

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

**REPORT OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE TO  
THE 6<sup>th</sup> SESSION OF THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES**

**Contents**

Introduction.....	1
Membership of the Committee .....	2
Delivery of the Technical Committee's work in 2012-2015 .....	2
Work planning: the status quo .....	3
Work planning: learning from the experience of other MEAs .....	3
Work planning: proposed approach for the Technical Committee .....	4
TC assessment of AEWA effectiveness and future needs .....	4
Key threats negatively influencing migratory waterbirds.....	4
Key issues that the Technical Committee should be addressing .....	5
How AEWA could be made more effective?.....	6
Technical Committee outreach .....	7
Register of Interests .....	8
Table 1. Technical Committee Working Groups and their membership (2012-2015) .....	9
Table 2. AEWA Technical Committee Work Plan 2009-2012 .....	10
Table 3. Other Technical Committee activities over the past intersessional period 2012-2015.....	24
Appendix 1. Guidance on conflicts of interest from Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.....	26

**Introduction**

This report is submitted to the 6<sup>th</sup> Session of the Meeting of Parties (MOP6) by the Technical Committee (TC), in accordance with Article VII paragraph 3(c) of the Agreement. It describes the activities of the Technical Committee for 2012-2015 as well as a summary of results achieved. Article VII paragraphs 3-5 of the Agreement specifies that:

“3. The Technical Committee shall:

- (a) provide scientific and technical advice and information to the Meeting of the Parties and, through the Agreement secretariat, to Parties;
- (b) make recommendations to the Meeting of the Parties concerning the Action Plan, implementation of the Agreement and further research to be carried out;
- (c) prepare for each ordinary session of the Meeting of the Parties a report on its activities, ...; and
- (d) carry out any other tasks referred to it by the Meeting of the Parties.

4. Where in the opinion of the Technical Committee there has arisen an emergency which requires the adoption of immediate measures to avoid deterioration of the conservation status of one or more migratory waterbird species, the Technical Committee may request the Agreement secretariat to convene urgently a meeting of the Parties concerned. These Parties shall meet as soon as possible thereafter to establish rapidly a mechanism to give protection to the species identified as being subject to particularly adverse threat.

Where a recommendation has been adopted at such a meeting, the Parties concerned shall inform each other and the Agreement secretariat of measures they have taken to implement it, or of the reasons why the recommendation could not be implemented.

5. The Technical Committee may establish such working groups as may be necessary to deal with specific tasks.”

During the triennium 2012-2015, the Technical Committee held two meetings; both meetings were chaired by David Stroud (UK), regional representative for N & SW Europe.

The eleventh meeting (TC11) was held from 27-30 August 2012, in Accra, Ghana, hosted by the Ghana Wildlife Commission. The twelfth meeting (TC12) took place from 3-6 March 2015 in Bonn, Germany and was hosted by the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat. We express our sincere thanks to all involved in the organisation of these meetings for ensuring their smooth and effective organisation – both before, during and after the Committee met.

As in previous triennia, a TC Work Plan for the period 2012-2015 was developed following MOP5 as the basis for the Committee’s work (Table 2). As previously, tasks were organised for progression by ten Working Groups (Table 1), each with a Chair responsible for supervising and leading the necessary work. Membership of the Working Groups comprised regional representatives, thematic experts, NGO representatives and observers, as well as at least one representative of the Secretariat.

In addition to the specific tasks requested by MOP5, the TC also undertook a range of other work to fulfill its mandate as outlined by the Agreement and subsequent MOP decisions. These are summarised in Table 3.

As noted in the Committee’s report to MOP5, effective use was made of an online [Technical Committee Workspace](#), a password-protected communication and working area for the TC that provides easy access to documents, enables discussions, and archives all TC work. This greatly facilitated inter-sessional communication between Committee members.

As the result of TC work, the Committee has drafted 13 Resolutions to be endorsed for submission to MOP6 through the Standing Committee. More than 20 MOP6 meeting documents and information documents were drafted by the TC or prepared with the close involvement of the Committee.

## **Membership of the Committee**

In June 2013, Mark Brown stood down as the TC’s Southern African representative. We thank him for his work for the Committee. Following a call to Parties within the region for nominations, in 2014 the Committee welcomed Lizanne Roxburgh (South Africa) as representative for Southern Africa.

## **Delivery of the Technical Committee’s work in 2012-2015**

The Work Plan for 2012-2015 is summarised in Table 2.

In contrast to previous triennia, a significant proportion of the tasks in the Work Plan were not completed (or progressed) by the TC (Table 2). The reasons for this essentially relate to:

- the growing volume of requests to the TC by the Meeting of Parties;
- the lack of any earmarked resources with which to contract significant elements of work (e.g. technical reviews) and thus consequent reliance on prior fundraising by the Secretariat to progress these work areas; and
- for TC members from developed countries in particular, the consequences of economic austerity measures resulting in heavy constraints on the amount of *pro bono* input to the Committee’s work that was possible as a consequence of other organisational responsibilities.

