



11th MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
27 – 30 August 2012, Accra, Ghana

**REPORT OF THE CHAIR OF THE AEWA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE TO
THE 5th SESSION OF THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES**

Introduction

This report is being submitted to the 5th Session of the Meeting of Parties (MOP5) by the Technical Committee (TC), in accordance with Article VII paragraph 3(c) of the Agreement. The report describes the activities undertaken by the TC to implement its Work Plan for the period 2009-2012 as well as the results achieved. According to the Work Plan, ten major issues (each consisting of several tasks) had to be fulfilled in the past quadrennium. Each of these issues was delegated to a working group consisting of several regional representatives, thematic experts, NGO representatives or observers as well as a representative of the Secretariat. Each working group had a designated chair, who initiated and monitored the work as well as ensuring the delivery of results.

During the quadrennium 2009-2012, the Technical Committee held two meetings; both meetings were chaired by Jelena Kralj from Croatia, regional representative for Central Europe. The ninth meeting (TC9) was held from 20-23 April 2009 in Zagreb, Croatia, hosted by the Government of Croatia, Ministry of Culture. The tenth meeting (TC10) took place from 12-16 September 2011 in Naivasha, Kenya and was hosted by the Government of Kenya and the Kenya Wildlife Service. We would like to express our sincere gratitude and thanks to the hosts for their generous invitations, the excellent logistics and the conditions provided which contributed significantly to the success of both meetings.

Prior to TC9, the TC Work Plan 2009-2012 was developed and agreed, and working groups were established. At TC9, the majority of work was done in working groups, which proved to be very productive in dealing with their tasks and drafting documents. Another novelty was the [Technical Committee Workspace](#), launched in January 2009. It is a web-based, password-protected communication space and working area for the TC that provides an easy access to documents, enables correspondence and discussions and archives all the work of the TC. This virtual workspace has a dedicated space for each working group in the Working Area, a separate Discussion Area, where everyone can create a forum topic on issues not covered by the work plan and the Resource Area that enables a quick and easy access to a number of AEWA documents. The TC Workspace proved to be of great advantage and it is widely used by the TC (with almost 500 comments and notes posted during the last three years), making the communication very much easier and more effective. A great part of work was thus done intersessionally, including review of reports and guidelines, and the finalisation of resolutions etc.

As the result of TC work, the Committee drafted 12 resolutions to be endorsed for submission to MOP5 through the Standing Committee. Twenty MOP5 meeting documents and four information documents were drafted by the TC or prepared with the close involvement of the Committee.

Work Plan 2009-2012

The operations of the Technical Committee during the quadrennium 2009-2012 were guided by a work plan, which outlined the major tasks to be fulfilled as instructed by MOP4 and previous MOPs or by the Agreement's Action Plan. The TC also included a rolling topic on emerging issues in its Work Plan, in order to regularly review issues of importance or interest, which have not been mandated by decisions of legal

texts, and to take a proactive role in addressing them. The TC Work Plan 2009-2012 was collated by the Secretariat after the 4th Session of the Meeting of the Parties (MOP4), which took place from 15 to 19 September 2008 in Madagascar.

The work of the TC started just after MOP4 and has been an ongoing process throughout the quadrennium. The TC approved the Work Plan by correspondence in January 2009. According to this Work Plan, 10 working groups were established covering major issues (each consisting of several tasks) that had to be fulfilled and the outputs delivered to MOP5. Each TC working group consisted of several regional representatives, organisation representatives, thematic experts, observers, as well as Secretariat staff and was chaired by one of the group members.

All the tasks of the Work Plan were completed with the exception of two: (1) providing guidance on how to deal with the look-alike species with regard to hunting and (2) assessing whether the existing international networks of sites are sufficient for the protection of migratory waterbirds taking into account the projected climate change effects. Both tasks could not be fulfilled solely by the TC, but required input by external consultants, so therefore had to be outsourced. Due to lack of funding during the period 2009-2012, they were included amongst the proposed International Implementation Tasks for the next intersessional period 2012-2015/2016.

