

**REPORT OF THE 10<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE<sup>1</sup>**  
*8-10 July 2015, Kampala, Uganda*

**Contents**

StC10 Decisions and Required Actions.....	3
Agenda item 1. Opening of the Meeting .....	9
Agenda item 2. Adoption of the Agenda and Work Programme.....	10
Agenda item 3. Welcome and Admission of Observers.....	10
Agenda item 4. Reports by: .....	10
a. Standing Committee (StC) Regional Members and Party Observers .....	10
b. Technical Committee (TC).....	10
c. Depository.....	11
d. Secretariat.....	11
e. Other Observers .....	11
Agenda item 5. Preparations for the 6 <sup>th</sup> Ordinary Session of the Meeting of the Parties and Celebration of the 20 <sup>th</sup> Anniversary of AEWA .....	12
Agenda item 6. African Initiative for the Conservation of Migratory Waterbirds and their Habitats in Africa .....	12
Agenda item 7. Report on the Implementation and Revision of the Communication Strategy.....	14
Agenda item 8. Implementation Review Process .....	15
Agenda item 9. International Reviews .....	16
Agenda item 10. International Single Species Action and Management Plans (ISSAPs and ISMPs) and International Multi-Species Action Plan (IMSAP).....	18
Draft ISSAP for the Grey Crowned Crane (Document StC 10.11).....	18
Draft ISSAP for the Taiga Bean Goose (Document StC 10.12).....	19
Draft ISSAP for the Long-tailed Duck (Document StC 10.13).....	19
Draft ISSAP for the Eurasian Curlew (Document StC 10.14) .....	19
Draft revised ISSAP for the Lesser White-fronted Goose (Document StC10.15) .....	19
Draft revised ISSAP for the Northern Bald Ibis (Document StC 10.16).....	20
Agenda item 11. Waterbird Monitoring .....	21

<sup>1</sup> Report finalised after a process of consultation with the Standing Committee and other participants of StC10.

Agenda item 12. Renewable Energy .....	22
Agenda item 13. Seabirds.....	23
Agenda item 14. Conservation Guidelines .....	24
Agenda item 15. Report on the Implementation and Revision of the AEWA International Implementation Tasks 2009-2016.....	25
Agenda item 16. Issues Affecting the Conservation Status of Migratory Waterbirds in the AEWA Region .....	26
Agenda item 17. Proposals for Amendments to the Agreement and/or its Annexes.....	28
Agenda item 18. Institutional Arrangements.....	28
a. Standing Committee .....	28
b. Technical Committee.....	29
Agenda item 19. Financial and Administrative Matters .....	29
a. Execution of the Budget 2013-2015 .....	29
b. Draft Budget Proposal 2016-2018.....	30
c. Administrative and Personnel Matters.....	33
Agenda item 20. Other Draft Resolutions .....	34
Agenda item 21. Selection of the AEWA Waterbird Conservation Award Winners (closed session).....	36
Agenda item 22. Dates and Venues of the 11 <sup>th</sup> and 12 <sup>th</sup> Meetings of the Standing Committee .....	36
Agenda item 23. Any Other Business .....	36
Agenda item 24. Closure of the Meeting.....	36
APPENDIX 1-StC10 Participants List.....	38

AGENDA ITEM		DECISION	ACTION
<b>Agenda item 2.</b>	Adoption of the Agenda and Work Programme	The Chair declared the agenda and provisional work programme adopted.	
<b>Agenda item 3.</b>	Welcome and Admission of Observers	The Meeting agreed to admit the Observers.	
<b>Agenda item 7.</b>	Report on the Implementation and Revision of the Communication Strategy	Document StC10.25 <i>Development of the Communication Strategy</i> should be revised according to the suggestions made and circulated to the members of the StC for comments.	The Secretariat will circulate the revised Communication Strategy to the StC for comments mid-August 2015.
		DR10 on the <i>Communication Strategy</i> was approved for submission to MOP6 for consideration with the incorporation of a preambular paragraph relating to the communication needs of different audiences.	The Secretariat will revise DR10 accordingly before submission to MOP6.
<b>Agenda item 8.</b>	Implementation Review Process (IRP)	The StC will report to MOP6 on the four ongoing IRP cases.	The Secretariat will prepare a succinct draft report and send it to the StC in August 2015 for approval for submission to MOP6.
		Regarding the potential IRP case in France on the windfarm development, it was decided that the StC should keep it as a watching brief.	
<b>Agenda item 9.</b>	International Reviews	The Meeting approved Document StC10.9 the <i>Sixth Edition of the Report on the Conservation Status of Migratory Waterbirds in the Agreement Area</i> for submission to MOP6.	
			The Secretariat will finalise the <i>Report on the Status of Preparation and Implementation of AEWAs ISSAPs and ISSMPs as well as Multi-species Action Plans 2015</i> and circulate it to the TC and StC in time for approval for submission to MOP6.

AGENDA ITEM	DECISION	ACTION
<p><b>Agenda item 10.</b></p>	<p>International Single Species Action and Management Plans (ISSAPs and ISMPs) and International Multi-Species Action Plan (IMSAP)</p>	<p>1. The Meeting took note of the following International Single Species Action plans and agreed that they will be presented to MOP6 for adoption:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <i>Draft ISSAP for the Grey Crowned Crane</i></li> <li>b) <i>Draft ISSAP for the Taiga Bean Goose</i></li> <li>c) <i>Draft ISSAP for the Long-tailed Duck</i></li> <li>d) <i>Draft ISSAP for the Eurasian Curlew</i></li> </ul> <p>The Meeting agreed that the <i>Draft Revised ISSAP for the Lesser White-fronted Goose</i> will be presented to MOP6 for adoption, pending the incorporation of comments by the Range States (due by the end of August 2015).</p> <p>The Meeting approved Doc. StC10.17 <i>Draft Guidance for prioritising AEWA populations for Action and Management Planning and for retirement of ISSAPs, as well as Guidance on the definition of Principal Range States in Action Plans</i> for submission to MOP6; Sections A &amp; C for information and Section B for adoption.</p> <p>The Meeting approved DR8 <i>Adoption and Implementation of International Single Species and Multi-species Action and Management Plans</i> for submission to MOP6 for consideration.</p>
<p><b>Agenda item 11.</b></p>	<p>Waterbird Monitoring</p>	<p>The Meeting approved DR3 <i>Strengthening Monitoring of Migratory Waterbirds</i> for submission to MOP6 for consideration, pending incorporation of comments made by the Meeting.</p>

AGENDA ITEM	DECISION	ACTION
<b>Agenda item 12.</b>	Renewable Energy	The Meeting approved DR11 <i>Addressing Impacts of Renewable Energy Deployment on Migratory Waterbirds</i> for submission to MOP6 for consideration, pending incorporation of comments made by the Meeting.
<b>Agenda item 13.</b>	Seabirds	Document StC 10.18 <i>Potential Impacts of Marine Fisheries on Migratory Seabirds within the Afrotropical Region</i> was approved for submission to MOP6.
		Document StC 10.19 <i>Status, Threats and Conservation Action Priorities for the Seabird Populations covered by the Agreement</i> will be circulated to the StC in August for approval for submission to MOP6.
		DR9 Rev.1 on <i>Improving the Conservation of Seabird Species in the African-Eurasian Region</i> will be finalised by the Secretariat and circulated to the StC for approval by the end of August, before being submitted to MOP6 for consideration.
<b>Agenda item 14.</b>	Conservation Guidelines	Document StC10.22 <i>Draft Guidelines on National Legislation for the Protection of Species of Migratory Waterbirds and their Habitats</i> was approved for submission to MOP6 for adoption.
		Document StC10.24 <i>Guidelines for Sustainable Deployment for Renewable Energy Technologies</i> was approved for submission to MOP6 for adoption.

AGENDA ITEM		DECISION	ACTION
			The <i>Draft Revised Guidelines on Sustainable Harvest of Migratory Waterbirds</i> will be circulated to the StC for approval in August.
		DR5 <i>Revision and Adoption of Conservation Guidelines</i> was approved for submission to MOP6 for consideration.	The Secretariat will amend the last operative paragraph in the French version of DR5, as suggested.
<b>Agenda item 15.</b>	Report on the Implementation and Revision of the AEWA International Implementation Tasks 2009-2016	DR13 <i>AEWA International Implementation Tasks 2016-2018</i> was approved for submission to MOP6 for consideration.	
<b>Agenda item 16.</b>	Issues affecting the Conservation Status of Migratory Waterbirds in the AEWA Region	DR4 <i>Conservation and Sustainable Use of Migratory Waterbirds</i> was approved for submission to MOP6 for consideration with the inclusion of the comments made.	The Secretariat will revise DR4 accordingly.
		DR6 <i>Update Guidance on Climate Change Adaptation Measures for Waterbirds</i> was approved for submission to MOP6 for consideration with the inclusion of the comments made.	The Secretariat will revise DR6 accordingly.
		DR12 Rev.1 <b>Avoiding Unnecessary Additional Mortality for Migratory Waterbirds</b> was approved for submission to MOP6 for consideration with the inclusion of the comments made.	The Secretariat will revise DR12 Rev.1 accordingly.
<b>Agenda item 17.</b>	Proposals for Amendments to the Agreement and/or its Annexes	DR1 <i>Adoption of Amendments to the AEWA Annexes</i> was adopted for submission to MOP6 for consideration.	The Secretariat will add the appendices reflecting the amendments in Annexes 2 and 3 to the Agreement to the final draft resolution.

AGENDA ITEM		DECISION	ACTION
Agenda item 18.	Institutional Arrangements	DR16 <i>Institutional Arrangements: Standing Committee</i> was approved for submission to MOP6 for consideration.	
		DR17 <i>Institutional Arrangements: Technical Committee</i> was approved for submission to MOP6 for consideration.	During MOP6, the Secretariat will add the names of the recommended candidates after assessment by the Advisory Group.
Agenda item 19.	Financial and Administrative Matters	Document StC10.26 <i>Report of the Secretariat on Finance and Administrative Issues 2013-2015</i> was noted and approved for submission to MOP6 with the inclusion of the additional information suggested.	The Secretariat will revise the document accordingly before submission to MOP6.
		Document StC10.27 <i>Draft Budget Proposal 2016-2018</i> was noted and approved for submission to MOP6 after incorporation of the comments made.	The Secretariat will revise the document accordingly before submission to MOP6.
		Document StC10.7 <i>Report on the CMS/AEWA Information Management, Communication and Awareness-raising Unit</i> was noted by the Meeting.	The Secretariat will update the document for submission to MOP6.
		DR18 <b>Financial and Administrative Matters</b> was approved for submission to MOP6 for consideration.	
Agenda item 20.	Other Draft Resolutions	DR2 <i>Adoption of the Arabic Text</i> was approved for submission to MOP6 upon receipt of feedback from the Depositary.	

AGENDA ITEM	DECISION	ACTION
	<p>DR7 Rev.1 <i>Adoption of Guidance and Definitions in the Context of Implementation of the AEWA Action Plan</i> was approved for submission to MOP6 for consideration pending the incorporation of comments.</p>	<p>The Secretariat will revise DR7 Rev.1 accordingly before submission to MOP6.</p>
	<p>DR14 Rev.1 <i>Extension and Revision of the AEWA Strategic Plan 2009-2017 and the Plan of Action for Africa 2012-2017 until 2018 and their Revisions</i> was approved for submission to MOP6 pending the incorporation of comments.</p>	<p>The Secretariat will revise DR14 Rev.1 accordingly before submission to MOP6.</p>
	<p>DR15 <i>Update on AEWA's Contribution to Delivering the Aichi 2020 Biodiversity Targets</i> was approved for submission to MOP6 for consideration with the addition of an annex on AEWA's contribution to the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).</p>	<p>The Secretariat will include the agreed annex, which will be compiled by the TC Chair, Mr David Stroud, before submission to MOP6.</p>
	<p>DR19 Rev. 1 <i>Date, Venue and Funding of the 7<sup>th</sup> Session of the Meeting of the Parties</i> was approved for submission to MOP6 for consideration.</p>	
	<p>DR20 <i>Tribute to the Organizers</i> was approved for submission to MOP6 for consideration.</p>	

