditions the word "annual" be replaced by "next".

187. These guidelines would be recommended to MOP3 for adoption.

Avian influenza

188. Ward Hagemeyer enquired about progress on this issue.

189. Sergey Dereliev reported that in accordance with the decision of TC5 he had obtained the position of the CMS Scientific Council and had made this available to the members and observers of the TC. At its meeting in March 2004 the CMS Scientific Council had decided to establish a working group that would collaborate with Wetlands International and look more closely at the issue of avian influenza. The working group was asked to report to the next meeting of the Scientific Council.

190. Ward Hagemeyer would contact the officer in charge at CMS to follow the progress on the work being done by the CMS Scientific Council Working Group.

31. Closure of meeting

191. Olivier Biber thanked the Government of Mauritius for hosting the meeting, and thanked everyone involved for their hospitality. He also expressed thanks to the Secretariat for their hard work.

192. Sergey Dereliev also thanked the host government and especially Yousoof Mungroo and his team, whose excellent planning had made things so easy for the Secretariat.

193. Yousoof Mungroo said that it had been an honour to host the meeting, and that he hoped everyone had been comfortable. He in turn expressed his appreciation of the efforts of his staff, and that of the Agricultural Services, the Agricultural Information Division, as well as of the National Park and Conservation Service.

194. The meeting closed at 14.30.

Appendix I

6th MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

08 - 11 May 2005, Flic en Flac, Mauritius

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

(Amended according to the proposals approved by TC6)

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. The Technical Committee works closely with the Standing Committee to ensure consistency across the Agreement's work.

Rule 2

In particular the Technical Committee 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 southern 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.

2. 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.

3. With the 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 **step** 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 of a Member and his/her Alternate standing 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 the Chair of the AEWA Standing Committee.

2. Furthermore he may invite or admit a maximum of four observers from specialized international inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations.

3. 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. Regions shall nominate their regional representatives for the TC and submit their proposal to the Meeting of the Parties for formal adoption.

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 votes are equally divided in the second ballot, 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 that 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 **and voting**. 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

In so far 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 of 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 thus 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, through the Secretariat.

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

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS 6th TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE REGIONS

NORTH AND SOUTH WESTERN EUROPE

Dr. Olivier Biber

Swiss Agency for the Environment, Forests
and Landscape

3003 Bern

SWITZERLAND

Tel: 0041 313230663

Fax: 0041 313247579

E-mail: olivier.biber@buwal.admin.ch

CENTRAL EUROPE

Dr. Dan Munteanu (Vice-Chair)

President

Commission for the Protection
of Nature Monuments

Str. Republicii, nr. 48

400015 Cluj - Napoca

ROMANIA

Tel: (+40) 264 5912 38

Fax: (+40) 264 5912 38

E-mail: muntndanvic@yahoo.com

EASTERN EUROPE

Prof. Valentin Serebryakov

Associate Professor

Shevchenko National University in Kiev

Volodymyrska Str. 64

Kiev 01033

UKRAINE

Tel: (+38 044) 2669239

Fax: (+38 044) 2520120

E-mail: bcssu@univ.kiev.ua

EASTERN AFRICA

Dr. Charles Mlingwa

Director General

Tanzania Wildlife Research Institute

P.O. Box 661

Arusha

TANZANIA

Tel: (+255) 27 2548240/2509871

Fax: (+255) 27 (254)8240

E-mail: tawiri@habari.co.tz

SOUTHWESTERN ASIA

Dr. Elena Kreuzberg

Manager of Ecosystem Management

Programme The Regional Environmental

Centre for Central Asia 40, Orbita-1,

480043, Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan

Tel: +7(3272) 785110, 785022, 292619, 296646, ext.
123

Fax: +7 (3272) 705337

E-mail: EKreuzberg@carec.kz

SOUTHERN AFRICA

Mr. Yousoof Mungroo (Chairman)

Director

National Parks and Conservation Service

Reduit

MAURITIUS

Tel.: +230 464 2993

Fax: +230 465 1184

E-mail: npcsagr@intnet.mu

OBSERVERS FROM CONTRACTING PARTIES

WETLANDS INTERNATIONAL

Mr. Ward Hagemeijer

Head of Wetlands Species Conservation Programme
Wetlands International
P.O. Box 471
6700 AL Wageningen
THE NETHERLANDS
Tel: (+31) 317 47 88 67
Fax: (+31) 317 47 88 50
E-mail: Ward.Hagemeijer@wetlands.org

CIC

Prof. Dr. Heribert Kalchreuter

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

REPRESENTATIVES OF ORGANISATIONS

RURAL ECONOMICS

Mr. Elijah Yaw Danso

Social Development Advisor
Forest Sector Development Project
P.O. Box M 4341457
Accra
GHANA
Tel.: (+233) 21 70 12 404
Fax: (+233) 21 70 12 405
E-mail: eliyawdanso@yahoo.com