The volume of work undertaken by the Committee is more than just the direct requests made of it in MOP Resolutions. For example, the TC mandate also includes the development and review of guidelines (paras 7.3 & 7.6 of AEWA's Action Plan) as well as its role in the Implementation Review Process and the selection procedure related to the Small Grants Fund. Also, in line with its general advisory function, the TC has, in recent years, taken a look as to new and emerging issues of potential significance for waterbird conservation.

**Work planning: the status quo**

The number of requests made of the Technical Committee by the Meeting of Parties has progressively increased (Figure 1). This is good as it indicated the Committee is serving a useful function, but it does have consequences in relation to capacity to respond to these requests.




Figure 1. The increasing number of substantive requests for technical and scientific work or guidance made of the Technical Committee through MOP Resolutions: 1999-2012.

An additional issue is that currently, the Technical Committee develops its triennial work plan following each MOP, organising the various tasks requested by the MOP for progressing by a number of thematic working groups. The consequence is lack of clear prioritisation from Parties within the multiple tasks requested by MOP (Figure 1).

**Work planning: learning from the experience of other MEAs**

The situation described above is virtually identical to that faced by the Ramsar Convention in the management of the work of its Scientific and Technical Review Panel (STRP) in the early-mid 2000s, especially in an increased volume of unprioritised tasks requested for STRP guidance from Ramsar's COP. The outcome was the drafting of a prioritised STRP work programme for discussion and agreement by COP. This gave the Parties oversight of *all* the work being requested of STRP.

The draft work programme included indicative costings to deliver early work on many of the tasks where external consultancies is an effective means of taking forward initial work. This has enabled the Panel to truly operate as a 'Review' Panel – i.e. adding value to, and finessing, initial drafts prepared for its consideration. This has been a cost-effective means of gaining high quality scientific inputs from those who would not have the time for significant review or initial drafting.

Whilst initially the establishment of a zero budget line established a principle of support for STRP work in the core budget, more recent COP allocations have enabled the funding of highest priority tasks without the need to seek voluntary contributions.

An important part of the approach that has been adopted by Ramsar to managing the development of its technical guidance has been the ability it gives the COP to have a more strategic overview of the work of STRP. In particular, which issues (e.g. climate change adaptation, agricultural wetlands etc.) should be prioritised thematic areas. Within the Ramsar model, the selection of STRP members follows *after* the agreement of the thematic areas and work programme. This enables the selection, as members, of those individuals with most appropriate expertise to deliver the COP-agreed priorities.

### ***Work planning: proposed approach for the Technical Committee***

Following agreement of the Standing Committee at its 9<sup>th</sup> Meeting, the TC is proposing:

- a. that a draft prioritised Work Plan is tabled for discussion and endorsement at each MOP (included as part of document AEWA/MOP 6.XX);
- b. that this work plan will contain indicative costs for each task;
- c. that at least some element of the Core Budget determined by MOP is assigned to support the work that the MOP requests from the TC; and
- d. that tasks will be arranged (as at present) within thematic areas, with the anticipation (as at present), that the TC will take these forward through smaller working groups working on each of these areas.

### **TC assessment of AEWA effectiveness and future needs**

At its 11<sup>th</sup> Meeting, the Technical Committee undertook an assessment of problems faced by migratory waterbirds and means of improving the effectiveness of the implementation of the Agreement. Whilst of a limited and informal nature, the participation of regional representatives from across the Agreement area, as well as a significant number of organisational representatives with extensive relevant expertise, resulted in valuable conclusions.

Participants were asked:

1. “In your experience, what are the top two threats negatively influencing migratory waterbirds?”
2. “Irrespective of the current TC work plan, what are the three key issues that the TC should be addressing?”
3. “If you could make one thing happen, how would you make AEWA (meaning the Contracting Parties, Secretariat and Technical Committee) more effective?”

### ***Key threats negatively influencing migratory waterbirds***

A wide range of threats were identified, broadly summarised in Figure 2. Threats involving habitat loss and degradation, especially in Africa dominated. Assessments included the following broad issues (not in any order of priority):

- wetland habitat loss and land-use change, including:
  - the extension of agriculture into formerly uncultivated areas;
  - its intensification (to the detriment of waterbirds) elsewhere;
  - land-claim in coastal and other areas including through wetland drainage;
  - biofuel production in agricultural and other habitats (often driven by foreign investment); and
  - unsustainable levels of water extraction from wetlands;

- the above are largely consequences of ever expanding human populations which is a key driver of habitat loss and degradation, with its greater demand for food, water, infrastructure development, urbanisation, mineral and energy resources;
- weak political will and inadequate government policies in some regions;
- badly informed decision making often linked to limited appreciation of the value of waterbirds (in multiple senses) and negative public attitudes;
- negative effects of disturbance at key sites leading to ‘virtual’ habitat loss there;
- unsustainable and/or illegal use or hunting of waterbirds, lack of estimates of harvest levels/bags, and limited or inadequate regulation of hunting in many regions;
- population impacts from ‘invisible’ poisoning, especially from lead shot, pesticides and nutrient pollution; and
- climate change impacts leading to hydrological change (e.g. drought) and other natural system modifications.