## Agenda item 1. Opening of the Meeting

1. In his capacity as Permanent Secretary to the Ugandan Ministry of Tourism, Wildlife and Antiquities, His Excellency, Ambassador Patrick Mugoya opened the Meeting, welcoming the delegates to the 10<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the AEWA Standing Committee (StC10) in Uganda, the *Pearl of Africa*. He acknowledged the 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of AEWA and all that had been achieved so far under the Agreement.
2. It was appropriate to hold this meeting in Uganda as the country played an important role in migratory waterbird conservation and 50% of Africa's bird species occurred in Uganda. Uganda was also one of the top 10 biodiversity-rich countries in the world and host to 53% of the world's remaining population of mountain gorillas, the numbers of which were on the increase. Money from gorilla tourism also supported the conservation of other species including waterbirds. He declared the meeting open and wished all those present successful and productive discussions.
3. Mr Stephen Asimwe, Chief Executive Officer of the Ugandan Tourist Board also welcomed the participants to Uganda and went on to give a presentation of how sound nature conservation and the fast-growing ecotourism sector went hand-in-hand in Uganda.
4. In his capacity as Chair of the Standing Committee, Mr Øystein Størkersen stressed all the hard work and achievements of the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat since StC9 in September 2013 in Trondheim. He extended a warm welcome to the observers present, and welcomed their contribution to the meeting. He went on to say that a number of the outcomes of the CMS COP11 in November 2014 would play a role in the issues discussed at this meeting, in preparation for MOP6. He stressed the growing importance of synergies and collaboration between biodiversity MEAs due to the many cross-cutting issues.
5. Mr Bradnee Chambers, CMS Executive Secretary greeted all those present and acknowledged the rich biodiversity of Uganda and the good example of promoting ecotourism and sustainable use. He went on to note the progressive steps forward made by the CMS COP11 in Quito in November 2014, where a number of very important resolutions – many of which involved AEWA – were adopted, relating to e.g. illegal killing, renewable energy and avian species. There was an ongoing, close and successful collaboration between CMS and AEWA on these and many other issues, which he would continue to support.
6. Mr Jiří Hlaváček, who had only recently taken on his new role as Special Advisor & Head of MEA Support and Cooperation Branch at UNEP's Division of Environmental Law and Conventions (UNEP/DEL/C), reported that one of the main tasks for the entire UNEP family was the promotion of synergies between biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements. He reminded those present about the special decision of the Governing Council 12/3, requesting the Executive Director to report to the UNEP member States on progress made; the final report would be ready by the end of July 2015.
7. He reported that he was glad that both the UNEP/CMS and the UNEP/AEWA Secretariats had been involved in the deliberations of the expert group, which proposed options for the administrative and programmatic areas of cooperation. He had already discussed UNEP's potential assistance with the Chair of the StC and the Executive Secretary, particularly regarding the implementation of the goals of the Agreement and how UNEP could contribute to the success of MOP6 in November.
8. Aware of challenges with the development agenda and sustainable development goals, he highlighted the first session of the [United Nations Environment Assembly](#) (UNEA), which had adopted a resolution concerning illegal trade in wildlife, requiring the close collaboration of all players, including AEWA.
9. He thanked the Secretariat and the StC, and not least the Government of Uganda for hosting this meeting. He wished all those present successful deliberations.
10. Mr Jacques Trouvilliez, AEWA Executive Secretary reported that he was proud to be in Uganda and thanked the host, stressing his appreciation for the dedication of Mr Barirega Akankwasah (AEWA National Focal Point and StC Vice-Chair) and his staff, as well as the staff of the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat for organising the meeting and collaborating so well together.

11. He went on to thank the small but very dedicated UNEP/AEWA Secretariat Team. He also thanked Mr Bradnee Chambers and his staff for all their support, acknowledging the good collaboration and the joint issues where the Secretariats had been working together, such as the online registration system, the renewable energy and illegal killing issues. He noted that the meeting had a heavy schedule and wished all those present a successful meeting.

12. On behalf of the Standing Committee, Mr Størkersen congratulated Mr Trouvilliez as the new Executive Secretary. He praised the Secretariat for working very hard and being so productive and thanked both Mr Trouvilliez and the entire Secretariat Team.

## **Agenda item 2. Adoption of the Agenda and Work Programme**

13. Since there were no proposals to amend the Agenda and Work Programme, the Chair declared this adopted.

A closed session would be held to decide on the winners of the AEWA Waterbird Conservation Award (Agenda item. 21).

*Decision: The Chair declared the agenda and provisional work programme adopted.*

## **Agenda item 3. Welcome and Admission of Observers**

14. The Chair informed the members about the Parties not members of the Committee, intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations represented at this meeting.

*Decision: The Meeting agreed to admit the Observers*

## **Agenda item 4. Reports by:**

### **a. Standing Committee (StC) Regional Members and Party Observers**

15. The Chair noted that written reports had been submitted on behalf of the Europe and Central Asia, Western and Central Africa and Eastern and Southern Africa regions. These were available as information documents on the [AEWA website](#).

### **b. Technical Committee (TC)**

16. The Chair of the Technical Committee, Mr Stroud thanked Uganda for hosting the meeting. He introduced document StC10.4., which was the report of the TC to MOP6 and included the work plan and activities of the TC during the past triennium. He took the opportunity to thank the staff of the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat for their support in helping the Committee to deliver its work during the past triennium and also for their support to him in his role as Chair.

17. He went on to introduce the intention of presenting a prioritised and costed work programme developed for the Technical Committee to MOP6 to give Parties a chance to see all the tasks requested of the TC in one place and comment directly at the MOP; in the past, the work programme for the Technical Committee had always been compiled after the respective MOP. He commented on the limited capacity of the TC to be able to deliver on all the tasks requested by the MOP. The number of *pro bono* contributions that members could make was limited due to increasing professional pressure.

18. The production of major reviews was dependent on fundraising by the Secretariat, which was becoming increasingly difficult. During the current cycle, funding had arrived late, leaving little or no time to develop this important work.

19. Mr Stroud felt it would be useful to at least establish a TC-related zero core budget line in all proposed scenarios to MOP6, to give the Parties a chance to consider providing the resources to enable the Committee to be able to deliver on the tasks requested of it.

20. Finally, Mr Stroud reported on the proposed register of interests form, which was standard good practice and he proposed that the establishment of a register of interests become a matter of course in the TC operations for the next triennium.

21. The Chair thanked Mr Stroud and the TC and noted the full programme of work that was apparent from the TC report. He welcomed the proposed overview of work requested of the TC and its presentation to the MOP. He regretted the lack of funds and it was apparent that the situation with relation to MEAs had never been so bad. He noted that in the case of other MEAs, core budget lines already existed. He also welcomed the proposed registry of interests.

#### c. Depositary

22. Representing the Depositary, the Netherlands, Ms Anja Pel-Roest thanked Uganda for hosting the Meeting and referring to the Report of the Depositary (Document StC10.5), she reported that since StC9 in Trondheim in 2013, four further countries had become Parties to the Agreement, Guinea-Bissau, Rwanda, Burundi and Mauritania. She congratulated the Secretariat on the good work with regard to the recruitment of new Parties.

#### d. Secretariat

23. Referring to Document StC10.6 Rev. 2, Mr Trouvilliez reported on the activities of the Secretariat since StC9 in 2013. He also welcomed the new African Parties and the success of the AEWA African Initiative. He stressed that the collaboration with other organisations, such as CAFF was an important aspect of the Secretariat's work.

24. With regard to staffing, he reported on the successful recruitment of the Coordinator of the African Initiative, thanking Switzerland for providing the additional funding necessary to extend this position to 100% (it was currently established in the core budget at 50%). He also thanked Norway for the continuous support of the position of Associate Programme Officer for Single Species Action Plans Support.

25. The Secretariat was grateful for the financial support received towards the implementation of the Agreement, however, he reiterated that fundraising had become increasingly difficult, meaning that the level of support was still far below the amount estimated as necessary to implement the Agreement at a satisfactory level.

26. With the agreement of the Chairs of the CMS and AEWA Standing Committees, the *Common Information Management, Communication and Awareness-raising Unit* (IMCA) had been established as a pilot initiative. This would be further elaborated in Agenda item. 19c Administrative and Personnel Matters.

27. With regard to implementation, he stressed the importance of the triennial Conservation Status Report (the sixth edition of which would be presented to MOP6), as this was the scientific basis for setting the conservation priorities. Another important issue related to the impact of renewable energy developments, whereby CMS and AEWA had jointly commissioned a report and guidelines. The implementation of the resolutions under CMS and AEWA are to be dealt with by an Energy Task Force.

#### e. Other Observers

28. On behalf of Wetlands International, Mr Szabolcs Nagy thanked Uganda, pointing out the long-standing collaboration between Wetlands International and Uganda. He went on to report on a major project in the inner Niger Delta with the support of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the sustainable development of a hydraulic programme. He also briefly reported on the progress of an application for funding to the International Climate Initiative (IKI) of Germany, together with the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat, BirdLife International, the Governments of Mali and Ethiopia and other partners and local NGOs and addressing

[Resolution 5.13](#) *Climate Change Adaptation Measures for Waterbirds*. The full proposal, which would include an update of the Critical Site Network Tool ([CSN](#)), has been submitted and was awaiting a decision.

29. He went on to report that Wetlands International had recently adopted its new [Strategic Intent 2016-2025](#), which included five major streams, one relating to waterbird monitoring and four relating to habitats.

#### **Agenda item 5. Preparations for the 6<sup>th</sup> Ordinary Session of the Meeting of the Parties and Celebration of the 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of AEWA**

30. Mr Jacques Trouvilliez reported that because MOP6 was being organised without a host country, the Meeting would take place on the premises of the UN Campus in Bonn, Germany from 9-14 November 2015. Logistical preparations were well underway. He thanked the Governments of Germany, Switzerland and Norway for covering some of the costs of the Meeting and part of the costs of funded delegates, noting that a funding gap of 30,000 Euros still remained.

31. Mr Sergey Dereliev, AEWA Technical Officer, reported on the plans to commemorate the 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Agreement, proposals for which had been presented to StC9. Making use of the available resources, a joint MOP6/20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary logo had been developed, giving the Meeting, coupled with this event, an identity.

32. A series of ‘behind-the-scenes’ profiles were planned for the AEWA website throughout the year to feature a representative group of the dedicated people behind the scenes of the Agreement, who are closely related to AEWA operations. The Secretariat felt that this was important to illustrate the people from all walks of life who are involved in the conservation of migratory waterbirds.

33. During MOP6, a short session was planned featuring key note speakers, including Dr Gerard Boere, Honorary Patron of AEWA, Ms Melissa Lewis, TC Expert on Environmental Law, Professor Jesper Madsen from Aarhus University, Denmark and Coordinator of the AEWA Pink-footed Goose International Working Group. Nicola Crockford from BirdLife International would speak collectively on behalf of the NGOs.

34. A bilingual (English/French) coffee table book featuring 20 species and consisting of high quality royalty-free photographs was being compiled by the Secretariat. Each of the species was introduced by a relevant expert, many of which were coordinators of AEWA International Species Working or Expert Groups. The book, which was the product of a total of 72 contributors, was kindly being funded by the Governments of the Netherlands and Germany. The launch of the book was planned on the evening of the first day of MOP6, where all MOP6 delegates would receive a copy. The evening would culminate with a reception hosted by the German Government.

#### **Agenda item 6. African Initiative for the Conservation of Migratory Waterbirds and their Habitats in Africa**

35. Introducing document StC10.8, which was a detailed report on the African Initiative-related activities, Mr Jacques Trouvilliez reported that the Coordination Unit for the [AEWA African Initiative](#) was based at the Secretariat and that the Coordinator position had recently been filled and was partly funded by the Government of Switzerland. The Unit also comprised a Programme Assistant, kindly funded by the Government of Germany until the end of 2015. The Position had been established in the core budget by MOP5, albeit without allocating any funds and a part-time position was being proposed for to retain this important support position to the African Initiative Unit. He added that technical support to the AEWA African Initiative had been provided by the Technical Support Unit (TSU), offered by the Government of France.

36. He gave a brief summary of the main activities relating to the implementation of the AEWA African Initiative and the [AEWA Plan of Action for Africa](#), which included the compilation of a list of Column A populations occurring in each African Contracting Party to support the countries in adopting national legislation for their protection. The list would be finalised after MOP6 in order to be able to incorporate the expected changes in the status of some AEWA populations.

37. Other activities included the development of International Single Species Action Plans (ISSAPs) relevant for the African region, including the Grey Crowned Crane, the International Multi-species Action Plan for Benguela Upwelling System Coastal Seabirds and the AEWA Small Grants Fund (SGF), which had been able to support a number of worthy projects in Africa in the past years, had unfortunately not been included in the Secretariat's budget proposal for the coming triennium. Operating the SGF would have to rely solely on voluntary contributions.

38. On behalf of France, Mr François Lamarque thanked Uganda for the wonderful hospitality offered to all those present. He went on to report further on behalf of the TSU, which had been active since its creation in 2012. (more details on TSU activities could be found in the French part of the Report on the [Europe and Central Asia Region](#)). In June 2015, for example, a workshop had been organised at the Kenya Wildlife Service Training Institute in Naivasha, to develop a wetlands management plan and the [Flyway Training Kit](#), developed under the WOW project was being put to good use and introduced into the curricula of relevant training colleges.

39. The TSU had developed a project proposal *Strengthening expertise in sub-Saharan Africa on birds and their sustainable use for the benefit of communities and the environment*, RESSOURCE for short, aiming at gaining better knowledge through monitoring, better managing and sustainably using waterbirds and wetlands and contributing to training and capacity building in the Sahel and Nile Valley regions. The proposal had been submitted to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the French Global Environment Facility (FFEM) and had recently been accepted for further development so that implementation could start in 2016, meaning that the TSU could continue to operate after MOP6.

40. On behalf of Ghana, the Regional Representative for Western and Central Africa, Mr Nana Kofi Adu-Nsiah thanked the Secretariat for all the work done under the AEWA African Initiative, he also thanked the French Government for all its support. He very much hoped for a continuation of efforts to boost the implementation of AEWA in Africa.