The table below summarises activities undertaken against each task over the past quadrennium and the results delivered.

AEWA Technical Committee Work Plan 2009-2012

Issue/task	Working group composition	Action taken and results delivered
<p>1. Lead shot, hunting and trade</p> <p>a) examine, as far as waterbird species covered by the Agreement are concerned, any potential problems from the use of lead shot in terrestrial ecosystems as well as from the use of lead fishing weights (Resolution 4.1)</p> <p>b) provide a definition of the term “<i>long-established cultural practice</i>” used in paragraph 2.1.1 of the Action Plan; to review the conservation status of populations listed in Column A and marked with an asterisk; to provide advice to the MOP on how to improve their conservation status (Resolution 4.3)</p> <p>c) review the exemptions listed in paragraph 2.1.3 a-e) of the Action Plan and to advise on whether the term “<i>other overriding public interests</i>” should be amended or defined (Resolution 4.3)</p> <p>d) provide guidance on a species-by-species basis to the Parties on how to deal with look-alike species with</p>	<p>JYMM, JK, DS, MA, NK, ML, AM, JH, JOS/NC, BH, BL, CL, SD</p>	<p>MOP4 requested the TC to provide definitions or guidance for wording used in the AEWA Action Plan (AP) regarding taking (Resolutions 4.1 and 4.3). The outputs from the work of this group served as a basis for draft Resolution AEWA/MOP5 DR6, which includes all proposed changes of the AEWA Action Plan wording.</p> <p>a) The available literature relating to the impact of lead fishing weights on waterbird species has been reviewed. The review includes the types and size of fishing weights ingested and its quantities dispersed in the environment, waterbird species affected and extent of their mortality, alternative materials and availability, existing regulations and their effectiveness. The results are collated in document AEWA/MOP Inf. 5.2. It was found that fishing weights weighing between 0.06 and 28.35 grams could pose a threat to waterbirds. The change in wording of Action Plan paragraph 4.1.4. was suggested (see document AEWA/MOP 5.20). The scientific evidence on lead poisoning of waterbirds in terrestrial ecosystems is needed. TC decided to wait for the CMS COP10 resolution on minimizing the risk of poisoning to migratory birds (CMS Resolution 10.26) to see if there could be an option for the research in the next intersessional period.</p> <p>b) While reviewing the conservation status of asterisk-marked populations listed in Column A, the TC decided that it is impossible to define “<i>long-established cultural practice</i>” and suggested deleting that part of text from the AP paragraph 2.1.1. Instead, the sustainable use was defined as the use that is conducted within the framework of special provisions of an international single species action plan, which seeks to implement the principles of adaptive harvest management. (Single species action plans are already required for the hunting of asterisk-marked populations under the current “<i>long-established cultural practice</i>” exception.) (see document</p>