Guidance related to the management of many of these issues has already been developed by AEWAs (as summarised, *inter alia*, in documents AEWAs/MOP 6.XX [StC10.DR.12 – Avoiding Unnecessary Additional Mortality for Migratory Waterbirds], AEWAs/MOP 6.XX [StC10.DR.6 – Updated Guidance on Climate Change Adaptation Measures for Waterbirds], and AEWAs/MOP 6.XX [StC10.25 – Communication Strategy]). Ultimately however, such guidance typically does not address the primary drivers of the change factors outlined above.

As noted by UNEP (2012)<sup>1</sup> “There are compelling reasons to consider policies and programmes that focus on the underlying drivers that contribute to increased pressure on environmental conditions, rather than concentrating only on reducing environmental pressures or symptoms. Drivers include, *inter alia*, the negative aspects of population growth, consumption and production, urbanization and globalization.”

### ***Key issues that the Technical Committee should be addressing***

A large number of issues were identified, as broadly summarised in Figure 3. Many of the priorities are already work areas for the Committee. Unsurprisingly, many related to the need to address key threats (above). Significant other issues raised included (not in any priority order) the need to:

- have a clearer focus on those issues where AEWAs and the Technical Committee can uniquely make a difference and successfully address: e.g. promoting the phase out the use of lead shot; promotion of sustainable hunting; implementation of single species action plans; and
- use the expertise within the Committee to provide technical assistance to Parties that request it – including via the Implementation Review Process and supporting the development of technical capacity development in countries where expertise is lacking;
- give greater focus on sustainable use issues generally (including the creation of a sustainable use officer position within the Secretariat);
- help to improve awareness of AEWAs and waterbird conservation issues through proactive campaigns, perhaps particularly targeted at NGOs and universities (as a source of next generation of natural resource managers?);
- prioritize knowledge (research) gaps and develop plan(s) to address them; and
- promote better targeting of AEWAs guidance to potential users and stakeholders
- give high priority to improve the taxonomic and geographic scope of monitoring in all regions [issue addressed in AEWAs/MOP 6.XX and AEWAs/MOP 6.XX [StC 10.10 – Report on the Development

---

<sup>1</sup> United Nations Environment Programme 2012. *Global Environmental Outlook 5. Summary for Policy Makers*. UNEP, Nairobi. 20 pp. [http://www.unep.org/geo/pdfs/GEO5\\_SPM\\_English.pdf](http://www.unep.org/geo/pdfs/GEO5_SPM_English.pdf)

of Waterbird Monitoring Along the African-Eurasian Flyways and StC10.DR3 – Strengthening Monitoring of Migratory Waterbirds]; and

- give greater focus to issues related to landscape scale habitat/land-use changes, including guidance related to the development of policies that benefit waterbirds (and other biodiversity) as well as food production.

The Committee stressed that two cross-cutting issues stand out:

- a) The multi-faceted issue of hunting/taking and AEWA's unique role at the interface between interested parties was repeatedly stressed indicating that AEWA should give greater priority to sustainable use issues, enforcement of existing legislation, and addressing of illegal killing.
- b) The need for better targeting of communications and guidance. Who is AEWA trying to influence, how is that most effectively achieved, and what do they need from AEWA (specifically) to conserve migratory waterbirds?

### ***How AEWA could be made more effective?***

Issues where TC participants consider AEWA could be made more effective included (not in any priority order):

#### *Working through others*

- Focus on actions uniquely in AEWA's remit and/or not addressed by others: don't duplicate what other MEAs address, but rather better develop tools and advice to those responsible for AEWA implementation – as necessary interpreted for AEWA contexts;
- Work more closely and effectively with, and through, other organisations whose activities impact on waterbirds;
- Coordinate with other MEAs or policy mechanisms to increase efficiency/effectiveness in addressing conservation issues and threats; and
- Work with other MEA secretariats to build capacity in selected countries for co-ordinated implementation of MEAs, e.g. through national biodiversity working groups.

#### *Funding*

- Enhanced funding support for the implementation of the Agreement, especially in Africa and other developing countries.

#### *Capacity of Parties*

- Give priority to work to strengthen capacity (including through training of focal points and others) to implement the Agreement within Parties and Range States; and
- Continue to promote accession to the Agreement from Range States giving priority to those which are especially significant for migratory waterbirds.

#### *Secretariat capacity*

- Maintain and ideally increase staffing capacity of the Secretariat, including full-time posts to a) support the work of the Technical Committee, and b) act as focus for sustainable hunting issues.