41. On behalf of South Africa, Ms Humbulani Mafumo thanked Uganda for the warm welcome. She remarked that the timing of the joint AEWA/CMS global campaign World Migratory Bird Day (WMBD), i.e. in early May each year, did not really function for South Africa because the birds were not there in May. It was also scheduled only a week apart from the International Day for Biodiversity. South Africa would like to take the celebrations to a higher level to involve all the relevant stakeholders. For 2015, the celebration in South Africa would be moved towards the end of the year when the birds return.

42. On behalf of Eastern and Southern Africa, Mr Barirega Akankwasah reiterated that the work done by the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat towards the implementation of the Plan of Action for Africa was greatly appreciated, particularly the training workshops. He also thanked the TSU for the good work and efforts in the region. He strongly requested the continuation of this support towards the implementation of the Agreement in the African region.

43. Mr Nagy echoed the responses of the African representatives, on behalf of Wetlands International, he also very much appreciated the increased efforts of the Secretariat and the TSU towards taking the PoAA forward, as well as the support from the donor countries. Resources were sadly still lacking so that he appealed to other Parties to consider how further resources could be mobilised for this purpose.

44. On behalf of Switzerland, Mr Lamarque congratulated all those at the Secretariat and the TSU dedicated to implementing of the African Initiative. Although Switzerland had been able to contribute during the past triennium, it would not be possible to continue funding. The Secretariat was urged to find alternative solutions at the upcoming MOP to be able to continue the good work.

45. In that context, Mr Trouvilliez reiterated the problem of lacking resources and referred to the Secretariat's cooperation with the Secretariat of the Wadden Sea Initiative and the Ramsar Convention and the aim to use synergies more effectively and avoid double efforts.

46. He also very much hoped that Governments would support by helping to keep the staff necessary to be able to implement the African Initiative-related activities.

47. With regard to WMBD, he reported that the strategy for the future of the global campaign was currently being reconsidered, however the concept of the campaign allowed the celebration to take place at any time of the year. He took the opportunity to thank the German Government for providing support towards all the [WMBD](#) materials which were sent out for people to use and enjoy, while celebrating migratory birds all over the world.

48. Mr Chambers noted that WMBD campaign was getting stronger each year. At the last MOP, Kenya had put forward a proposal to make it an official UN Day, by drafting a resolution at the next session of the UN General Assembly. He was hoping for countries' support. Despite the many UN-related World Days already established, he hoped that this would go through.

49. The Chair reiterated that WMBD was one of the best CEPA initiatives amongst all the biodiversity MEAs. The suggestion to have two dates could be recommended and discussed in order to generate as much interest as possible globally.

50. Representing Tanzania, Mr Sadiki Laisser thanked Uganda for generously hosting the Meeting. Tanzania had been a beneficiary of AEWA support through the Small Grants Fund, which had enabled the implementation of four of the objectives of the National Action Plan for the Conservation of the Lesser Flamingo. He also thanked the Secretariat for its support towards WMBD celebrations in Tanzania, which had taken place twice at the important Lesser Flamingo site, Lake Natron.

#### **Agenda item 7. Report on the Implementation and Revision of the Communication Strategy**

51. Mr Trouvilliez introduced document StC 10.25 *Development of the Communication Strategy*, stressing the fact that visibility must increase, both for species conservation and also for fundraising purposes.

52. Through Resolution 5.5, the Parties instructed the Secretariat to carry out a full revision of the Communication Strategy. The process of developing aligned Communication Strategies for both CMS and AEWA was led by the Joint Information Management, Communication and Awareness Raising Unit. He stressed the need for identifying clear targets and target groups.

53. France suggested that the National Reports could be less comprehensive but rather more focussed on key issues specific to AEWA which could provide strong and relevant communication elements.

54. On behalf of Germany, Ms Christiane Paulus thanked Uganda for the perfect organisation of this meeting. She suggested taking up aspects from other conventions and particularly streamlining and aligning the AEWA and CMS Communication Strategies.

55. Mr Stroud agreed and with regard to the document, suggested producing one or two pages of strategic aims and then going on to elaborate further. He also pointed out that it was not clear throughout the document what was meant by 'AEWA', i.e. the Agreement, the Secretariat, or the wider audience. The draft Resolution should include the issue of targeting the communication strategy to the different audiences.

56. Mr Chambers stressed the close collaboration with Mr Trouvilliez and the consultant and also the aspect of cost-sharing between the two Secretariats. The aim was to see the CMS Family in a global context and to understand how it contributes to the UN Sustainable Development Goals and to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, developed under the Convention on Biological Diversity. Common tools should be developed and social media used to the full. The Global Communication Strategy would be submitted to the 44<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the CMS Standing Committee in October 2015 for adoption.

57. The Chair summarised that the current draft would require quite some further work and noted the suggestion of Ms Mafumo that the pre-MOP6 meeting planned for August 2015 would provide a platform for collecting comments on behalf of the African Parties towards the re-drafting procedure. The final draft would be circulated to the Standing Committee for comments by the Secretariat before being submitted to MOP6.

*Decision: Document StC10.25 Development of the Communication Strategy should be revised according to the suggestions made and circulated to the members of the StC for comments.*

*DR10 on the Communication Strategy was approved for submission to MOP6 for consideration with the incorporation of a preambular paragraph relating to the communication needs of different audiences.*

*Action: The Secretariat will circulate the revised Communication Strategy to the StC for comments by mid-August 2015.*

*The Secretariat will revise DR10 accordingly before submission to MOP6.*

## **Agenda item 8. Implementation Review Process**

58. A Technical Officer, Mr Sergey Dereliev introduced this agenda item by explaining that MOP4 had tasked the StC with the Implementation Review Process (IRP), allowing the StC, supported by the TC in an advisory capacity, to address incidents of adverse or potential adverse effects on migratory waterbirds, or on their sites and habitats, as a result of human activities. The Secretariat supported the StC in performing this duty. He went on to briefly report on the four IRP cases currently open.

1. Syria - The first ever IRP case had been in Syria on illegal hunting of the globally threatened Sociable Lapwing (*Vanellus gregarius*). Due to the current political situation, the case was currently on hold.
2. Bulgaria - In Bulgaria a case had been opened due to the issue of a planned windfarming project adjacent to Lake Durankulak putting the globally threatened Red-breasted Goose (*Branta ruficollis*) at risk. The Government of Bulgaria had refused to accept an on-the-spot assessment mission because of ongoing court procedure. There had also been recent changes in the staffing at the Ministry. The Secretariat intended to re-new the contact in the near future.
3. Montenegro – In Montenegro a case had been opened due to plans for draining of the salina of Ulcinj for tourism development. The salina is the most important wetland for migratory waterbirds in Montenegro, as well as being one of the most important sites along the eastern Adriatic coast. Although no progress had been made initially regarding communication with Montenegro on the case, contact had been made in the margins of a workshop held in Montenegro in April 2015. Mr Dereliev had met with officials of the Ministry on 7 April 2015 and it had been agreed that the outcomes of the international meeting would be considered in the follow-up work on the IRP case.
4. Iceland – In Iceland there was an ongoing case due to the large-scale plans for lowland afforestation threatening breeding habitats of AEW species. There had been regular communication with the Icelandic Government for over a year, however the Government of Iceland's position relating to the involvement of other treaties (Ramsar, Bern Convention, CAFF) was not yet clear. It was possible that a mission would take place in 2016.

59. The Secretariat would compile a succinct report on the IRP and submit it to the Standing Committee in August 2015 for approval for submission to MOP6.

60. France reported on the possible IRP case relating to a further windfarm development in Aquitaine, overlapping a site designated for the conservation of the Eurasian Crane (*Grus grus*) as a stopover site.

61. Mr Dereliev requested France to provide a short verbal report to the next meeting of the Standing Committee or if there should be any significant developments between meetings to contact the Secretariat and that the Committee keep this issue as a watching brief.

62. Mr Chambers mentioned that CMS COP11 had passed a resolution for a possible review mechanism and that the UNEP/CMS Secretariat was following the AEWA process and learning from it.

<i>Decision:</i>	The StC will report to MOP6 on the four ongoing IRP cases. Regarding the potential IRP case in France on the windfarm development, it was decided that the Standing Committee should keep it as a watching brief.
<i>Action:</i>	The Secretariat will prepare a draft report and send it to the StC in August 2015 for approval for submission to MOP6.

### **Agenda item 9. International Reviews**

63. Mr Dereliev reported that according to paragraph 7.4 of the AEWA Action Plan, the Agreement Secretariat, in coordination with the Technical Committee and the Parties should prepare a series of seven international reviews (at different frequencies) necessary for the implementation of the Action Plan. The production of these reviews required immense resources so that not all of them could be produced for submission to MOP6 due to lack of resources.

64. The Conservation Status Review (*6<sup>th</sup> Edition of the Conservation Status Report CSR6* - document StC10.9) was the flagship report and had traditionally been produced by Wetlands International using in-house expertise and a wide network of other stakeholders. The format had been revised during the last triennium, and this continued to be a convenient and useful resource for referencing on different issues. Wetlands International had done a tremendous job, providing detailed information for each population, provided the basis for proposed amendments to AEWA Table 1.

65. Mr Nagy (Wetlands International) went on to report that as coordinator of the development of this report, he had worked very closely with BirdLife International, CAFF Seabird Group and the IUCN species specialist groups, whom he thanked for their contributions. The EU Birds Directive Article 12 reporting had also been a good source of information for this report. CSR6 provided trend analyses for 169 populations; the key conclusions reflected the fact that more and more species were becoming globally threatened.

66. The conservation status of many AEWA populations was improving. It was clear that investment in capacity building had been worthwhile. Guidelines on monitoring schemes would have to be developed; special schemes were necessary for the monitoring of some species. A funding scheme should be in place for countries lacking the necessary resources. The indicators in CSR6 showed a mixed result with achieved targets in a smaller number of indicators. For the most part, targets were not being achieved for species on Column A of the Agreement. It was important to improve the indicators and to intensify the implementation of International Single Species Action Plans.

67. France congratulated the Waddensee Initiative for the good results achieved in Western Africa. The Technical Support Unit had also been involved in monitoring and training activities, which contributed to the implementation of the African Initiative, including in South Sudan, Sudan, Egypt and the Nile Valley, as well as all the North African countries, where stakeholders had been trained to manage data. As such, it would deserve to be quoted along with the Waddensee initiative in the report.

68. Representing *Nature* Uganda, Mr Achilles Byaruhanga expressed his congratulations to Wetlands International for the work providing information on the status of waterbirds, which had been really useful in Uganda. Some sites had already been designated as Ramsar sites. He welcomed the establishment of a fund to support this process as necessary. Countries should recognise the importance of the data coming from this review and incorporate this in their financial planning. In Uganda, for example, 10,000 - 15,000 USD would be sufficient to carry out the counts for the whole country.

69. Mr Stroud also congratulated Mr Nagy and the army of collaborators working on this report, which was an impressive piece of work, going from strength to strength. This data informed conservation action and constituted a central piece of work for all activities under the Agreement. The importance of further funding and the real difference it could make must be made clear at MOP6.

70. Mr Dereliev went on to report that two mandatory reviews could not be delivered; the *Site Network Review*, a first draft of which had been submitted to MOP5, however fundraising efforts to produce a final draft had not been successful and would be needed for the next triennium, otherwise this review would remain dormant for 10 years; the other review which had not been prepared for MOP6 was the *Update report on the status of non-native waterbird species within the AEWA area*. The TC had decided not to go for a fully-fledged review but to base the synthesis on information taken from the national reports. However, funding had not been made available to date.<sup>2</sup>

71. Due to the lack of voluntary contributions, a limited review, the *Overview on the Status of Preparation and Implementation of AEWA ISSAPS and ISSMPS*, had been produced by the Secretariat, based on customised enquiries sent to all the range states of the action plans produced so far. The final draft would be sent to the TC for approval to be submitted to MOP6.

72. Mr Trouvilliez regretted the fact that fundraising had not been very successful during the past triennium. One of the issues to be discussed at MOP6 would be the frequency of delivery of the mandatory reports. He stressed the importance of starting fundraising activities at the beginning of the triennium.

73. Mr Nagy stressed that this was a feedback mechanism on key issues for the Agreement, thus it might be useful to review the periodicity and to align it with the EU reporting cycle, i.e. every six years with smaller updates being made every three years.

74. Mr Dereliev recalled that due to the lack of sufficient resources, some reports had been delayed and therefore a backlog had occurred. He agreed that the frequency should be discussed within the TC together with the Waterbird Monitoring Partnership.

75. Mr Stroud confirmed that the TC should look into the frequency of the required reports; this should be linked to the next strategic planning priorities and the reporting needs against those priorities.

76. Mr Dereliev remarked that human resources at the Secretariat were limited and the review on species action plans had been carried out on an exceptional basis, however the task of the Secretariat was to coordinate and run processes rather than to produce highly technical reviews.

77. Summarising the discussion on the frequency of mandatory reviews to the MOP, the Chair confirmed that the StC recommended a thorough review of the issue in collaboration with the TC.

*Decision:* The Meeting approved the ***Sixth Edition of the Report on the Conservation Status of Migratory Waterbirds in the Agreement Area*** for submission to MOP6.

*Recommendation* The StC recommends reviewing the frequency of mandatory reviews to the MOP, in close collaboration with the TC and in conjunction with the revision of the AEWA Strategic Plan.

