

## REPORT OF THE 9<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE<sup>1</sup> 20 - 23 April 2009, Zagreb, Croatia

Agenda item 1. Opening .....	3
Agenda item 2. Welcome Address .....	4
Agenda item 3. Modus operandi of the Technical Committee .....	4
Agenda item 4. Adoption of the Agenda and Work Programme .....	4
Agenda item 5. Admission of Observers .....	4
Agenda item 6. Election of Officers .....	4
Agenda item 7. Adoption of the Minutes of the 8 <sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Technical Committee .....	4
Agenda item 8. Report by the former Acting Chair .....	5
Agenda item 9. Report by the Secretariat .....	5
Agenda item 10. Reports by the Regional Representatives .....	7
Eastern Africa .....	8
Northern Africa .....	9
North and Southwestern Europe .....	9
Western Africa .....	10
Southern Africa .....	10
Eastern Europe .....	10
Southwestern Asia .....	11
Central Europe .....	11
Extraordinary Agenda Item: The role of the AEWA Technical Committee in the Implementation Review Process (IRP) .....	14
Agenda item 11. Current status regarding implementation of the International Implementation Tasks 2009-2016 .....	15
Agenda item 12. AEWA Single Species Action Plans .....	17
a. Progress in implementation on and development of SSAPs .....	17
b. Working Groups for coordination of the implementation of SSAPs .....	18
Agenda item 13. Update on avian influenza .....	20
Agenda item 14. IUCN Red List threat categories and their applicability to the listing of species in AEWA Table 1 .....	22
Agenda item 19 <sup>2</sup> . Recapitulation of the Workshops of TC Working Groups 1-8 .....	23
Working Group 1 - Hunting and Trade .....	23
Working Group 2 - Re-establishment .....	28
Working Group 3 - Annexes .....	28
Working Group 4 - Fluctuations .....	29
Working Group 5 - Climate Change related issues .....	29
Working Group 6 - Single Species Action Plans .....	30
Working Group 7 - International Implementation Tasks .....	31
Working Group 8 - Conservation Guidelines .....	32

<sup>1</sup> Adopted by the 10<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Technical Committee in Naivasha, Kenya, 12-16 September 2011

<sup>2</sup> Agenda items 15. – 18. consisted of meetings of the individual Working Groups (1 – 8), the results of which are noted in Agenda item 19.

Agenda Item 20. TC Working Group 9 (Extractive industries) .....	33
Agenda Item 21. TC Working Group 10 (Emerging Issues) .....	34
Agenda item 22. TC Work Plan 2009 – 2012 .....	40
Agenda item 23. Date and Venue of the next Technical Committee Meeting .....	40
Agenda item 24. Any other business .....	41
Agenda item 25. Closure .....	42
 ANNEX I : Modus operandi of the Technical Committee of the Agreement on the Conservation of African- Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds .....	 44
 ANNEX II: TC9 LIST OF PARTICIPANTS.....	 55
 ANNEX III List of tasks resulting from the 9 <sup>th</sup> Meeting of the AEWA Technical Committee	

**Agenda item 1. Opening**

1. The Acting Chair, Ms. Jelena Kralj welcomed Mr. Bert Lenten, the AEWA Secretariat, all the Technical Committee (TC) Members and Observers, particularly those attending the Meeting for the first time, as well as the representatives from the Ministry of Culture, whom she thanked for hosting the meeting. She hoped that all the delegates had enjoyed the field trip organised on the previous day and that they had been able to see some of the beautiful nature of Croatia. She stressed the importance of this meeting as it was the first meeting after the 4<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Parties, which had delegated a huge amount of tasks to the Technical Committee for the coming quinquennium. She requested the delegates to actively participate during the three days of the meeting, in order to manage the workload.
2. Ms. Kralj welcomed the representatives of the Ministry of Culture and thanked Ms. Ana Kobaslic and Ms. Zrinka Domazetovic for their hard work in organising the meeting. She went on to introduce Ms. Kornelija Pintarić, Director of the Nature Protection Directorate of the Ministry of Culture in Zagreb.
3. In her address, Ms. Pintarić welcomed all the delegates on behalf of the Government of Croatia and expressed her country's honour at having the opportunity to host the meeting of the Technical Committee. Croatia had ratified all the relevant biodiversity-related conventions, of which AEWA was one. Croatia was making every effort to ensure the preparation of all the relevant laws and regulations relating to the implementation of AEWA. Ms. Pintarić reported that Species Action Plans were part of the daily work of the Ministry. Within the framework of Natura 2000, Croatia had encompassed a network of 27 areas important for waterbirds, amounting to 1,5 million hectares. These habitats, many of which are important for the species listed under AEWA, would be preserved in future. Ms. Pintarić mentioned the enjoyable excursion, which had preceded the meeting and had enabled the participants to get a glimpse of her country's natural beauty and concluded by wishing all those present a successful meeting.
4. Mr. Lenten thanked Ms. Pintarić for the warm welcome to Zagreb. He reiterated that this is an important meeting with a heavy agenda covering many difficult issues. He looked forward to a fruitful meeting and expressed a special welcome to the new TC members; Mr. Mark Anderson, Regional Representative for Southern Africa, Ms. Melissa Lewis, expert on Environmental Law, Mr. John Mshelbwala, Regional Representative for Western Africa, Mr. Hichem Azafzaf, Regional Representative for Northern Africa, Mr. Szabolcs Nagy, representing Wetlands International, Mr. Jean-Yves Mondain-Monval, expert on Game Management, Dr. Hussein Sosovele, expert on Rural Economics and Mr. Oliver Nasirwa, Regional Representative for Eastern Africa. He regretted that Dr. Sosovele and Mr. Nasirwa had not been able to attend the meeting due to unforeseen problems with visa issues, despite all the many efforts on the part of the Croatian Government and the AEWA Secretariat to solve these problems. On behalf of everyone at the Meeting, Mr. Lenten sent best wishes to both TC members and gave his assurance that he would follow up the outcomes of the meeting with both. He went on to thank the Government of Croatia for the excellent field trip and the opportunity to see Crna Mlaka fish ponds.
5. He stressed the value of convening the meeting at different venues throughout the AEWA region and having the opportunity to become acquainted with them and receiving direct feedback on local problems and issues. He thanked Ms. Pintarić and her staff for all the hard work involved in the organisation of the meeting.
6. Ms. Kralj introduced Ms. Vlatka Dumbovic, Head of the Vertebrates Section in the Department for Wild and Domesticated Taxa and Habitats, State Institute for Nature Protection.
7. Ms. Dumbovic was happy to be able to greet the participants of this meeting. She reported that the State Institute for Nature Protection was a young institute, which was established only 5 years ago. She reported on some of the many activities being carried out towards implementing AEWA such as the NATURA 2000 network Special Protection Areas (SPA) under the EU Birds Directive, many of which were of particular importance for Migratory Birds. Management plans are in preparation, e.g. for the Vransko Lake, a large wetland area on the Adriatic coast. She concluded by reporting that a National Single Species Action Plan (SSAP) was currently under preparation for the Corncrake. Ms. Dumbovic wished all the participants a successful meeting and a pleasant stay in Croatia.

## **Agenda item 2. Welcome Address**

8. There were no further addresses.

## **Agenda item 3. *Modus operandi* of the Technical Committee**

9. Mr. Dereliev introduced document TC 9.2. *TC Modus operandi*. In previous meetings, this document was examined page by page; however the present document had already been revised and approved by the representatives of the Contracting Parties at MOP4. The major difference between this document and the former Rules of Procedure was the inclusion of the procedure of nomination and election (Rules 7 – 12). Mr. Dereliev informed the TC that any proposals for further changes or additions could be submitted in writing for approval by the next MOP.

## **Agenda item 4. Adoption of the Agenda and Work Programme**

10. Mr. Dereliev introduced documents TC 9.3 *Provisional annotated agenda* and TC 9.4 *Provisional work programme*. He reported that in previous meetings, all sessions had been plenary sessions; however it had been decided to change the setting of this meeting because of the longer intersessional period so that the Working Groups have the opportunity of retreating into workshops and working on details of their tasks. Notes would not be taken in the workshops. The group leaders had been briefed on the expected outcomes the previous evening and on the last day of the meeting; the results of the workshops would be signed off and prioritised so that the available resources could be applied appropriately. Referring to Agenda item 6. *Election of Officers*, Mr. Dereliev noted that the previous Chair, Mr. Mungroo had stepped down at the end of the previous triennium and Ms. Kralj had been Acting Chair since then so that a new Chair and Vice Chair would be elected during the meeting.

11. Mr. Lenten proposed reporting on the recent meeting on the Adriatic Flyway in Montenegro where the Ulcinj Declaration had been adopted and Mr. Stroud intended reporting on the exchange of good practice between flyway initiatives under Agenda item 24. *Any other business*.

12. The Meeting adopted the Agenda and Work Programme with the above-mentioned additions.

## **Agenda item 5. Admission of Observers**

13. The Meeting agreed to admit the Observers present (see document TC Inf 9.1, *Preliminary List of Participants*), and welcomed them.

## **Agenda item 6. Election of Officers**

14. The meeting elected Ms Jelena Kralj as the new Chair, replacing Mr. Yousoof Mungroo and Mr. Hichem Azafzaf as the new Vice-Chair, replacing Ms. Kralj. Both thanked the Meeting for the confidence placed in them and looked forward to working closely with all those involved throughout their term of office.

## **Agenda item 7. Adoption of the Minutes of the 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Technical Committee**

15. Mr. Lenten introduced document TC 9.5 *Draft minutes of the 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Technical Committee* and proceeded to go through them page by page.

16. He noted that the *Report on the experiences of countries, which have phased out lead shot for hunting in wetlands* mentioned in para 7 was on the TC Workspace for comments and that a popular version of the report was almost ready for printing.

17. Mr. Lenten commented on para 12, that despite the efforts of Mr. Hamza to improve contact with the African Union, no significant progress had been made as yet.

18. Regarding para 18, Mr. Lenten reported that the MoU for the conservation of African-Eurasian migratory raptors and owls had meanwhile been concluded; the Secretariat was based in Abu Dhabi and work would begin in June 2009.

19. Referring to para 31, Mr. Lenten reported that the Great Rift Valley project proposal had led to lengthy and difficult discussions at the beginning of MOP4 and during the course of the meeting. In close consultation with the respective stakeholders, the idea evolved to strengthen waterbird and wetland conservation capacity for the whole of Africa; thus the project was renamed as the *African Initiative*. Mr. Lenten was happy to be able to announce that the Government of France had recently confirmed funding for an Officer to take up the coordination of this project, in cooperation with the AEWA Programme Officer.

20. Mr. Harradine mentioned that he did not find a reflection of a long and detailed discussion about the trend analysis of populations and the respective amendment to the AEWA Action Plan. The discussion had been on the interpretation of that data and there had been no reflection of the outcome in the minutes.

21. Mr. Dereliev explained that there had been no real decision made at the meeting. The decision on the proposal for amendments was taken after the meeting in close cooperation with Wetlands International. He suggested checking the TC8 records after the present meeting and summarizing the discussions referred to by Mr. Harradine in more detail.

22. In response to a question by Mr. Harradine on the reference to 'unwise responses' in para 152, Mr. Stroud explained that this related to the discussion on the Ramsar Resolution on avian influenza and referred to the destruction of wetland habitats and the killing of waterbird species in response to concerns about Avian Influenza.

23. Mr. Hughes commented that 'Resolution' should be amended to 'draft Resolution' throughout the document as the Resolutions referred to were not final.

24. The minutes were adopted subject to the incorporation of the above amendments.

### **Agenda item 8. Report by the former Acting Chair**

25. Ms. Kralj reported on the Technical Committee's activities since September 2008, when the former Chair, Mr. Mungroo completed his term of office. The Secretariat had compiled the TC Workplan whereby 10 major issues were considered, consisting of many tasks to be completed during this quadriennium; these issues were delegated to 10 Working Groups, whose members were selected according to their expertise. Each Working Group has a leader responsible for the timely delivery of the expected results. Ms. Kralj went on to mention the TC Workspace, which was launched in time for the run-up to TC9 and has already proved to be of great advantage and used by many of the TC members. She encouraged the other TC members to also actively use this tool. The previous meeting, TC8, was the last one for 6 members: the Regional Representatives for North and Southwestern Europe, Central Africa and Southern Africa and the experts in Rural Economics, Environmental Law and Game Management. During MOP4 all the experts were elected as well as the Regional Representative for North and Southwestern Europe. In accordance with the *Modus operandi*, the Secretariat and the Acting Chair had been able to select a Regional Representative for Southern Africa; however the position of Regional Representative for Central Africa remained vacant. The former Regional Representative for Northern Africa, Mr. Hamza, had had to stand down and had been replaced by his Alternate, Mr. Azafzaf.

### **Agenda item 9. Report by the Secretariat**

26. Mr. Lenten introduced document TC 9.6 *Report of the Secretariat*. He explained that this was a rolling document, which was up-dated for each meeting. The Secretariat consisted of 4 professional staff members and 3 general staff members. The workload was divided up between:

- Bert Lenten – General Management
- Sergey Dereliev – Implementation and Compliance
- Florian Keil – Information Management; and
- Catherine Lehmann – Project development

27. He went on to highlight some of the activities of the Secretariat since the last meeting. He reported that since the adoption of the AEWA Strategic Plan by MOP4, this had been the strategic document providing the context for the implementation of the Agreement.

28. New developments included the conclusion of the CAF Action Plan launched by CMS, which was important for AEWA due to the geographical overlap of 30 CAF Range States, 16 of which were located in the AEWA Region. At the CMS COP in Rome, a Working Group on the future structure of CMS had been established, in which AEWA is represented.

29. Fundraising remained an ongoing issue and only 10% of the funds necessary for fully implementing the International Implementation Priorities 2006 – 2008 had been raised so fundraising efforts would continue and new sources of funding would be examined.

30. Regarding recruitment of staff, it had been agreed by MOP4 to upgrade the post of the Technical Officer from P-2 to P-3 and to transfer the post of Programme Officer from L-2 to P-2. The standard UN recruitment procedure was applicable in both cases so these positions would be advertised on the UN Job Vacancy Portal. Nina Mikander from Finland had been recruited to take over the coordination of the Lesser White-fronted Goose (LWfG) Action Plan from her predecessor Ms. Kirsten Martin, in early May. Recruitment was ongoing for an African Officer to take up the coordination of the African Initiative project.

31. The number of Contracting Parties amounted to 62; however a number of countries were showing strong interest in joining the Agreement, e.g. Saudi Arabia, Cameroon, Ethiopia and Azerbaijan. Mr. Lenten expressed his appreciation to BirdLife International for helping to promote countries to join through the *Born to Travel* campaign.

32. Regarding cooperation with other organisations, an MoU had been signed with Oiseaux Migrateurs du Paléarctique Occidental (OMPO) and the Programme Officer was preparing another MoU with the Agreement on the Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF), which would hopefully be concluded in 2009.

33. The Information Unit had gone from strength to strength since the Information Officer was able to dedicate more time to AEWA issues. The e-newsletter was distributed regularly to all our contacts to keep them informed about AEWA news and activities. The Secretariat relied on input about ongoing projects and asked those present to provide feedback and ideas, wherever possible, so that this resource could be further improved. The Information Officer had developed a series of websites, the last one being AFRING, the ringing scheme in Africa developed for the Avian Demography Unit (ADU). Preparations for WMBD 2009 were well underway; the theme was *Barriers to Migration*, such as windfarms, power lines, masts and tall buildings. This was an excellent awareness-raising campaign, which attracted people from all over the world to take part and learn about bird migration and all it involves. The Secretariat had brought out a number of publications such as the *SSAP for the Lesser White-fronted Goose* (available in English and Russian) and the brochure on the *Effects of Climate Change on Migratory Waterbirds within the African-Eurasian Flyways* (available in English and French). Mr. Lenten reminded those present that all the Technical Series brochures were available for download from the AEWA website and majority of them also in hard copy from the Secretariat.

34. The online national reporting system was being developed by Mr. Dereliev in close cooperation with UNEP/WCMC. This project was also dependent on funding, which UNEP hoped to be able to accrue.

35. Funding was also a major challenge with regard to the International Implementation Tasks (IIT). A total of 5.2 million Euros would have been necessary to be able to implement all of the tasks in the previous list and only 10% of that amount had been received. This reflected on the implementation of WOW, as many IIT are linked to the WOW project and therefore a shortfall of 600,000 Euros still needs to be covered.

36. The Head of the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) had left to take up a position in Nairobi, he would, however, continue to be involved in the coordination of WOW together with the Operations Manager, who would be re-located to the AEWA Secretariat in Bonn as from July 2009, facilitating the ultimate hand-over of the project to the Secretariat. A 'Life after WOW' meeting had recently taken place in Ede, the Netherlands, attended by representatives of the main stakeholders, the AEWA and Ramsar Secretariats, Wetlands International and BirdLife International. The focus of this meeting was on how to achieve a continuation of the activities of the project and continue to benefit from its results.

37. MOP4 had agreed on the establishment of a review process similar to that of the Ramsar Advisory Missions (RAM). The Secretariat participated in the RAM mission to assess the impact of the soda ash plant planned at Lake Natron and would soon participate in a RAM mission to Mozambique because of mining issues there. The Secretariat also took part in an on-the-spot appraisal mission of the Bern Convention regarding the windfarms planned on the northern coast of Bulgaria.

38. Project development was the responsibility of Ms. Lehmann. Funding for the recently launched WetCap project, for capacity building in North Africa had been received from the Spanish Development Agency (AECID). The main partners for this project were the Spanish BirdLife partner SEO, Wetlands International and Birdlife International. This was an important initiative using the achievements from the WOW project and implementing them in North Africa. Mr. Lenten invited the delegates to contact Ms. Lehmann for more information on this promising project.

39. Another recently launched project was the African Initiative, which was a reaction to the outcomes of the seven international reviews presented at MOP4, which underpinned the need for increased conservation action, especially in Africa. A coordinator would be recruited to develop a plan of action and to coordinate AEWA activities in Africa within the AEWA Secretariat. The French Government had kindly provided funding for the post of coordinator for 2 years so that activities towards implementing the African Initiative would be able to start in May 2009.

40. The Chair thanked the Secretariat for this impressive report including such a wide range of activities and projects and the hard work involved. She particularly welcomed the Africa-related activities and regretted the fact that two African TC members had not been able to attend this meeting as planned.

41. With regard to the situation of the Lesser White-fronted Goose Action Plan, Mr. Kanstrup enquired about the status of funding and if there had been any signal from the Norwegian Government regarding potential funding of the project and what the time framework for that would be.

42. Mr. Lenten responded that the coordinator post had been funded by Norway and that Norway was willing to continue supporting that post. Germany had also provided a small grant for this purpose. One of the tasks of the coordinator would be to fundraise towards activities; Finland had already indicated that funds would be provided for this purpose. The main focus of activities would be on the wild population in Kazakhstan.

43. Mr. Dereliev reported that three funding proposals had been submitted to the Norwegian Government, which were being processed.

44. Ms. Crockford took the opportunity to thank the AEWA Secretariat for funding the production of the Slender-billed Curlew identification leaflet, which had been distributed with the January issue of *Birdwatch*.

## **Agenda item 10. Reports by the Regional Representatives**

45. The Chair introduced this Agenda item, explaining that according to the *Modus operandi* the Regional Representatives were required to report on the implementation of AEWA and the situation in their regions as well as to inform stakeholders in those regions of the outcome of the Technical Committee's activities and keep them informed.