#### *Communication and outreach*

- Give focus to outreach initiatives involving children and youth – today's children are tomorrow's decision makers;

- Improve communication between Contracting Party focal points, regional representatives, Secretariat and other partners;
- Build more strategic funding partnerships with business to continue to seek (major) funding inputs (as already has occurred for some initiatives) - a key role for the Executive Secretary;
- Better and more focused targeting of different stakeholder groups at the decision making level nationally and internationally, and critically including the corporate sector; and
- Undertake comprehensive translation of AEWA guidance into a wider range of (local) languages, and encourage dissemination of this information through relevant networks.

### **Technical Committee outreach**

During the triennium, Members of the Committee have participated, in various capacities, in a wide range of processes and meetings. Such participation directly benefits AEWA through the identification of opportunities for joint working and synergies; through the promotion of AEWA's objectives to other stakeholders and organisations; and through the development of networks and contacts that may assist in the task of conserving migratory waterbirds. Additionally, such engagement assists the Committee to deliver its own work through inputs of external knowledge and expertise, including the benefits of experience from outside the Agreement area.

TC members engaged with or participated in the following processes and meetings during 2012-2015:

- Accession issues: participation in 2013 international workshop on Russian Federation's potential accession to AEWA
- Agreement on the conservation of albatrosses and petrels; Advisory Committee
- Arctic Council; Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna
- Arctic Council; Arctic Migratory Birds Initiative
- Bern Convention; Standing Committee
- Convention on Migratory Species (CMS); Scientific Council
- CMS; Conference of the Parties
- CMS; Flyways Working Group
- CMS; Preventing Poisoning Working Group
- CMS; Strategic Plan Working Group
- CMS; Scientific Task Force on Wildlife Disease
- CMS; African-Eurasian Migratory Landbirds Action Plan Working Group
- CMS/AEWA; Workshop to develop the Plan of Action to Address Bird Trapping Along the Mediterranean Coasts of Egypt and Libya
- Convention on the Conservation of European wildlife and Natural Habitats (Bern Convention); 2<sup>nd</sup> Conference on the Illegal Killing, Trapping and Trade of Wild Birds
- Bern Convention; 4<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Group of Experts on the Conservation of Birds
- East-Asian Australasian Flyways Partnership
- European Union; Expert Group on the Birds and Habitats Directives
- Global Interflyways Network
- 14<sup>th</sup> International Wildlife Law Conference, Cameroon (presentation on AEWA given)
- International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN); Specialist Groups
- International Wader Study Group
- MoU on the conservation of migratory raptors in Africa and Eurasia; Technical Advisory Group
- Ramsar Convention; Conference of Parties
- Ramsar Convention; Scientific and Technical Review Panel
- Species Action Plans; participation in several International Working Groups

- Species Management Plans; meeting of International Working Group on the Svalbard population of Pink-footed Goose
- Symposium on Contemporary Conservation Practice, South Africa (presentation on AEWA given)
- TraProBio Conference on the Regulation on Invasive Species in South Africa and Germany, Germany (presentation on AEWA given)
- Wetlands International; Waterbird Monitoring Partnership
- Wetlands International; Specialist Groups

## **Register of Interests**

The need for transparency is an increasingly important element of the good governance of international scientific subsidiary bodies. This includes the need for clear procedures to deal with potential conflicts of interest.

As the guidance TC develops for consideration by MOP often addresses sensitive issues of public policy, it considers it important that there are transparent procedures for dealing with potential conflicts of interest.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) adopted a thorough Conflicts of Interest Policy at its 34<sup>th</sup> Session in 2012. IPCC's guidance includes useful guidance (Appendix 1). The issue has also been addressed by a number of other scientific subsidiary bodies, notably by the Advisory Committee of the Agreement on the conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels.

Following ACAP procedures, the Technical Committee is proposing that, in future, all members and permanent observers will complete a simple interest form (appended to document AEWA/MOP 6.XX) at the commencement of each triennium.

---

<sup>2</sup> [https://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/ipcc-principles/ipcc-conflict-of-interest\\_decision.pdf](https://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/ipcc-principles/ipcc-conflict-of-interest_decision.pdf)