Issue/task	Working group composition	Action taken and results delivered
<p>regard to hunting (Resolution 4.3)</p> <p>e) review paragraph 2.1.2 (a) of the AEWA Action Plan and its passage “<i>if the taking has an unfavourable impact on the conservation status of the population concerned</i>” and to provide guidance to the Meeting of the Parties on the impact of this passage for the implementation of this paragraph (Resolution 4.3)</p> <p>f) review the periods during which huntable bird populations of conservation concern covered by the Agreement return to their breeding grounds and, if needed, to provide further guidance on the implementation of paragraph 2.1.2 (a) AEWA Action Plan (Resolution 4.3)</p> <p>g) elaborate a definition or enumeration of examples for the term “modes of taking” used in paragraph 2.1.2 (b) of the Action Plan (Resolution 4.3)</p> <p>h) review paragraph 2.1.2 (c) and its term “<i>where appropriate</i>” in order to provide Parties with elaborate guidance on the question whether and how bag limits are to be established in the respective countries (Resolution</p>		<p>AEWA/MOP 5.20)</p> <p>c) Paragraph 2.1.3. of the Action Plan provides that exemptions from legal measures listed in paragraphs 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 may be granted for a number of purposes, including “<i>in the interests of air safety or other overriding public interests</i>”. Rather than to define the term “<i>other overriding public interests</i>”, the Technical Committee suggested additional text which lists several types of interests that can, depending on the circumstances, constitute overriding public interests and thus can justify the use of these exemptions (see document AEWA/MOP 5.20).</p> <p>d) The TC developed ToR for the development of guidance on how to deal with the look-alike species with regard to hunting. Due to the lack of resources, it was not implemented and will be forwarded to the work plan for the next intersessional period.</p> <p>e) With regard to assessment of the “<i>unfavourable impact on the conservation status</i>”, the TC discussed a possible change of wording. Finally, it was decided to leave the text as it is, but instead to propose an International Implementation Task (IIT) project on harvest data collection (see draft Resolution AEWA/MOP5 DR3) as well as a project on AEWA sustainable harvest guidelines so that, in the long term, countries are enabled to assess if their taking has an unfavourable impact on the conservation status of the population concerned.</p> <p>f) To review the periods during which huntable bird populations of conservation concern covered by the Agreement return to their breeding grounds and breed, document AEWA/MOP Inf. 5.3 was developed. This document lists relevant EU guidelines and gives the definition of the ‘reproduction period’. Period of pre-nuptial migration for each species cannot be easily assessed as it changes with latitude, elevation and other factors and is influenced by geographical and year-to-year variation within the country. To assist Parties to assess the period of the breeding</p>

Issue/task	Working group composition	Action taken and results delivered
<p>4.3)</p> <p>i) review paragraph 2.5 of the Action Plan and to provide advice on whether the term “<i>if they consider it necessary</i>” should be deleted from the text or amended in order to bring it in line with Article III 2 (g) of the Agreement text (Resolution 4.3)</p> <p>j) review paragraphs 2.1.2 and 4.1 of the Action Plan and, if needed, to provide advice to the Meeting of the Parties on how to amend the text in the way that provisions on “<i>hunting modes</i>”, but also on limitations on hunting seasons as well as limits on taking, clearly refer to Column B and C populations (Resolution 4.3)</p> <p>k) provide guidance to the Parties on how to implement Paragraph 4.1.1 and, if needed, to advise on possible amendments to the Action Plan in order to provide Parties with more specific requirements with respect to the “<i>principle of sustainable use</i>” (Resolution 4.3)</p>		<p>season, for each species the definitions for the start and end of breeding periods are given. It was only possible for European species, while for all waterbirds, the most valuable sources of information useful to determining the start and end of breeding seasons, and the timing of migration were given.</p> <p>g) To provide guidance to “<i>modes of taking</i>”, a list of modes of taking based on the Annex 4 of the Bern Convention was developed and proposed for addition into AP paragraph 2.1.3.b. However, an additional sentence was proposed that will leave a space for exemptions for livelihood purpose, where taking is sustainable (see document AEWA/MOP 5.20).</p> <p>h) Paragraph 2.1.2(c) of the AP instructs Parties to establish limits on taking, “where appropriate”. Regarding the use of the term “<i>where appropriate</i>”, the TC discussed the change in wording in order to clarify whether and how bag limits are to be established. The issue of “<i>limits of taking</i>” covers temporal, spatial, practical (methods) and quantitative (bag) limits. Types of limits applied should be done in relation to local and national conditions and the resources available. Therefore, it was decided not to change the wording, but to add the guidance on the term and possibilities of “<i>limits of taking</i>” to the sustainable harvest guidelines, when they are re-drafted.</p> <p>i) In order to bring the text in the Action Plan paragraph 2.5. in line with Article III 2 (g) of the Agreement text it was proposed that the phrase “<i>if they consider it necessary</i>” be removed from paragraph 2.5.1 and 2.5.2.of the Action Plan (see document AEWA/MOP 5.20).</p> <p>j) The TC discussed the implications of equaling columns B and C of the AEWA Table and decided that there is no need for specific hunting requirements for Column C populations, but that it would be preferable to stick to the current system of the AEWA Action Plan, which provides specific restrictions for Column A populations</p>