## Eastern Africa

46. Mr. Oliver Nasirwa, who was unfortunately unable to attend this meeting, kindly forwarded his report for the Eastern African Region for inclusion in the Minutes of the meeting:

47. *The Eastern Africa region of AEWA consists of nine countries namely Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, Sudan, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Réunion (territory of France) and Mayotte (territory of France). To date, six of these countries namely Djibouti, Kenya, Sudan, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Réunion and Mayotte have ratified AEWA. Three countries are yet to ratify namely Somalia, Eritrea and Ethiopia. During MOP4, Ethiopia expressed their intention of adhering to the Agreement as soon as possible and provided details of the current status of the legal and administrative processes required.*

48. *There are only two AEWA technical focal points for Eastern Africa on the official AEWA lists. No official response or communication has been received from the focal points. Hence this report does not contain any communication directly from the countries in the region. There is need for the Secretariat to assist in identifying national technical focal points for the eastern Africa countries as well as to contact the current ones on the list to check whether they are still available.*

49. *Tanzania and Kenya are drafting National Lesser Flamingo Single Species Action Plans. The Lesser Flamingo SSAP for Kenya is almost ready. This Kenya draft has been shared with Tanzania, which is just initiating the process of developing one. The Lesser Flaming SSAP for Kenya is an adaptation from the International Single Species Action Plan for the Conservation of Lesser Flamingos. More action plans being developed are on the Madagascar Pond Heron to which some Eastern Africa countries are Range States.*

50. *Drought has been a problem in the region causing rivers to dry and wetland habitat to shrink. There is increased conflict between agricultural communities and pastoralists mainly over water and grazing areas.*

51. *Cases of misuse of pesticides to directly kill migratory waterbirds and other wildlife to resolve human-wildlife conflict, have been reported in Kenya and Tanzania and may be happening in other Range States in the region. One of the chemicals variously mentioned is Furadan®, a Carbamate poison whose active ingredient is carbofuran produced by the FMC Corporation, a US-based chemical company. Campaigns have led to FMC withdrawing the pesticide from the Kenyan Market and more campaigns are underway to get it banned altogether as well as to have the same measures extended to other neighbouring countries.*

52. *Efforts to increase energy are coming up that will have significant impacts on migratory waterbirds in the region. These are mainly to enhance the use of wind energy, production of biofuel and increase in the network of powerlines. While biofuels are a threat due to conversion of wetlands, there are projects to build hydro-dams, i.e. one on the Omo River in Ethiopia that threatens the existence of Lake Turkana, its biodiversity and human livelihood in the two countries (Kenya and Ethiopia).*

53. *Other threatened sites for migratory waterbirds are wetlands on the River Nile (oil exploration), Lake Natron (soda mining), Tana Delta (biofuel and commercial agriculture), Lake Naivasha, and Yala Swamp (commercial agriculture).*

54. *Many organizations and government agencies are gearing-up to also implement climate change mitigation programmes. The programmes are coming from a diverse range of stakeholders. There will be a need to get involved in the discussions in order to represent the priorities of migratory waterbirds in these plans.*

55. *Some site inventories have been carried out in the region by various organizations. There have been surveys done in South Sudan (Sudd Region) by Wetlands International and also with the Wildlife Conservation Society in collaboration with the Government. Other small scale inventories mainly with an aim to build-up local/national capacities have been carried-out in Somalia (Somaliland) and more are being planned in Ethiopia, under the Wings Over Wetlands project.*

56. *Though no specific report has come from the countries, no waterbird species re-establishment, re-introductions or supplementation as well as habitat restoration and rehabilitation have been reported in the*

region. No progress has been reported in the steps to phase out the use of lead shot for the hunting of waterbirds.

57. The African Waterbird Census (AfWC) coordinated by Wetlands International is ongoing in the region. Data from this waterbird and wetland monitoring scheme is collected around the months of January and July. Most of these countries contribute to this scheme, but consistency of data gathering varies from country to country and year to year. For the last two years, Somaliland and Mayotte contributed data to AfWC for the first time.

58. There is a push to increase availability of electricity in Africa, hence infrastructure development in the area of powerlines and wind turbines are increasing, which will have an impact on migratory waterbirds.

## **Northern Africa**

59. Mr. Azafzaf reported of several conservation actions in the past years, the most important being the designation of further Ramsar sites, e.g. in Tunisia and Algeria as well as in Libya; the process to designate more sites is ongoing. Several Species Action Plans were being implemented for 15 species listed under CMS; most conservation actions carried out are for the protection of waterbirds. Other activities in North Africa and in the Mediterranean Sea were the creation of two partnership networks involved in monitoring and evaluation, the first of which is the Observatory of Mediterranean Wetlands and the main organisations involved are Tour du Valat in France, the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands and MedWet as well as governments and NGOs in North Africa, e.g. Association “Les Amis des Oiseaux” (AAO), the BirdLife Partner in Tunisia. The second is for the conservation of Mediterranean Small Island and marine birds (PIM), which is led by the Conservatoire du Littoral in France.

## **North and Southwestern Europe**

60. With the help of a presentation, Mr. Stroud reported that most of the countries in his region had already joined the Agreement with the exception of Canada, Greenland, Iceland, Andorra and Lichtenstein. A significant factor was that apart from Norway, Switzerland and Monaco, all countries in the region were members of the European Union and thus shared a common legal framework for many aspects of environmental management with obligations under the Birds and Habitats Directives. Key issues included, in terms of site protection, the EU Natura 2000 Network, which remained incomplete in some countries and was an issue for policy debate, and the classification of marine Special Protection Areas (SPAs) particularly for seabirds and divers. Many countries had good networks of nationally protected sites; however there are no good audits of the content of those networks on a national level, i.e. numbers of birds, which should be reflected on in future. There had not been a uniform application of the Birds Directive in the past, although this had improved in recent years. The Birds and Habitats Directives provided a strong legal basis for the conservation and management of Natura 2000 sites. Pressures on these sites however included the continued impacts of development, including transport infrastructures such as roads, shipping and airports.

61. One major issue throughout the EU was the impact of agricultural policies, particularly on breeding waterbirds due to the intensification of farmed areas. Lead in wetlands was still a major issue although good progress had been made in the region. Alien invasive species were also an issue in the region, for example the Ruddy Duck, which had been introduced from the Nearctic into the UK; a major LIFE Project-funded programme to control, reduce and eventually eradicate them from the UK was being successful. A recent meeting convened in France highlighted the urgent need to control and reduce numbers in continental Europe. The implications of climate change had been raised by some Contracting Parties. An example was the distributional change of a number of waterbird species from the west to the east coast of the UK and from there to continental Europe. Such changes have major implications for the designation and management of protected sites and are starting to influence policy debates. Whilst there has been concentration in the region on key priority issues, the status of many species continues to decline. Ultimately this was caused by lack of influence by the conservation sector with economic sectors of governments, and which were the driving force behind many policy changes impacting on conservation measures for waterbirds in North-Western Europe (and indeed for all other regions).

## Western Africa

62. Mr. Mshelbwala reported that Parties to AEWA in the Western African region continued to implement the Agreement under very stringent conditions. Due to the high population, the demand for land is very high and most of the important wetlands had already been impaired, many of them silted. Especially Lake Chad, which was a major wintering ground for migratory waterbirds, had been reduced to a small volume. A Lake Chad Basin Commission consisting of representatives from Niger, Nigeria, Cameroon and Chad had already been established to see what could be done to salvage this wetland for conservation and the livelihood of those inhabitants dependent on it. The needs in many countries were manifold and initiatives depended very much on funding from outside the region.

63. He reported on the very serious problem regarding invasive weeds in Lake Chad, blocking the river system and causing flooding in villages and subsequently curbing the implementation of two wetlands projects. This had grown to be a real dilemma. The River Niger basin had a commission to try and salvage as much as possible; several dams had been established for sustaining waterflow. Apart from these two major water systems, several other major lakes and reservoirs were under very serious threat. Mr. Mshelbwala reported that it was an ongoing struggle to make progress in the field of conservation as a whole, due to the competing needs of the countries. He was, however, happy to report that the WOW capacity initiative was on and there would be a Meeting of the Board in early May, which should help to address some manpower needs in the sub-region. He concluded by reporting that several countries were in the process of ratifying AEWA.

## Southern Africa

64. Mr. Anderson reported that feedback from the Contracting Parties in the Southern African region had been poor so he would compile a written report and submit it to Secretariat. He thanked the Technical Committee for his selection as Regional Representative. Due to his recent appointment as Director of Birdlife in South Africa there had been little time to dedicate to his Technical Committee tasks. He went on to report that there were 15 Range States in Southern Africa of which 5 were Contracting Parties. One ongoing project related to the coordination of waterbird counts, which was conducted in midsummer and midwinter by the University of Cape Town, Avian Demography Unit (ADU). The Important Bird Areas (IBA) project has been rekindled in South Africa on his initiative and discussions were ongoing with some NGOs on developing a sensitivity map for windfarms to be used by the windfarm industry. The implementation of SSAPs continued to be a problem because although documents existed, there was little or no actual implementation happening.

65. Mr. Anderson had approached Mr. Brooks Childress with regard to the implementation of the SSAP for the Lesser Flamingo in Southern Africa.

66. The Mallard eradication programme would start soon and activities were ongoing with regard to the birds and environmental change partnership with the South African National Biodiversity Institute. In addition, the first phase of the Southern African Bird Atlas project would be completed at the end of the year. Information from this and from the previous project would be used to assess the distribution of birds. A further project was the avian influenza programme conducted by Prof. Graham Cummings from the University of Capetown, which had led to a number of publications. Mr. Anderson went on to report on the deep concerns regarding developments, which were increasing at an unprecedented rate, particularly mining, which was very severe in wetlands. Discussions were ongoing with the Ministry of Environmental Affairs and Tourism.

<p>67. Mr. Anderson concluded by reporting that Ramsar sites had been affected as a result. He confirmed that he would submit a more comprehensive report after the meeting in consultation with the relevant Contracting Parties.</p>
--

## Eastern Europe

68. Mr. Khomenko reported that he had recently signed a contract with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) in Rome and had unfortunately therefore not had the time to compile a regional report. He informed the TC that he would forward his report.

## Southwestern Asia

69. Mr. Jaradi reiterated the problem mentioned by the other regional Representatives of getting information from the AEWA Focal Points in his region and requested the Secretariat to inform and urge the Contracting Parties of the regions that one of their tasks is to collect information on the implementation of AEWA.

He reported that in the Southwestern Asian region only Cyprus, Israel, Lebanon, Syria, Jordan and Uzbekistan were Contracting Parties. He had received information from Jordan, Syria and Lebanon; all 3 countries had specific policies and legislations in place. The protection and conservation of species were the focus of activities. Recently Syria had published the first book of birds, which represented the first study for 20 years especially with regard to threatened species. Lebanon and Jordan had also carried out a listing of birds. Site and habitat conservation was being carried out in a number of ways, e.g. the recently active research for Important Bird Areas (IBAs) by BirdLife International led to a declaration of some sites to be protected including wetlands. One very important wetland in Lebanon was privately owned and could not be declared as a reserve by law so it was added to another biosphere reservation as a transition zone.

70. Legislation on the prohibition and regulation of taking of threatened birds in columns A and B of the Action Plan was in place in Lebanon and Jordan. Mr. Jaradi reported that he is a Member of National Council of Hunting in Lebanon and that while making applications for law the AEWA, Ramsar and IUCN lists were adopted so that the respective species were being strictly protected. Although the methods of bird taking were also regulated by law, law enforcement was generally very poor in the region. There was also a definite lack of awareness-raising measures. The introduction of non-native waterbirds was not widely known to be a problem and therefore not tackled seriously. The only SSAP being given attention to was the one for the Bald Ibis, which was being tracked and monitored in Syria. The majority of Parties were making good progress with regard to the development of a national network of sites. Two projects were being implemented, one in the area of sustainable hunting and another on the mainstreaming of migratory bird conservation into key productive sectors for which an inception workshop was planned to take place soon. Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) was being conducted in Jordan and Lebanon and presumably also in Israel.

## Central Europe

71. In her capacity as Regional Representative for Central Europe, Ms. Kralj reported on the following issues in the Central European region:

1. Number of Contracting Parties in the region / number of Range States in the region. New accessions since the previous TC meeting. Actions by the regional representative to persuade non-parties to ratify the Agreement.

72. The region of Central Europe consists of 19 Range States, 10 of which are Contracting Parties. Recently, Kosovo<sup>3</sup> showed interest in joining AEWA and the representative from the Ministry of Environmental and Spatial Planning had requested Ms. Kralj to inform the Secretariat about their intention.

2. Number of Range States (Parties and non-Parties) that provided feedback for this report.

73. The first questionnaire was sent out in February to all Parties and Non-Contracting Parties for whom contacts were available, and a reminder was sent in March. Seven Parties responded: Czech Republic, Italy, Hungary, Slovenia, Bulgaria, Macedonia, and Croatia, as well as for the first time the Non-Contracting Party Montenegro and Kosovo. Slovenia had appointed a Technical Focal Point, Mr. Andrej Hudoklin from the Institute of the Republic of Slovenia for Nature Conservation, while Slovakia is in the process of changing its Focal Point for AEWA; however it is still not clear who will take over this duty. All countries reported several activities, except Kosovo and Macedonia. The latter reported about the lack of funds but also about low awareness and lack of concern from the responsible bodies.

3. Activities to implement the Single Species Action Plans relevant to the region

74. The preparation of two national Action Plans was reported: for the Lesser White-fronted Goose in Hungary (in 2009) and for the Dalmatian Pelican in Montenegro. In Hungary, the Pochard became protected as of 27 June 2008, partly to prevent unintentional shooting of the Ferruginous Ducks. In Croatia, a draft

---

<sup>3</sup> The self-declared Republic of Kosovo is, to date, not recognised as an independent and sovereign state by the United Nations.

regional Action Plan for the Corncrake for Odransko polje was prepared, and a National Action Plan was planned to be finalised in 2009.

75. Hungary had paid compensation for delaying mowing for the Corncrake and stopping farming activities during the breeding time for the only pair of Black-winged Pratincoles known to breed in Hungary. Slovenia and the Czech Republic reported the continuation of the agro-environmental scheme for the Corncrake, monitoring measures as well as an intensive ringing programme.

76. Bulgaria reported the designation of most of the key sites for Corncrake, White-headed Duck, Ferruginous Duck, Great Snipe, and Black-winged Pratincole as Special Protection Areas (SPAs). Monitoring activities were being carried out by NGOs on White-headed Duck and Ferruginous Duck.

4. Emergency situations (extreme cold, drought, toxic or oil spills, etc.) that have happened and affected waterbirds and/or their habitats since the last TC meeting and response to them.

77. Emergency situations were reported from Bulgaria and Slovenia: In Bulgaria, the extreme cold along the Black Sea coast caused higher mortality than usual due to the freezing of some of the key wetlands (most affected were Coot and Mute Swan). The same situation was reported for the last period. In Slovenia, very high tides in the winter 2008/09 damaged dikes and canals in salt pans Sečovlje (SPA). The breeding season is now endangered, because the water level cannot be managed in an adequate way to assure breeding conditions for targeted bird species.

5. New or major ongoing waterbird species re-establishment (reintroduction, supplementation) initiatives.

78. Bulgaria reported the restocking of Mallards carried out by hunting organizations, but with a high mortality of the released birds due to inappropriate methods used.

6. Activities on eradication or other types of action regarding alien species.

79. The occurrence of alien waterbird species is generally insignificant in the whole region. Hungary: measures were taken with regard to invasive plant species with the aim of improving waterbird habitats. A list of invasive animal species is being prepared to plan future measures, listing of Canada Geese *Branta canadensis*, Egyptian Geese *Alopochen aegyptiacus* and Ruddy Ducks *Oxyura jamaicensis*.

7. New or major ongoing activities on habitat (site) inventory, conservation or restoration and rehabilitation of waterbird habitats.

80. The restoration of major wetlands was reported from Bulgaria and Hungary. The detailed inventory of 114 Bulgarian Important Bird Areas (IBA) had been published. In Montenegro, the Tivat salt pans, already designated as an IBA, were protected as a Special flora & fauna reserve in November 2008. A restoration project at the only Redshank breeding habitat was successfully finished in Croatia in 2008. The new breeding site of the Ferruginous Duck in Slovenia was designated as an Important Bird Area and proposed as a Special Protection Area in 2008. Croatia was continuing with the development of its Natura 2000 network.

8. Progress of the region in phasing out the use of lead shot for hunting in wetlands.

81. A ban is already in force in Italy and Hungary. In the Czech Republic a ban on the use of lead shot for hunting of waterfowl will come into force on 31 December 2010 according to the Czech Hunting Act. Bulgaria reported that appropriate measures were taken on legislative and administrative level, but with insufficient law enforcement. No progress was reported from other countries. In 2008, Hungary carried out a review on implementation through a questionnaire to all nature conservation authorities. The results confirm that in addition to the most important wetlands listed by the ministerial decree, the use of lead shot was prohibited by the authorities in most of the other wetlands important for waterbirds.

9. New or major ongoing research and monitoring activities on waterbirds and waterbird habitats.

82. Most countries (including Montenegro) reported mid-winter bird counts (IWC) and monitoring of qualifying species for Natura 2000 in SPAs or IBAs. Kosovo joined the monitoring of waterbirds organized by FAO. Intensive monitoring of waterbird populations at key sites was reported by Hungary and the Czech Republic; the project in Hungary focused on the preparation of monitoring in the SPA network.

83. The results of long-term monitoring of waterbirds in the most important sites of the Czech Republic were elaborated and published last year. Waterbird numbers were monitored in four regions for several decades at monthly intervals. Reasons for recorded changes in trends and numbers for particular species were analyzed.

Some recommendations for management of sites are also given. Two other projects are ongoing in the Czech Republic: "Long-term changes of numbers and distribution of waterbirds in the Czech Republic in relation to climate and environmental changes (2007-2011)" and "The influence of disturbance on summer and autumn gathering places of Greylag Goose". Under the latter project, the influence of hunting, traffic and distribution of feeding places on numbers and distribution of geese was analyzed. In Croatia, ducks and coots were monitored throughout the year in the Nature Park Lonjsko polje with the purpose of determining hunting quotas for game species.

10. New or major ongoing education and information activities on waterbirds, waterbird habitats and the Agreement.

84. The Czech Republic published "Results of long-term monitoring of waterbirds in southern Moravia and southern Bohemia (Czech Republic)" and the first volume of the yearbook "Aythya", devoted to the topic of waterbird monitoring, research and conservation in the Czech Republic. In Hungary, The Wild Goose Festival in Tata, a kind of "bird fair", was organised for the eighth time in November 2008, with around four thousand visitors enjoying presentations on this Ramsar site, and the spectacle of approximately 20,000 wild geese.

85. Many local education and public awareness activities were reported from Bulgaria, including ongoing activities in the Education Centre 'Poda' near Burgas. Montenegro organized the promotion of 13 IBA: 6 movies were produced about them and shown on state TV. In Montenegro, The Flyway Conference had recently taken place, co-organized by Euronatur, aiming at stressing the importance of the Adriatic coast for migratory birds.

11. Problematic cases threatening waterbirds or their habitats (e.g. infrastructural developments, changes in legislation, etc.).

86. The planned or already realized, large-scale development of tourist infrastructure in major wetland areas was reported from Bulgaria and Montenegro. The situation in Bulgaria seems to be very problematic with reports about building tourist infrastructure and windparks in globally important sites along the Bulgarian Black Sea coast. BirdLife Bulgaria had approached the EU legal authorities to react against the Bulgarian government for violation of the EU nature Directives.

87. Hungary: A serious waterbird conservation problem is emerging due to the conflicting situation with the Great Cormorant. At present, no culling method seemed to be effective in controlling the population. This is an important issue as fish farms provide some of the most important waterbird habitats in Hungary, and their economic failure and potential conversion into other land use could have very serious effects on waterbird populations. In Croatia and Slovenia, gravel extraction on the River Drava poses a threat to Little and Common Terns.