*Action:* The Secretariat will finalise the ***Report on the Status of Preparation and Implementation of AEWA ISSAPs and ISSMPs as well as Multi-species Action Plans 2015*** and circulate it to the TC and StC in time for approval for submission to MOP6.

---

<sup>2</sup> Editor's note: In the meantime, the synthesis had been contracted to UNEP/WCMC due to a generous contribution by the Government of Switzerland and had been approved for submission to MOP6 by the StC in August 2015.

## **Agenda item 10. International Single Species Action and Management Plans (ISSAPs and ISMPs) and International Multi-Species Action Plan (IMSAP)**

78. Introducing this agenda item, Mr Dereliev noted that the species conservation approach is a central part in the operations of the Agreement, mandated by the legal text. The process had evolved through the years from the original International Single Species Action Plans (ISSAP) to International Species Management Plans (ISMP) and lately to International Multi-species Action Plans (IMSAP).

79. He went on to report that a total of 21 action and management plans had been developed, 20 of which had been adopted by the MOP and the 21<sup>st</sup> for the conservation of the Shoebill had been adopted by StC9 on a temporary basis.

80. The MOP had requested the Secretariat to develop coordination mechanisms to coordinate and facilitate the implementation of Action Plans adopted for globally threatened and Near Threatened species; an approach which was approved by the TC. Initially 10 International Species Working Groups (IWGs) had been established, comprising government officials and experts. In addition, four AEWA International Species Expert Groups were in the process of being established. Although the ties of the Expert Groups to the Agreement were not as close as is the case for the Working Groups, the formal affiliation with AEWA could nonetheless bring much added value to the international status and work of a species group or expert network, such as enhanced support by governments and the international conservation community, access to AEWA contacts and guidance of the AEWA bodies such as the Technical Committee as well as possible access to new sources of funding.

81. He went on to report that there was no funding available for these mechanisms on behalf of the Secretariat. Most of the support received was in-kind, with many coordinators coming from the NGO sector. In the cases where funding did exist, it was possible to achieve objectives. The Secretariat invested a lot of time mentoring and ensuring that the processes ran smoothly. Currently there were 14 coordination mechanisms in place, two were being developed and the remaining five action plans would be reviewed and could be retired by the MOP.

82. The Chair stressed the fact, that despite all the hard work involved, these mechanisms were the best way of facilitating the implementation of the action plans, particularly by involving cooperation partners and signing agreements with them.

83. Mr Dereliev went on to introduce the Draft International Multi-species Action Plan for the Conservation of the Benguela Current Upwelling System Coastal Seabirds, an approach which had been discussed within the bodies of the Agreement and which had been a good choice as a trial for the multi-species approach. A very successful action-planning workshop had taken place in Namibia in 2014. In this context, he noted that on the basis of the workshop, guidance for the process of the development of multi-species action plans could be produced and made available. This action plan, compiled by BirdLife South Africa, covered nine species. The draft would be sent to the three range countries, Namibia, South Africa and Angola, for comments after which the TC and StC would be asked to approve the final draft for submission to MOP6.

84. He went on to give a brief introduction to each of the draft Plans that the StC was being asked to sign off for submission to MOP6 for approval.

### **Draft ISSAP for the Grey Crowned Crane (Document StC 10.11)**

85. The development of this Plan had been contracted to the Endangered Wildlife Trust Partnership (EWT) / International Crane Foundation (ICF) African Crane Conservation Programme; the leading compiler was Ms Kerry Morrison. The work had been kicked off by a well-attended action planning workshop in Rwanda in 2013. EWT would also be coordinating the future International Working Group for this plan.

86. Mr Byaruhanga (*Nature* Uganda) welcomed the good work towards the conservation of the Grey Crowned Crane and reported that Uganda had started the process of compiling a National Action Plan, thus adoption of the Plan would be a big boost towards the already ongoing efforts for national implementation.

#### Draft ISSAP for the Taiga Bean Goose (Document StC 10.12)

87. This was a recovery plan for a population which was declining; at the same time the population was being harvested, it therefore also included strong elements of adaptive harvest management. This was one of the priority species for devising a mechanism for a case such as this. Hunters had a major role in the conservation of this species. One of the major range states was the Russian Federation, which was not yet a Party to the Agreement, although cooperation with the hunting department was ongoing. Finland had initiated this Plan and had sponsored the action-planning workshop.

88. Germany raised concerns that the Plan could create legislative problems in Germany and other EU countries and hoped that a solution can be found.

89. Mr Dereliev reported that he was in contact with the German National Focal Point and had been able to clarify some of the points raised and would assess the situation according to the comments received.

#### Draft ISSAP for the Long-tailed Duck (Document StC 10.13)

90. This Plan was developed by the Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust (WWT). The Action-planning workshop had been hosted by the Estonian Environmental Board and the Ministry of the Environment of Estonia and co-organised by the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat, Wetlands International and the Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust (WWT). The workshop was facilitated by WWT and kindly funded by the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety, the UK Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, the Estonian Environmental Board, the Estonian Ministry of Environment as well as the European Commission.

#### Draft ISSAP for the Eurasian Curlew (Document StC 10.14)

91. Due to the lack of available funds, it had not been possible to arrange a workshop for all the sub-species within the AEWA area and covered by the Plan, thus the process for the eastern sub-populations was carried out by correspondence, using a questionnaire. The action framework was well-elaborated and targeted. Different categories of range states were identified, which had led to the process of developing criteria for categorizing range states. This plan also envisaged strong elements of adaptive harvest management wherever hunting was allowed. The current version reflected comments from the range states.

92. France had many comments on the latest draft that will be provided in writing to the Secretariat. It was pointed out that AEWA had developed an international Plan, France had a national Plan in place and the EU was developing a European Plan for the Eurasian Curlew, and although the added value of a plan on European level was doubtful, these plans should, at least, be aligned.

93. Mr Dereliev added that the European plan was actually a MSAP for lowland grassland waders, which constituted a different approach and that the Secretariat also strongly advocated alignment.

94. In that context, Ms Crockford, representing Birdlife International, pointed out that a position advertised by the RSPB for a full-time, five-year post to implement the AEWA and RSPB action plans for Curlew in the United Kingdom.

#### Draft revised ISSAP for the Lesser White-fronted Goose (Document StC10.15)

95. This had been a lengthy process with complex and diverse views in the approaches to the conservation of the species. Since the AEWA process had been set up in 2005, some success had been recorded. In 2008, the first Action Plan had been approved and a post had been established at the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat for the coordination of the International Working Group, which had met three times so far. Also a sub-group, the *Committee for Captive Breeding, Reintroduction and Supplementation of Lesser White-fronted Geese in Fennoscandia (Recap)* had been established.

96. The current revision process had been delayed because of diverging views, which had meant that the draft could not be finalized. The current draft was the version, including the feedback of the TC, which had reviewed it in February 2015. It seemed that an agreement had been reached between the two stakeholders with the most differing views and a new version, which the Secretariat considered to be the most neutral and acceptable had been accepted by both. That version had recently been sent to the IWG for consultation. Depending on the feedback received, the revised Plan would then be forwarded to the governments for

formal consultation. Should it not be possible to come to a consensus, the process would have to be referred to the next triennium.

#### Draft revised ISSAP for the Northern Bald Ibis (Document StC 10.16)

97. The Northern Bald Ibis was one of the five Critically Endangered AEWA species, numbering around 500 individuals (western population). Major problems were related to hunting and electrocution. The Plan was a challenging one because of different views and approaches to the conservation work; reintroduction being the main contentious issue with regard to the divergent approaches and opinions.

98. Mr Dereliev stressed that any reintroduction activities should be meticulously planned and carried out in accordance with the priorities and guidelines under AEWA.

99. He went on to inform about a new process being discussed at the TC. France had requested the Secretariat to facilitate the establishment of a Western European Plan for management of the Greylag Goose, whereby several conditions would need to be met. At the same time there was an ongoing process for management of the Barnacle Goose in Denmark, run by Jesper Madsen and after consultation with the Secretariat, a broader framework for a pan-European Goose Management Platform would be developed involving not only technical experts, but also policy officers. Fertilised grasslands and grain crop agriculture had led to changes in behaviour and distribution of birds, creating conflicts with all stakeholders. The Multi-species Management Platform would build on the experience of the Pink-footed Goose Single Species Management Plan and would be a way of achieving efficiencies by using joint processes and saving resources.

100. Mr Størkersen reported that Norway would be willing to contribute to this process, which was generating a lot of political interest due to the necessity of compensatory payment schemes for damage caused to agricultural crops. He confirmed that AEWA should have a central role. France, Belgium and the Netherlands had also expressed interest.

101. On behalf of the Netherlands, Ms Pel-Roest confirmed her country's enthusiasm and thanked AEWA for promoting this initiative.

102. Answering a question from Mr Nagy about the declining duck populations and whether a similar approach could be considered for those, Mr Dereliev reported that this would be more difficult to fund because duck species caused less damage. However, the TC could consider how these species could be grouped.

103. Mr Dereliev went on to report about a project that AEWA was involved in under the name of EuroSAP. The project was coordinated by BirdLife International and funded by the European Union. It involved the linking and streamlining of the development of action plans with other stakeholders (Bern Convention, EU and CMS) to avoid overlap of efforts for European species. The development of an MSAP for grassland waders was planned as well as the development of three ISSAPs for the Velvet Scoter, Dalmatian Pelican and White-headed Duck. AEWA had committed to co-funding these plans, Germany had already pledged funding for the Velvet Scoter, however funds were still lacking for the other two species and the Secretariat would be approaching potential donors in due course.

104. He went on to introduce document StC10.17, which had been produced by the TC and dealt with three issues; the prioritisation of species for action and management planning, development of criteria for the assessment, revision and retirement of action plans and the definition of major Range States in action plans for species with a wide geographical range.

105. South Africa noted that when compiling the country's National Report, in the Black-winged Pratincole and Great Snipe ISSAPs from 2004, actions were mostly concentrated in the Northern hemisphere, thus it was difficult to align national actions to the international actions. These plans had been developed 10 years ago so new information could probably be considered in terms of these older plans.

106. Appreciating this feedback, Mr Dereliev confirmed that the criteria developed for this purpose would be properly reviewed in order to assess what appears to be redundant.

107. Mr Dereliev briefly introduced the corresponding draft resolution, document StC10.DR8, dealing with the *Adoption and Implementation of International Single Species and Multi-species Action Plans*.

**Decision:** The Meeting took note of the following International Single Species Action plans and agreed that they would be presented to MOP6 for adoption:

*Draft ISSAP for the Grey Crowned Crane*  
*Draft ISSAP for the Taiga Bean Goose*  
*Draft ISSAP for the Long-tailed Duck*  
*Draft ISSAP for the Eurasian Curlew*

The Meeting agreed that the *Draft Revised ISSAP for the Lesser White-fronted Goose* will be presented to MOP6 for adoption, pending the incorporation of comments by the Range States (due by the end of August).

The Meeting approved Doc. StC10.17 *Draft Guidance for prioritizing AEWA populations for Action and Management Planning and for retirement of ISSAPs, as well as Guidance on the definition of Principal Range States in Action Plans* for submission to MOP6; Sections A & C for information and Section B for adoption.

The Meeting approved Doc. StC10 DR8 *Adoption and Implementation of International Single Species and Multi-species Action and Management Plans* for submission to MOP6 for consideration

**Actions:** The *MSAP for Benguela Coastal Seabirds* will be sent to the TC and StC by the Secretariat at the end of August for approval and subsequent submission to MOP6.

The Secretariat will circulate the final *Draft Revised ISSAP for the Northern Bald Ibis* to the StC by mid-August for comments and approval for submission to MOP6

**LWfG ISSAP** - The Secretariat will incorporate Range State comments into the final draft for submission to MOP6.

**StC10 DR8** - The Secretariat will finalise Appendix 1 upon completion of the ISSAP/ISMP review.

## Agenda item 11. Waterbird Monitoring

108. As the main person behind the **Waterbird Monitoring Partnership**, which was created in 2011 as a result of a review on the future of waterbird monitoring, and had been meeting regularly on a biannual basis, Mr Nagy reported that it included all key International Waterbird Census (IWC) partners including AEWA and Wetlands International. Document StC10.10 Report on the *Development of Waterbird Monitoring along the African-Eurasian Flyways* described the progress of all the work and its impact on the knowledge base, also describing the funding situation and sustainability since MOP5 in 2012. He summarised that good progress had been made in the field of organisation and technical development and that the number of countries and counts had been increased. Approximately 12 publications had been produced on the basis of IWC data.

109. Resolution 5.22 had invited Contracting Parties, international organisations and others to make contributions to support international waterbird monitoring and in the period between 2012-2014, a large part of the necessary funds had stemmed from the MAVA Foundation, regular contributions from Switzerland and other contributions from the United Kingdom and France. In 2015, Wetlands International had contributed by maintaining the data management, however there were no funds available for monitoring to date. Current efforts were being made to develop alternative complimentary approaches to this issue.

110. France mentioned that the RESOURCE Project for the period 2016-2019 would increase the possibility of funding for the monitoring of waterbirds in the Sahelian region and the Nile Valley and that this could be mentioned in the draft resolution.