Issue/task	Working group composition	Action taken and results delivered
		<p>and more general requirements with respect to Column B and C populations In the case that the AEWA Action Plan would be updated to require concrete actions with respect to hunting of and trade in Column C populations, at least part of the Contracting Parties will have to review and probably amend their national legislation.</p> <p>k) MOP4 requested guidance on how to implement Action Plan Paragraph 4.1.1 and to provide Parties with more specific requirements with respect to the “principle of sustainable use”. This issue has been addressed by the AEWA Guidelines on Sustainable Harvest of Migratory Waterbirds (No.5), which were first developed in 2002 and later updated in 2005. This document does not take into consideration the Addis Ababa Principle and Guidelines for the Sustainable use of Biodiversity (2004) or the European Charter on Hunting and Biodiversity (2008), which offer more detailed guidance for both regulators and practitioners. The TC proposed to completely re-write the Guidelines on Sustainable Harvest of Migratory Waterbirds. That task was added to the IIT for the next triennium.</p>
<p>2. Re-establishment</p> <p>a) develop supplementary guidance for the re-establishment of waterbirds drawing from data and information compiled in the AEWA review, and <i>inter alia</i> including simple check-lists of necessary activities to guide conservation practitioners (Resolution 4.4)</p> <p>b) develop a reporting structure, including a standard set of evaluation criteria, to encourage practitioners to provide detailed information about</p>	<p>JCV, ON, ML, DS, JOS/NC, BH, PT/GNO, SD</p>	<p>The ToR for a contract to be outsourced to an external consultancy was prepared at TC9 (2009). The AEWA guidelines for the translocation of waterbirds for conservation purposes were developed by the Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust in early 2012, and reviewed and approved by the TC by correspondence. The guidelines themselves provide a very detailed set of useful directions in each part of the process from pre-project planning to post-release stage as well as a suggested structure on reporting by Parties to the AEWA Secretariat on translocation projects. The guidelines are presented in document AEWA/MOP 5.36.</p>

Issue/task	Working group composition	Action taken and results delivered
each project stage, and to make this information widely accessible (Resolution 4.4)		
<p>3. AEW A Annexes 2 and 3 (Resolution 3.3)</p> <p>a) review ornithological data on the Little Tern <i>Sterna albifrons</i> for a better delineation of the Mediterranean populations taking into account the relevant information concerning the Italian breeding population and to draft a consequent proposal for amendments to Table 1, as appropriate, to be presented to MOP5 (Resolution 4.11)</p> <p>b) review the definitions of geographical terms used in range descriptions of populations in Table 1 and to draft a consequent proposal for amendments to Table 1, as appropriate, to be presented to MOP5 (Resolution 4.11)</p> <p>c) review, as a matter of priority, in the light of the development of terminology used by IUCN for Red Data Lists, 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</p>	<p>SK, HA, DS, JK, SN/WH, JOS/NC, BH, NK, SD</p>	<p>a) At TC9, the status of the Little Tern <i>Sterna albifrons</i> was reviewed and the existing population was split into western and eastern Mediterranean population. This change was included in 5th edition of the Conservation Status Report (see document AEW A/MOP 5.14).</p> <p>b) The TC agreed that geographical terms used in range descriptions of populations in Table 1 have no political significance and the short text to highlight this fact was added to Table 1: “Note that waterbird ranges respect biological, not political, boundaries and that precise alignment of biological and political entities is extremely unusual. The range descriptions used have no political significance and are for general guidance only, and for concise, mapped summaries of waterbird ranges, practitioners should consult the Critical Site Network Tool internet portal: http://wow.wetlands.org/informationflyway/criticalsitenetworktool/tabid/1349/language/en-US/Default.aspx” (see the 5th edition of the Conservation Status Report, document AEW A/MOP 5.14)</p> <p>c) The applicability of the Near Threatened IUCN Category, to the listing of populations in Table 1 as well as the consequences of different options were discussed. The TC decided to add a 4th category to Column A for Table 1 for species, with the following description: “<i>Category 4: Species, which are listed as Near Threatened on the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (as reported in the most recent summary by BirdLife International), but do not fulfil the conditions in respect of Category 1, 2 or 3 as described above</i>” and to allow the possibility of hunting of Category 4 populations on a sustainable use basis, providing that such hunting is conducted within the framework of an international single species action plan. Proposed changes and amendments of the Table 1 and para 2.1.2 are listed in document AEW A/MOP 5.20.</p>