12. Extent of use of the AEWA Conservation Guidelines by the parties (please check for the AEWA Conservation Guidelines as per Section 3 of Annex 2)

88. The Hungarian waterbird monitoring programme covering 41 important wetlands follows the AEWA Guidelines for a waterbird monitoring protocol. Also, the Guidelines on the preparation of National SSAPs for migratory waterbirds will be taken into consideration during the preparation of the Lesser White-fronted Goose (*Anser erythropus*) NSSAP.

13. Any other information:

89. Following CMS Resolution 7.4, the Italian Ministry for the Environment approved detailed guidelines to prevent the impact of power-lines on birds. These guidelines give information on the measures to be adopted to protect birds against electrocution and collision, considering both the existing towers and parts of medium-voltage transmission lines (to be modified) and the new ones (to be adequately planned). They also encourage agreements among protected areas and power-line constructors/operators, following a standardised protocol.

90. Referring to the interest of Kosovo in becoming a Party to AEWA, Mr. Lenten explained that its independence and sovereignty had not been acknowledged by the United Nations so this issue would have to wait.

91. Mr. Kanstrup thanked the Regional Representatives for the reports which, despite all the positive feedback continued to give the overall impression that Governments were not aware of the importance of the Agreement and what it involved. He felt this was a fundamental issue, which should be duly addressed.

92. As an addition to the report on North- and Southwestern Europe, Mr. Kanstrup reported that he was Chair of the Wadden Sea Forum Goose Management Group and that this Group was trying to set up a management plan, including agro-environmental schemes to cope with the explosion of geese in the area. He would continue to report to the TC on the development of the management plan. He went on to point out another important issue being the situation in Albania, where he took part in a World Bank mission, working with local hunting communities. He reported that the biodiversity situation in Albania, as in fact in many of the Balkan countries, was extremely worn down and that input from the international conservation community was badly needed.

93. Mr. Lenten concurred that regional reporting was a problem throughout the MEAs. He intended to contact the Focal Points in the AEWA region and inform them of the contact details of their respective Regional Representatives and urge them to report to that person, thus enabling the Technical Committee to get a better and more realistic picture of how the Agreement is being implemented in the regions.

94. In response to an enquiry by Mr. Anderson, Mr. Dereliev reported that a template was available on the TC Workspace together with the lists of appointed Technical Focal Points.

95. The Chair reiterated the difficulties encountered with regard to obtaining feedback from the Contracting Parties. She stressed that personal contacts were important and urged all the Regional Representatives to establish and use their contacts. She proposed allocating a further month to give the Regional Representatives more time to obtain feedback and to incorporate this in their reports, which should then be submitted to the Secretariat.

96. Referring to the site issues mentioned in the regional reports, Mr. O'Sullivan went on to report on the Implementation Review Process and that although the Standing Committee (StC) was taking the leading role in this; it was also important to discuss the TC's role in advising the StC on sites' issues. Thus the information available to the Regional Representatives of the Technical Committee should be fed through to the Standing Committee in a timely manner to enable appropriate action to be taken.

97. Upon the request of Mr. Lenten, a small Working Group met and discussed the TC's role in this new process, particularly from the point of view of limited resources.

#### **Extraordinary Agenda Item: The role of the AEWA Technical Committee in the Implementation Review Process (IRP)**

98. Mr. O'Sullivan presented a first draft of proposals on how the Technical Committee should deal with issues coming to light, for finalisation by the Secretariat. This included a list of situations, where the IRP should apply: threats to sites of (high) importance for waterbirds; direct threats to significant numbers of a waterbird, or waterbirds; and matters of policy of key importance. An issue for possible use of the IRP could be notified by a Government of an AEWA Party, a Regional Representative on the Technical Committee or Standing Committee or another organisation such as an MEA or NGO.

99. The role of the TC was defined as being one to comment and advise, using the TC Workspace, on whether the use of IRP was appropriate and, if so, to request the Secretariat to inform the Standing Committee. The TC should have a role in drafting the formal notification to the relevant government, and, in due course, comment on any response from the government.

100. The Secretariat should be allowed flexibility for dealing with urgent cases, by contacting the Standing Committee, or in exceptional cases, the government concerned, first, and informing the TC as soon as possible. The first step of the procedure could be agreement from the Party concerned, followed by the identification of an appropriate consultant/expert, a visit to the country and consultation with key stakeholders. Finally the expert could, in consultation with the Secretariat, produce a timely report and circulate this to the TC, StC and finally to the government. According to the role of AEWA, species issues

should be tackled first, a good example could be the taking of Sociable Lapwing in Syria. A standard format for the information needed for the TC should be drafted by the Secretariat and distributed to the TC for comments. The Format could be placed on the AEWA website and may be used to initiate an enquiry. As there was no budget for this, funds would need to be sought for this process.

101. Mr. Dereliev confirmed that an information pro-forma would be drafted and distributed for comments soon.

102. Mr. Hughes remarked on the issue of flagging priority species and suggested the Ruddy Duck issue in this context.

103. Mr. O'Sullivan agreed that this was a priority issue but pointed out that the TC already had the remit from MOP4 to deal with this so there would be no need to use the IRP mechanism in this case.

104. Mr. Lenten reported that he had recently received the information that the Netherlands had started to eradicate the Ruddy Duck.

105. After some discussion, and based on the clear mandate by MOP4 in Resolution 4.5, the TC decided to request the Secretariat to take active measures on the issue of the Ruddy Duck.

106. Mr. Dereliev concurred that this was a clear mandate by MOP4. He added that this issue should be handled in conjunction with a meeting of the Working Group for the White-headed Duck SSAP, which should be convened in the near future.

107. Mr. Hughes remarked that a LIFE meeting in connection with the end of the eradication programme in the UK, taking place in Spain in 2010, may be a good opportunity to convene a meeting of the Working Group.

108. After further discussion, the TC requested the Secretariat to draft an official letter to the Governments of the Netherlands and France on the issue of the eradication of the Ruddy Duck, requesting them to take urgent action, according to the clear mandate in Resolution 4.5.

109. Mr. Dereliev reiterated the issue of the Sociable Lapwing in Syria and underlined the fact that this was a strong issue for the IRP, which the Secretariat would like to pursue by approaching BirdLife Middle East to review the situation in Syria. The TC agreed that the Secretariat should pursue this issue as soon as the template for IRP initiation had been approved by the TC.

## **Agenda item. 11 Current status regarding implementation of the International Implementation Tasks 2009-2016**

110. Mr. Dereliev introduced document TC 9.7 *Current status of the implementation of the AEWA International Implementation Tasks 2009 – 2016*.

111. This document included the list of IITs as adopted by MOP4 with the addition of short implementation reports, where progress had been made since 1 January 2009. Voluntary contributions had not been forthcoming to support the implementation of these tasks; the main reason for this had been the worldwide economic recession, which had also had an impact on the accession of new parties, many of which had put their accession procedures on hold; this global recession would ultimately have an impact on the implementation of the Agreement.

### IIT 1 – Implement existing international single species action plans (AP 2.21, 7.4)

112. Mr. Dereliev was happy to be able to report on some positive progress with regard to the implementation of SSAPs. The SSAP of the Lesser White-fronted Goose had been recently approved at MOP4 and Norway and Germany had provided funding for the post of Coordinator; the new Coordinator would start in early May. Fundraising for activities was underway and grant applications were in the pipeline. This Action Plan represented an exemplary implementation process because of the strong funding

on the part of the Range States, which was vital for successful implementation. He went on to report that there was a Working Group in place for both the critically endangered Sociable Lapwing and the Black-winged Pratincole, which were being considered together due to their similar breeding habitats. The large number of Sociable Lapwings being hunted and killed every year in Syria posed a serious threat and was leading to a decline in the population. With the support of AEWA and the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB), a Coordinator based in central Asia was funded for the first year and funds had now been secured for a new Coordinator in Kazakhstan. A very successful workshop was recently held in Almaty, convened under the umbrella of AEWA and CMS, attended by experts and government representatives from the Range States. The new Action Plan also covered the Eastern Flyway, including India, which was a Range State of CMS. The Action Plan for the Sociable Lapwing was currently being revised and would hopefully be approved by the AEWA Standing Committee and the CMS Scientific Committee intersessionally and launched in early 2010. The Darwin Initiative from the UK had provided crucial funds for a follow-up project, which would focus on flyways and involve satellite tagging and monitoring.

113. The Red-breasted Goose is a species where Range States were not providing funds for action. The Coordinator based in Romania was funded by several organisations; the RSPB, WWT, BirdLife Netherlands and AEWA. The Action Plan was being revised and the revision process would be extended from the EU-level to the flyway level under the AEWA-umbrella.

114. The implementation of the Northern Bald Ibis Action Plan was led by BirdLife International. Some implementation was taking place; a meeting, which took place in 2008 in Turkey, decided that the Syrian population should be supplemented by birds from the Turkish captive flock. Hunting was a major issue along the flyway. The Western population in Morocco, which largely disperses in the non-breeding season, was nevertheless being monitored by the authorities in Morocco and by the BirdLife Partner in Spain.

115. All coordination mechanisms mentioned are run by expert groups and are due to be revised in the light of the ToR, which were to be discussed later on in the meeting. The Secretariat hoped to establish more coordination mechanisms for further plans. Because of limited resources the focus would be on the highest priority species.

IIT 2 Develop new international single species action plans (AP 2.2.1, 7.4).

116. The Action Plan for the Endangered Greenland White-fronted Goose was drafted 18 years ago but never formally agreed by the Range States. Scottish Natural Heritage had recently re-opened the process and convened an international workshop in February 2009. The population has only four Range States: Greenland, Iceland, UK and Ireland. As these are not all AEWA Contracting Parties, a final decision about the legal framework for the Action Plan was still being considered.

117. For the Slaty Egret, a Southern African species classified as Vulnerable, steps were being taken for the development of a SSAP. This was one of the species at the top of the priority list for Action Planning as adopted by MOP4. BirdLife Botswana had agreed to compile this plan and would provide a budget estimate for fund-raising purposes.

118. The implementation in the case of many of the current Action Plans was severely hampered due to the lack of necessary resources, thus fewer Action Plans would be initiated in future.

IIT 12 – Developing guidance to avoid or mitigate the impacts of extractive industries on habitats of importance for waterbirds (AP 4.3.1)

119. A joint desk study would be undertaken in collaboration with the Ramsar Scientific and Technical Review Panel (STRP), for which a grant had already been received. Mr. Stroud had drafted ToR to be distributed to the delegates later during the meeting. The products would be tabled at the Ramsar COP and the AEWA MOP in 2012.

IIT 15 - Survey work in poorly-known areas

120. A grant was received from Germany and forwarded to Wetlands International Headquarters to fill funding gaps in the International Waterbird Census (IWC). Funding has been provided on an annual basis also in the form of matching funds for the WOW project.

121. Thus progress could be reported in 4 out of 31 IIT projects only. Mr. Dereliev asked the TC members to help with fundraising wherever possible; all the tasks listed deserved attention but as also decided by MOP4, priority should be given to enable the completion of IIP covered under the WOW project, which was the major initiative within the AEWA area. Any voluntary contribution to tasks marked as matching funds to the WOW project would be very welcome. On behalf of the Secretariat, Mr. Dereliev offered support with the preparation of any necessary documentation for grant application.

122. Mr. Lenten added that a grant application with the EU was still outstanding and that he was hoping for a positive signal soon.

123. Mr. Krabbe remarked on the priorities for developing Species Action Plans, e.g. in the case of the Bittern, where an EU Action Plan already existed – he asked about the necessity of extending it to the full range as the population had, according to new data, increased. The same applied to the Brent Goose; he suggested that the Light-bellied Brent Goose could have a higher priority.

124. Mr. Dereliev thanked Mr. Krabbe for his feedback and reported that the Bittern was not a priority species for Action Planning; it was listed here together with those species for which an Action Plan on EU level already existed. In terms of the Agreement an EU Species Action Plan was considered as being a national Action Plan as the EU was a Party to the Agreement and thus seen as one unit. He added that the Brent Goose would be dealt with in the next Agenda item.

## **Agenda item 12. AEWA Single Species Action Plans**

### **a. Progress in implementation on and development of SSAPs**

125. Mr. Dereliev reported on the case of the Species Action Plan for the Dark-bellied Brent Goose, which was initiated by the Secretariat in the 1990s but never finished. A desk study had been commissioned to ALTERRA, Netherlands and NERI in Denmark on the effect of hunting on the mortality of Brent Geese. Although the deadline was over and this study had not been delivered, Mr. Dereliev reported that progress had, nevertheless, been made and that a draft paper would be ready in July 2009. The Working Group established for the development of this Action Plan could make a decision on how to proceed on the basis of the results of this paper.

126. Mr. Stroud suggested convening a meeting of the Working Group in August 2009 at the latest, in order to finalise the plan without any further delays.

127. Mr. Harradine, who had been involved from the outset, supported Mr. Stroud's suggestion and confirmed that the population been decreasing. He added that the hunting community was considerably interested in the outcome of this study and that the Dark-bellied Brent Goose lent itself to exploring ways of management in certain populations. He concluded that every effort should be made to make progress on this issue in the short-term.

128. Mr. Dereliev went on to report on Adaptive Harvest Management, which, according to the AEWA Strategic Plan should be prepared for at least 2 populations within the next decade. This was a process, which was already quite common in North America but not in Europe. He reported on a recent meeting with Jesper Madsen, Institute of Nature Conservation and Arctic Research in Denmark, who would like to assist in initiating such a management plan for the Svalbard-breeding population of the Pink-footed Goose, which was causing problems to farmers in Norway due to its growing population. Norway, Denmark, Belgium and the Netherlands are being approached as the Range States of this species. On the whole, this was a challenging undertaking, as the species is being hunted in Norway and Denmark, whereas the other Range States are investing in the conservation of its habitats. This very well studied population could, however, set a standard for Adaptive Harvest Management in Europe. The Secretariat would inform the TC of progress of this initiative.

129. Mr. Hughes commented on the issue of prioritising the production of future Species Action Plans and the respective use of resources. Whereas, with regard to resources, the focus should be on the most threatened species, mainly to promote the flyway approach to conservation, Mr. Hughes felt that AEWA

should also endorse Action Plans with a more favourable conservation status as these provided the framework for conservation action; he referred to the East Canadian High Arctic Light-bellied Brent Goose, which migrates from Canada to Ireland and for which the existing Action Plan provides the framework for conservation measures.

130. Mr. Nagy remarked that there had been no mention of activities in connection with the Eurasian Spoonbill Action Plan, which was being successfully implemented. He went on to report that Wetlands International had initiated an Action Plan for the non-breeding population of the Bewick Swan in cooperation with WWT and the IUCN/Wetlands International Swan Specialist Group under the framework of the Dutch Government Implementation Agency. The Action Plan workshop would take place in St. Petersburg later in 2009. This is an example of a follow-up to the WOW project in that this plan promotes twinning with site managers from different parts of the flyway. Mr. Nagy went on to introduce a new, long-awaited publication, the Wader Atlas, to be launched in London on 20 May 2009.

131. Referring to the issue of prioritisation, Mr. Dereliev confirmed that the Secretariat can only concentrate on using available resources for Action Planning for higher priority species. The Secretariat was often approached by NGOs and other governmental organisations interested in initiating Action Plans within the AEWA framework; however the initiators should be ready to take up the co-ordination and facilitate implementation within the respective Range States.

132. Mr. Kanstrup endorsed that approach. The need for action should remain the priority; however it was clear that not only decreasing species but also increasing species, as in the case of some of the goose populations, were in need of management so that both priorities should be kept in mind.

#### **b. Working Groups for coordination of the implementation of SSAPs**

133. Mr. Dereliev introduced document TC 9.8 *Draft generic Terms of Reference for working groups to coordinate the implementation of SSAPs*

134. Mechanisms had already been established for several Action Plans, i.e. for Red-breasted Goose, Sociable Lapwing and Black-winged Pratincole; these were based on expert groups, which had limitations with respect to implementation. Based on past experience, this mechanism had been revised and Terms of Reference had been developed. Mr. Dereliev asked the TC members to review the ToR and adopt them for further use by the Secretariat. The framework was a generic one, which could be adjusted to each individual Working Group. The relationship between the Secretariat and the coordinating organisation would be formalised by a Memorandum of Understanding to which the ToR would be attached. Sponsoring or co-sponsoring coordination by the AEWA Secretariat, funds permitting, would be complemented by a formal agreement.

135. The membership of the Working Groups to coordinate the implementation of Action Plans should mainly consist of governmental representatives and experts designated by the government; observers from organisations and individual experts could also be invited by the Chair. A Coordinator should ideally carry out his function in the form of a part-time or full time job based in one of the member-organisations in the Range States of the species. Each Range State should designate a Focal Point for the Working Group, which should meet at least every 3 years – other meetings could be organised back to back with international meetings. The report of each Working Group should be submitted for incorporation into the AEWA Report on the stage of preparation and implementation of SSAPs every 6 years. The Working Groups should also report to the Range States on the implementation in each country on a regular basis. The bottleneck was the financing, which should be the responsibility of the Range States of the species. The Secretariat could perhaps help in some cases but could not commit to regular financial support of the implementation of Action Plans so that funding had to be provided by the Range States or other conservation funds outside governments.

136. On behalf of the Danish TC Observer, Mr. Preben Clausen, Mr. Krabbe pointed out that the size of the Working Groups should be considered as they become inefficient if they are too big. He suggested a maximum of 10 members. In the case of species with a large number of Range States, regional representation could be established.

137. Mr. Dereliev referred to the problems the TC Regional Representatives had in obtaining vital feedback from all the Range States in their regions. Working Groups urgently needed feedback from the Range States in order to be effective in implementation. He added that the new SSAP format was based on a shortlist of those Range States holding the critical numbers of the respective populations so that the number was already limited in that way; however some species were widely distributed with more than 70 Range States and in order to run Working Groups efficiently, as many of the Range States as possible should be involved.

138. Mr. Nagy reiterated that the document reflects this concern in referring to the ‘*major Range States*’ i.e. those countries having a very important role in strengthening the status of the population or for managing the population. He welcomed the emphasis given to the state authorities because without their full involvement Action Plans had no value. One example of a large network was that for the Corncrake Working Group, whereby a Core Group was established to meet regularly and promote implementation. Another example of the importance of governmental involvement was that of the Lesser White-fronted Goose, which suffered under expert groups not reaching agreements and yet where progress could only be made with the full involvement of the respective governments.

139. Mr. O’Sullivan pointed out that reporting was referred to twice, once under *Remit* (second to last bullet) and again under *Reporting*, which could be misleading. He went on to point out that there was no mention of the Chairperson ensuring that this thorough paper was to be produced; this should perhaps be more clearly defined.

140. Mr. Harradine suggested that the remit should include a requirement of consistency in the production of SSAPs with the standard format tools and recommended guidelines.

141. Mr. Dereliev pointed out that the Secretariat would observe this requirement as the compilation of the Action Plans is the first step before the Working Group to coordinate its implementation is established. He went on to refer to Mr. Clausen’s concern about the size of Working Groups and reiterated that the countries represented would be restricted to those (key countries) where the respective SSAP requires specific action.

142. With regard to the remit point, facilitating internal and external communication, Mr. Stroud suggested adding ‘*facilitating with wider networks of specialists and other parties*’.

143. Mr. Harradine suggested adding a last bullet point with regard to communicating the successful implementation of a SSAP, whereby the reversal of a declining population was achieved, to a wider public.

144. Mr. Dereliev agreed and added that this would fit into external communication in a wider sense.

145. After consultation with Mr. O’Sullivan, the document was revised to incorporate the suggested amendments. Doc TC9.8 Rev1 was distributed and Mr. Dereliev explained the amendments

146. Regarding reporting, he observed that the reporting referred to in the remit was very basic using the National Reporting Format. The reporting referred to under the heading ‘*Reporting*’ on the second page of the document related to much more thorough reporting for inclusion in the general International Review on the Stage of Preparation and Implementation of Single Species Action Plans to the AEWA Meeting of the Parties, which would be compiled using a very comprehensive questionnaire. Thus these were two different types of reporting, without any overlapping as such.