**Table 1. Technical Committee Working Groups and their Membership (2012-2015)**

Working Group	Members
1. Lead, hunting and trade	<b>Jean-Yves Mondain-Monval (Chair)</b> , Lorenzo Serra, Melissa Lewis, Sharif Jbour, Arto Marjakangas, Angus Middleton, John Harradine, Thomas Eske Holm, Nicola Crockford, Baz Hughes, Catherine Lehmann and Sergey Dereliev
2. National reporting, Strategic Plan and Aichi targets	<b>Melissa Lewis (Chair)</b> , David Stroud, Szabolcs Nagy, Muchai Muchane, Kelly Malsch/Patricia Cremona, Jean-Yves Mondain-Monval, Angus Middleton, Thomas Eske Holm, Florian Keil and Sergey Dereliev
3. International reviews	<b>David Stroud (Chair)</b> , Hussein Sosovele, Szabolcs Nagy, Nicola Crockford, Baz Hughes, Arto Marjakangas and Sergey Dereliev
4. Waterbird monitoring	<b>Szabolcs Nagy (Chair)</b> , David Stroud, Erasmus Owusu, Hichem Azafzaf, Saulius Svazas, Sharif Jbour, Jean-Yves Mondain-Monval, Patrick Triplet, Baz Hughes, Thomas Eske Holm and Sergey Dereliev
5. CEPA and Communications Strategy	<b>CEPA specialist – unfilled position (Chair)</b> , Hichem Azafzaf, Hussein Sosovele, Erasmus Owusu, David Stroud, Nicola Crockford, Patrick Triplet, Florian Keil and Sergey Dereliev
6. Conservation Guidelines	<b>Mark Brown (Chair until 2013, then David Stroud)</b> , Hichem Azafzaf, Hussein Sosovele, Erasmus Owusu, Melissa Lewis, Nicola Crockford, Baz Hughes, Angus Middleton, Catherine Lehmann and Sergey Dereliev
7. Climate change	<b>David Stroud (Chair)</b> , Muchai Muchane, Lorenzo Serra, Saulius Svazas, Patrick Triplet and Sergey Dereliev
8. Renewable energy and migratory waterbirds	<b>Sharif Jbou (Chair)</b> , Saulius Svazas, Mark Brown (until 2013), Nicola Crockford, Baz Hughes, Thomas Eske Holm and Sergey Dereliev
9. Disturbance	<b>Lorenzo Serra (Chair)</b> , Jean-Yves Mondain-Monval, Mark Brown (until 2013), Muchai Muchane, David Stroud, Baz Hughes, Arto Marjakangas, John Harradine and Sergey Dereliev
10. Emerging issues	<b>All TC members</b>

**Table 2. AEWA Technical Committee Work Plan 2012-2015**

Issue/Working Group	Actions undertaken	Relevant MOP6 documents
<b>1. Lead, hunting and trade</b>		
1.1. Provide guidance on a species-by-species basis to the Parties on how to deal with look-alike species with regard to hunting (Resolution 4.3) ( <u>carried over from Work Plan 2009-2012</u> )	A possible general approach to address this issue was developed and discussed at TC12 and is being submitted to MOP6 for information. Work to be continued and finalised for MOP7.	AEWA/MOP 6.XX
1.2. Prepare the Terms of Reference for the revision of Conservation Guideline No. 5 on sustainable harvest of waterbirds, which shall include, amongst other things:  1) the guidance on breeding and pre-nuptial migration periods in Resolution 5.10;  2) more specific requirements with respect to the “principle of sustainable use” as a guidance to the Parties on how to implement para 4.1.1 of the AP; and  3) the guidance on the use of “limits of taking” in the sense of para 2.1.1(a) of the AP (Resolution 5.3 & IIT No. 30, Resolution 5.10, Resolution 4.3) ( <u>carried over from Work Plan 2009-2012</u> )	With funding from Fondation François Sommer (France), Jægerne Naturfond (Denmark) and Danish Centre for Environment and Energy, Aarhus University, a revision of the sustainable harvest guidelines was prepared late in the triennium.	AEWA/MOP 6.XX
1.3. Examine, as far as waterbird species covered by the Agreement are concerned, any potential problems from the use of lead shot in terrestrial ecosystems (Resolution 4.1) ( <u>carried over from Work Plan 2009-2012</u> )	Contributed to the work of the CMS Poisoning in birds Working Group – established by the CMS Scientific Council - which lead to the adoption of CMS Resolution 11.15 on Preventing Poisoning of migratory birds ( <a href="http://www.cms.int/en/document/preventing-poisoning-migratory-birds">http://www.cms.int/en/document/preventing-poisoning-migratory-birds</a> ) and associated guidance ( <a href="http://www.cms.int/en/document/review-and-guidelines-prevent-poisoning-migratory-birds">http://www.cms.int/en/document/review-and-guidelines-prevent-poisoning-migratory-birds</a> ).  In the light of the recommendation to phase out the use of lead ammunition which was adopted by CMS Parties	