111. Going on to introduce the corresponding draft resolution StC10 DR3, which was mainly about the required funding and the possibility of setting up two complimentary funds: a Voluntary Monitoring Fund and a Waterbird Partnership Fund. Mr Nagy noted that the promotion of twinning schemes, as requested through Resolution 5.20, could also benefit waterbird monitoring, as well as WMBD, which could potentially be used for obtaining funds for this purpose. Among calls to Contracting Parties and organisations to provide financial support towards monitoring and for the further development of the *Report on the Site Network for Waterbirds in the Agreement Area – 1<sup>st</sup> Edition*, the call to the Wings Over Wetlands Partnership to revamp the Critical Site Network (CSN) Tool and the call for closer synergies with the Ramsar STRP, as one of the other main users of this data set, were also important in the context of this draft resolution.

112. On behalf of Switzerland, Mr Lamarque reported that operative paragraphs 4 and 7, regarding the identification of funding needs and the establishment of a separate fund were very much welcomed. He went on to suggest using the word ‘suivi’ instead of ‘surveillance’ for monitoring throughout the French document versions.

113. Ms Crockford remarked that the issue of funding for waterbird monitoring was ongoing and that new approaches should be thought about. The hunting community could, for example, be asked to support the monitoring of huntable species financially. Each hunting organisation could pass on a small amount of their members’ subscriptions, a concept which was already successful in Fennoscandia and North America.

114. Mr Nagy reported that this had been looked into and would remain on the agenda.

115. Mr Dereliev confirmed that the need for gathering data was also strongly identified in the Adaptive Harvest Management Guidelines.

*Decision:* The Meeting approved DR3 ***Strengthening Monitoring of Migratory Waterbirds*** for submission to MOP6 for consideration, pending incorporation of comments made by the Meeting.

*Action:* The Secretariat will revise DR3 accordingly.

## **Agenda item 12. Renewable Energy**

116. Mr Dereliev introduced the issue, recalling Resolution 5.16, after which AEWA and CMS approached the [International Renewable Energy Agency \(IRENA\)](#) and funds were secured for the production of the *Review of the Occurrence and Magnitude of the Conflict between Migratory animals and Renewable Technologies deployment* (document StC10.23). The corresponding draft resolution, StC10 DR11, was worded closely along the lines of the corresponding CMS Resolution 11.27. Operative paragraph 4 of DR11 instructed the Secretariat to stay closely involved in the multi-stakeholder task force, *Task Force on Reconciling Selected Energy Sector Developments and Migratory Species Conservation* (aka the Energy Taskforce), whereby CMS would be taking the lead.

117. France questioned the relevance of submitting this document for adoption again and suggested that for cross-cutting issues, it could be an option for one Convention to take the lead to avoid duplicating efforts.

118. Responding, Mr Dereliev explained that although the mandates for both treaties corresponded closely, it was better to have two separate resolutions, since each treaty required a tailored mandate from its own Parties. AEWA had been supporting the issue from the onset and close collaboration would continue, however, CMS was the leading framework. This was an example of successful synergies, which also applied to the relevant reporting formats for CMS and AEWA on this issue, which should also be closely aligned.

119. Mr Chambers stressed the really good cooperation on this issue, [RIO21](#) had produced a report recently stating that seven million jobs were currently related to renewable energy worldwide and that 20% of the world's energy was being produced by renewables. He expressed his gratitude to the Government of Germany for providing the funds to be able to run the task force. He also thanked Mr Dereliev, who had been leading the work on this issue, providing a very solid foundation from which CMS profited.

120. Uganda welcomed the resolution, however sharing the sentiments of France that the spectrum was too broad for AEWA, particularly the reference to '*migratory species*'. The reference to 'avoiding existing protected areas' in operative paragraph 2.1, was questioned, as this contradicted the application of SEA and EIA in the same paragraph, which was a fixed aspect.

121. Mr Dereliev confirmed that '*migratory species*' would be changed to '*migratory waterbirds*' and requested Mr Akankwasah to provide suggested wording to amend the paragraph, thus avoiding the above-mentioned contradiction.

**Decision:** The Meeting approved DR11 *Addressing Impacts of renewable Energy Deployment on Migratory Waterbirds* for submission to MOP6 for consideration, pending incorporation of comments made by the Meeting.

**Action:** The Secretariat will revise DR11 accordingly.

### Agenda item 13. Seabirds

122. Mr Dereliev introduced the agenda item, which referred to the issue of seabirds under the Agreement. He started by introducing the *Review on the Potential Impacts of Marine Fisheries on Migratory Seabirds within the Afrotropical region (Doc StC 10.18)*, which had been re-commissioned and provided useful recommendations, whereby the main conservation problems were between conservation and fisheries. This document had been reviewed by the TC and approved for submission to MOP6.

123. Mr Chambers welcomed this report, reporting that CMS was also in the process of scaling up its work on all the marine areas, particularly in areas of collaboration with the Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMOs). He hoped that there would be more sharing of information among the relevant CMS Family instruments, which, together with strengthening collaboration with RFMOs, would boost the implementation of their work.

124. Mr Stroud reported that seabird conservation had grown in importance since MOP3 and had been very much a focus during the past triennium. He saw some good opportunities for AEWA to be able to make a difference, while working with other processes, such as RFMOs.

125. Referring to the other report, the *Status, Threats and Conservation Action Priorities for the Seabird Populations covered by the Agreement (document StC 10.19)*, commissioned to BirdLife International, Mr Dereliev reported that this document, which was much broader, dealing with all the 84 species of seabirds under AEWA and describing their status, threats and relevant conservation actions, still required some refinement. Final comments from the TC had been forwarded to the compilers and the final draft would be signed off by the TC and submitted to the StC for approval for submission to MOP6 in August.

**Decision:** Document StC 10.18 *Potential Impacts of Marine Fisheries on Migratory Seabirds within the Afrotropical Region* was approved for submission to MOP6.

**Actions:** Document StC 10.19 *Status, Threats and Conservation Action Priorities for the Seabird Populations covered by the Agreement* will be circulated to the StC in August for approval, pending the incorporation of comments by the TC.

DR9 on *Improving the Conservation of Seabird Species in the African-Eurasian Region* will be finalised by the Secretariat and circulated to the StC for approval by the end of August, before being submitted to MOP6 for consideration.

#### **Agenda item 14. Conservation Guidelines**

126. Mr Dereliev introduced document StC 10.22, *Draft Guidelines on National Legislation for the Protection of Species of Migratory Waterbirds and their Habitats*, which had been approved by the TC. The work had been led by the TC Expert on Environmental Law, Melissa Lewis and Programme Officer at the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat, Catherine Lehmann, who has a legal background, together with the IUCN Environmental Law Centre, which had provided in-kind support. This was a very useful document, which would serve the needs of authorities and other stakeholders with regard to the implementation of AEWA.

127. The Chair agreed on the importance of providing Parties with support and he congratulated the compilers for having produced such a useful document.

128. Mr Dereliev went on to introduce document StC 10.24 *Guidelines for Sustainable Deployment for Renewable Energy Technologies*, which were the product of a joint project between CMS, AEWA, IRENA and BirdLife International (see Agenda item 12). An earlier version of the Guidelines had been adopted by CMS COP11; the current version contained some slight technical amendments and superseded the version adopted by the CMS COP11. Approval by MOP6 would help to align the mandate of the two treaties on the issue of energy.

Although the current version of the Guidelines had been accepted by IRENA, meetings between IRENA and the UNEP/CMS and UNEP/AEWA Secretariats were still ongoing due to some remaining concerns, thus a revised version would be produced after MOP6. The Secretariat recommended submitting the present version to MOP6 for approval.

129. The Chair approved this option and to submit the revised version to next meetings of the AEWA Bodies. He welcomed this alliance with IRENA and the dissemination of the useful guidelines, perhaps by producing a shorter version of 10-20 pages, to companies and ministries to arouse their interest in following guidance on this issue.

130. Mr Stroud reminded those present of the MOP5's request to the TC to undertake a review of the style and format of Conservation Guidelines and reported that a review was currently being carried out in the form of a questionnaire, which had been distributed to a large number of stakeholders to identify the best format for this guidance. The questionnaire is available on the AEWA website [here](#).

131. Mr Dereliev urged all stakeholders to make use of the guidelines available, which were very targeted, employing the best experts in the relevant fields. The Secretariat was doing all it could to disseminate the guidelines and hoped that a revised format and further language versions (depending on available funding) would enable countries to make more use of this very useful resource. At national level, the Secretariat relied on the National Focal Points and national coordination mechanisms to disseminate guidelines and involve the relevant national stakeholders. Thus, this was very much a collective effort.

132. The AEWA Conservation Guidelines are available for download [here](#).

133. He went on to refer to the *Revised Guidelines on the Sustainable Harvest of Migratory Waterbirds*, which were not yet available as a document. They were being produced by the Wetlands International Waterbird Harvest Specialist Group, which was re-launched four years ago, and being chaired by Jesper Madsen from Aarhus University in Denmark. This was the first product to provide overall guidance to the future of AEWA's sustainable harvest work and promised to be a very high quality document and one of the best guidelines available in the AEWA set. The final draft would be sent to the StC for approval.

134. Finally, Mr Dereliev introduced document StC10 DR5 *Draft resolution on the Revision and Adoption of Conservation Guidelines*, which was a standard resolution endorsing and mandating the above-mentioned draft guidelines.

135. France pointed out that the last operative paragraph was rather long in the English version and not clear in the French version.

*Decisions:* Document StC10.22 ***Draft Guidelines on National Legislation for the Protection of Species of Migratory Waterbirds and their Habitats*** was approved for submission to MOP6 for adoption.

**Document StC10.24 *Guidelines for Sustainable Deployment for Renewable Energy Technologies*** was approved for submission to MOP6 for adoption.

DR5 ***Revision and Adoption of Conservation Guidelines*** was approved for submission to MOP6 for consideration.

*Actions:* The ***Draft Revised Guidelines on Sustainable Harvest of Migratory Waterbirds*** will be circulated to the StC for approval in August 2015.

DR5 - The Secretariat will amend the last operative paragraph in the French version of DR5, as suggested.

#### **Agenda item 15. Report on the Implementation and Revision of the AEWA International Implementation Tasks 2009-2016**

136. Mr Dereliev introduced document StC10 DR 13, explaining that a list of international implementation tasks for each triennium was revised by the TC for each session of the MOP for approval. The current list was a succinct version of the top priority tasks needing support, followed by a list of further tasks, which could be elaborated, should interest be shown by a donor. He explained that finding the necessary funds was an ongoing problem and very few of the tasks listed had received support, primarily those related to the development of new species action plans and their implementation, at the level of coordination of implementation and also national level. The renewable energy issue had received support, for which he thanked the Governments of Norway and Germany.

137. The efficiency of the format of this list would be looked into by the TC and would be aligned with the AEWA Action Plan, the Strategic Plan and the Plan of Action for Africa in the next triennium.

138. France confirmed that it would have a leading role on the development of the ISMP for geese and, through the RESSOURCE project, on a number of other priorities on the African level under A. Species Conservation, IIT No. 2 *Development of new International Species Action and Management Plans*.

139. The Netherlands suggested mentioning the synergies with Ramsar with regard to B. Habitat Conservation, IIT No. 3 *Maintain overview of the sites of international importance for AEWA species*, in the draft resolution and would provide a suggestion for wording.

140. The Chair summarised that the suggested priorities should be clearly depicted and that funds would have to be raised accordingly.

*Action:* DR13 AEWA ***International Implementation Tasks 2016-2018*** was approved for submission to MOP6 for consideration, subject to the inclusion of the above-mentioned suggestion.

## **Agenda item 16. Issues Affecting the Conservation Status of Migratory Waterbirds in the AEWA Region**

141. Mr Dereliev introduced document StC10 DR4, on the *Conservation and Sustainable Use of Migratory Waterbirds*, which was a result of the TC feeling the need to highlight certain issues, particularly as some of the most vulnerable and threatened populations of AEWA species were still not benefiting from protection on a national level. In order to support countries with their obligations regarding the implementation of AEWA, a list of Column A species should be developed for each country, which could potentially be done in conjunction with the revamping of the CSN Tool by including an automated functionality. This would, however, be dependent on the resources available. The draft resolution also made reference to document StC10.20 *Guidance for Dealing with the Accidental Shooting of Look-alike Species in the Western Palearctic*, which had been developed by the TC. The task of further geographical extension of the guidance would be added to the TC Work Plan for the next triennium.

142. The issues of sustainable hunting, data needs and the involvement of the hunting community, as well as the phase-out of leadshot in wetlands was also referred to and Parties were called upon to adhere to their obligations under AEWA and also to make full use of the revised Sustainable Harvest Guidelines.

143. Parties were welcomed to add operative paragraphs relating to any further issues of their own to this draft resolution.

144. Speaking on behalf of Switzerland, Mr Lamarque welcomed the relevance of items 28, 29 and 30 under *Pressures and Responses 6. Management of Human Activities*, of the national reports. Switzerland felt that more could be gained by congratulating Parties which had made progress on the issues of illegal taking and phasing out of lead shot and that a step-by-step approach would be more beneficial.

145. Referring to the issue of lead shot, the Chair mentioned that the CMS Resolution 11.15, asked for a total ban on lead shot, whereas AEWA required a ban in wetlands only.