147. Regarding the remit point whereby the Species Working Group should facilitate communication and the exchange of information amongst all stakeholders, the bullet point was amended to read:

“Facilitate internal and external communication and exchange of scientific, technical, legal and other required information, *including with other specialists and interested parties*”

148. The last amendment to the draft paper reflects Mr. Krabbe’s proposal on behalf of Mr. Clausen to limit the number of members in the working groups to make them more operational. After some discussion and reference to particular examples of species’ Working Groups, the heading and clarification were amended to read:

**“Countries forming the Working Group: [List of the core Range States required by the SSAP to take specific action]”**

149. The Meeting adopted the document Doc TC9.8 Rev1 subject to incorporation of the above-mentioned amendment.

**Agenda item 13. Update on avian influenza**

150. Document TC 9.9 *Operative paragraphs of Resolution 4.15 of relevance to the work of the Scientific Task Force on Avian Influenza and Wild Birds*

151. Mr. Dereliev informed the Meeting that this document would be presented by Mr. Stroud and preceded by a short presentation by Mr. Khomenko. He reported that the AEWA Secretariat was involved in the work of the Avian Influenza Task Force and was represented at the meetings and teleconferences.

152. Mr. Khomenko proceeded to give a short presentation under the title ‘*Searching for ghost host of HPAI H5N1*’. The presentation dealt with the following questions:

- Active surveillance did not help much in finding natural host/s of the virus;
- Seasonal Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza (HPAI) H5N1 incidence mismatches that of LPAI and backyard poultry population dynamics (why in winter, but not in fall?);
- Disease associated with waterfowl tends to occur and persist in (semi)-arid environments (why?);
- H5N1 invasions are associated with critical environmental conditions e. g. cold or drought (where it hides when they are over?);
- How H5N1 could have been silently introduced to the host population and spread so quickly?

After examining all the above-mentioned issues, a potential vector would have to be one, which fitted the following categories:

- Normally restricted to shallow (hyper)saline lakes;
- Rarely shares the habitat with other Antidae: (a) under the unusual environmental conditions, (b) during seasonal movements;
- Normally not hunted and rarely captured for surveillance;
- Highly congregative, nomadic movements, cold resistant ... occurs all over H5N1 range (except sub-Saharan Africa).

153. Mr. Khomenko came to the conclusion that Shelduck (*Tadorna tadorna*) was the only species that fitted such criteria. Freshwater Antidae could pick up the disease from the Shelducks; when infected birds were killed by hunters the virus could, in turn, be introduced to poultry, which could constitute the introductory mechanism. Shelducks feed on brine-shrimp *Artemia* cysts, which could have been the source of the disease as *Artemia* ponds in parts of China are fertilised by chicken manure. Thus the Eastern population of Shelducks may have been originally infected and then moved westwards following the migratory pattern of the Shelducks. Mr. Khomenko concluded that most of the dynamics observed could be explained by the movements of this species. If the disease reached East Africa, he considered that other species (e.g. Flamingo) which use similar hypersaline habitats might subsequently become a similar host.

154. The Chair thanked Mr. Khomenko for the interesting presentation.

155. Mr. Krabbe requested clarification on the transmission of the disease of the *Artemia* shrimp.

156. Mr. Khomenko explained that this was a small crustacean, which was found in extremely saline waters, had no predators and that the Shelducks relied on this resource. *Artemia* attracted birds and made them feed close to each other on *Artemia* or *Artemia* cysts. It was a filtrator so apparently the disease could have been mechanically transmitted from one bird to another.

157. Mr. Mshelbwala agreed that Mr. Khomenko's presentation provided interesting new information, however he was still concerned with regard to the explanation of outbreaks occurring in West Africa. The history of outbreaks jumped from Egypt to Nigeria avoiding several countries in between, whereas the disease had remained endemic in Nigeria. In Nigeria outbreaks were actually in poultry farms and not among free range stock. He agreed there must be a host reservoir somewhere but suggested that maybe other factors could be involved, such as feeding.

158. Mr. Khomenko concurred that there was no explanation for all the outbreaks of the disease but that once introduced it could be spread in a number of ways. Nigeria was, for example an interface of seasonal monsoons and arid country in the North. Flamingos or other species could be involved and again a mixture of factors such as ecosystem, hunting and the peaking of incidents during droughts should be considered.

159. Mr. Hughes asked if the AI Task Force planned to review contingency planning to take a more targeted approach to surveillance. He went on to ask if there was any evidence of the disease being present in live Shelduck or *Artemia*. Recent research had shown that the species most likely to transmit the disease could be dabbling ducks.

160. Mr. Khomenko answered that financial support was still lacking for testing this theory. He added that he would present the outline of the hypothesis to FAO in order to try and secure funding. Missions were already being planned for this purpose.

161. Referring to Mr. Mshelbwala's concern about the disease being endemic in Nigeria, Mr. O'Sullivan recalled that when the disease first emerged in Nigeria, the surprisingly high proportion of poultry trade in Nigeria came to light and the first official comments from Nigeria confirmed that poultry was being imported from Egypt, where the disease already existed at that time.

162. With reference to the hypothesis of a potential vectors for the disease, Mr. Anderson pointed out that Lesser Flamingos do not feed on crustaceans.

163. Mr. Khomenko noted that the *Artemia* factor may not necessarily be the key factor in the chain, it could, for example, be the hyperconcentration of birds, which also plays a role.

164. Mr. Stroud also thanked Mr. Khomenko for his informative overview and resulting hypothesis. The process of responding to outbreaks of Avian Influenza had been occupying many people during the past few years, not least the Task Force. In 2008, AEWA, Ramsar and CMS Resolutions on this issue were endorsed. As discussed at TC8, these were not identical in content but consistent and complementary. The Task Force on Avian Influenza brought together the relevant international parties. It had produced much guidance, particularly a comprehensive leaflet, which was available in six languages. In addition to regular teleconferences, two meetings of all those involved had taken place, in Nairobi in 2006 and Aviemore in 2007 so that contingency planning and risk assessment could take place. Ramsar CoP10 had endorsed a 'guide to HPAI guidance', which many stakeholders would find useful, particularly managers of wetland sites.

165. The media interest in avian influenza had quietened down recently but the disease continued to be endemic in parts of the Agreement area. As illustrated by Mr. Khomenko's presentation, much new research was being carried out and the results were being published. The next meeting of the Task Force would be convened towards the end of 2009; the agenda was being compiled. Mr. Stroud invited the TC members to suggest issues for the development of possible further guidance. Regarding the document TC 9.9, Mr. Stroud explained that the respective operative paragraphs of the three Resolutions had been brought together by theme and appropriate responses by the Task Force fleshed out.

166. In response to the question of a strategic review of surveillance, Mr. Stroud confirmed that this was a major theme for the up-coming AI Task Force meeting.

**Agenda item 14. IUCN Red List threat categories and their applicability to the listing of species in AEWA Table 1.**

167. Mr. Dereliev explained that this was a task under Working Group 3, however it had been requested to present the issue in plenary in order to be able to incorporate comments in the ensuing Working Group discussion. This was an issue, which emerged towards the end of MOP4 and was included in Resolution 4.11 *Amendments to the Annexes to the Agreement* as a task for the Technical Committee to clarify. The wording of the task was as follows:

*‘... requests the Technical Committee, in the light of the development of terminology used by the IUCN for Red Data Lists, to review, as a matter of priority, the applicability of the threat criteria, especially the Near Threatened IUCN Category, to the listing of populations in Table 1 and to present options for the amendment of Table 1 to be considered at the 5<sup>th</sup> Session of the Meeting of the Parties’* (operational para 8, c.).

168. Mr. O’Sullivan went on to introduce a discussion paper, which he had prepared on this subject and recently posted on the TC Workspace. He explained that there had been no opportunity for a formal discussion on the subject, which had been raised by BirdLife at MOP4 and that the paper represented a summary of the informal discussion at the time and since, on the question of the various possible interpretations of the Agreement’s intentions and role. It was clearly stated in the debate at MOP4 that this issue was of political significance as well as being technical in nature. Reviewing the outcome of the meeting where the Agreement was concluded, the AEWA species listed as “Endangered” and those listed as “Threatened” by IUCN were linked as both requiring strict protection. The term “Near Threatened” had, however not formed any part of the discussions during the conclusion of AEWA. Thus the question remained whether the AEWA category “Endangered” included “Near Threatened” species. It was hard to compare IUCN definitions with the much less formal wording of AEWA and CMS. A total of 31 Near Threatened populations of 17 AEWA species are listed; the majority of these would profit from having attention drawn to them.

169. Mr. Nagy reported that after examining the list and the species concerned he had concluded that any change in listing would apply to 3 species only.

170. Mr. Harradine commented that more time would be needed to consider the discussions outlined in the paper.

171. Mr. Stroud commented on the concept of the Near Threatened category as being those populations, which should be particularly closely monitored as they are subject to rapid decline. He suggested establishing a mechanism to give this list of species some additional visibility so that Parties are best placed to take action in the case of species deterioration.

172. Mr. Vié congratulated Mr. O’Sullivan on this comprehensive discussion paper and confirmed that the terminology under discussion was a recurrent problem within IUCN. The use of terms relating to ‘Favourable’ and ‘Unfavourable Conservation Status’ posed similar problems. He noted that BirdLife applied Near Threatened more vigorously than other organisations.

173. Mr. Kanstrup concluded that this issue should be considered further, also taking into account the implications for the Birds Directive and resulting changes in legislation.

174. The Chair summarised that the issue would be discussed with all its aspects within Working Group 3.

**Agenda items 15. – 18. consisted of meetings of the individual Working Groups (1 – 8), the results of which are noted in Agenda item 19.**

## Agenda item 19. Recapitulation of the Workshops of TC Working Groups 1-8

### Working Group 1 - Hunting and Trade

175. Mr. Mondain-Monval, who was heading this Working Group, reported that the tasks had been split up into those which may need outsourcing (tasks a, d, f, and e) and those, which could be dealt with within the Working Group. These were outlined in a presentation prepared by Ms. Lehmann.

#### Task 1a) Leadshot

176. Ms. Lehmann reported that the Working Group had come to the conclusion that the Secretariat should review the published literature relating to the impact of lead fishing weights on waterbird species; the resulting review would be circulated in 2010. The issue of the use of lead shot in terrestrial ecosystems was less important as the priority was on contamination in wetlands and the need to raise the awareness of hunters. Thus it was decided that no further research should be carried out in this case; however a list of AEWA species, which may potentially be affected would be compiled for further consideration by the TC.

177. Mr. Mondain-Monval invited Mr. Kanstrup to give a short presentation on a project he had initiated with regard to the lead shot issue and the wide-reaching impact of lead poisoning on ecosystems as a whole. As documented by the AEWA Secretariat in the review on the phasing out of lead shot, phase-out is unsatisfactory due to the lack of priority at a national level and the fact that resources were not being sufficiently allocated to the issue. Mr. Kanstrup stressed that the proven advantages of phasing out lead shot had to be documented and that the use of steel shot for clay shooting should be phased in quickly to give young hunters the experience they need. Further research had to be supported. The focus of this project was on compiling knowledge from literature and other sources, which was at present rather diffuse, and making it more readily available to the target groups. Mr. Kanstrup regretted the fact that funds had not as yet been acquired, he went on to invite the TC members to post their comments on this initiative and how it could be further developed.

#### Task 1d) Look-alike species and hunting

178. Mr. Mondain-Monval reported that FACE, CIC, BASC would take the lead on this issue and would look into possibilities for developing guidelines.

179. Mr. Middleton introduced the draft ToR for *Developing guidelines for dealing with the accidental shooting of look-alike species*. The background was illustrated by using the example of the Slender-billed Curlew often being confused with the Curlew. A list of look-alike species and their respective populations in Table 1 column A and also those listed in Table 1 column B, which warrant attention, should be compiled. He went on to stress that the final product should be translated and disseminated accordingly to ensure that it reaches the target group.

180. Mr. O'Sullivan suggested adding '*day shooting vs. night shooting*' to the point addressing risk issues.

181. Mr. Dereliev suggested adding '*behaviour*' before '*etc*'. in the bullet point relating to the set of criteria to be taken into account.

182. After some discussion, it was decided to change the term '*accidental hunting*', which could be misleading, to '*accidental shooting*'.

183. Mr. Dereliev requested indication of a timeframe for feedback from FACE, BASC, and CIC with regard to the possibility of developing these guidelines so that an eventual tender for outsourcing this task as well as fundraising could be organised in time.

184. Mr. Middleton confirmed that this could be provided by the end of June 2009.
---

Task 1f) AEWA Action Plan 2.1.2 (a) – hunting during pre-nuptial migration and reproduction periods.

185. Mr. Mondain-Monval reported that the experience already gained through the implementation of the EC Birds Directive could be the basis for devising a methodology for this task as it was impossible to produce the same amount of work for each species in a short period of time. Mr. Stroud offered to draft a paper by October 2009.

186. Mr. Dereliev underlined the importance of anchoring the conclusions of this paper in a Resolution, whereby the countries would be requested to produce a list of their migration periods for species by a certain deadline, in order to be able to apply it, when enforcing this part of the Agreement.

Task 1e) AEWA Action Plan para 2.1.2 (a) – taking causing unfavourable impact on conservation status

187. Ms. Lehmann reported that the Working Group had come to the conclusion that the deletion of the following wording should be recommended to the next MOP “*if the taking has an unfavourable impact on the conservation status of the population concerned*”, as this is not measurable, i.e. not backed by a comprehensive and internationally harmonised harvest data system in all countries and the verification of all data, and to rather extend para 2.1.3, whereby Parties may grant exemptions to the prohibitions laid down in paras 2.1.1 and 2.1.2, to allow for subsistence hunting.

188. The exact wording would be: “*and in the case of populations listed in Column B of Table 1 for the purpose of subsistence use within local communities*”. An explanatory paragraph would be added to explain what is meant by subsistence to read: “*for the sole purpose of providing for yourself, family or community*”, i.e. not for commercial objectives, only taking for survival.

189. Mr. Mondain-Monval suggested examining this together with the issue of traditional hunting and looking for a possibly already existing definition.

190. Mr. Nagy questioned whether subsistence hunting is sustainable. He felt that a better understanding was necessary to be able to make amendments and to be careful not to provide an open door for subsistence hunting and thereby discouraging governments to find alternative ways of supporting communities.

191. Mr. Kanstrup stressed that this had not been the intention of the Working Group and that subsistence hunting with *no unfavourable impact* was meant.

192. Mr. Mshelbwala stressed that this should be an interim position because by the time assessment of the respective situation had been done, it would have to be revised and a different approach adopted.

193. Mr. Middleton suggested adding a definition taken from the EU Birds Directive “*where no suitable alternative exists*”.

194. Mr. Lenten pointed out that in para 2.1.3 of the AEWA Action Plan, the exemptions were listed and the second to last sentence actually covered the issue of unfavourable impact: “*Such exemptions shall be precise as to content and limited in space and time and shall not operate to the detriment of the populations listed in Table 1.*”

195. Mr. Stroud noted that the first step should be a clear explanatory note for MOP, capturing the results of the discussion leading to a recommendation.

196. The Chair pointed out that subsistence is ongoing and cannot therefore be “*limited in time*” as specified for the exemptions in para 2.1.3.

197. Mr. Mshelbwala reiterated that if subsistence were to be assessed as being detrimental, it would have to stop, pending alternatives provided for the communities by the governments.

198. Mr. Nagy suggested that subsistence would fit under the definition 2.1.3 (d): “*to permit under strictly supervised conditions, on a selective basis and to a limited extent, the taking and keeping or other judicious use of certain birds in small numbers*” without any further addition.

199. Mr. Lenten suggested examining the addition of subsistence and the exact wording together with the legal experts.

200. Mr. Harradine suggested removing “*strictly supervised*” and noted that “*detrimental*” would require exact definition in this context.

201. Mr. Mshelbwala underlined that the African Parties would insist on the inclusion of subsistence under the exemptions.

202. Ms. Lewis pointed out that caution should be taken in taking out “*strictly supervised conditions*” because it would make the Action Plan more permissive.

203. After some further discussion, the Chair summarised that the intentions would need exact definition and that the legal experts should work on the wording, which could be done via the TC Workspace.

Task 1b) AEWA Action Plan para 2.1.1 – “long-established cultural practice”

204. Mr. Mondain-Monval introduced this task referring to the definition of the term ‘long-established cultural practice’ used in para 2.1.1 of the AEWA Action Plan, where hunting may exceptionally continue on a sustainable use basis for populations listed in Categories 2 and 3 in Column A. These populations are marked with an asterisk.

205. Ms. Lehmann reported that the Working Group had decided to keep the existing asterisks but not add any in future when populations are moved from column B to A.

206. Mr. Dereliev pointed out that this was not something that the TC could take a decision on; individual Parties had the right to propose an asterisk to a species in Column A, whereby the MOP made the ultimate decision. So there was no actual limit to this procedure.

207. Mr. Lenten referred to the history of the asterisk, which had been introduced in 1995 after long discussions. The background had been that hunting could be allowed in the cases of species/populations where it could improve the conservation status. He went on to explain that in practice, in accordance with the Agreement, the first step (when a species is moved from Column B to A) was to develop an Action Plan, which when adopted by MOP provided the basis for a decision on the hunting issue.

208. Ms. Lehmann added that according to the AEWA Action Plan, an international Species Action Plan is actually a requirement for asterisked species, where hunting is allowed. She suggested that this requirement could be incorporated in a Resolution to remind the Parties that this had to be the case.

209. Mr. Dereliev questioned the justification and application of the application of the term ‘long-established cultural practice’ in this context. Of the 4 populations with asterisks, none had an Action Plan in place although hunting was being practised; thus the respective Parties involved were not enforcing the Agreement properly.

210. Mr. Lenten reiterated that if a species was moved from Column B to A, the first step had to be to adopt an international Action Plan for that species and then make an informed decision on whether hunting should be allowed or not.

211. Mr. Nagy commented that for the 4 populations with asterisks, a management plan was required and if a species did move from Column B to Column A, it should be carefully examined as to what extent the level of hunting based on ‘long-established cultural practice’ related to other threats, i.e. other forms of taking. An Action Plan was an absolute prerequisite for determining when this definition could be applied.

212. Mr. Mondain-Monval referred to Mr. Dereliev’s above-mentioned observation and suggested using the asterisked White-backed Duck as a case test as there was no Action Plan in place for this species at present and it was probably being hunted.

213. Mr. Harradine agreed that hunting and other taking should be controlled by the Action Plan, which acted as a basis for a decision on whether hunting would be beneficial or not. The term used actually referred to long-established hunting practices – he was not sure if ‘*cultural*’ had any relevance in that context.

214. Mr. Dereliev concurred with Mr. Nagy on this issue confirming that the asterisk should not be extended to other species in future but should be considered as being exceptional (in the case of these 4 populations) at the time of drawing up the Agreement. There was however no text in the Action Plan indicating any kind of limitation of the use of the asterisk. This limit could be confirmed through a Resolution so that no further revision/definition of this term ‘long-established cultural practice’ would be necessary, as it would no longer apply.

215. Mr. Vié added that the focus should remain on the impact on the species population. The terminology was less relevant and could represent a risk in that it could provide an open door for abuse due to difficult definitions, as in this case.

216. Mr. Kanstrup asked if this implied that in the long-term, hunting of species in this completely protected list (Column A) would be prohibited without exception, even if hunting would benefit the conservation status of the species.

217. Mr. Dereliev replied that all Column A species were currently protected apart from these four exceptions, already mentioned.

218. Mr. Kanstrup referred to the example of the Curlew, which was a Near Threatened species with a population of millions of birds and asked if hunting would be banned for ever in this case.