Issue/Working Group	Actions undertaken	Relevant MOP6 documents
	(which includes all but two AEWA Parties) at CMS COP11 in 2014 (above), the Technical Committee has undertaken no further work on this issue.	
1.4. Examine whether there is need for establishing a comprehensive monitoring system for domestic trade in the AEWA area and, provided there is need, give guidance to the Meeting of the Parties on how to implement such a system (Resolutions 4.3 and 5.2)	The issue was considered by the Committee and the conclusion was that – in the context of implementation of AEWA - there was no need for the comprehensive monitoring of the domestic trade in waterbirds (although there may, of course, be national need as determined by Contracting Parties). Accordingly, no further work has been undertaken to develop guidance to that end.	
1.5. Advise on a more adequate implementation of the Action Plan’s population approach in the national legislation (particularly with regard to ban on hunting and trade) and, if needed, provide guidance on its consequences for Parties. Such guidance may e.g. clarify the question how to deal with different populations of the same species in a country (Resolution 4.3)	The TC elaborated guidance on measures in national legislation for different populations of the same species, particularly with respect to hunting and trade and it is being submitted to MOP6 for consideration and approval..	AEWA/MOP 6.XX
1.6. Provide guidance concerning measures that should be taken in order to prevent exemptions listed in AP paragraph 2.1.3 operating to the detriment of species listed in Table 1 (Resolution 4.3)	No TC capacity to undertake work on this subject so not progressed this triennium.	
1.7. Review the ARTEMIS project and give advice on steps to be taken in order to establish an international system for the management of harvest data for the countries in the AEWA area that are not covered by ARTEMIS (Resolution 4.3) <b>and/or</b> prepare the Terms of Reference for the project on increasing knowledge on waterbird harvest in the AEWA area (Resolution 5.3 & IIT No. 7)	Issue included in the revised sustainable harvest guidelines prepared in 2015.	
1.8. Provide advice on whether provisions concerning the control of restocking for hunting should be included in the Action Plan (Resolution 4.3)	Issue included in the revised sustainable harvest guidelines prepared in 2015.	
1.9. Provide minimum standard requirements for hunting	Included in the revised sustainable harvest guidelines	

Issue/Working Group	Actions undertaken	Relevant MOP6 documents
proficiency tests (Resolution 4.3)	prepared in 2015.	
1.10. Develop simple guidance that will allow Contracting Parties to report back to MOP6 on national knowledge concerning lead fishing weights and waterbirds and the phasing out of lead (Resolution 5.6) <sup>3</sup>	Undertaken and included in the national reporting format for MOP6.	
1.11. Provide further documentation on the nature and scale of the effects of lead fishing weights on waterbirds (Action Plan 4.3.12)	<p>Contributed to the work of the CMS Poisoning in birds Working Group – established by the CMS Scientific Council - which lead to the adoption of CMS Resolution 11.15 on Preventing Poisoning of migratory birds (<a href="http://www.cms.int/en/document/preventing-poisoning-migratory-birds">http://www.cms.int/en/document/preventing-poisoning-migratory-birds</a>) and associated guidance (<a href="http://www.cms.int/en/document/review-and-guidelines-prevent-poisoning-migratory-birds">http://www.cms.int/en/document/review-and-guidelines-prevent-poisoning-migratory-birds</a>).</p> <p>In the light of the recommendation to phase out the use of lead fishing weights adopted by CMS Parties (which includes all but two AEWAs Parties) at CMS COP11 in 2014 (above), the Technical Committee has undertaken no further work on this issue.</p>	
1.12. Provide basic guidance on the preparation of adaptive harvest management plans (task identified at TC11)	Included in the revised sustainable harvest guidelines prepared in 2015.	
<b>2. National reporting, Strategic Plan and Aichi targets</b>		
2.1. Revise the national report format and make the necessary adjustments on the basis of received feedback after the MOP5 reporting cycle; address necessary changes following MOP5, amongst others, develop a module for the national report format on	National reporting format for MOP6 revised with respect of some detailed issues, but no TC capacity to undertake a more fundamental review of harmonisation of reporting formats with respect to other MEAs for MOP6.	

<sup>3</sup> Task 2.1 of WG2 on National Reporting, Strategic Plan and Aichi targets is dependent on the outputs of the implementation of this task

Issue/Working Group	Actions undertaken	Relevant MOP6 documents
the designation and management of important sites for informing the next editions of the Site Network Report <sup>4</sup> (Resolution 5.2) and reporting framework on climate change adaptation measures <sup>5</sup> (Resolution 5.13), as well as reporting requirements spelled out in other MOP5 resolutions <sup>6</sup> ; consider harmonisation with the formats of CMS, Ramsar, EU Birds Directive and others, as appropriate (Resolution 4.7)	Consideration of site-related reporting needs awaits funding of finalisation of Site Network Report (Task 3.1 below).	
2.2. Consider the need for modular approach to national reporting with modules reported at different intervals; synchronise timing with reporting cycles of CMS, Ramsar, EU Birds Directive and others, as appropriate	No TC capacity to undertake a more fundamental review of harmonisation of reporting formats with respect to other MEAs, although in recognition of moving to a modular approach, questions on the status of species were removed from the reporting format for MOP6 to be included in the reports for MOP7.	
2.3. Provide input into the Terms of Reference for the development of the Analytical Tool of the Online Reporting System (Resolutions 5.1 & 5.2)	No progress owing to lack of funding to take forward.	
2.4. Determine how to assess progress towards reaching targets 2.4, 3.3, 3.4 and 5.8, elements of targets, 1.2, 2.3 and 4.4, and achieving indicator G10 of the Strategic Plan 2009-2017; review the thresholds of target 4.3 and indicator G8; determine what further data and comprehensive analysis will be needed on target 3.2 and 5.7 (Resolution 5.2)	<p>Questions were added to the national report format in order to assess progress towards targets 2.4 and 3.3, and elements of targets 1.2 and 2.3. The report format was further amended to obtain clearer information on progress towards targets 3.2 and 5.7.</p> <p>It was decided that there is no need for further guidance on indicator G10, and that there is no need to raise the threshold for indicator G8.</p> <p>Approaches were identified for assessing progress towards targets 3.4 and 5.8.</p>	