146. Mr Dereliev confirmed that if the CMS Parties implemented the CMS Resolution, then their obligations with regard to the phase-out of lead shot in wetlands under AEWA would automatically also be covered.

147. On behalf of Norway, the Mr Størkersen suggested replacing 'wetlands' with 'waterbird species' in operative paragraph 5, i.e.: '*...phasing out of lead shot use for hunting of waterbird species...*', to align it with CMS Resolution 11.15.

148. Mr Dereliev explained, however, that the wording was taken from that of the Agreement and it was also used in the National Reports, so that it would be difficult to change.

149. Ms Crockford suggested referring to CMS Resolution 11.15 in the preamble; she would provide the Secretariat with suggested wording. She also proposed using more generic wording on page 2, para 3: '*...the drivers of population change may be incompletely understood, hunting may or may not be a key driver to population change or be any one of a number of factors influencing population change...*'. She went on to briefly outline some further suggestions regarding the operative paragraphs, which she would send to the Secretariat.

150. She also reported on the production of the BirdLife International review based on the first ever comprehensive scientific study to quantify the scale and scope of illegal killing across the Mediterranean region and that national fact sheets had been compiled reflecting BirdLife partner understanding of national legislation in the relevant countries.

151. South Africa referred to the fact that experience had shown that accidental or incidental killing by other poisons was more of a threat than lead shot. It was suggested to find a way of including questions on other poisons in the national reports, which were limited due to being based on the Agreement text.

152. Referring to the BirdLife International review on the illegal killing of birds across the Mediterranean region, France questioned the methodology used and the confusion between legal and illegal killing. Figures provided by l'Office National de la Chasse et de la Faune Sauvage (ONCFS) and La Ligue pour la protection

des oiseaux (LPO) had been transformed giving figures that France could not endorse. The study did not seem credible.

153. In answer to the comments from France, Ms Crockford, having consulted with BirdLife colleagues, reported that a robust scientific approach to the study had been taken and she felt confident that the concerns voiced by France could be allayed. Regarding the methodology, participants had been provided with guidance on appropriate ways of extrapolating from patchy data and each country had used a method appropriate to the type of data available. Seven national governments had been involved in providing or contributing to the first draft estimates for the review, either through the national BirdLife Partner when the data were first compiled, or through a subsequent round of open-access review of all the datasets.

154. The UNEP/AEWA Secretariat had kindly given permission for BirdLife to circulate a request to all AEWA National Focal Points to review the draft data for their country and provide comments or contribute further data, however response had been poor. The review had not yet been finalised or published and in the final report, the estimates would be presented with appropriate caveats and interpreted appropriately.

155. The main aim of the review would be to support governments, treaties and others in their efforts to eliminate this illegal activity and it was hoped that, with the engagement of all stakeholders, monitoring of illegal killing would improve over time.

156. Referring to the suggestions made by BirdLife International, Mr Dereliev confirmed that the submitted wording would be considered. Referring to the addition of other poisons to the national reports, he informed that this would come out of DR12 Rev. 1 *Avoiding Additional and Unnecessary Mortality for Migratory Waterbirds*.

157. Referring to South Africa's intervention regarding other poisons, he believed that the CMS Resolution 11.15 should cover the issue. With regard to the Column A species, the problem many countries had, was the necessity of adapting their national legislation after each triennium and this procedure could take time. He suggested that countries look at the status of their relevant legislation and ensure that a mechanism to tackle changes is in place.

158. Mr Stroud introduced StC10 DR 12 Rev.1, *Avoiding Additional and unnecessary Mortality for Migratory Waterbirds* which the TC regarded as being complimentary to StC10 DR4 *Conservation and Sustainable Use of Migratory Waterbirds*. The preamble reflects on the many ways in which waterbirds are killed, noting that this was a central issue to the implementation of the Agreement, and reflecting other mandates and resolutions since MOP5.

159. Appendix 1 to DR 12 reflected the very large body of existing guidance developed on these causes of mortality, which needed to be implemented. He briefly went through the operative part, which urged Parties to implement CMS Resolution 11.15.

160. France requested that the penultimate operative paragraph be deleted for the time being.

Mr Stroud went on to introduce StC10 DR6 *Updated Guidance on Climate Change Adaptation Measures for Waterbirds*. MOP5 had agreed to a framework for adaptation measures. DR6 reflected on the conclusions of other recent processes and decisions by other conventions. Parties were urged to make full use of existing guidance in relation to the management of wetlands and the TC was requested to periodically keep the guidance up to date, as appropriate. The TC recognised that relevant guidance in French and for the non-European situation was lacking and Parties were being requested to help fill those gaps.

161. Ms Crockford suggested an addition to highlight an initiative led by the CBD and Ramsar Secretariats and many other stakeholders – [Caring for Coasts Initiative](#). She also suggested adding a reference to the relevant Ramsar Resolution. The last CBD COP encouraged the development of this initiative; she would provide the Secretariat with suggested wording.

*Decisions:* DR4 *Conservation and Sustainable Use of Migratory Waterbirds* was approved for submission to MOP6 for consideration subject to the incorporation of the comments made.

DR6 *Update Guidance on Climate Change Adaptation Measures for Waterbirds* was approved for submission to MOP6 for consideration subject to the incorporation of the comments made.

DR12 Rev.1 **Avoiding Unnecessary Additional Mortality for Migratory Waterbirds** was approved for submission to MOP6 for consideration with the inclusion of the comments made.

*Actions:* The Secretariat will revise DRs 4,6 and 12 accordingly.

## **Agenda item 17. Proposals for Amendments to the Agreement and/or its Annexes**

162. Mr Dereliev introduced the two documents related to this item, *Proposed Amendments to the AEWA Annexes* document StC Inf. 10.4 and StC10 DR 1 *Adoption of Amendments to the AEWA Annexes*. The amendments referring to AEWA Annexes 2 and 3 had been proposed by Norway and sent to all Parties for comments by 10 September 2015. The draft resolution suggested the adoption of amendments, originating from a five-year process by AEWA and CMS regarding the taxonomy and nomenclature of birds, whereby the CMS Parties decided to adopt a standard taxonomic and nomenclature reference for birds:

*The Handbook of the Birds of the World/BirdLife International Illustrated Checklist of the Birds of the World, Volume 1: Non-passerines, by Josep del Hoyo, Nigel J. Collar, David A. Christie, Andrew Elliot and Lincoln D.C. Fishpool (2014).*

163. AEWA would need to follow CMS to harmonise taxonomy and nomenclature within the CMS family. One further amendment referred to a clarification in the criteria for categorisation of Table 1 and a long list of amendments had been made to Table 1, resulting from the taxonomic review and CSR6.

164. France requested clarification as to how the issue would be dealt with, with regard to [The Waterbird Population Estimates \(WPE\) online database](#) as well as the many IWC stakeholders who were used to the old taxonomic names.

165. Mr Nagy explained that the estimates feeding into the database were already aligned with the BirdLife taxonomy. The database was very flexible in that regard.

166. Mr Byaruhanga (*Nature* Uganda) mentioned that changes could cause confusion at the local level, particularly as most stakeholders did not have access to the relevant publications.

167. Mr Nagy explained that the Birdlife data zone was an open access database and changes were reflected there. People in the field often used old field guides. National IWC coordinators should be informed about these changes and field guides updated appropriately. This would probably not be difficult to resolve.

*Decision:* DR1 *Adoption of Amendments to the AEWA Annexes* was adopted for submission to MOP6 for consideration.

*Action:* The Secretariat will add the appendices reflecting the amendments in Annexes 2 and 3 to the Agreement, to the final draft resolution

## **Agenda item 18. Institutional Arrangements**

### **a. Standing Committee**

168. Mr Trouvilliez briefly introduced StC10 DR 16 *Institutional Arrangements: Standing Committee*. The Resolution was mainly to set up the new composition of the StC. Countries could be re-confirmed after one

term so there was no need of re-election. The Standing Committee was the body for providing guidance to the Secretariat and taking decisions on various issues (e.g. IRP cases) intersessionally.

169. The Chair confirmed that the regions should liaise well in advance of the MOP to discuss their nominations. This could be prepared in advance of the MOP. Nominations should be carefully evaluated in order to promote an active and operational Standing Committee.

#### b. Technical Committee

170. Mr Dereliev introduced *Institutional arrangements: Technical Committee (StC 10 DR.17)*, which suggested the appointment of new members following the recommendations of the Advisory Group, which would be announced at the MOP. He regretted the fact that it was getting increasingly difficult to recruit members for the TC who had the time and ability to participate and contribute to the work of the committee. Some countries had reported that financial restrictions prevented them from being able to nominate candidates for the posts.

171. The draft resolution also suggested that the Work Plan for the TC should be approved by the MOP so that Parties are aware of the amount of work requested of the committee and the funds required to meet all the demands in the next triennium.

172. Mr Stroud noted that it was clear for the Parties to determine what they require from the committee and that the TC would have to focus on the top priorities during the next triennium because of the limited resources available.

173. Responding to a request by Mr Lamarque for feedback regarding nominations received, Mr Dereliev reported that nominations had been received for all positions apart from Central Africa and Alternates for some other regions.

<i>Decision:</i>	DR16 <i>Institutional Arrangements: Standing Committee</i> was approved for submission to MOP6 for consideration.
	DR17 <i>Institutional Arrangements: Technical Committee</i> was approved for submission to MOP6 for consideration.
<i>Action:</i>	DR17 – During MOP6, the Secretariat will add the names of the recommended candidates after assessment by the Advisory Group.

### Agenda item 19. Financial and Administrative Matters

#### a. Execution of the Budget 2013-2015

174. Mr Trouvilliez introduced the report on the income and expenditures in the period 2013-2015 (document StC10.26 Rev. 1), which would be up-dated for MOP6. He thanked both Mr Marco Barbieri and Mr Bert Lenten for having taken on the role of Acting Executive Secretary on an interim basis and went on to report that the position of the AEWA Executive Secretary had been advertised in October 2012 and that he had entered on duty on 1 June 2014.

After a very long recruitment process, the position of the Associate Programme Officer for the coordination of the African Initiative was able to be filled as of 4 May 2015. He thanked the Governments of Switzerland and Germany for supporting the African Initiative Coordinator and Programme Assistant respectively. He went on to thank the Government of Norway for supporting the position of the Associate Programme Officer for Single Species Action Plans Support, which was secured until 2017.

175. He welcomed the CMS Family Internship Programme, through which interns were regularly recruited to support the work of the Secretariat. Their tasks ranged from supporting the WMBD campaign to the national reporting process for MOP6.

176. Regarding the AEWA core budget, Mr Trouvilliez reported that a number of contributions had remained unpaid. In this context, he pointed out that countries with arrears of more than three years were not eligible to receive funding for participation in MOP6 or for receiving support via the Small Grants Fund

(SGF). The Secretariat had already sent out two reminders in 2015 and, in the case of large deficits, was in contact with the relevant countries.

177. He stressed the importance of countries paying their contributions as early as possible because, due to the new administration system (Umoja), expenditures were dependent on the availability of sufficient funds. This was particularly important in the case of staff salaries.

178. In 2013 and 2014, positive end-of-year Trust Fund balances amounting to ca. 90.000 EUR and ca. 190.000 EUR respectively had been registered. For 2014 an overexpenditure amounting to ca. 65.000 EUR was forecasted.

179. Mr Trouvilliez reminded that the contributions from countries becoming Parties to the Agreement between two sessions of the MOP went directly to the Trust Fund and that the current Trust Fund balance amounted to ca. 1,000,000 USD. The Trust Fund should always contain a balance of a minimum of 15% of total costs or 150,000 EUR p/a, whichever is higher.

180. He thanked the Governments of Germany, France, Norway, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, Finland, the Czech Republic and also the Hellenic Ornithological Society for their voluntary contributions and continuing support.

181. Responding to a question regarding the possibilities of using the reserve, Mr Trouvilliez explained that ca. 800,000 USD were theoretically available. MOP5 had decided to withdraw 370,000 USD from the Trust Fund to decrease the contributions of Parties, which were above the 2,000 EUR threshold.

182. As requested by some Parties, Mr Trouvilliez confirmed that he would provide an outline of the Secretariat's procedure for following up on unpaid pledges. He also mentioned that the submission of a national report could be an additional pre-requisite when deciding on funding priorities for MOP6.

*Decision:* Document StC10.26 Rev.1 **Report of the Secretariat on Finance and Administrative Issues 2013-2015** was noted and approved for submission to MOP6 with the inclusion of the additional information suggested.

*Action:* The Secretariat will revise the document accordingly before submission to MOP6.

#### b. Draft Budget Proposal 2016-2018

183. Mr Trouvilliez introduced document StC 10.27 *Preparation of the Draft Budget Proposal for 2016-2018*. Through Resolution 5.21, the Secretariat had been instructed to develop budget scenarios for MOP6. In consultation with the Standing Committee, the Secretariat had prepared the following four core budget scenarios:

- scenario 1 - zero nominal growth;
- scenario 2 - zero real growth;
- scenario 3- 2% increase; and
- scenario 4 - 5% increase.

184. He explained that the core budget only dealt with the basic operations of the Agreement, i.e. cost of staff, travel and meetings. Looking at the execution of the budget for the last triennium, there was a clear underestimation of the staff costs and annual savings had been used in the past to cover this deficit. In the past triennium, it had also been possible to increase the percentages of some of part-time staff due to savings.