219. Mr. Dereliev confirmed that the asterisk could be applied in future for a population moving to Column A, as hunting would be regarded as a factor contributing to the decline of that population.

220. After further discussion, Mr. Lenten concurred that it was clear that more thought was needed on the issue.

221. Mr. Stroud commented that the focus should be on sustainability, as some activities, although ‘long-established cultural practices’ were often far from sustainable. A term based on sustainability would be more appropriate.

222. Mr. Harradine suggested that a clearly set-out assessment of all the implications involved in the form of a paper on the issue would help inform a decision, which was obviously a complex one.

223. Replying to a question regarding a MOP Resolution leading to the removal of the asterisks currently in place, Mr. Lenten reported that the asterisks were originally brought in to allow hunting in the exceptional cases of originally six populations. In principle Column A populations are not huntable and according to the AEWA Action Plan an international Species Action Plan has to be in place as a basis for a decision, i.e. many countries are not in line with the Agreement. He went on to explain that an asterisk could only be removed if the population was moved from Column A to another Column.

224. Mr. Stroud remarked that it is within the mandate of a Contracting Party to make a recommendation to the MOP to remove an asterisk.

225. Mr. Dereliev confirmed that a proposal could be made; asterisked species identified at the time of the negotiation of the Agreement could be split up and additional text could be added to the Action Plan explaining what those exceptional cases could constitute, i.e. hunting would only be allowed under extremely strict conditions. In this way the contentious definition ‘long-established cultural practice’ could be avoided. This decision could only be taken at the MOP.

226. Mr. Lenten welcomed this suggestion and proposed that the Working Group should draft this text together with the legal experts and to keep it very rigid so that hunting would be allowed in very exceptional cases only.

227. Mr. Dereliev added that the term ‘long-established cultural practice’ would remain in the context of the asterisk species and be limited to those which were agreed upon during the negotiations for the Agreement. The additional paragraph to be drafted would define the very strict conditions under which any further exceptions could be allowed. The new text would be discussed at the next TC meeting.

228. The Chair summarised that the Secretariat would draft an appropriate text in close collaboration with the legal experts and post it on the TC Workspace for comments.

229. Mr. Mondain-Monval went on to explain that the Tasks

1c) *AEWA Action Plan para 2.1.3 (a-e) – exemptions and “other overriding public interests” (definition);*

1g) *AEWA Action Plan para 2.1.2 (b) “modes of taking” and*

1k) *Provide guidance to the Parties on how to implement para 4.1.1 regarding the principle of “sustainable use”*

would be dealt with in the context of Working Group 8 (Guidelines), in the form of additions to the Sustainable Harvest Guideline.

230. In conjunction with the definitions to be included in the guideline, Mr. Dereliev went on to reiterate that the Action Plan was a legally binding part of the Agreement Text, whereas the guidelines were not. Thus the clarifications suggested to be made in the guidelines would not necessarily be followed. The question still remained how this could be put into practice.

231. Mr. Lenten explained that it should be examined on a ‘case-by-case’ basis, which was the best option, a Resolution or an Amendment to the Action Plan etc.

232. Mr. Middleton suggested giving the guidance a legal standing by adding a reference to it in the Action Plan.

233. After some discussion on the difficulties relating to linking various documents in order to give the guidelines more force, it was clear that this would be very confusing for the Parties, particularly as a guideline was a document, which could be easily changed and the Action Plan was not, thus establishing a link between the two would not function.

234. Mr. Middleton suggested dealing with the additions to the guidelines first and then going on to decide on how to take this forward to MOP5.

235. After a short discussion, it was decided that the Working Group would follow this suggestion and discuss the guidelines before considering all the options mentioned for submission to MOP5 for approval, in the context of providing a legally binding basis for enforcement by the Parties.

Task 1i) AEWA Action Plan para 2.5.1 – non-native species “if they consider it necessary”

236. Mr. Mondain-Monval explained that there was a contradiction between the AEWA text and the AEWA Action Plan.

Agreement Text: Article III, 2, *To this end, the Parties shall: (g) prohibit the deliberate introduction of non-native waterbird species [...].*

AEWA Action Plan: Introductions: *Parties shall, if they consider it necessary, prohibit the introduction of non-native species of animals and plants...*

237. The TC recommended proposing the deletion of the above sentence from the Action Plan and submitting this amendment to MOP5 for adoption.

238. Following from this, Mr. Dereliev stressed the need for a written justification from the TC, as this was an amendment to the Annexes, which would have to be proposed by a Party.

239. Ms. Lewis and Mr. Hughes offered to draft this document.

Task 1j) AEWA Action Plan para 2.1.2 and 4.1 – reference to Column B and C populations

240. Mr. Mondain-Monval explained that this task involved providing advice to the MOP on how to amend the text of the Action Plan in the way that provisions on “hunting modes”, but also on limitations on hunting seasons as well as limits on taking, clearly refer to Column B and C populations (Resolution 4.3).

241. There was some concern that making modifications could be problematic for some Parties, especially in Africa. It was decided that the Secretariat would assess such amendments in consultation with the Parties outside the EU first and will report to the TC on the outcome.

242. Referring to the original discussion on the difference between A, B and C Column species when the Agreement was founded, Mr. Lenten stressed that the Secretariat would need to take a close look at this.

It was decided that Ms. Lehman and Ms. Lewis should examine the implications relating to the original idea of the Agreement, should additional text be added to Column C.

Task 1h) AEWA Action Plan para 2.1.2 - bag limits

243. Mr. Mondain-Monval reported that the Working Group had advised to wait for the coming conference on hunting bag monitoring, which will take place in autumn 2009. FACE would draft the paper and circulate it to the TC by January 2010.

**Working Group 2 - Re-establishment**

244. Mr. Vié, as chair of the WG, reported that the task was to establish guidance for re-establishment of AEWA waterbird species. It was agreed that this task would be outsourced and ToR were drafted for a consultant to take on this task. The duties of the contractor were split into the elaboration of the guidelines, reporting structure and establishing a standard set of evaluation criteria. The first draft should be submitted by the consultant to the Secretariat by 31 March 2011; the final draft was to be submitted to the Secretariat by 31 July 2011.

**Working Group 3 - Annexes**

Task a) Review ornithological data on the Little Tern (*Sterna albifrons*)

245. Mr. Khomenko, as chair of the WG, reported that according to the evidence submitted by Italy, there were sufficient grounds to include this population in Table 1. However the population sizes of the other remaining populations needed to be re-evaluated and Wetlands International had been approached to help with this. The timescale was still to be determined. Mr. Khomenko confirmed that he would take the lead on this issue and invited other TC members to join.

Task b) Review the geographical terms used in range descriptions of populations in Table 1

246. The following solutions were suggested: to divide the terms by following the official political scheme and to use wording in accordance with the biogeographical reality or change the geographical terms to biogeographical terms, adding footnotes to explain everything. Another suggestion was to provide the Contracting Parties with official notification about the changes being made and to seek their agreement. The final proposal would be to omit the geographical terms as such from the table and refer to relevant information sources such as WI's flyway atlases and the WOW web-site which has range maps for all species. This would avoid the need to explain complex distributions in a few words. A sub-Working Group would be established to define problematic definitions. Mr. Mshelbwala and Mr. Nasirwa would probably be able to add valuable input to this.

Task c) Review the applicability of the threat criteria, especially the Near Threatened IUCN Category

247. Mr. O'Sullivan briefly reported on the outcome of the small Working Group, formed to discuss this task. He summarised that it had been established that “Near Threatened” was not included in the definition in the key to Table 1, Column A, Category 1b. It had been encouraging to note that AEWA was addressing most of these “Near Threatened” species in one way or another; however some were not the subject of attention at the moment. In order to amend this situation, it should be examined if Table 1 could be modified;

this could be further discussed on the TC Workspace. Attention should be drawn to the “Near Threatened” status in the Review on the conservation status of migratory waterbirds produced for each MOP, in particular the summary of this comprehensive report. What remained to be discussed was the precise definition of “endangered”, as used by AEWA and CMS.

248. After some discussion, it was decided that work should focus on trying to incorporate Near Threatened in the classification of, for example, Column B.

249. Mr. Vié pointed out that IUCN categories such as “Endangered” should always be written with an initial capital.

Task d) Review taxonomic classifications and suggest the most appropriate classification for the purposes of the Agreement

250. A table would be prepared as a background for further discussions; Mr. Dereliev would take the lead on this issue in cooperation with CMS with the help of other members of the Working Group.

Task e) draft a proposal for amendments to the AEWA Action Plan to deal with tackling the effects of aquatic invasive non-native species on waterbird habitats to be presented to MOP5 (Resolution 4.11)

251. Mr. Khomenko reported that Mr. Stroud had agreed to take a closer look at the AEWA Action Plan in the context of this task, in order to suggest a way forward. Another suggestion, which came up was to look into the possibility of preparing a ‘guide to guidelines’ and published reports on the topic, and so to collate this existing information on best practices. For this task, Mr. Stroud will initiate the process and others would become involved. All the work would be done intersessionally. Mr. Khomenko agreed to set realistic deadlines in cooperation with the individual group members.

252. Mr. Stroud pointed out that the Ramsar STRP had an almost identical task so it would make sense to link this to the work of AEWA from the point of view of efficiency.

**Working Group 4 - Fluctuations**

253. Mr. Stroud, as chair of the WG, introduced this task, which was to develop guidance for the interpretation of the term ‘extreme fluctuations in size and trend’ in the context of the criteria for Table 1 of the Action Plan. He reported that IUCN already had a criterion for extreme fluctuation, which was, however, unsuitable for waterbirds. Rather than redefine the term ‘extreme’ in the context of waterbirds, the WG’s proposal was therefore to change the word used in this criterion from “extreme” back to “large”. This would thus avoid the confusion that would come from two definitions of the same word. Brent Geese were a good example of a species showing extreme/large fluctuations owing to their intermittent breeding or intermittent high mortality. The first draft of the definition should be finalised by the end of May 2009 in cooperation with Wetlands International and IUCN. The TC would consult by the end of June on the Workspace. This task could be concluded by the end of 2009.

254. Mr. Hughes added that the main criterion to determine whether a population fluctuates was population size. The actual number of populations in the Action Plan categorised as undergoing extreme/large fluctuations was approximately six; this should therefore not be seen as being a priority issue.

255. Mr. Dereliev remarked that a short note would be necessary to support a Contracting Party to propose this amendment.

256. Mr. Stroud confirmed that he would add this item to the process and timetable of the task.

**Working Group 5 - Climate Change related issues**

257. Mr. Stroud, as chair of the WG, introduced this task, which was to identify further research priorities that would inform future adaptation measures, and bring these to MOP5 for possible inclusion in the Action Plan (Resolution 4.14). The idea was to join with the Ramsar Convention and produce a guide for guidance

and identify gaps where adaptation guidance did not exist. Mr. Stroud would help flesh out a first draft by the end of 2009.

258. Mr. Khomenko flagged the potential of much of the historical research in Asia relating to long term fluctuations in semi-arid environments there. It could be useful to explore how this could be made available.

259. The second task to assess whether existing international networks of sites are sufficient for the protection of migratory waterbirds, including the projected climate change effects, was an enormous task, which the Working Group split into three parts:

- The first part was an audit of site networks. Wetlands International had initially taken this through with the Critical Site Networks development. There was a need to identify a cross-link to several other AEWAs and STRP tasks.
- The second part of the task should be able to draw key messages from current work being undertaken by IUCN-SSC, with input from BirdLife International. The output would probably be an information paper for MOP5.
- The third part was an assessment for policies affecting agro-environmental and other measures. This was not a high priority. The aim was to summarise sources of information. It should be considered that information would be biased towards EU sources.

If no progress was made by the end of 2009, it would be considered whether to outsource the task.

260. Mr. Nagy remarked that he would like to see a wider range of issues considered, including water management measures in the wider context.

261. Mr. Dereliev commented on the history and tasks of the Resolution, which had been re-drafted by StC before going to MOP. He referred to the complimentary approach, whereby AEWAs could play a role in providing a complementary network of sites to that of Ramsar, which was exclusively for wetlands; however AEWAs species did not only depend on wetlands throughout their life history. The question was since the analysis was done under the Critical Sites Network, to what extent was there room for an additional complementary network of sites which fall outside international designations.

262. Mr. Stroud answered that the ToR for the Review on international site networks developed under WG7 would have to be amended to align to this parallel task.

### **Working Group 6 - Single Species Action Plans**

263. Mr. Hughes, as chair of the WG, introduced the output of this Working Group, the task of which was to examine the open and/or controversial issues in the SSAPs identified at MOP and to propose appropriate revisions to the SSAPs for consideration and adoption by MOP5 (Resolution 4.16). The suggestion of the Working Group was that the TC addresses this as a wider issue for all 7 action plans presented to MOP and to approach Action Plan compilers to provide the TC with details of any issues requiring revision. The Meeting agreed that this was a prudent approach and Mr. Hughes confirmed that he would take the necessary steps. He hoped to have that feedback by the end of May 2009.

264. Another issue, which came up was the inclusion of community involvement and the interests of local people, including traditional knowledge in new Action Plans and revisions to existing ones. Mr. Hughes gave the example of the Red-breasted Goose Action Plan, which does include the involvement of local people and farmers in land management practices; however the White-headed Duck Action Plan is an example of one which does not. One solution could be to remind Working Groups to consider this important aspect when producing their work plans.

265. Mr. Stroud reported that the IUCN had produced some very good guidance on public awareness and community involvement<sup>4</sup> that would be useful to disseminate more widely in this context.

266. The Working Group had discussed the issue of AEWAs endorsing other SSAPs for waterbirds produced under non-AEWAs initiatives in the Agreement Area as a general principle and had agreed that this should be

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.cbd.int/cepa/toolkit/2008/cepa/index.htm>

the case on the condition that they (new Action Plans) are produced as official AEWA action plans to the AEWA format and that the compilers/coordinators are committed to implementing the plans and chairing the international working groups. It was also agreed that AEWA should be active in identifying coordinators/compilers, both for new and existing plans.

267. Another issue discussed was the use of AEWA resources for the production of SSAPs for globally threatened species, which the Working Group had felt, should be the case.

268. Mr. Dereliev noted that implementation fundraising would be a task mainly for the species working groups. There was no fundraising officer at the AEWA Secretariat. He went on to explain that with so many plans, each involving diverse issues, it would be difficult for a central body to fundraise for national activities; this was a task for the respective coordinator.

269. Based on the AEWA Review *of the stage of preparation and implementation of Single Species Action Plans*, Mr. Hughes proposed producing a summary of the current state of Action Plan production and implementation and working group establishment and coordination. The deadline for this would be 20 May 2009. The Working Group would also produce a list of priorities for production of Action Plans by 31 July 2009.

270. Another issue considered was the need of further guidance for Action Plan compilers, i.e. guidance on the process of running workshops.

271. Mr. Stroud concurred that written guidelines could be useful; these could be kept short, i.e. in the form of a check-list of issues to consider.

272. The Chair noted that the Meeting had agreed on the propositions made by Working Group 6.

### **Working Group 7 - International Implementation Tasks**

273. Mr. Dereliev, as chair of the WG, reported on the discussion with regard to the draft ToR for the Report on the conservation status of migratory waterbirds in the Agreement area (CSR), that population trend estimates were discussed in detail and that two types of trend analysis were required; long-term (a definition on 'Significant long-term decline' is appended to the ToR) to provide guidance, and short-term trends, on which Mr. Nagy would draft a technical annex to the ToR and lead a discussion on the TC Workspace.

274. Mr. Dereliev stressed the importance of giving the contractor absolutely clear instructions as to what kind of trend analysis was required as there had been problems in the past due to misunderstandings. He requested Mr. Nagy to draft the technical annex as soon as possible so that it could be agreed upon within 2 months at the latest.

275. Mr. Mondain-Monval referred to the hunting questionnaire, where this was one of the questions dealt with and suggested using the results of that survey as a basis for further discussion.

276. Mr. Lenten reiterated that the issue was whether there were really sufficient changes within populations in a 3-year period to justify the financial investment.

277. Mr. Nagy reported that this was a complicated issue because data from the International Waterbird Census was linked to other reports and the aim was to find a way of rationalising these processes to make them more effective.

278. Mr. Harradine referred to the discussion on the implications of proposed criteria, and how they would affect the classification in Table 1, started at TC8. He went on to suggest the development of criteria to interpret 'trends'. Definitions were also needed for a 'stable population' and what constituted an 'increase' and 'decrease' in this context.

279. Mr. Nagy remarked that it would be best to discuss these issues on the TC Workspace in order to be able to post some background documents. The rules should be discussed in advance before going ahead with the analysis.

280. Mr. Stroud concurred that this was a complex area with significant implications for all stakeholders so that a detailed written proposal and sufficient consultation with all those affected were necessary. He went on to refer to the proposed amendment to the criteria for Table 1 'extreme fluctuations', which could already be included in anticipation of a decision by MOP5 to avoid unnecessary delays in its application.

281. After some discussion it was agreed that this could be added to the ToR by applying the appropriate draft Resolution and that the contractor should be asked to highlight the effect of this newly suggested definition.

282. Mr. Dereliev then went on to report on the draft ToR for the *Report on gaps in information from surveys in the Agreement Area*, explaining that this review had not been produced as yet. After considering the options, it was decided that the report should be based on the scope of the available information in the International Waterbird Census Database (Wetlands International) and the World Bird Database (BirdLife International). Attention would be focused on sites and areas and the identification of priorities through this for further gap-filling in knowledge. The contractor would be requested to provide priority lists of sites and areas. All issues should be reviewed with regard to the 255 species under the Agreement.

283. Mr. Stroud suggested adding a clear statement of purpose, objectives, expectations and target groups for this and also the site network review. He added that quite a lot more detail was needed, for example, the terms 'data' and 'gaps' should be clarified in this context. This would help give the contractor a clearer picture of what is being asked for.

284. Mr. Dereliev summarized that, with the help of Mr. Stroud, the draft would be re-worded and posted on the TC Workspace within the next couple of weeks for final sign-off.

285. With regard to the draft ToR on the site network for Waterbirds in the Agreement area, the Critical Site Network Tool (CSN) would be able to provide the large part of the knowledge on the network of sites used by AEWA species, which the contractor will be required to compile together with their protection status and management measures. An important part of this review will be the identification of gaps so there would be an obvious link to the gaps in knowledge on surveys as the knowledge of bird numbers played a role in both.

286. Mr. Stroud reiterated that this draft ToR also urgently needed a detailed statement of purpose and objectives, which, in turn, determined the type, scale and extent of information collected. The terminology used should be clearly defined, e.g. what was exactly meant by a 'site' or 'protection status' used in this context. Mr. Stroud felt that the term 'management measures' was not feasible as it was unlikely that it would be consistently interpreted across the Agreement area. He felt that this should be tied into other related issues dealing with sites, e.g. climate change. In summary, he stressed that this was a potentially important report so time invested in the planning would help to get a high quality end-result.

287. Mr. Dereliev confirmed that this would be re-drafted with Mr. Stroud after this meeting and posted on the TC Workspace.

### **Working Group 8 - Conservation Guidelines**

288. In her capacity as head of this Working Group, Ms. Kralj reported that the task of this Working Group was to assess the guidelines prepared under Action Plan paragraph 7.3 and formulate draft recommendations and/or resolutions relating to their development/update, content and implementation. The Working Group discussed a detailed workplan and deadlines for delivery of 10 guidelines; two further Guidelines, on infrastructure and climate change had recently been approved by MOP4 so there was no need of revision in those 2 cases. The level of necessary up-dating was assessed and the Conservation Guidelines 1, 2, 5 and 6 were identified as those for which substantial changes might be needed. Ms Kralj outlined the approach of the Working Group in that smaller Working Groups had been established to carry out more detailed assessment of each Conservation Guideline and propose changes as appropriate. She went on to list these and

invited other TC Members and Observers to join in where they felt that their expertise would contribute to the task.