<sup>4</sup> Task 3.1 of WG3 on International Reviews is dependent on the outputs of the implementation of this Task

<sup>5</sup> Linked to WG7 on Climate Change

<sup>6</sup> This task is dependent on the outputs of WG1 (Lead, hunting and trade), Task 1.10.

Issue/Working Group	Actions undertaken	Relevant MOP6 documents
2.5. Consider developing common implementation indicators for AEWA and Ramsar, if appropriate, based, for example on the TEMATEA tool (Resolution 5.19)	No TC capacity to undertake a more fundamental review of harmonisation of indicators with respect to Ramsar and other relevant MEAs.	
2.6. Assess progress on issues relevant to the Aichi Targets, and to present triennial assessments of AEWA's contribution to each of the relevant Aichi Targets, elaborating further needs as necessary and appropriate, as an agenda item for each future MOP through to 2020 (Resolution 5.23)	An assessment of progress and needs in relation to delivery of Aichi Targets through AEWA implementation was developed and submitted to MoP6.	AEWA/MOP 6.XX
<b>3. International Reviews</b>		
3.1. To continue to develop the "Report on the Site Network for waterbirds in the Agreement area" <sup>7</sup> so as to better reflect information on the management and conservation status of key sites, to further develop ways of summarising this information accessibly (Resolution 5.2) while taking into account reporting needs on the AEWA Strategic Plan and assessment against relevant Aichi targets (Resolution 5.23)	No funding to allow further work on this topic. Highlighted as priority for next triennium. Links also to Task 2.1.	
3.2. Guide the process of preparation of (1) CSR6, (2) the Review on gaps in knowledge, (3) the Review on preparation and implementation of SSAPs and (4) the Review on non-native species of waterbirds (Action Plan 7.4) while taking into account reporting needs on the AEWA Strategic Plan and assessment against relevant Aichi targets (Resolution 5.23)	<p>1. CSR 6 prepared and submitted to MoP6, with inputs from Wetlands International and co-funding from the Federal Office for the Environment of Switzerland.</p> <p>2. Review of gaps in knowledge: No TC capacity or funding to undertake</p> <p>3. Review on preparation and implementation of SSAPs undertaken by Secretariat and presented to MOP6.</p> <p>4. Review on non-native species: No TC capacity or funding to undertake review.</p>	<p>1. AEWA 6.XX</p> <p>3. AEWA/MOP 6.XX</p>

<sup>7</sup> This task is dependent on the outputs of WG2 (National Reporting, Strategic Plan and Aichi targets), Task 2.1

Issue/Working Group	Actions undertaken	Relevant MOP6 documents
<b>4. Waterbird monitoring</b>		
4.1. Provide additional guidance to the Parties on how to ensure that populations are covered by international monitoring schemes which are appropriate both in their scopes and methods to produce reliable international population size and trend estimates, including monitoring of seabirds and colonial breeding waterbirds (Resolution 5.2)	No TC capacity or funding to develop guidance.	
4.2. Develop Conservation Guidelines in order to provide guidance to the Parties on how to develop individual monitoring programmes which are appropriate in their scope and methods to obtain reliable estimates of population sizes and trends of waterbird populations breeding or wintering in their territories while striving towards a harmonised methodology (Resolution 5.2)	No TC capacity or funding to develop guidance.	
4.3. Identify priorities for the systematic development of waterbird monitoring, in order to reach the target of a 50% increase by 2017 in the number of populations whose status is assessed on the basis of regular monitoring data, as per the AEWA Strategic Plan 2009-2017, taking into account the conservation status of the populations, their geographic representativeness and other factors (Resolution 5.2)	No TC capacity or funding to develop guidance.	
4.4. Work with the Waterbird Monitoring Partnership to make progress towards the monitoring related targets of the AEWA Strategic Plan 2009-2017 and to report to MOP6 and, if required, to propose this issue to be revisited at MOP6 with the aim to secure a long-term, sustainable solution for international waterbird monitoring (Resolution 5.22)	The TC gives continued strong support for the Waterbird Monitoring Partnership, noting progress report from the Partnership submitted to MOP6. However, sustainable, long-term funding solution remains elusive.	AEWA/MOP 6.XX
<b>5. CEPA &amp; Communication Strategy</b>		
5.1. Provide advice and prioritisation on the ongoing	Advice provided to AEWA Communications Team on	