185. With the launch of the new administration system, Umoja, this would no longer be possible; in future staff costs would have to be calculated more precisely. Following the advice of the relevant unit at UNEP headquarters in Nairobi, the Secretariat had used the standard cost for positions (as in the case of CMS at COP11). The total amount of the standard costs was equal to the total amount, had real costs been used.

186. He also stressed that all the G4 staff were working above the G-4 level. The need to upgrade G4 positions in the Secretariat to G5 could also be an issue in conjunction with Umoja pre-requisites for some of the necessary finance- and travel-related functions.

187. The staffing cost had previously been underestimated by 12-14%. In order to retain the staff to be able to deliver on all the Secretariat's obligations, the Secretariat had been forced to decrease all operational costs in the scenarios.

188. The only staff increase proposed was to cover the increase in African Initiative activities, by financing the zero position created at MOP5 for the G4 Programme Assistant on a 50% basis to support the work of African Initiative. This would be the minimum necessary to be able to continue the operations of the African Initiative.

189. Mr Trouvilliez briefly went through the scenarios, explaining that *scenario 1* represented the baseline by keeping all staff but with no provision for meetings of the AEWA governing bodies or travel and an absolutely minimal amount for translations.

*Scenario 2* included a small increase in operational costs linked with general management and the organisation of the meetings of the governing bodies.

*Scenario 3* also included a further amount for organising MOP7 and a limited amount for the implementation of the Plan of Action for Africa.

*Scenario 4* also included funds for one international review, costs of interpretation for MOP6 and an increase in the amount available for the implementation of the African Initiative.

The Small Grants Fund remained at zero throughout all four scenarios.

190. Appendix II reflected the annual contributions for each country per triennium. The minimum contribution was 2,000 EUR. Mr Trouvilliez reiterated that MOP5 had decided to make a withdrawal from the Trust Fund in order to decrease the amount of contributions due from Parties. In the context of this proposal, no withdrawal had been considered, resulting in an increase in contributions, even in the case of the zero nominal scenario. The preference would be for countries to pay the annual average of the three-year total each year.

191. Mr Dereliev stressed that with Umoja, it would not be possible to make expenditures if the budget lines were not covered. It would be best if countries were to pay their total contribution for the three years in advance, or if that was not possible, at least the same amount each year. The Umoja-related rules were very strict and in order to remain operational, the availability of funds would become absolutely crucial. If not, the Secretariat would be forced to continually monitor the relevant budget line and withdraw money from the Trust Fund in time to fill any gaps. This would mean a great deal of additional administrative work and, of course, the constant uncertainty of availability of sufficient reserves in the Trust Fund.

192. Responding to an enquiry by the Netherlands regarding the contributions, Mr Trouvilliez explained that the amount of contributions in the proposal were higher because they were based on a three-year average and there was no withdrawal from the Trust Fund considered, as in the case of MOP5, which had resulted in a 20% decrease in the contributions of the last three years.

193. France was also concerned about the increase in the amount of contributions, which would represent a 10% increase for the French Government.

194. On behalf of Switzerland, Mr Lamarque reported that Switzerland was in favour of scenario 4 (5% increase), however Switzerland also recommended being realistic and decreasing the programme of work accordingly.

195. France requested that a calculation of necessary withdrawal from the Trust Fund, in order to avoid any increase of contributions for the Parties, should be made available to MOP6.

196. The Chair reiterated that Parties must pay promptly, so that the Secretariat remains operational, although the Trust Fund must hold sufficient funds in case they are needed. He suggested the possibility of withdrawing e.g. 200,000 EUR to be able to conduct the business throughout the year. He went on to confirm that Norway also supported scenario 4.

197. Representing Germany, Ms Christiane Paulus thanked the Secretariat for the budget scenarios, which she considered to be very transparent. She was concerned as to using the Trust Fund to lower the contributions, as this would also lower the amount of funds available for implementation, particularly as Scenario 1 included no funding whatsoever for any meeting of the governing bodies. She could not confirm the position of Germany with regard to the scenarios, but a number of them were under consideration. Further clarification with regard to the standard salary costs was requested.

198. Mr Trouvilliez explained that the Standard Salary Costs were comparable to the salaries of the Vienna Duty Station, where it was much easier to calculate the mean costs due to the number of staff holding different positions. The estimation was based on all relevant positions and their incumbents.

199. Representing Estonia, Mr Üllar Rammul proposed the addition of an extra column to Annex 2, reflecting the current (MOP5) contributions being paid by Parties to make it easier to compare. He confirmed that Estonia would support, at least, Scenario 2.

200. Mr Trouvilliez explained that 370,000 EUR had been withdrawn for the last triennium, so that in order to offset the increase in the new triennium that amount and a further amount would have to be withdrawn, in order to achieve the same decrease.

201. France stressed that the document should be very clear on the fact that even in the case of scenario 1, the budget for the Secretariat remained the same but the contributions for the Parties were higher. It was suggested that fundraising could be one way of filling the gap.

202. Mr Dereliev explained that the core budget was completely separate and that it takes the minimum foundation for operations, i.e. staff to ensure that operations continue, including fundraising activities. For implementation work, there was only a provision in scenario 3 for the African Initiative. Practically all core budget funding went towards basic operations so fundraising for this purpose would be too risky.

203. Mr Trouvilliez commented on the healthy reserve, however the option of using this to fill any gaps resulting from unpaid pledges had to be kept open.

204. The Chair summarised by stressing that the Parties would require all the above information in the document presented, i.e. a clear explanation with regard to the higher contributions but also with regard to Umoja and the necessity of cash availability, in order to be able to take a decision at MOP6.

205. Mr Dereliev reiterated the Umoja rules and the necessity of cash availability. He strongly warned about withdrawing a substantial amount from the trust fund; the Secretariat would lose the chance to withdraw to compensate for missing contributions in order to be able to operate and for salaries to be paid. The Secretariat might have to rely on the reserve for at least half a year and then replenish it when contributions were paid.

206. Enquiring what a healthy reserve could be, the Chair requested the Secretariat to calculate this amount. This could also be added as a recommendation to advise against going much below a certain threshold.

206. Answering a question on the UN scale of assessments, which had been adopted by the Parties at MOP4, Mr Trouvilliez recommended keeping this scale and working together within the StC on this issue. He would be willing to clarify any questions on the scale or any other aspects of the budget proposal.

*Decision:* Document StC10.27 **Draft Budget Proposal 2016-2018** was noted and approved for submission to MOP6 after incorporation of the comments made

*Action* The secretariat will update Document StC10.27 accordingly for submission to MOP6.

### c. Administrative and Personnel Matters

208. Mr Trouvilliez introduced the report on administrative and personnel matters since StC9 in September 2013 (document StC10.26 Rev.1) and reported on the pilot phase of the *Joint CMS/AEWA Information Management, Communication and Awareness-raising Unit - IMCA* (document StC10.7 Rev.1), which had been established in 2014, in accordance with the decision of StC9 and consisted of five staff members, two from the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat and three from the UNEP/CMS Secretariat. IMCA was coordinated by the AEWA Information Officer. The issues covered by the team included the CMS family website, the coordination of national reporting, press, campaigns and social media.

209. In the assessment of the pilot phase, the Secretariat had two options, either not to continue, or to enter into a permanent agreement between the two Secretariats and to set clear priorities; however, it was not easy to share responsibilities and thus, the related costs. Lessons learnt had to be taken into account in order to be able to take the pilot further.

210. Thanking Mr Trouvilliez for this introduction, Ms Paulus was surprised to see the written report submitted to the StC, since MOP6 would be taking a decision on the issue on the basis of the independent analysis requested by COP11. Representing the Secretariat's host country, she was in close contact to the Secretariat and saw the pilot phase as being a great success and she pointed out that Germany welcomed the resulting synergies and was in favour of a wider programme of synergies between CMS and AEWA.

211. This view was shared by the Netherlands, welcoming the updated document. The Netherlands was in favour of synergies between different MEAs.

212. France was also in favour of waiting for the results of the independent analysis, which had been contracted by the UNEP/CMS Secretariat, but as a member of the Standing Committees of both AEWA and CMS, France had expected to be consulted or, at least, informed about the ToR for the analysis and the whole process.

213. Uganda welcomed the report on the pilot phase, since the StC had approved the pilot so it was prudent for the StC to receive feedback. He appreciated the decision at the CMS COP11, but in order to make it binding for AEWA, there should be a draft resolution to guide the AEWA Parties and to indicate the relevant recommendations of the StC. He reminded those present that, referring to the functions of the StC, Rule 7 of the StC Rules of Procedure stated that '*It makes recommendations or draft resolutions, as appropriate, for consideration by the Meeting of the Parties.*'

214. Speaking as an observer, Mr Nagy had noticed that the communication activities for AEWA had reduced considerably since the establishment of the Joint Unit. He wondered how it would be possible to accommodate all the family events, which the team had to serve. There was also the question of the implementation of the AEWA communication strategy and how this could be factored into the joint services.

215. The Chair referred to the lengthy debate on this issue at StC9, after which the StC had advised close collaboration between the CMS and AEWA Executive Secretaries. CMS had been requested to produce an independent study by COP11, which was ongoing. He concurred with Germany that a written report on the pilot had not been expected for this meeting. He looked forward to seeing the independent analysis including facts and figures on the savings made. The management of the Joint Unit would need to be strengthened, which would be discussed at the upcoming CMS StC Meeting and MOP6. The independent analysis would provide the basis for further discussion at MOP6.

216. Estonia welcomed the report, however shared the concerns of France and Uganda as to the process leading to the choice of the consultant to carry out the independent analysis and if this had been done by public procurement.

217. Uganda reiterated that the decision made by the CMS COP with regard to the independent analysis was valid for CMS, however AEWA had its own decision-making bodies and the decision regarding the independent report had neither been approved by the StC, nor had the relevant Terms of Reference been shared with the members of the StC, which would have been expected.

218. In answer, Mr Chambers referred to CMS Resolution 11.3, requesting the Executive Secretary to commission an independent analysis in time for the CMS StC in October 2015 and the CMS StC had been asked to make recommendations on the advantages and disadvantages to the AEWA MOP6. He explained that the ToR had been taken from the resolution. The analysis had been commissioned to consultants from the Free University of Brussels, who had the relevant expertise and discussions with the consultants had started in March. The due diligence and the entire process had been carried out according to the UN rules. The consultants had already carried out interviews with a range of CMS family staff members.

219. He went on to explain that the Pilot had very much been a process of learning-by-doing. A joint costed programme of work had been produced to make it clear which services were being provided for each Secretariat. The work programme was also being monitored.

220. The Chair reminded the Meeting about the CMS future shape process, which had been a guiding factor, as well as the recommendations on a higher political level by UNEA to seek out more synergies and efficiency. There were many examples of systems of task-sharing already ongoing and this was on the increase. The [Biodiversity Liaison Group \(BLG\)](#) was one successful example. These things took time and the focus should be on finding more common areas of interest and sharing.

221. Mr Trouvilliez referred to the difficulties of coping with the needs of different conventions and being fair to the respective Parties. The Secretariat had to provide the Parties with all the relevant information to help them to make a well-informed decision. He went on to explain that the report on the pilot had been shared with the CMS management, which had provided some very useful comments. The report had also been sent to the Chair of the StC for approval in advance of the Meeting. The current report could be updated and presented to MOP6 for consideration.

*Decision:* Document StC10.7 ***Report on the CMS/AEWA Information Management, Communication and Awareness-raising Unit*** was noted by the Meeting.

*Action:* The Secretariat will update the document for submission to MOP6.

222. Mr Trouvilliez went on to give a brief introduction to the corresponding draft resolution, StC10 DR18 *Financial and Administrative Matters* (StC10 DR.18), which the Meeting approved for submission to MOP6 for consideration.

*Decision:* DR18 **Financial and Administrative Matters** was approved for submission to MOP6 for consideration.

## **Agenda item 20. Other Draft Resolutions**

223. Mr Trouvilliez introduced document StC10 DR2, *Adoption of the Arabic Text of the Agreement*, explaining that MOP5 had given the StC the mandate to agree on the Arabic translation. This had been a lengthy process. The relevant Parties had been consulted per email. The translation had been sent to the AEWA Depository, the Netherlands, to check the translation in comparison with the official text and there were some discrepancies, however he hoped that this could be amended in time for MOP6.

224. Mr Dereliev introduced document StC DR7 Rev.1, *Adoption of Guidance and Definitions in the Context of Implementation of the AEWA Action Plan*, which responding to requests from previous sessions of the MOP to provide guidance and definitions. There were three documents linked to the draft resolution, document StC10.20 *Guidance for Dealing with the Accidental Shooting of Look-alike Species in the Western Palearctic*, which was suggested to be submitted to MOP6 as an information document since it was geographically restricted and would require further elaboration. The second document was document StC10.21 *Guidance on Measures in National Legislation for Different Populations of the Same Species*, elaborated by the TC. The third item was the definition of the term ‘*disturbance*’ (attached as an appendix to the draft resolution), which drew largely on existing guidance from other sources and how this should be interpreted in the context of the Agreement.