GAME MANAGEMENT

Dr. Preben Clausen

Senior Scientist
National Environmental Research Institute
Department of Wildlife Ecology & Biodiversity
Grenaavej 12
8410 Roende
DENMARK
Tel: (+45) 8920 1519
Fax: (+45) 8920 1515
E-mail: pc@dmu.dk

ENVIRONMENTAL LAW

Ms. Rachelle Adam

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

OBSERVERS FROM CONTRACTING PARTIES

FINLAND

Dr. Petri Nummi

Docent University of Helsinki
Department of Applied Biology
Wildlife Management
University of Helsinki
P.O. Box 27
FIN-00014
FINLAND
Tel: (+358) 9 191 58366
Fax: (+358) 9 191 58463
E-mail: petri.nummi@helsinki.fi

Chairman of the Standing Committee

Mr. Emmanuel Severre

Director of Wildlife
Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism
P.O. Box 1994
Dar es Salaam
TANZANIA
Tel.: (+255 22) 2866 408
Fax: (+255 22) 286 5836/ 2863496
E-Mail: director@wildlife.go.tz

UNITED KINGDOM

Dr. David Stroud

Senior Ornithologist
JNCC - Joint Nature Conservation Committee
Monkstone House
City Road, Peterborough PE1 1JY
UNITED KINGDOM
Tel: (+44) 1733 562 626
Fax: (+44) 1733 555 948
E-mail: David.Stroud@JNCC.GOV.UK

TANZANIA

Mr. Mzamilu Kaita

Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism
P.O. Box 1994
Dar es Salaam
TANZANIA
Tel.: (+255 22) 2866 408
Fax: (+255 22) 286 5836/ 2863496
E-Mail: kaitam2003@yahoo.co.uk

OBSERVERS FROM INTERNATIONAL NGOs

BirdLife International

Mr. John O'Sullivan

International Treaties Adviser
Birdlife International
RSPB, The Lodge, Sandy
SG 19 2DL Bedfordshire
UNITED KINGDOM
Tel.: (+44) 1767 680 551
Fax: (+44) 1767 683 211
E-mail: john.osullivan@rspb.org.uk

O.M.P.O.

Mr. Guy-Nöel Olivier

Secrétaire General
5, Avenue des Chasseurs
75017 Paris
FRANCE
Tel.: (+33) 01 44 01 05 10
Fax: (+33) 01 44 01 05 11
E-mail: ompo@ompo.org

United Nations Environment Programme/ World Conservation Monitoring Centre

UNEP/WCMC

Dr. Robert Pople

219 Huntingdon Road
Cambridge CB3 0DL,
UNITED KINGDOM
Tel.: (+44) 1223 277314
Fax: (+44) 1223 277136
E-mail: Robert.Pople@unep-wcmc.org

Federation of Association for Hunting & Conservation of the EU (FACE)

Mr. John Swift

Vice-President
Marford Mill, Rossett
Wrexham LL12 0HL
UNITED KINGDOM
Tel.: (+44) 1244 573 039
Fax: (+44) 1245 79 138
E-mail: john.swift@basc.org.uk

UNEP/AEWA SECRETARIAT

Mr. Bert Lenten, Executive Secretary
Mr. Sergey Dereliev, Technical Officer
Ms. Marie-Therese Kämper, Assistant
Mrs. Patricia Stadié, Assistant

Secretariat for the Agreement on the Conservation of
African-Eurasian
Migratory Waterbirds

Martin-Luther-King-Str. 8
53175 Bonn
GERMANY
Tel: (+49 228) 815-2414
Fax: (+49 228) 815-2450
E-mail: aewa@unep.de

TOPIC	ACTION	RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE	COMPLETED
Rules of Procedure (para 3)	To amend RoP based on discussion in TC6	Secretariat	June 2005	
Minutes of TC5 (para 5)	To amend the minutes as agreed in TC6	Secretariat	September 2005	
Proposal for IIP 2006-2010 (para 10)	To recommend to MOP3 through the Standing Committee that a Strategic Plan should be developed for the Agreement as a basis for the inclusion of projects into the IIP.	Secretariat	Before MOP3	
	To add a paragraph emphasising that sustainable development and poverty alleviation are priorities.	Secretariat	July 2005	
IIP 2006-2010, Habitat Conservation (para 54-59)	To modify the text to include other regions and to reflect the fact that in Africa only demonstration might be needed.	Secretariat	Before MOP3	
	To contact the proponents to ask for more specific information on the Conservation Programme of migratory bird roosting sites located in the Albertine Rift region (Eastern Africa) and consult the TC-members per e-mail.	Secretariat	Before MOP3	
	To request more information on the remaining proposals in this section and come back to the TC on that.	Secretariat	Before MOP3	
IIP 2006-2010, Management of human activities (para 60-61)	To leave this project on the list as priority 3 and to await information from the EU before making a final decision.	TC		
IIP 2006-2010, Education and Information (para 64-65)	To develop a new proposal on regional training courses to replace project 35.	Secretariat	Before MOP3	
Draft resolution 3.XX IIP for 2006-2008 (para 66)	To shorten the text by referring to the almost identical Resolution 2.4. adopted by MOP2.	Secretariat	Before MOP3	