1. Guidelines on the preparation of National Single Species Action Plans for migratory waterbirds

Ms. Crockford, Mr. Dereliev and Mr. Hughes

2. Guidelines on identifying and tackling emergency situations for migratory waterbirds

Ms. Kralj – another TC Member or Observer was invited to help assess these guidelines.

3. Guidelines on the preparation of site inventories for migratory waterbirds

Mr. Stroud and Mr. Azafzaf

4. Guidelines on the management of key sites for migratory waterbirds

Mr. Stroud and Ms. Kralj

5. Guidelines on sustainable harvest of migratory waterbirds

Mr. Middleton, Mr. Harradine and Ms. Lehmann

6. Guidelines on regulating trade in migratory waterbirds

Ms. Lehmann and Ms. Kralj

7. Guidelines on the development of ecotourism at wetlands

Mr. Anderson and Mr. Harradine

8. Guidelines on reducing crop damage, damage to fisheries, bird strikes and other forms of conflict between waterbirds and human activities.

Mr. Anderson and Mr. Kanstrup.

9. Guidelines for a waterbird monitoring protocol

Wetlands International

10. Guidelines on Avoidance of Introduction of non-native Waterbird Species

Mr. Middleton, Mr. Hughes and Mr. Mondain-Monval

289. Ms. Kralj reported that deadlines for the first drafts had been set for the end of 2009 apart from CG No. 5, which depended on the outcome of the work of Working Group 1. The deadline in this case was set for 2010.

290. Ms Kralj pointed out that the Table 1 of the Action Plan was often annexed to the Conservation Guidelines and it was proposed to keep this updated, i.e. replace it, if amended. This proposal should be included in the relevant Resolution to MOP5.

## **Agenda item 20. TC Working Group 9 (Extractive industries)**

291. Mr. Stroud, as chair of the WG, introduced a supplementary paper, which was originally prepared by Ramsar. The task in question, regarding wetlands and extractive industries, was an issue for AEWA and a high priority task for Ramsar, discussed at the last Ramsar COP in South Korea<sup>5</sup>. The increase in the commodity price of many metals had resulted in an increase in mining activities in many areas around the world. Simultaneously, the current economic situation had led to cuts in funds available for environmental protection. Thus there was an urgent need for a review of existing guidance on assessing, avoiding, minimizing and mitigating the direct and indirect impacts of extractive industries on wetlands, and based on that possible development of new technical guidance. Funds would be needed for contracting an expert consultant for this work. A small workshop was being planned at the University of British Columbia. The UK had already pledged a voluntary contribution.

292. Mr. Middleton suggested involving the mining industry; the Minerals Initiative (IIED) in London could be approached for funding.

293. Mr. Nagy suggested exploring synergies with conservation NGOs and mining companies. Wetlands International was in partnership with Shell in order to look at potential cooperation and sites important for waterbirds. BirdLife International worked with the company Rio Tinto. These cooperations had come about as a result of the development of the CSN Tool and could also lead to synergies for further measures.

<sup>5</sup> [http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/res/key\\_res\\_x\\_26\\_e.pdf](http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/res/key_res_x_26_e.pdf)

294. Mr. Stroud offered to follow this up. He went on to point out that a number of the TC tasks are based on data extraction from CSN.

295. The Chair enquired if this should be finalised here and appropriate ToR produced.

296. Mr. Dereliev answered that it could be finalised; however Ramsar would not be commissioning this in the near future because of a shortfall in funds.

297. Mr. Stroud informed the Meeting that the UK was funding the 1<sup>st</sup> phase. Ramsar had signed off the Work Plan for approval by the Scientific Committee. This was a dynamically evolving document. He added that he would provide the TC with feedback and coordinate the cooperation between the stakeholders. The issue would be followed up on the TC Workspace.

## **Agenda item 21. TC Working Group 10 (Emerging Issues)**

298. David Stroud introduced document TC 9.10 *A preliminary list of ongoing and emerging issues for the conservation and management of African-Eurasian migratory waterbirds*, which he had developed with Mr. Dereliev.

299. This paper presented a non-exhaustive number of issues (not in any particular order of priority), which may become of significance for waterbird conservation in the AEWA area. The issues listed should be considered by the TC and further issues added, as applicable.

### **1. Emerging diseases**

300. Mr. O’Sullivan requested guidance regarding the last sentence, which referred to the Task Force on Wildlife Disease established by CMS and on the level of involvement of the AEWA bodies.

301. Mr. Stroud stressed the importance of all those involved reporting back to the AEWA Secretariat and disseminating inputs. The Task Force on Avian Influenza joined up the policy thinking; the Wildlife Diseases Task Force was a separate task force. Duplication should be avoided with others working in this field.

302. Mr. Mshelbwala remarked that this new Task Force was all-encompassing i.e. it would deal with all wildlife diseases apart from Avian Influenza and that the Avian Influenza Task Force served as a model for it.

303. Responding to a question by Mr. O’Sullivan, Mr. Lenten noted that the Secretariat would be involved; however participation would be limited to issues relevant to AEWA species.

304. The Chair summarized that the Secretariat would follow up the activities of this Task Force as long as they were relevant for AEWA.

### **2. Promoting waterbird conservation through ‘non-traditional’ sectors of society**

305. Mr. Lenten remarked that this was not necessarily an issue whereby AEWA could play a role, as the Secretariat did not have the necessary manpower; this issue could be taken up by NGOs.

306. Mr. O’ Sullivan agreed with this sentiment and confirmed that Birdlife International worked more in the field of specific projects.

307. Mr. Nagy pointed out that Single Species Action Plans included relevant information in the chapter on “Managing Human Activities”.

308. Mr. Vié suggested that AEWA could contribute by the production of, for example, leaflets.

309. The Chair pointed out that World Migratory Bird Day was an effective way of disseminating information and informing different groups in the community about waterbird conservation.

310. Mr. Nagy added that the key point was how State Governments could interact with communities; it would be useful to collect information on available best practises. The TC could examine available experience and consolidate it for Parties to work with.

311. Mr. Mondain-Monval requested clarification as to what was meant by the ‘traditional’ or ‘non-traditional’ sectors of society in order to be able to define the target group more efficiently.

312. Mr. Lenten explained that as AEWA is an MEA, its Focal Points were governmental so the Guidelines are aimed at governments or, for example, at hunters. Governments have the role of implementing the Agreement; activities in the field are carried out by NGOs. The AEWA Secretariat could support these activities by producing posters and other material, such as for the global initiative of WMBD.

313. The Chair suggested that the TC Regional Representatives could play a role by distributing information and material to stakeholders in their regions.

314. Mr. Stroud concurred that the Secretariat did not have a role in this case but could contribute by providing guidance to national administrations on how to organise outreach, such as in the case of IUCN, where a manual had been produced for this purpose.

315. Mr. Dereliev summarised that he could create an area on the Workspace to continue this discussion so that outcomes could be crystalised to take the discussion forward.

### **3. Invasive species (including impacts of aquatic weeds)**

316. A review of two case studies from Africa on the impact of aquatic weeds had been completed. The TC had not yet made a clear proposal as to how to bring this work and the Guidelines based on it to the MOP.

317. Mr. Nagy referred to a conclusion reached previously on whether a need existed to provide guidance to manage the problem. In fact tackling the problem often actually led to damage to wetlands and habitats.

318. Mr. Dereliev suggested that the Secretariat could prepare the report for publication in the Technical Series. The TC should decide on whether a resource with weblinks on the AEWA website may be a useful addition. This issue was also linked to the outcome of Working Group 3, sub-task e). The draft Guidelines could be posted on the Workspace to allow the TC to comment.

319. Mr. Stroud pointed out that the Ramsar STRP had developed Guidelines and had already presented them to their COP 8 in 2002 (although they had not been endorsed); it would be useful to explore synergies in this context.

320. Mr. Vié agreed that this was an important issue. Invasive species were a major cause of biodiversity loss. He felt that AEWA could help combat this threat to biodiversity. The Chair summarised that the draft guidelines would be up-loaded onto the TC Workspace and that Mr. Stroud would keep the TC informed about Ramsar activities on this issue. The TC could then decide how to proceed.

### **4. Waterbirds in urban environments**

321. Mr. Dereliev reported that increasing urbanisation was bringing waterbirds into closer proximity to human settlements, which could require guidance due to the potential risk of diseases spreading. Local wild birds were something that Europeans were used to, in contrast to the inhabitants of other continents.

322. Mr. Mshelbwala reported that in Africa, some migratory waterbird species roost in trees in villages and these roosts are often traditional. This was a harmonious coexistence and if it suddenly should be seen as

being a threat due to, for example, misplaced awareness as to the risks associated with avian influenza, this could have serious consequences.

323. Mr. Nagy suggested that the risk of disease transmission could be an issue appropriate for para 1. Emerging diseases. Issues relating to the change of birds' behaviour should be communicated to local communities.

324. Mr. Stroud referred to draft Task Force guidance on this topic and stressed that communities should be made aware of real risks.

325. It was decided that no specific activity was required by the TC on this issue.

## **5. Traditional knowledge and harvest schemes**

326. The Chair requested clarification on whether this was a conservation issue or if it was more involved with cultural aspects.

327. Mr. Stroud remarked that this issue and the next, 'Ensuring consumptive harvests are sustainable' are perhaps linked. This was an issue related to waterbird harvests, which had not been discussed at length in the past and should perhaps be given more attention.

328. Mr. Dereliev reported that the Danish Hunting Association was outposted at Lake Chilwa in Mali and may agree to help with finalising the outstanding review on the traditional use of waterbirds.

329. Mr. Mshelbwala underlined the difference between traditional harvest and local harvest. Traditional harvest was sustainable but local harvest was done by 'all and sundry'. He went on to explain that most tribes in Africa had hunters from particular families and tribes, who followed a set of rules and guidelines for hunting. Currently anyone who had access to guns was hunting, which resulted in the destruction of species. This should be considered when planning this review.

330. Mr. Nagy underlined that it was difficult to judge the extent of the issue, particularly as little knowledge actually exists. Traditional hunting should take priority over recreational hunting. European bag statistics do exist. It was a factor to be considered when compiling SSAPs and management plans. This issue should be put on the agenda to start the thinking process.

331. The issue of unsustainable hunting in Europe but particularly by Europeans outside Europe was discussed.

332. Mr. Middleton noted that hunting tourism was a serious issue and difficult to control. The Council of Europe had guidelines on this. Operators could be targeted as they are often based in Europe. He stressed that this was a very difficult issue to address.

333. In response to a question raised by Mr. Middleton, Ms. Lewis answered that jurisdiction for environmental crimes was a contentious point due to transboundary issues. She offered to look into it.

334. Mr. Dereliev pointed out that the importance of wetlands/habitat conservation was also one of conserving livelihoods. This should be considered.

335. Mr. Khomenko suggested that FAO could be interested in the issue of waterbirds as food, harvested on a traditional basis. Collaborative efforts could be achieved. This was also an issue connected to food security; Italian hunters were going further east to Hungary and the Ukraine, game was being frozen and taken back to Italy illegally. The issue of illegal hunting was therefore on the FAO agenda.

336. Mr. Mshelbwala pointed out that one mistake made in conservation was not being able to identify the true custodians of natural resources, who follow guidelines and rules and need to plan long-term so their natural focus is on sustainability. It was hunting for leisure and economy that disrupted the equilibrium, e.g. the demand for bushmeat from people in cities, which led to unsustainable hunting.

337. Mr. Harradine suggested looking to circumpolar communities for guidance on subsistence hunting and practice.

338. Mr. Kanstrup suggested that this was an issue for Working Group 1, to examine what constitutes 'traditional hunting'.

339. The Chair summarised that the lack of data made this a difficult issue to deal with. The issues '*Traditional knowledge and harvest regimes*' and '*Ensuring consumptive harvests are sustainable*' should be put under the umbrella of WG1 and further discussed on the TC Workspace.

## **7. Impacts of pollution**

340. Following a short discussion on the subject of pollution, which touched on the question of whether pollution was a conservation or rather a health issue, the meeting noted that monitoring schemes for pollution levels in waterbirds exist but are probably not collated. It was also noted that AEWA had a legal requirement to tackle pollution, which was a wide issue and that lead shot was already a priority; however pollution had not been identified as a major cause for decline in the numbers of waterbirds so far.

341. Responding to a question by Mr. Vié with regard to the issue of light pollution and its impact on waterbirds, Mr. Lenten reported that the 'Dark Sky' conference, on stopping the adverse effects of light pollution, would take place in 2009. There was no current knowledge that waterbirds were affected by light pollution. Mr. Lenten would keep the TC informed on the outcome.

## **8. Seabird bycatch**

342. The Chair reported that at MOP4, 20 seabirds had been added to the AEWA species list. The question was how to develop synergies in this area, for example with CMS.

343. Mr. Lenten reported that efforts were being made to improve the link to ACAP and the Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF) (particularly the Seabird Working Group) and that Mr. Dereliev closely followed the meetings and discussions of these two bodies. The aim was to raise awareness of these species; this was being followed up by the Secretariat but was not among the top priority tasks.

344. With regard to the avoidance of overlap between AEWA species and those of the Albatross Agreement (ACAP), Mr. Lenten explained that, for example no Petrels had been included in the AEWA list in order to avoid duplication and that Mr. Dereliev would attend the ACAP meeting and follow up any issues relating to AEWA.

345. The Chair summarized that in communication with other initiatives, all the issues connected to seabirds should be dealt with, not only bycatch.

## **9. Impacts of agricultural chemicals on waterbirds**

346. Mr. Khomenko reported on a case of contaminated grain leading to mass mortality in North Crimea.

347. Mr. Dereliev added that there had been a recent report on poisoning of Geese in the Ukraine on their way back to their breeding areas. There had been no investigation; the bodies had simply been destroyed. Mr. Dereliev asked M. Khomenko if the information on the case of contaminated grain could be put at their disposal for this purpose.

348. He went on to inform the meeting that a report had been contracted out on the use of agrochemicals in Africa and their impact on migratory birds. There had, however been a problem with the compiler, so that the AEWA Secretariat had established contact with the University of Bonn and would finalise the review with the help of a Masters student. The review should be completed by 2010.

## 10. Extractive industries

349. This issue was already being covered by Working Group 9.

## 11. Waterbirds and Corporate industry

350. Mr. Middleton stressed the importance of approaching transnational corporations for support, particularly in the areas of biofuels and mining and that corporations were very focused on the standard for environmental management systems, ISO 14000, particularly Rio Tinto, where Guidelines would be welcomed.

351. Mr. O'Sullivan noted that this could be problematic as measures taken could eventually influence corporations' daily operations.

352. Mr. Lenten reported that not very much had been done in this area due to lack of time. CMS had been more active and had approached corporate industry through the 'Friends of CMS', however with limited success so far. The Friends of CMS projects that were supported in the past, where those related to particular species such as dolphins or gorillas. A proposal had been made to the Deutsche Telekom regarding flamingos, as the Telekom corporate identity colour was pink. Contact has also recently been made with the World Wind Energy Association, which gives guidance to countries with regard to wind energy issues.

353. Mr. Stroud added that the Ramsar COP had approved formal guidelines for entering into partnerships with the business sector. He would place a link on the TC Workspace<sup>6</sup>.

## 12. Reducing airstrike risk for waterbirds

354. This was an issue already covered by Guideline No. 8. There was already an active international Working Group on this issue so it was not a priority for AEWA.

## 13. AEWA Conservation Guidelines

355. This issue referred to the extent of use of Conservation Guidelines. Working Group 8 had the task of assessing the guidelines so it seemed appropriate to postpone the discussion until the outcome of the assessment was available.

## 14. Conflicting renewable energy development

356. A number of renewable energy projects were mentioned, including windfarm developments in Bulgaria and Italy as well as hydropower in Iceland and that MEAs had a role to play.

357. Biofuel production and hydropower stations were noted as having a serious impact on habitats, which should be addressed, if necessary, via IRP. It was also suggested that the Secretariat should pursue strategic guidance or impact assessment and, draft a resolution to that effect.

358. Mr. Middleton noted that Guidelines on infrastructural development had been adopted by MOP4 however these did not necessarily refer to windfarms.

359. Mr. Dereliev stressed that a strong Resolution for the long-term planning of windfarms and the production of biofuels and their impacts on habitats was necessary. Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) was also of utmost importance.

360. Mr. Middleton added that Sustainability Impact Assessment should be linked in with this process.

361. Mr. Stroud reported that he had the task of reviewing developments for the Ramsar STRP, as this could be pertinent, he would make it available on the TC Workspace.

<sup>6</sup> [http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/res/key\\_res\\_x\\_12\\_e.pdf](http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/res/key_res_x_12_e.pdf)

362. Mr. Lenten confirmed that the Secretariat could draft a rough version of the Resolution. In the UK, the RSPB had already developed a strategy plan. A popular brochure may also be useful in this context, which could stimulate governments to prevent unsustainable developments and so prevent the need for action having to be taken when it is too late.

363. Mr. Nagy reported that research had been done on flyways in the framework of radar work specifically designed for studying bird movements. This expertise could be made use of. He would provide the Secretariat with contact details on this.

He went on to report on the BIOSCORE project, which Wetlands International had participated in together with various stakeholders and Wageningen University, whereby a tool would be developed to support biodiversity monitoring and to quantify the impacts of selected European Community policy measures.

364. The Chair summarised that Mr. Dereliev would draft the resolution and post it on the TC workspace so that it could be prepared for the next MOP.

## 15. Power lines as barriers

365. Mr. Lenten reported that World Migratory Bird Day 2009 had played a major role in raising awareness on this issue. The German Society for Nature Conservation (NABU) had published a brochure on suggested practices for bird protection on power lines. The Secretariat could play a role by approaching major electricity companies and suggesting simple but effective measures.

366. Mr. Anderson explained that collision was more a problem than electrocution. The Wildlife Energy Interaction Group in South Africa had been internationally active, including in Kenya. Lines could be made more visible. Graham Martin, an expert in avian vision was looking at birds and the colours or markers, which would be most easily visible for them. Mr. Anderson regretted that little monitoring took place after mitigation, making many measures relatively ineffective.

367. Mr. Lenten requested Mr. Anderson to inform the Secretariat of these developments, the information could be included in a brochure on guidance.

368. Mr. Dereliev reiterated that an exchange of information would be very useful. Most countries had no understanding of the magnitude of this problem so awareness-raising was an important aspect. The most problematic power lines would need to be identified and risks mitigated in time. A respective Resolution should be prepared for the next MOP.

369. Ms. Crockford mentioned that the Bern Convention was preparing a review with recommendations on power lines involving the feedback from their Contracting Parties; this could be linked and extended to AEWA Contracting Parties.

370. Mr. Nagy reported that only Portugal and Hungary had made a complete mapping of the danger of power lines. The experience of these countries could also be included.

371. Mr. Ghassan Ramadi reported that mitigation methods were in place in Beirut. He added that there were widespread wind turbines in Spain and that some serious research was being done. He offered to follow this up and provide the Secretariat with the information.

372. Mr. Andreotti reported that the Italian Environment Ministry had prepared guidelines for reducing the impact of power lines on birds. This guideline was presented to the companies involved and efforts were made to change construction methods. This was still in the first phase and it is not known in how far it has been successful. Mr. Andreotti would provide the Secretariat with the link to this project.

373. Mr. Anderson noted that underground lines were one solution, however, much more expensive. Nocturnal flyers were most endangered. He went on to say that there was still a long way to go in finding efficient mitigation measures.

374. Mr. Nagy pointed out that choice of location was still more important than mitigation. This should be considered in relation to environmental impact assessment and what exactly the assessment should cover.

375. The Chair summarised that infrastructure guidelines had been approved by MOP4 and that the Secretariat would look into other possibilities of approaching this issue and draft a resolution to that effect.