225. On behalf of BirdLife International, Ms Crockford had some suggestions in relation to disturbance and look-like species recommendations, which she would provide to the Secretariat.

226. Mr Dereliev introduced document StC10 DR14 Rev.1 *Extension and Revision of the AEWA Strategic Plan 2009-2017 and the Plan of Action for Africa 2012-2017 until 2018 and their Revisions*, which was submitted to accommodate the timeframes of the existing formal documents. The Strategic Plan was valid until 2017 and the Plan of Action for Africa adopted at MOP5 was valid for two triennia, i.e. until 2017, whereas MOP7 would take place in 2018 so this would have to be accommodated in both documents. The revision of both documents would be carried out in parallel so that they correspond. The report of the progress of the implementation of the AEWA Strategic Plan would be reliant on the outcomes of the analysis of the national reports to MOP6 and would be provided to the StC in August 2015.

227. Introducing document StC10 DR15 *Update on AEWA's Contribution to Delivering the Aichi 2020 Biodiversity Targets*, Mr Stroud explained that this document had been developed as a result of request by MOP5 and drew from the AEWA Strategic Plan, mapping out where AEWA could contribute to each of the Aichi Targets. The annexes contained the substantive content. He referred to a very productive discussion at TC12 where a number of areas of work had been highlighted, for example relating to a better understanding of the socio-economic importance of traditional harvesting, not only in Africa. Referring to UNEP's opening statement with regard to the forthcoming Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to be agreed upon by the UN General Assembly in late September 2015, he suggested adding an additional annex to this draft resolution, outlining as to how AEWA's activities could contribute to some of those goals. This suggestion was welcomed by the Meeting and Mr Stroud offered to compile this addition to the document.

228. Mr Hlaváček (UNEP) pointed out that it may also be helpful to consider the letter from the CBD Executive Secretary to the relevant stakeholders and CBD Member States concerning biodiversity issues and how these could be better covered by the UN Biodiversity Summit.

229. Reiterating this, Mr Chambers confirmed that efforts had been made to work through the BLG to better understand how the biodiversity cluster could contribute to SDG goal 15. He welcomed the outline of what AEWA's contribution could be and confirmed that the same exercise would have to be done for CMS. There was still no clarity as to how CBD would follow-up on and collect these inputs, however discussions were currently ongoing to gain clarity on the issue.

230. Mr Trouvilliez briefly introduced document StC10 DR19 Rev.1 *Date, Venue and Funding of the 7<sup>th</sup> Session of the Meeting of the Parties*, which was approved by the Meeting for submission to MOP6.

231. He went on to introduce document StC10 DR20 *Tribute to the Organisers*, explaining that this draft resolution thanked the donors for their support. There was no host for MOP6, thus the session would be taking place at the UN Campus in Bonn where the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat was based. The resolution would be up-dated with regard to any further contributions in time for submission to MOP6. He went on to express his gratitude to Germany for providing the venue and the excellent facilities. He also thanked the Executive Secretary of the UNEP/CMS Secretariat for providing staff to facilitate the servicing of MOP6.

**Decision:** DR2 *Adoption of the Arabic Text* was approved for submission to MOP6 upon receipt of feedback from the Depositary.

DR7 *Adoption of Guidance and Definitions in the Context of Implementation of the AEWA Action Plan* was approved for submission to MOP6 for consideration pending the incorporation of comments

DR14 *Extension and Revision of the AEWA Strategic Plan 2009-2017 and the Plan of Action for Africa 2012-2017 until 2018 and their Revisions* was approved for submission to MOP6 pending the incorporation of comments.

DR15 *Update on AEWA's Contribution to Delivering the Aichi 2020 Biodiversity Targets* was approved for submission to MOP6 for consideration with the addition of an annex on AEWA's contribution to the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

DR20 *Tribute to the Organizers* was approved for submission to MOP6 for consideration.

*Action:* DRs 7 and 14 will be revised accordingly by the Secretariat.

DR15 - The Secretariat will include the agreed annex, which will be compiled in close collaboration with the TC (David Stroud), before submission to MOP6.

### **Agenda item 21. Selection of the AEWA Waterbird Conservation Award Winners (closed session)**

232. The Members of the Standing Committee met in a closed session to discuss the nominations for the AEWA Waterbird Conservation Award.

233. After the closed session, the Chair announced that the Members had selected the following winners of the 2015 AEWA Waterbird Conservation Award:

#### Individual category:

Mr Abdoulaye N'Diaye, Senegal

#### Institutional category:

The Association Inter-Villageoise du Ndiaël (the inter-village Association of the Ndiaël), Senegal, represented by the President of the Association Mr Amadou Sow.

234. The winners would be notified directly after the meeting and asked if they would like to accept their awards and subsequently invited to attend the award ceremony at MOP6 in November 2015,

### **Agenda item 22. Dates and Venues of the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> Meetings of the Standing Committee**

235. Mr Trouvilliez explained that StC11 would take place back-to-back with MOP6 in November 2015 in Bonn, Germany, and that StC12 was scheduled to take place in late 2016<sup>3</sup>.

### **Agenda item 23. Any Other Business**

236. There were no issues tabled under this agenda item.

### **Agenda item 24. Closure of the Meeting**

237. On behalf of the Secretariat, Mr Trouvilliez thanked Mr Størkersen for his efficiency in chairing the Meeting, he went on to thank the Government of Uganda, represented by Mr James Lutalo and Mr Barirega Akankwasah from the Ministry of Tourism, Wildlife and Antiquities for hosting the Meeting and providing such excellent facilities together with the warm welcome and wonderful hospitality, which had helped all those present to be able to concentrate on the many issues discussed in the meeting. He also thanked *Nature* Uganda for the organization of the memorable excursion to Mabamba Bay, which is one of Uganda's 33 Important Bird Areas and since 2006 a Ramsar-listed wetland of international importance, giving participants a close-up impression of the local flora and fauna.

238. The Chair also thanked the host for the wonderful hospitality. This would be his last Meeting as Chair of the AEWA Standing Committee and he encouraged the StC Regional Representatives to contact their Parties to either renew the terms of office of present representatives or to nominate new candidates in

---

<sup>3</sup> Editor's note: In the meantime, France has kindly offered to host StC12, which is scheduled to take place from 30 January to 1 February 2017.

preparation for the selection procedure at MOP6. He thanked Mr Trouvilliez, who had put the Secretariat back on track, since coming on duty in June 2014 and Mr Dereliev for his substantial contribution as Technical Officer. He also thanked the Technical Committee for the great amount of work successfully carried out under the chairmanship of Dr Stroud. Last-but-not-least, he thanked all the members of the Secretariat for their continual hard work and dedication.

The Meeting was closed.

## APPENDIX 1-StC10 Participants List

### MEMBERS

#### EUROPE AND CENTRAL ASIA (1)

Mr Øystein Størksen (Chair)  
Principal Advisor  
Norwegian Environment Agency  
P.O. Box 5672 Sluppen  
7485 Trondheim  
Norway

Tel.: +47 735 805 00  
Fax: +47 735 805 01  
oystein.storkersen@miljodir.no

#### EUROPE AND CENTRAL ASIA (2)

Dr François Lamarque  
European and International Actions Officer  
Ministry of Ecology, Sustainable Development and  
Energy (MEDDE)  
Tour Séquoia  
92055 La Défense Cedex  
France

Tel.: +33 140 813 190  
francois.lamarque@developpement-durable.gouv.fr

#### WESTERN AND CENTRAL AFRICA

Nana Kofi Adu-Nsiah  
Executive Director  
Wildlife Division, Forestry Commission  
P.O. Box MB 239  
Ministries Post Office  
Accra  
Ghana

Tel.: +233 244 107 143  
adunsiah@yahoo.com

#### EASTERN AND SOUTHERN AFRICA

Dr Barirega Akankwasah (Vice-Chair)  
Ag. A/Principal Wildlife Officer  
Ministry of Tourism, Wildlife and Antiquities  
Rwenzori Towers, Plot 6, Nakasero Road  
P.O. Box 4241  
Kampala  
Uganda

Tel.: +256 414 561 723  
abarirega@tourism.go.ug/akankwasah@gmail.com

#### DEPOSITARY / THE NETHERLANDS

Ms Anna Pel-Roest  
Policy Coordinator  
Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality  
P.O. Box 20401  
2500 EK The Hague  
The Netherlands

Tel.: +31 646 714 694  
A.J.Pel@minez.nl

## ***OBSERVERS***

### **CHAIR OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE**

Dr David Stroud  
Senior Ornithologist  
Joint Nature Conservation Committee  
Monkstone House, City Road  
Peterborough PE1 1JY  
United Kingdom

Tel.: +44 173 356 68 10  
David.Stroud@jncc.gov.uk

### ***OTHER OFFICIAL DELEGATIONS***

#### **ESTONIA**

Mr Üllar Rammul  
Senior Officer  
Nature Conservation Department  
Ministry of Environment  
Narva mnt 7a  
15172 Tallinn  
Estonia

Tel.: + 372 62 62 802  
Fax: + 372 62 62 801  
yllar.rammul@envir.ee

#### **LUXEMBOURG**

Mr Gilles Biver  
Attaché de Gouvernement  
Ministère du Développement durable et des  
Infrastructures, Département de l'environnement  
4, Place de l'Europe  
L-1499 Luxembourg  
Luxembourg

Tel.: +35 2247 868 34  
Fax: +35 2247 868 35  
gilles.biver@mev.etat.lu

#### **GERMANY**

Dr Christiane Paulus  
Deputy Director General  
Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature  
Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety  
Robert Schumann Platz 3  
53175 Bonn  
Germany

Tel.: +49 228 99305 2605  
Fax: +49 228 99305 2602  
christiane.paulus@bmub.bund.de

#### **SOUTH AFRICA**

Ms Humbulani Mafumo  
Deputy Director  
Directorate of Biodiversity Conservation  
National Department of Environmental Affairs  
P.O. Box 447  
Pretoria, 0001  
South Africa

Tel.: +27 123 999 586  
Fax: +27 865 411 102  
Hmafumo@environment.gov.za

## **TANZANIA**

Mr Sadiki Lotha Laisser  
Wildlife Officer-Wetlands Conservation  
Wildlife Division  
Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism  
Mpingo House, 40 Nyerere Road  
15472 Dar es Salaam  
Tanzania

Tel.: +255 754 203 925  
Mob: +255 754 203 925  
laissersadiki@yahoo.com

## **UGANDA**

Mr James Lutalo  
Commissioner Wildlife Conservation  
Ministry of Tourism, Wildlife and Antiquities  
Wildlife Conservation  
P.O. Box 4241  
Kampala  
Uganda

Tel.: +256 414 561 721  
lutaloj57@gmail.com

### ***INTERNATIONAL NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS***

#### **BIRDLIFE INTERNATIONAL**

Ms Nicola Crockford  
International Species Policy Officer  
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)  
The Lodge, Sandy  
Bedfordshire  
SG19 2DL  
United Kingdom

Tel.: +44 176 769 30 72  
nicola.crockford@rspb.org.uk

#### **WETLANDS INTERNATIONAL**

Dr Szabolcs NAGY  
Senior Advisor  
Wetlands International  
P.O. Box 471  
6700 AL Wageningen  
The Netherlands

Tel.: +31 628 554 823  
szabolcs.nagy@wetlands.org

### ***NATIONAL NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS***

#### ***NATURE UGANDA***

Mr Achilles Byaruhanga  
Executive Director  
Plot 1 Katalima Crescent  
Lower Naguru,  
P.O. Box 27034  
Kampala  
Uganda

Tel.: +256 414540719 |  
achilles.byaruhanga@natureuganda.org

## ***INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS***

Dr Jiří Hlaváček  
Special Advisor  
Head of MEAs Support and Coordination  
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)  
Block 2, Level 2, North Wing  
P.O. Box 30552 - 00100  
Nairobi  
Kenya

Tel.: +254-20-7624012  
jiri.hlavacek@unep.org

### ***UNEP/CMS SECRETARIAT***

Dr Bradnee Chambers  
Executive Secretary  
UNEP/CMS Secretariat  
UN Campus  
Platz der Vereinten Nationen 1  
53113 Bonn  
Germany

Tel.: +49 228 815 2410  
Fax: +49 228 815 2449  
Bradnee.Chambers@cms.int

### ***UNEP/AEWA SECRETARIAT***

Dr Jacques Trouvilliez  
Executive Secretary  
UNEP/AEWA Secretariat  
UN Campus  
Platz der Vereinten Nationen 1  
53113 Bonn  
Germany

Tel.: +49 228 815 2414  
Fax: +49 228 815 2450  
Jacques.Trouvilliez@unep-aewa.org

Ms Jolanta Kremer  
Programme Assistant  
UNEP/AEWA Secretariat  
UN Campus  
Platz der Vereinten Nationen 1  
53113 Bonn  
Germany

Tel.: +49 228 815 2455  
Fax: +49 228 815 2450  
Jolanta.Kremer@unep-aewa.org

Mr Sergey Dereliev  
Technical Officer  
UNEP/AEWA Secretariat  
UN Campus  
Platz der Vereinten Nationen 1  
53113 Bonn  
Germany

Tel.: +49 228 815 2415  
Fax: +49 228 815 2450  
Sergey.Dereliev@unep-aewa.org