Issue/task	Working group composition	Action taken and results delivered
<p>Table 1 to be considered at MOP5 (Resolution 4.11)</p> <p>d) review taxonomic classifications of birds and suggest the most appropriate classification for the purposes of the Agreement, including application to Annex 2, and to draft a consequent proposal for amendments to Annex 2 and Table 1, as appropriate, to be presented to MOP (Resolution 4.11)</p> <p>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)</p>		<p>d) During the assessment of the most appropriate taxonomic classification of birds for the purposes of the Agreement, the TC considered the report of the CMS Scientific Council Intersessional Working Group on Bird Taxonomy and Nomenclature. This Group proposed that apart from birds listed under the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP), CMS should follow taxonomy and nomenclature by Dickinson (2003). The TC considered all the aspects of taxonomic classifications in the case of AEWA species and although there would be obvious advantages in aligning the taxonomy used by CMS and AEWA, and, despite the possible disadvantage noted by the CMS Working Group that the BirdLife International's taxonomic reference list is not printed, it considered the BirdLife taxonomy to be more appropriate. The TC had compiled a communication to the CMS WG to this effect including a table outlining the pragmatic and financial reasons and benefits for AEWA choosing the BirdLife taxonomy over Dickinson. At the 10th Conference of the Parties to CMS in late 2011, the CMS Parties decided to postpone the decision until the next meeting and requested the CMS ScC chair to undertake consultations with the other biodiversity-related MEAs and other stakeholders. The TC therefore did not make a proposal to MOP5 and will continue to work on this issue in the next intersessional period in collaboration with the CMS Scientific Council.</p> <p>e) MOP4 requested TC to propose amendments to the AEWA Action Plan to deal with tackling the effects of aquatic invasive non-native species on waterbird habitats. The most appropriate place to do this is para 3.3. of the AEWA Action Plan, dealing with Rehabilitation and Restoration. However, it was noted that it would not be appropriate to highlight only aquatic invasive non-native species. Therefore, the list of other impacts and factors that might cause the degradation of habitats is added to para 3.3 (see document AEWA/MOP 5.20).</p>