## **Agenda item 22. TC Work Plan 2009 – 2012**

376. Mr. Dereliev introduced document TC 9.11 *TC Work Plan 2009-2012* reporting that a revised version of the Work Plan would be posted on the TC Workspace soon. Amendments would be made according to the tasks defined and the deadlines set during the Working Group discussions. It was decided that five reports would have to be outsourced; these should be prioritised due to the limited funds available.

377. Mr. Lenten explained that the AEWA budget for reviews for the following quadrennium amounted to 50,000 Euros, which might just cover the CSR. Funds had to be acquired for any additional tasks. Mr. Lenten made a strong plea to governmental representatives at the meeting to support AEWA in finding the necessary additional funds.

378. Mr. Lenten felt that the site network report should be second in the priority list as it was linked to the WOW project and the report on gaps in knowledge, which was a huge task, should be third.

379. Mr. Stroud concurred with this order of prioritisation and added that linking aspects of the site network report to that of gaps in knowledge would be more cost effective.

380. The TC tasks to be outsourced were therefore prioritised as follows (the first three are mandatory and must be prepared for MOP5):

1. Conservation Status Report 5 (AP review)
2. Site network (AP review)
3. Gaps in knowledge from surveys (AP review)
4. Look-alike species (to be clarified by FACE/BASC/CIC by end of June)
5. Re-establishment guidelines

381. A decision on whether the report on look-alike species would need outsourcing would be made after feedback from FACE, BASC and CIC, by the end of June.

## **Agenda item 23. Date and Venue of the next Technical Committee Meeting**

382. The Chair reported that the next TC Meeting would take place during the second half of 2011.

Mr. Lenten added that there was no date fixed as yet. Last year Kenya had kindly offered to host the meeting, which, unfortunately had to be cancelled due to the political unrest at the time; this offer is still open. Another option would be to link the TC meeting to a WetCap meeting and try to find a venue in North Africa.

383. Mr. Dereliev noted that the timing would depend on that of MOP5, which, in turn, depends on the timing of the Ramsar COP and the CBD meetings. The AEWA Secretariat would try to coordinate with the other Secretariats concerned in order to avoid delegates having to travel to many meetings within a short period.

## Agenda item 24. Any other business

384. Mr. Lenten reported on the first Adriatic Flyway Conference, which took place in Ulcinj, Montenegro from 14-17 April 2009, which he had attended. Nature conservationists and ornithologists from the Balkans had joined 120 representatives from international organisations working in bird protection at this conference organised by EuroNatur and its partners. The main goal of the meeting was to facilitate the dialogue between these groups and to point out the major importance of the East Adriatic Coast within the Central European migration route. The Bojana-Buna-Delta, a coastal area situated between Albania and Montenegro, was an area of significant ecological value; however unsustainable hunting and developments such as wind farms on the mountains and migratory corridors were posing threats for migratory birds along the Adriatic Flyway. One problem was that not all the countries along the flyway were Parties to CMS, AEWA or the Raptors MoU so one priority is to urge these to ratify. Mr. Lenten noted that having a Declaration on this issue was important so that it would be taken seriously.

385. The pressures on waterbirds should be addressed with the involvement of the ORNIS committee. During the meeting, delegates reported the sighting of a Critically Endangered Slender-billed Curlew in Albania, where hunting goes on. Mr. Lenten suggested initiating a follow-up meeting with CIC and FACE in the coming years to bring governments as well as experts together to discuss the issues concerned in detail and to raise awareness of the threats. The Ulcinj Declaration was signed to underline the importance of this flyway.

386. Mr. Nagy gave a short presentation of the WOW project and the development of the Critical Sites Network tool as well as the demonstration projects. The CSN tool has been redesigned by WCMC since MOP so that information can now be filtered by country and the user is linked to the actual site. Protected areas were indicated and gaps were made visible species by species. The IWC database was linked so it was visible if a population was declining. The WOW flyway training modules had been designed to help site managers understand the flyway approach, apply it and communicate it. In June 2008 a test run had been carried out in four regions; based on this test, the materials had been revised. Mr. Nagy invited those present to get further information from the WOW website: <http://wow.wetlands.org>, which was being maintained by the AEWA Information Officer, Florian Keil.

387. The Chair thanked Mr. Nagy for this presentation and was happy to acknowledge that the project was going well.

388. Mr. O'Sullivan reported on a new flyway initiative run by CMS. The CMS COP9 had passed two resolutions calling for a review to develop appropriate conservation frameworks/agreements for migratory species to be undertaken during the inter-sessional period. Resolution 9.2 stated that the COP "decides to establish an open-ended working group on global bird flyways within the framework of the Scientific Council to act as a think tank on flyways and frameworks, and tasked with reviewing scientific and technical issues for conservation of migratory birds and their habitats, and relevant international instruments, initiatives and processes, as the basis for future CMS policy on flyways and contributing to the work on the future shape of CMS". A note would go out to organisations and individuals, inviting them to participate in the open-ended group, which included several states, organisations and individuals represented at the TC meeting and the AEWA Secretariat. Mr. O'Sullivan urged all those invited to participate.

389. Mr. Stroud introduced another initiative following from Ramsar Resolution X.22<sup>7</sup>, adopted last year, which is a major Resolution on international cooperation for the conservation of waterbird flyways. This Resolution recognised the multiple international instruments for the conservation of migratory waterbirds, such as the Ramsar Convention and its International Organization Partners, CMS, AEWA the East Asian – Australasian Flyway Partnership, the North American Waterfowl Management Plan, the Western Hemisphere Migratory Species Initiative, the Western Hemisphere Shorebird Reserve Network (WHSRN), the West/Central Asian Site Network for the Siberian Crane and other waterbirds (WCASN), the European Union's Natura 2000 site Network, individual flyway management plans for threatened species, and the CMS's recent Action Plan for the Central Asian Flyway. Through this Resolution, the Ramsar COP strongly encourages Parties to share knowledge and expertise on best practices in the development and implementation of flyway-scale waterbird conservation practices and policies and urges the Secretariats of

<sup>7</sup> [http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/res/key\\_res\\_x\\_22\\_e.pdf](http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/res/key_res_x_22_e.pdf)

Ramsar, CMS and AEWA and the biodiversity programme of the Arctic Council to work together with their governments and scientific subsidiary bodies and other interested organisations to establish a mechanism to share knowledge, good practice and experience between all these different mechanisms. There were many different models, some legally binding, such as AEWA, others more informal or with more community involvement. The aim of the Ramsar STRP was to take this forward by arranging a workshop during the second half of 2009<sup>8</sup> with representatives from all of organisations to explore how a range of different conservation issues were addressed by those instruments such as the identification and designation of protected areas, the regulation of hunting, single species conservation, and education and community involvement.

390. Another aspect to be looked at was also a range of different processes such as how scientific advice flowed into relevant instruments, governance instruments, and engagement with national partners and other stakeholders. Plans were currently being developed and formal contact with the representatives of all the relevant flyway initiatives would be made in due course. Mr. Stroud would keep the TC informed via the Workspace.

391. Mr. Lenten reported that the AEWA Secretariat already had contact with some of the flyway initiatives, e.g. the East Asian-Australasian Flyway Partnership, where Mr. Dereliev would participate in a Symposium in early May 2009. The Government of Korea would provide the Secretariat for this Partnership in Incheon.

392. Mr. Vié informed the Meeting that the next IUCN-SSC Red List for birds will be published by BirdLife on 14 May 2009.

393. Mr. Lenten referred to the upgrading of the positions of Technical Officer and Programme Officer, which was agreed upon by MOP4. These had to undergo the standard recruitment procedure under UNEP and the vacancy announcements for both had been launched. Mr. Lenten stressed, that both Officers being Sergey Dereliev and Catherine Lehmann have done an excellent job and have contributed to the success of the Agreement.

394. The Chair concurred with Mr. Lenten and, on behalf of the whole TC, she confirmed the endorsement of all those present that Mr. Dereliev and Ms. Lehmann are re-instated in their respective functions. She went on to underline the tremendous job that both were doing, which was very much appreciated by all AEWA stakeholders, not only the TC. She expressed her genuine hope that their candidature would be successful so that they could continue making such a valuable contribution to the work of the Secretariat and the success of the Agreement.

## **Agenda item 25. Closure**

395. Mr. Lenten took the opportunity to pay tribute to Mr. O'Sullivan, as this was his last TC meeting before entering retirement. He thanked Mr. O'Sullivan for all his work over the years, on so many different levels. His knowledge, experience and expertise in combination with his valuable contributions to the linguistic input would be sorely missed. Mr. Lenten thanked Mr. O'Sullivan on behalf of all TC members, present and past; it had been a great pleasure to work with him. Mr. Lenten sincerely hoped that Mr. O'Sullivan would continue to be involved in AEWA and to support the work of the Secretariat. Mr. O'Sullivan was presented with a book, to acclamation from the meeting.

396. Mr. O'Sullivan thanked Mr. Lenten and his colleagues from the TC, noting that he had enjoyed his work in the TC tremendously and had made a great many friends along the way. He expressed his thanks and best wishes to all those present.

397. Mr. Lenten thanked the Government of Croatia for hosting the meeting and for providing the excursion, which had been very informative as well as enjoyable. He went on to thank Ms. Kralj and her team for organising the meeting so efficiently. Mr. Lenten pointed out that this meeting, where the majority of work had been done in working groups, had led to active and productive discussions and thanked all the

---

<sup>8</sup> [Now likely to be in the first half 2010 - DAS]

participants, particularly Mr. O'Sullivan, who again had contributed on all fronts. He took the opportunity of welcoming Ms. Crockford, who would represent BirdLife at future TC meetings.

398. On behalf of Ms. Pintarić, Ms. Kralj expressed the pleasure of the Croatian Government at having being able to host this meeting and hoped that it would result in impulses to bird conservation in Croatia. Before closing the meeting, she apologised for any shortcomings as this was the first TC meeting she had chaired and she thanked the participants for creating such a relaxed atmosphere, which had made her job much easier.

## ANNEX I



### Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds (AEWA)

Secretariat provided by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

## Modus operandi of the Technical Committee of the Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds<sup>9</sup>

### General functions

#### Rule 1

The Technical Committee (hereinafter referred to as 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; it makes recommendations to the Meetings of the Parties concerning the Action Plan, implementation of the Agreement and further research to be carried out; it prepares for each ordinary session of the Meeting of the Parties a report on its activities, which shall be submitted to the Agreement secretariat not less than one hundred and twenty days before the session of the Meeting of the Parties; it carries out any other tasks referred to it by the Meeting of the Parties. The Technical Committee works closely with the Standing Committee to ensure consistency across the Agreement's work.

### Representation and attendance

#### Rule 2

1. In accordance with Article VII paragraph 1, the Committee membership shall comprise:
  - (a) nine experts representing the different regions of the Agreement Area (Northern & Southwestern Europe, Central Europe, Eastern Europe, Southwestern Asia, Northern Africa, Central Africa, Western Africa, Eastern Africa 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 (IUCN), Wetlands International, the International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC); and
  - (c) one thematic expert from each of the following fields: rural economics, game management, and environmental law; elected by the Parties.
2. 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 3

Except as provided for in Rule 6, attendance at meetings of the Technical Committee shall be limited to members of the Technical Committee or their Alternates and observers of the Parties.

<sup>9</sup> Adopted by the 4<sup>th</sup> Session of the Meeting of the Parties (MOP4), 15-19 September 2008, Antananarivo, Madagascar

#### **Rule 4**

Only members of the Committee (hereinafter “the members”) shall exercise the voting rights. In his/her absence, the Alternate shall act in his or her place.

#### **Rule 5**

1. The term of office of the regional representatives and the thematic experts shall expire at the close of the second ordinary Meeting of the Parties following that at which they were elected, unless extended by agreement of the Meeting of the Parties. 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 approved in accordance with Rule 2.

2. In the instance of a regional representative and his/her alternate or a thematic expert standing down simultaneously without completing a full term of office, the Chairperson of the Committee, in close cooperation with the region/organisation involved and in consultation with the Agreement Secretariat, is permitted to appoint an expert of the region or a thematic expert to replace the member and an 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.

3. The representatives of organisations, as per Rule 2, paragraph 1(b), and their alternates are not limited by a term of office. They can be replaced at any time by their organisations.

#### **Rule 6**

1. The Chairperson may invite observers of non-contracting Parties and the Chairperson of the AEWA Standing Committee.

2. Furthermore the Chairperson may invite or admit a maximum of four observers from specialised international inter-governmental and non-governmental organisations.

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

#### **Nomination and election of members**

#### **Rule 7**

Candidates proposed for nomination as regional representatives or thematic experts in the Committee must have the following:

1. Recognized experience and expertise in one or more aspects of waterbird science or conservation;
2. Demonstrated capacity for networking with waterbird science or conservation experts at local, national or international levels;
3. Full access to e-mail and internet communication systems on which the intersessional Committee work depends;
4. Commitment to undertake the work required of the Committee and actively participate in the delivery of the Committee working groups' tasks.

### **Rule 8**

The new regional representatives, their alternates and experts to the Committee will be elected by the Meeting of the Parties at the recommendation of the Advisory Group. The Advisory Group shall comprise the current Chair and Vice-chair of the Standing Committee, the current Chair and Vice-chair of the Technical Committee, the Executive Secretary and the Technical Officer. The Advisory Group will be chaired by the Technical Committee Chair.

### **Rule 9**

1. Nominations of candidates for regional representatives to the Committee can be submitted by:
  - 1.1 the National AEWA Administrative and Implementation Authorities of the Parties in the respective region<sup>10</sup>;
  - 1.2 the National AEWA Technical Committee Focal Points (in consultation with the National AEWA Administrative and Implementation Authority) of the Parties in the respective region;
  - 1.3 the current Technical Committee Chair and Vice-chair; and
  - 1.4 the current Technical Committee members and observers.
2. Nominations of candidates for thematic experts to the Committee can be submitted by:
  - 2.1 the National AEWA Administrative and Implementation Authorities of the Parties regardless of the region;
  - 2.2 the National AEWA Technical Committee Focal Points (in consultation with the National AEWA Administrative and Implementation Authority) of the Parties regardless of the region;
  - 2.3 the current Technical Committee Chair and Vice-chair; and
  - 2.4 the current Technical Committee members and observers.
3. Nominations for thematic experts are not limited to persons of the same country of origin as the nominator, since it is the relevant expertise and/or the networking capacity that is being sought, regardless of the nationality or country of current domicile of the expert. Thematic experts can be nominated from any of the AEWA Range States. For regional representatives, however, only persons from AEWA Contracting Parties may be nominated.

### **Rule 10**

1. The nominator of each candidate will provide the Advisory Group with a short summary of the relevant expertise and experience of the candidate in the form of a recommendation letter not later than 180 days before the date of the next session of the Meeting of the Parties.
2. Candidates being nominated will provide a declaration<sup>11</sup> that they are willing to be considered for appointment to the Committee, that they have the full support of their organisation or institution to deliver the work expected of the Committee members, including time, availability and funds (if applicable) for attending meetings<sup>12</sup>, and that they have the necessary language skills (English, French or both) to engage fully in the work of the Committee; they will provide a brief summary of how they see their skills and expertise contributing to the Committee's work, along with a *curriculum vitae* (CV).

---

<sup>10</sup> For the AEWA Technical Committee regionalisation please refer to Annex 1 appended to this document.

<sup>11</sup> Sample declaration is appended in Annex 3.

<sup>12</sup> Financial support for attending Technical Committee meetings will be available only to members from the eligible AEWA Parties (please refer to Annex 2).

### **Rule 11**

On the basis of the nominations received within the deadline, the Secretariat shall prepare an assessment and submit it to the Advisory Group for consideration. The Advisory Group will then submit a list of recommended candidates to the Meeting of the Parties for the election of new regional representatives, their alternates and thematic experts.

### **Rule 12**

If no candidates were elected by the Meeting of the Parties for either of the vacant positions the Chairperson may appoint members or alternates through a procedure as described in Rule 5.

### **Officers**

### **Rule 13**

The members 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 as soon as possible after the Meeting of the Parties, and the newly elected officers shall assume their functions upon election.

### **Rule 14**

The Chairperson shall preside at meetings of the Committee, approve the provisional agenda prepared by the Secretariat for circulation, and liaise with the members 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 15**

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 16**

The Agreement Secretariat shall serve the meetings of the Committee.

### **Elections of officers**

### **Rule 17**

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 18**

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 19**

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 17.

### **Meetings**

### **Rule 20**

Unless the Meeting of the Parties decides otherwise, meetings of the Committee shall be convened by the Agreement Secretariat at least twice between ordinary sessions of the Meeting of the Parties.

### **Rule 21**

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 22**

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 23**

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 24**

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

### **Rule 25**

Decisions of the Committee by voting (pursuant to Rule 24) 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 26**

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 27**

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 28**

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

### **Rule 29**

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

## **Communication procedure**

### **Rule 30**

Any member of the 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. In case of emergency the proposal shall be communicated to the members for comment within 30 days.

### **Rule 31**

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 32**

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 33**

The Secretariat shall inform the Contracting Parties on the date and venue of the next Meeting of the Committee. For each Meeting of the 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 34**

The regional representatives shall act as coordinators for Range States and Contracting Parties in their region, submit a report to the Committee on AEWA Implementation in their regions and disseminate to the technical focal points of Contracting Parties the outcomes of Committee meetings.

### **Other functions**

#### **Rule 35**

In accordance with Art. VII 3(c) of the Agreement, the Chairperson shall submit a written report on the Committee's activities to the Agreement Secretariat not less than one hundred and twenty days before the session of the Meeting of the Parties.

### **Final provisions**

#### **Rule 36**

This *Modus operandi* shall be applied at the first meeting of the Committee following its 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.

## Annex 1 to the *Modus operandi* of the Technical Committee

**Division of the Agreement area into nine regions** for the purpose of appointment of regional representatives to the Technical Committee as described in document AEWA/MOP 1.11/Rev 1 (*with pertinent amendments in country names and status of ratification (as of September 2008)*).