TOPIC	ACTION	RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE	COMPLETED
Guidance on definition of the term “long-term decline of populations” (para 67)	To recommend this definition to MOP3, together with guidance for its application.	Secretariat	MOP3 October 2005	
Guidance on defining bio-geographical populations of waterbirds (para 72-74)	To circulate a modified version of the document to the TC for subsequent submission to MOP3.	DS	Before MOP3	
Report on the status and trends of bird populations within the Agreement area (para 75-86)	To prepare the AEWA conservation status report for MOP3.	Secretariat/Wetlands International	Before MOP3	
	To submit a draft resolution to MOP3.	Secretariat	MOP3 October 2005	
Additional species to be included in the AEWA list (87-89)	To review the seabirds listed in Table 2 of the report and prepare a brief analysis of the available information on populations and threats, noting whether the threat was covered by the current Action Plan. To propose species for addition to the list to MOPs after consultation with the TC.	Secretariat	MOP3 October 2005	
Progress report on pilot study/review of potential from waterbird ringing recovery analyses (para 106)	To contact EURING and attempt to resolve tensions and report back to TC.	BL	ASAP	
Rehabilitation of important migratory waterbird sites that have been degraded by invasive aquatic weeds in Africa (para 107-108)	To extract conservation guidelines from the final report for the presentation to the Meeting of the Parties.	Secretariat	Before MOP4	
AEWA communication strategy (para 109)	To implement the strategy	FK	Rolling	

TOPIC	ACTION	RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE	COMPLETED
Review of the guidelines on national legislation (para 110)	To finalise and publish the guidelines.	CL	December 2005	
GROMS (para 111)	To review the feasibility of the system and after a working group meeting to pass on the report to the Standing Committee.	PC CMS consultant	ASAP	
Progress on phasing out of lead shot	To remind Parties (apart from Sweden) to submit their reports.	CL	MOP3 October 2005	
Proposal for development of an online format for National Reporting to MOP (para 124 – 132)	To recommend to the standing committee that the system should be developed further.	Secretariat	StC3 July 2005	
National reports for MOP3 (para 133-134)	To propose a resolution for adoption by MOP3 regarding timely delivery of National Reports	Secretariat	MOP3 October 2005	
AEWA contribution to 2010 target (para 145 – 152)	To work on this in conjunction with the Strategic plan as soon as MOP gives its go-ahead.	Working Group (RP, DS, WH, OB, CM)	Before MOP4	
Register of international projects (para 153-153)	To temporarily close the register and re-establish it as part of the online reporting.	TC	a.s.a. online reporting is established	
Establishing national TC focal points (para 156)	To press Parties until focal points had been named in all countries (currently 10 TCFPs nominated – 20% of Parties)	Secretariat	Rolling	
TC Report to MOP3 (para 157)	To submit information on the status of mallard, eider and pintail populations for the chairman's report to MOP3	PC	MOP3 October 2005	
International Status Reviews (para 159)	To keep the TC posted on the status of incoming reports.	Secretariat	June 2005	

TOPIC	ACTION	RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE	COMPLETED
Implementation of previously adopted ISSAPs ((161-163)	To make greater efforts to ensure that working groups are established to implement each action plan.	Secretariat	Rolling	
ISSAP White-headed Duck (para 166)	To obtain more information from the South Asian region.	EK	Before MOP3	
Draft report of the Chair of TC to MOP3 (179-182)	To send the chairman comments, including points having arisen during TC6	TC members	ASAP for presentation to MOP3 in October 2005	
AEWA funding guidelines (185-187)	To recommend these guidelines to MOP3 for adoption	Secretariat	MOP3 October 2005	
Avian influenza	To contact the officer in charge at CMS to follow the progress of ongoing work by the CMS Scientific Council Working Group	WH	ASAP	

Overview of abbreviations of full names of the TC members and Secretariat staff (in alphabetical order):

Abbreviation	Full name	Abbreviation	Full name
BL	Bert Lenten	JOS	John O'Sullivan
CL	Catherine Lehmann	JS	John Swift
CM	Charles Mlingwa	OB	Olivier Biber
DM	Dan Munteanu	PC	Preben Clausen
DS	David Stroud	RA	Rachelle Adam
EK	Elena Kreuzberg	RP	Robert Pople
EYD	Elijah Yaw Danso	SD	Sergey Dereliev
FK	Florian Keil	VS	Valentin Serebryakov
GNO	Guy-Noel Olivier	WH	Ward Hagemeijer
HK	Heribert Kalchreuter	YM	Youssof Mungroo
JM	Jerome Mokoko		