Issue/task	Working group composition	Action taken and results delivered
<p>4. Table 1 criteria</p> <p>Develop guidance for interpretation of the term “<i>extreme fluctuations in population size or trend</i>” used in Table 1 of the Action Plan (Resolution 4.12)</p>	<p>DS, SN/WH, JCV, GRJ, SD</p>	<p>This is the criterion used for categories A3d and B2d of the AEWA Table 1. The TC was requested already by MOP3 to develop interpretation guidance, but the task was not fulfilled and its finalization was postponed to the next triennium. It became clear that the definition of “<i>extreme fluctuation</i>” in the sense of the IUCN definition (i.e. tenfold increase or decrease) is not applicable, as waterbird populations do not fluctuate in size at a scale of one order of magnitude. To avoid confusion with the IUCN Red List term, it was suggested to change the wording of the criterion from ‘<i>extreme</i>’ to ‘<i>large</i>’ fluctuation, and the definition of large fluctuation as a variation greater than a factor of two within a short period of time. The factor of two and timescale suggested are likely to pick out only the most extreme species/populations from knowledge of waterbird dynamics. The outputs from the work of this Working Group are presented in document AEWA/MOP 5.21.</p>
<p>5. Climate change</p> <p>a) identify further research priorities that will inform future adaptation measures, and to bring these to MOP5 for possible inclusion in the Action Plan (Resolution 4.14)</p> <p>b) assess whether the existing international networks of sites are sufficient for the protection of migratory waterbirds, including the projected climate change effects, and if necessary, to propose to MOP5 which additional complementary approaches should be taken (Resolution 4.14)</p>	<p>DS, JM, GF, HS, SN/WH, ON, JK, PT/GNO, SD</p>	<p>a) An adaptation framework was developed as guidance for national adaptation measures related to the conservation of waterbirds and their wetland and other habitats (see draft Resolution AEWA/MOP5 DR13).</p> <p>b) While the sufficiency of the site network was assessed in the scope of the preliminary AEWA Review on the Network of Sites (document AEWA/MOP 5.15), the climate change aspect was considered separately. The list of potential methods for identifying important sites vulnerable to climate change was developed (see document AEWA/MOP Inf. 5.1) and a project on the identification of important sites vulnerable to climate change was included in the proposed IIT (see draft Resolution AEWA/MOP5 DR3). This task needs to be outsourced, funding permitting.</p>

Issue/task	Working group composition	Action taken and results delivered
<p>6. SSAPs</p> <p>Examine the open and/or controversial issues in the SSAPs identified at MOP4 and to propose appropriate revisions to the SSAPs for consideration and adoption by MOP5 (Resolution 4.16)</p>	<p>JM, GRJ, HS, JOS/NC, AM, BH, SD</p>	<p>At TC9 (2009), the Committee examined the existing Single Species Action Plans and could not identify any open and/or unresolved issues. Further consultations did not identify such issues either. The working group therefore focused on discussing the prioritisation of SSAPs for development, coordination of implementation and monitoring of SSAP processes.</p> <p>A summary table with the current state of single species action plan production and coordination was produced (document AEWA/MOP 5.24). During the last quadrennium, the first International Flyway Management Plan (for the Pink-footed Goose <i>Anser brachyrhynchus</i> -Svalbard/NW European population) was developed, which led to changes in the wording of paragraph 4.3.4 of the AEWA Action Plan – introducing the new type of international single species plan (see document AEWA/MOP 5.20 <i>Proposals to the 5th Session of the Meeting of the Parties for Amendments to Annex 3 (Action Plan and Table 1) of AEW</i>).</p> <p>The outcomes of this work are summarised in Draft Resolution AEWA/MOP5 DR8.</p>
<p>7. IIT</p> <p>Review the structure of the International Implementation Tasks (IIT) to enhance their responsiveness to key and emerging issues identified by the international reviews specified in paragraph 7.4 of the Action Plan to be produced in the following quadrennium, and to undertake this task alongside the assessment of these reviews as specified in paragraph 7.6 of the Action Plan (Resolution 4.10); after assessing the reviews also to formulate draft recommendation and resolutions for consideration by MOP (Action Plan 7.6)</p>	<p>HA, JK, SK, BL, SD</p>	<p>The List of International Implementation Tasks (IIT) 2009-2016 was thoroughly reviewed. Fulfilled tasks (many of them related to the implementation of the Wings over Wetlands project, which was closed in 2010) were deleted and others were updated and the list was largely re-written. Particular attention was paid to the alignment of tasks with the Plan of Action for Africa (to be revised upon completion of the PoA prior to MOP5). The draft IITs for [2012-2015] [2012-2016] are presented in draft Resolution AEWA/MOP5 DR3, where a total of 31 projects are listed.</p>