<b>Region</b>	<b>Names of the Range States and regional economic organisations (<i>current AEWA Parties are in bold</i>)</b>
<b>NORTH- AND SOUTHWESTERN EUROPE</b>	Andorra, <b>Belgium</b> , Canada, <b>Denmark</b> (incl. Greenland), <b>Finland</b> , <b>France</b> , <b>Germany</b> , Iceland, <b>Ireland</b> , Liechtenstein, <b>Luxembourg</b> , <b>Monaco</b> , the <b>Netherlands</b> , <b>Norway</b> , <b>Portugal</b> , <b>Spain</b> , <b>Sweden</b> , <b>Switzerland</b> , <b>United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland</b>
<b>CENTRAL EUROPE</b>	<b>Albania</b> , Austria, Bosnia-Herzegovina, <b>Bulgaria</b> , <b>Croatia</b> , <b>Czech Republic</b> , Greece, <b>Italy</b> , <b>Hungary</b> , Malta, Montenegro, Poland, <b>Romania</b> , San Marino, Serbia, <b>Slovakia</b> , <b>Slovenia</b> , the <b>Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia</b>
<b>EASTERN EUROPE</b>	Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Estonia, <b>Georgia</b> , <b>Latvia</b> , <b>Lithuania</b> , <b>Republic of Moldova</b> , Russian Federation (European part), <b>Ukraine</b>
<b>SOUTHWESTERN ASIA</b>	Bahrain, <b>Cyprus</b> , Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, <b>Israel</b> , <b>Jordan</b> , Kazakhstan, Kuwait, <b>Lebanon</b> , Oman, Qatar, Russian Federation (Asian part), Saudi Arabia, <b>Syrian Arab Republic</b> , Turkey, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, <b>Uzbekistan</b> , Yemen
<b>NORTHERN AFRICA</b>	<b>Algeria</b> , <b>Madeira (Portugal)</b> , <b>Canary Islands (Spain)</b> , <b>Egypt</b> , <b>Libyan Arab Jamahiriya</b> , Morocco, <b>Tunisia</b>
<b>CENTRAL AFRICA</b>	Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, <b>Congo</b> , Democratic Republic of Congo, <b>Equatorial Guinea</b> , Gabon, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe
<b>WESTERN AFRICA</b>	<b>Benin</b> , Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, <b>Gambia</b> , <b>Ghana</b> , <b>Guinea</b> , <b>Guinea-Bissau</b> , Liberia, <b>Mali</b> , Mauritania, <b>Niger</b> , <b>Nigeria</b> , <b>Senegal</b> , Sierra Leone, <b>Togo</b>
<b>EASTERN AFRICA</b>	<b>Djibouti</b> , Eritrea, Ethiopia, <b>Kenya</b> , Somalia, <b>Sudan</b> , <b>Uganda</b> , <b>United Republic of Tanzania</b> , <b>Réunion (France)</b> , <b>Mayotte (France)</b>
<b>SOUTHERN AFRICA</b>	Angola, Botswana, Comoros, Lesotho, <b>Madagascar</b> , Malawi, <b>Mauritius</b> , Mozambique, Namibia, Seychelles, <b>South Africa</b> , Swaziland, Zambia, Zimbabwe, <b>St. Helena (United Kingdom)</b> , <b>Ascension Island (United Kingdom)</b>

## Annex 2 to the *Modus operandi* of the Technical Committee

List of the AEWA Contracting Parties (as at September 2008) eligible to receive financial support for attending AEWA meetings:

Albania  
Algeria  
Benin  
Congo  
Croatia  
Djibouti  
Egypt  
Equatorial Guinea  
Gambia  
Georgia  
Ghana  
Guinea  
Guinea-Bissau  
Jordan  
Kenya  
Lebanon  
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya  
Macedonia, FYR  
Madagascar  
Mali  
Mauritius  
Moldova, Republic of  
Niger  
Nigeria  
Senegal  
Sudan  
Syrian Arab Republic  
Tanzania, United Republic of  
Togo  
Tunisia  
Uganda  
Ukraine  
Uzbekistan

## Annex 3 to the *Modus operandi* of the Technical Committee

### **Declaration of candidate nominated as regional representative or thematic expert to the AEWA Technical Committee**

I, *[fill in name and post]* would like to inform you that I am willing to be considered as *[fill the relevant position<sup>13</sup>]* to the AEWA Technical Committee and that I have the full support of my *[organization or institution, please fill the name]* to deliver the work expected of the Technical Committee members<sup>14</sup>, including time, availability and funds (if applicable) for attending Technical Committee meetings<sup>15</sup>.

I have the necessary *[English or French or both, please fill as appropriate]* language skills to engage fully in the work of the Technical Committee.

*[Please provide a brief summary of how you see your skills and expertise contributing to the work of the Technical Committee.]*

I am providing my *curriculum vitae* (CV) as an attachment. *[please attach]*

Signature:  
*[please sign]*

Date:  
*[please fill]*

---

<sup>13</sup> Regional representative of [state the relevant region, refer to Annex 1]; or expert in one of the following three fields: game management, environmental law or rural economics.

<sup>14</sup> As required by the *Modus operandi* and Resolution 3.13 (for the latter see Annex 4).

<sup>15</sup> Please note that only certain AEWA Parties are eligible to receive financial support for attending AEWA meetings (please refer to Annex 2).

## Annex 4 to the *Modus operandi* of the Technical Committee

### **Further obligations of the members of the Technical Committee as decided by the Meeting of the Parties in Resolution 3.13, operative paragraph 4:**

*“Further decides* that each Regional Representative shall:

- a) serve as the Technical Committee’s contact point for the Range States and, in particular, Contracting Parties of that geographical region, and as such maintain contact with the Contracting Parties’ technical focal points in order to synchronize regional activities for the implementation of AEWA;
- b) prepare, submit and present to the Technical Committee at each of its meetings a report on the implementation of AEWA in that geographical region represented by him/her;
- c) provide information on activities undertaken by the Range States, Contracting Parties and others in the region on implementation of AEWA;
- d) disseminate to the Contracting Parties’ technical focal points information on the outcomes of discussions at the meetings of the Technical Committee.”

## ANNEX II

### 9<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

20 - 23 April 2009, Zagreb, Croatia

### LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

#### *REPRESENTATIVES OF THE REGIONS*

##### **CENTRAL EUROPE**

Dr. Sci. Jelena Kralj (Chair)  
Institute of Ornithology  
Croatian Academy of Arts and Science  
Gundulićeva 24  
10000 Zagreb  
Croatia/ Croatie

Tel.: +385 1 4825 401  
Fax: +385 1 4825 392  
E-mail: zzo@hazu.hr

##### **EASTERN EUROPE**

Dr. Serhiy Khomenko  
Main Specialist  
ECTAD – Wildlife Unit, Food & Agriculture  
Organization of the United Nations (FAO)  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 1  
Rome 00153  
Italy/ Italie

Tel: +39 06 570 56493  
E-mail: sergei.khomenko@fao.org;  
khomenko@izan.kiev.ua

##### **NORTH AND SOUTH WESTERN EUROPE**

Dr. David Alan Stroud  
Senior Ornithologist  
UK Joint Nature Conservation Committee  
JNCC, Monkstone House  
City Road  
PE1 1JY Peterborough  
United Kingdom / Royaume-Uni

Tel.: +44 1733 562626  
Fax: +44 1733 555948  
E-mail: David.Stroud@jncc.gov.uk

##### **NORTHERN AFRICA**

Mr. Hichem Azafzaf (Vice-Chair)  
Birds of Tunisia  
11, rue Abou El Alaa El Maari  
Cité El Houda  
2080 Ariana  
Tunisia / Tunisie

Tel.: +216 23 207 238  
Fax: + 216 71 701 664  
E-mail: azafzaf@gnet.tn

##### **WESTERN AFRICA**

Mr. John H. Mshelbwala  
Assistant Director (Wildlife Management)  
Federal Ministry of Environment  
PLOT 393/394  
Augustus Aikhomu Way, Utako District, PMB 468  
Garki, Abuja  
Nigeria / Nigéria

Tel.: +234 9 80 33 28 70 39  
E-mail: johnmshelbwala2@yahoo.com

##### **SOUTHERN AFRICA**

Mr. Mark Anderson  
Executive Director  
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: director@birdlife.org.za

**SOUTHWESTERN ASIA**

Dr. Ghassan Ramadan Jaradi  
Professor for Taxonomy & Ecology  
Lebanese University  
c/o CNRS  
P.O.Box: 11-8281  
Beirut  
Lebanon / Liban

Tel: +961 3 68 98 40

Fax: +961 1 822 639

E-mail: r-jaradi@cyberia.net.lb

***REPRESENTATIVES OF ORGANISATIONS*****International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC)**

Mr. Niels Kanstrup  
President  
CIC Migratory Birds Commission  
Skrejrupsvej 31  
8410 Rønne  
Denmark / Danemark

Tel.: +45 20332999

Fax: +45 86372365

E-mail: nk@jaegerne.dk

**International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)**

Mr. Jean-Christophe Vié  
Deputy Head Species Programme  
International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)  
28, rue Mauverney  
1196 Gland  
Switzerland / Suisse

Tel.: +41 22 999 0208

Fax: +41 22 999 0015

E-mail: jcv@iucn.org

**Wetlands International**

Dr. Szabolcs Nagy  
Biodiversity Programme Manager  
Wetlands International  
Horapark 9  
6717 LZ Ede  
The Netherlands / Pays-Bas

Tel: +31 318 660 935

Fax: +31 318 660 950

E-mail: Szabolcs.Nagy@wetlands.org

***EXPERTS*****ENVIRONMENTAL LAW**

Ms. Melissa Lewis  
Environmental Expert  
8 Glenard Rd.  
Kloof  
Kwazulu Natal, 3610  
South Africa / Afrique du Sud

Tel.: +27 (0)82 496 5411; +27 (0)31 767 4857

Fax: +27 (0)31 767 4857

E-mail: mlewis24@gmail.com

**GAME MANAGEMENT**

Mr. Jean-Yves Mondain-Monval  
ONCFS (Office national de la chasse et de la faune sauvage)  
Le Sambuc  
13200 Arles  
France

Tel.: +33 490 97 27 90

Fax: +33 490 97 27 88

E-mail: jean-yves.mondain-monval@oncfs.gouv.fr

## ***OBSERVERS FROM CONTRACTING PARTIES***

### **DENMARK**

Mr. Jon Erling Krabbe  
Head of Section  
Danish Forest and Nature Agency  
Ministry of Environment  
Natur & Skov  
Haraldsgade 53  
2100 Copenhagen OE  
Denmark / Danemark

Tel.: +45 725 42507

Fax: +45 3927 9899

E-mail: [ekr@sns.dk](mailto:ekr@sns.dk)

### **ITALY**

Dr. Alessandro Andreotti  
Advisor  
Istituto Superiore per la Protezione e la Ricerca  
Ambientale - Tecnologo  
Via Ca' Fornacetta 9  
40064 Ozzano Emilia (BO)  
Italy / Italie

Tel.: +39 051 651 2225

Fax: +39 051 796628

E-mail: [alessandro.andreotti@infs.it](mailto:alessandro.andreotti@infs.it)

### **LUXEMBOURG**

Ms. Sandra Cellina  
Ministère de l'Environnement  
18, montée de la Pétrusse  
L 2918 Luxembourg  
Luxembourg

Tel.: +352 4786820

Fax: +352 478 6835

E-mail: [sandra.cellina@mev.etat.lu](mailto:sandra.cellina@mev.etat.lu)

## ***OBSERVERS***

### **BirdLife International**

Mr. John O'Sullivan  
International Treaties Adviser  
Birdlife International  
RSPB, The Lodge  
Sandy SG19 2DL, Beds  
United Kingdom / Royaume-Uni

Tel.: +44 1767 680 551

Fax: +44 1767 683 211

E-mail: [john.osullivan@rspb.org.uk](mailto:john.osullivan@rspb.org.uk)

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

*Also representing (at this meeting):*

### **Oiseaux Migrateurs Du Palearctique Occidentale (O.M.P.O.)**

Mr. Angus Middleton  
Director of Conservation  
Rue F. Pelletier 82  
1030 Brussels  
Belgium / Belgique

Tel.: +32 2 732 69 00

Fax: +32 2 732 70 72

E-mail: [conservation@face.eu](mailto:conservation@face.eu)

**BirdLife International**

Ms. Nicola Crockford  
International Species Policy Officer  
Birdlife International  
RSPB, The Lodge  
Sandy SG19 2DL, Beds  
United Kingdom / Royaume-Uni

Tel.: +44 1767 693 072  
Fax: +44 1767 683 211; +44 1767 692365  
E-mail: nicola.crockford@rspb.org.uk

**The Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust (WWT)**

Dr. Baz Hughes  
Head of Species Conservation  
WWT  
Slimbridge  
Gloucestershire, GL2 7BT  
United Kingdom / Royaume-Uni

Tel.: +44 1453 891 175  
Fax: +44 1453 890 827  
E-mail: baz.hughes@wwt.org.uk

***OTHER CONTRIBUTORS*****UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC)**

Dr. Lucilla Spini  
Programme Officer  
Climate Change & Biodiversity Programme  
UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre  
(UNEP-WCMC)  
219 Huntingdon Road  
Cambridge, CB3 0DL  
United Kingdom / Royaume-Uni

Tel.: +44 (0) 1223 2773 14  
Fax: +44 (0) 1223 2771 36  
E-mail: Lucilla.Spini@unep-wcmc.org

**The British Association for Shooting and Conservation (BASC)**

Dr. John Harradine  
Director of Research  
BASC  
Marford Hill, Rossett  
Wrexham LL12 OHL  
United Kingdom / Royaume-Uni

Tel.: +44 1244 573 016  
Fax: +44 1244 573 013  
E-mail: john.harradine@basc.org.uk

***UNEP/AEWA SECRETARIAT***

Mr. Bert Lenten, Executive Secretary  
Mr. Sergey Dereliev, Technical Officer  
Ms. Jolanta Kremer, Team Assistant  
Ms. Catherine Lehmann, Programme Officer  
Hermann-Ehlers-Str. 10  
53113 Bonn  
Germany/ Allemagne

Tel: +49 228 815-2413  
Fax: +49 228 815-2450  
E-mail: aewa@unep.de

ANNEX III –List of tasks resulting from the 9th Meeting of the AEWA Technical Committee

Topic	Action	Responsible	Deadline	Comments
<b>TC8 minutes - Trend analysis of populations and the respective amendment to the AEWA Action Plan</b>	Checking the TC8 records after the present meeting and summarizing the discussions referred to by Mr. Harradine in more detail.	Secretariat		
<b>Technical Focal Points needed for Eastern Africa</b>	Secretariat to assist in identifying national technical focal points for the eastern Africa countries as well as to contact the current ones on the list to check whether they are still available.	Secretariat	ongoing	
<b>Regional Reports - Focal Point reports to the TC Regional Representatives</b>	Contact the Focal Points in the AEWA region and inform them of the contact details of their respective Regional Representatives and urge them to report to that person..	Secretariat		
<b>International Review Process (IRP)</b>	Standard format for required information on potential IRP cases for consultation with TC	Secretariat		
<b>International Review Process (IRP)</b>	Sociable Lapwing in Syria - Review the situation in Syria by approaching BirdLife Middle East	Secretariat		
<b>Eradication of the Ruddy Duck</b>	Letters to the Governments of the Netherlands and France according to the mandate in Resolution 4.5.	Secretariat		
<b>WG1: Hunting and Trade</b>				
<b>Task 1d) Developing guidelines for dealing with accidental shooting of look-alike species</b>	Feedback from FACE, BASC and CIC with regard to their taking the lead on this issue	AM/WG1	by July 2009	
<b>Task 1f) Hunting during pre-nuptial migration and reproduction periods</b>	To draft a paper based on experience gained through the implementation of the EC Birds Directive	DS	by October 2009	
<b>Task 1e) AEWA Action Plan para 2.1.2 (a) - taking causing unfavourable impact on conservation status</b>	Ongoing discussion regard to the exact wording (via TC Workspace)	WG1		
<b>Task 1b) AEWA Action Plan para 2.1.1 - "long-established cultural practice"</b>	Draft an appropriate text and post this on the TC Workspace for comments.	Secretariat (CL,ML)		
<b>Tasks 1c), 1g) and 1k) to be dealt with in the context of WG 8 as additions to the Sustainable Harvest Guideline</b>	Definitions to be added to the Sustainable Harvest Guideline - consider the options for submission to MOP5 for approval.	WG1		
<b>Task 1i) AEWA Action Plan para 2.5.1 - non-native species "if they consider it necessary"</b>	Draft written justification for the proposed Action Plan amendment.	ML, BH		

ANNEX III –List of tasks resulting from the 9th Meeting of the AEWA Technical Committee

<b>Task 1j) AEWA Action Plan para 2.1.2 and 4.1 - reference to Column B and C populations</b>	Assess amendments in consultation with Parties outside the EU and report to TC.	Secretariat	
	Examine the implications relating to the original idea of the Agreement concerning the difference between A, B and C Column species, should additional text be added to Column C.	CL,ML	
<b>Task 1h) AEWA Action Plan para 2.1.2 - bag limits</b>	Draft a paper on the subject and circulate it to the TC.	FACE	by January 2010
<b>WG 2 - Re-establishment</b>	Guidance for re-establishment - task to be outsourced - final draft to be submitted to the Secretariat.	Secretariat	31 July 2011
<b>WG 4 - Fluctuations</b>	Draft and finalise the definition of 'extreme fluctuations in size or trend' in cooperation with WI and IUCN	DS	end June 2009
	Draft a short note to support a Contracting Party to propose this amendment to MOP5	DS	
<b>WG 5 - Climate Change-related issues</b>	Produce a first draft for a guide for guidance and identify guidance gaps	DS	end of 2009
<b>WG 6 - Single Species Action Plans</b>	Examine open or controversial issues in the seven SSAPs presented to MOP4	BH	end of May 2009
	Identification of coordinators/compiler for both new and existing SSAPs	Secretariat	
	Production of a summary of the current state of Action Plan production and implementation + WG establishment and coordination.	BH	20 May 2009
	List of priorities for the production of Action Plans	WG6	31 July 2009
<b>WG 7 - International Implementation Tasks</b>	Draft a technical annex to the ToR and lead a discussion on the TC Workspace	SN	early July 2009
	Conservation Status Report ToR - contractor should receive precise and detailed instructions regarding criteria definitions.	Secretariat	
	Re-word the draft ToR for the <i>Report on gaps in information from surveys in the Agreement Area</i> .	Secretariat + DS	Mid-April 2009

ANNEX III –List of tasks resulting from the 9th Meeting of the AEWA Technical Committee

	Re-word the draft ToR on the site network for Waterbirds in the Agreement area and post on the TC Workspace	Secretariat + DS	
<b>WG 8 - Conservation Guidelines</b>	Draft up-dates of CG 1-4 and 6-8	WG8	end 2009
	Draft up-dates of CG 5	WG 8 + WG 1	2010
<b>WG 9 - Extractive industries</b>	Explore synergies with conservations NGOs and mining companies/coordination of cooperation between stakeholders.	DS	
<b>WG 10 - Emerging issues</b>			
<b>Emerging diseases</b>	Follow-up activities of the Task Force on Wildlife Disease established by CMS with regard to their relevance for AEWA	Secretariat	
<b>Promoting waterbird conservation through 'non-traditional' sectors of society</b>	Continue discussion on waterbird conservation through 'non-traditional' sectors of society on the TC Workspace	SD	
<b>Invasive species (including impacts of aquatic weeds)</b>	Up-load of draft guidelines on invasive species onto the TC Workspace	Secretariat	
	The issues ' <i>Traditional knowledge and harvest regimes</i> ' and ' <i>Ensuring consumptive harvests are sustainable</i> ' should be put under the umbrella of WG1 and further discussed on the TC Workspace.	WG1	
<b>Traditional knowledge and harvest schemes</b>	Jurisdiction for environmental crimes is a contentious point due to transboundary issues which should be looked into	ML	
<b>Impacts of pollution</b>	Inform the TC on the outcome of the <i>Dark Sky conference</i> in 2009 with regard to the affect of light pollution on waterbirds.	BL	
<b>Impacts of agricultural chemicals on waterbirds</b>	Put report on poisoning of geese in the Ukraine on their way back to their breeding areas at the disposal of the TC.	SK	
<b>Waterbirds and Corporate industry</b>	Place link to Ramsar formal guidelines for entering into partnerships with the business sector on the TC Workspace.	DS	
<b>Conflicting renewable energy development</b>	Place a link relating to developments for the Ramsar STRP on the TC Workspace.	DS	

# ANNEX III –List of tasks resulting from the 9th Meeting of the AEWA Technical Committee

	Provide the Secretariat with details on research done on flyways in the framework of radar work specifically designed for studying bird movements.	SN	
	Draft a Resolution on renewable energy development and post on the TC Workspace for preparation for MOP5	SD	
<b>Power lines as barriers</b>	Provide the Secretariat with information on the research being done by Graham Martin on avian vision in connection with collisions with power lines for inclusion in a guidance brochure.	MA	
	Provide the Secretariat with information on research on wind turbines in Spain.	GR	
	Provide the Secretariat with a link to guidelines for reducing the impact of powerlines on birds developed by the Italian Environment Ministry.	AA	
	Draft a resolution on infrastructure reflecting other possibilities (apart from the infrastructure guidelines) of approaching this issue.	Secretariat	
<b>TC Work Plan 2009 – 2012</b>	Make decision on whether the report on look-alike species would need outsourcing after feedback from FACE, BASC and CIC..	Secretariat	end June 2009