Issue/task	Working group composition	Action taken and results delivered
<p>8. Conservation Guidelines</p> <p>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 (Action Plan 7.6)</p>	<p>JK, SK, ON, MA, AM, SD</p>	<p>The existing guidelines were reviewed and the need for their updating was assessed. Three guidelines were updated. Guidelines No. 6 - <i>Guidelines on regulating trade in migratory waterbirds</i> were completely re-written, while Guidelines No. 2 - <i>Guidelines on identifying and tackling emergency situations for migratory waterbirds</i> and Guidelines No. 10 - <i>Avoidance of introductions of non-native waterbird species</i> were reviewed and updated. The three revised guidelines are submitted to MOP5 for approval (documents AEWA/MOP 5.33, 5.34 and 5.35).</p> <p>The update of two guidelines (No.1 - <i>Guidelines on the preparation of National Single Species Action Plans for migratory waterbirds</i> and No. 5 – <i>Guidelines on sustainable harvest of migratory waterbirds</i>) should be outsourced, so they were added to the IITs for the next triennium (document AEWA/MOP5 DR3). The work in this group will continue over the following triennium.</p>
<p>9. Mining and extractive industries</p> <p>Produce a review on the effects of mining and extractive industries on wetlands and waterbirds (in collaboration with the Ramsar Convention STRP; grant provided by the UK) (IIT 2009-2016, No. 12)</p>	<p>All</p>	<p>This task was undertaken in conjunction with the Ramsar Scientific and Technical Review Panel (STRP) – funding was provided by the UK DEFRA to Ramsar for joint implementation of TC/STRP tasks related to extractive industries. The TC reviewed and commented on the ToR for review on effects of mining and extractive industries drafted by Ramsar STRP. While the tasks could not be fully accomplished in this intersessional period and will be finalised in the following one, a draft resolution was prepared and submitted to MOP5 (draft Resolution AEWA/MOP5 DR14).</p>
<p>10. Ongoing and emerging issues</p> <p>Regularly review ongoing and emerging issues and take a proactive role in dealing with and resolving them</p>	<p>All</p>	<p>At its 9th meeting (April 2009) the TC identified a list of potential ongoing and/or emerging issues of interest for AEWA. On several of them the TC undertook intersessional work and delivered outputs for MOP5. This working group will continue its work in the next intersessional period, also on some of the already-identified issues.</p>

Issue/task	Working group composition	Action taken and results delivered
		<p>a) <u>Invasive alien aquatic weeds</u>. The TC reviewed the <i>Study on the impact of invasive alien aquatic weeds on waterbird habitats in Africa</i> based on case studies on Lake Naivasha, Kenya and the Kafue Flats in Zambia conducted in 2006 (document AEWA/MOP Inf. 5.4) and compiled draft Resolution AEWA/MOP5 DR15.</p> <p>b) <u>Impact of agricultural chemicals</u>. The TC reviewed the Study on adverse effects of agrochemicals on migratory waterbirds in Africa (document AEWA/MOP Inf. 5.5) finalised in 2011 and compiled draft Resolution AEWA/MOP5 DR12.</p> <p>c) <u>Conflicting renewable energy developments</u>. In addition to wind energy installations, other renewable energy production methods may also have a negative impact on waterbird habitats or food sources. This issue was discussed at TC9 and TC10 and this resulted in the submission of draft Resolution AEWA/MOP5 DR16.</p> <p>d) <u>Powerlines</u>. The TC work on this issue was complemented by the compilation of a <i>Review of the Conflict Between Migratory Birds and Electricity Power Grids in the Africa-Eurasian Region</i> (document AEWA/MOP 5.38) and the draft <i>Guidelines on How to Avoid or Mitigate Impact of Electricity Power Grids on Migratory Birds in the African-Eurasian Region</i> (document AEWA/MOP 5.37). The TC was closely involved in the work on these two documents throughout all the stages of development, starting with the drafting of the ToR, through reviewing and commenting and signing-off of the final outputs.</p>

Overview of abbreviations of full names of the members of working groups (in alphabetical order):

Abbreviation	Full name	Abbreviation	Full name
AM	Angus Middleton	JK	Jelena Kralj
BH	Baz Hughes	JM	John Mshelbwala
BL	Bert Lenten	JOS	John O'Sullivan
CL	Catherine Lehmann	JYMM	Jean-Yves Mondain-Monval
DS	David Stroud	MA	Mark Anderson
FK	Florian Keil	ML	Melissa Lewis
GF	Gerardo Fragoso	NC	Nicola Crockford
GNO	Guy-Noël Olivier	NK	Niels Kanstrup
GRJ	Ghassan Ramadan-Jaradi	ON	Oliver Nasirwa
HA	Hichem Azafzaf	SD	Sergey Dereliev
HS	Hussein Sosovele	SK	Sergey Khomenko
PT	Patrick Triplet	SN	Szabolcs Nagy
JCV	Jean-Christophe Vié	WH	Ward Hagemeijer
JH	John Harradine		

Other activities of the Technical Committee over the past intersessional period 2009-2012

1. The TC reviewed, commented on and approved the drafts of Single Species Action Plans for five waterbird species/populations and one International Species Management Plan (see documents AEWA/MOP 5.25 to 5.30) for submission to MOP5.
2. The TC reviewed, commented extensively and approved the 5th edition of the Conservation Status Report (document AEWA/MOP 5.14) and the proposed amendments to Table 1 of the AEWA Action Plan (document AEWA/MOP 5.20), submitted to MOP5. The TC also closely guided the development of the 1st edition of the Review on the Site Network. The work on this paper progressed significantly, but due to time constraints and incomplete feedback from the Contracting Parties, it could not be fully finalised for submission to MOP5, therefore the TC decided to continue its development in the next triennium and submit it to MOP6. A preliminary version of the report with its conclusions and recommendations has been presented to MOP5 for information (document AEWA/MOP 5.15).
3. The TC was closely involved in the process of development of the African Plan of Action 2012-2017 that serves as a guide to the implementation of the AEWA Strategic Plan 2009-2017 in the African region. The TC reviewed its draft and developed two questionnaires to get direct feedback from the African AEWA Focal Points, potential donors and other stakeholders.
4. A number of TC members tested a late version of the CMS Family Online Reporting System, which was used for national reporting to MOP5. The TC commented on the proposal for amendments to the national report format, prepared by the Secretariat, before it was submitted for approval by the Standing Committee. Several TC members and observers worked with the Secretariat to design the analysis of information submitted through the national reports. This served as the basis for the production of document AEWA/MOP 5.12 *Analysis of AEWA National Reports for the Triennium 2009-2011*, which was also commented by the TC.
5. The TC reviewed three possible IRP cases intersessionally and provided advice to the Standing Committee through the Secretariat.
6. The TC reviewed project proposals submitted to the *Small Grants Fund* intersessionally and provided advice on their funding to the Standing Committee through Secretariat.
7. The Chair of the Technical Committee participated actively in the 6th and 7th AEWA Standing Committee meetings held on 16-17 June 2010 in The Hague, the Netherlands and 26-27 November 2011 in Bergen, Norway, respectively.
9. The Chair of the TC participated in the Symposium to celebrate the 15th Anniversary of AEWA under the slogan '*Flyway conservation in action*' held on 14-15 June 2010 in The Hague, the Netherlands.
10. The Chair of the Technical Committee participated actively in the CMS Scientific Council intersessional Working Group on Flyways and attended its first meeting held on 20-21 February 2011 in Edinburgh, Scotland.

Vote of Thanks

We would like to express our thanks to the Members and Observers of the Technical Committee, and especially to the various intersessional working groups for their dedication and hard work, as well as to the Secretariat for their unflinching support and timely finalisation of discussion documents.