Issue/Working Group	Actions undertaken	Relevant MOP6 documents
implementation of the Communication Strategy (Resolution 5.5)	various media-related issues over the course of the triennium including World Migratory Birds Day and H5N8.	
5.2. Guide and support the revision process for the Communication Strategy (Resolution 5.5)	Input to revised Communication Strategy made at TC12 and after.	AEWA/MOP 6.XX
5.3. Engage in the future implementation of the Global Interflyway Network (GIN) (task identified at TC11)	Discussion as to appropriate means of developing communications between international flyway initiatives at TC11 and subsequently, following participation of some TC members at the first meeting of the Global Interflyways Network in South Korea in 2011 ( <a href="http://www.wetlands.org/WatchRead/Currentpublications/tabid/56/mod/1570/articleType/ArticleView/articleId/3346/Default.aspx">http://www.wetlands.org/WatchRead/Currentpublications/tabid/56/mod/1570/articleType/ArticleView/articleId/3346/Default.aspx</a> ).	
<b>6. Conservation Guidelines<sup>8</sup></b>		
6.1. Undertake a critical review of the style and format of AEWA's Conservation Guidelines, <i>inter alia</i> considering some existing issues <sup>9</sup> and to make recommendations to the Standing Committee prior to developing further guidance in the current format for consideration (Resolution 5.10)	Questionnaire developed by TC12 for wide dissemination through the second half of 2015 in order to bring recommendations to the Standing Committee in 2016 concerning the style and format of future Conservation Guidelines.	Questionnaire available at <a href="https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/AEWA_Guidance_EN">https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/AEWA_Guidance_EN</a> (English) and <a href="https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/AEWA_Guidance_FR">https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/AEWA_Guidance_FR</a> (French)
6.2. Assess the guidelines prepared so far under Action Plan paragraph 7.3 and identify the need for the development of new	AEWA's Conservation Guidelines have some formal status – by virtue of their formal adoption by the Parties – as	

<sup>8</sup> Actions related to AEWA Conservation Guidelines have also been dealt with by WG1 (Tasks [1.1] and 1.2), WG4 (Tasks [4.1] and 4.2), WG7 (Task [7.3]), WG8 (Task 8.2), WG9 (Task [9.2]) and WG10 (Tasks 10.1a and 10.1b)

<sup>9</sup> (1) the merits or otherwise of shorter information notes that might be easier to translate into local languages; (2) the need to target different styles or types of guidance to different audiences (e.g. government policy makers, wetland managers, other relevant stakeholders or user groups); (3) the merits or otherwise of regionally specific guidance; (4) knowledge of the extent of use of the existing guidelines and implications for the dissemination of guidance; and (5) the potential value of a 'guidance to guidance' format as has been developed by the Ramsar Convention's Scientific and Technical Review Panel.

Issue/Working Group	Actions undertaken	Relevant MOP6 documents								
<p>ones and update of the current ones while taking into account the related tasks of WGs 1 &amp; 4 (Action Plan 7.6)</p>	<p>guidance on implementation of the Action Plan and other important areas of waterbird conservation that is adopted by the Parties. Accordingly, there is a need for such guidance to be reviewed periodically to ensure that the guidance continues to represent ‘best’ current practice in the light of new techniques and developing scientific understanding.</p> <p>The table below summarises when the adopted guidance was last reviewed.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Date last reviewed</th> <th>Conservation Guidelines</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td>1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td>11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2012</td> <td>2, 6, 10, 12, 13, 14</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Updating guidance has to balance resources (time by Technical Committee and/or cost to engage contractors) to undertake this task against the risk of having adopted guidance that is no longer ‘fit for purpose’. The TC proposes that two rules of thumb are adopted and unless otherwise directed, will work on this basis:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <b>1. At any time</b>, where it is known an adopted Conservation Guideline clearly no longer reflects international ‘best practice’ (for example if relevant IUCN guidance on the subject has changed), then it should be amended at the first possible instance to ensure AEWA’s guidance represents ‘best’ international practice – both legally and technically<sup>10</sup>. </li> </ol>	Date last reviewed	Conservation Guidelines	2005	1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9	2008	11	2012	2, 6, 10, 12, 13, 14	
Date last reviewed	Conservation Guidelines									
2005	1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9									
2008	11									
2012	2, 6, 10, 12, 13, 14									

<sup>10</sup> This also follows from the requirement of para 7.3. of the Action Plan that “The Agreement secretariat shall ensure, where possible, coherence with guidelines approved under other international instruments.”

Issue/Working Group	Actions undertaken	Relevant MOP6 documents
	<p>2. <b>All guidance</b> should be subject to review every three cycles<sup>11</sup> (nine years) with a view to update/ amendment if this is deemed necessary. Note that review does not necessarily imply amendment – it is just a process to assess whether there is any need for amendment or update so AEWA’s guidance continues to represent ‘best’ international practice.</p> <p>Such reviews will take into consideration the outcomes of the review of Conservation Guideline format and structure (Task 6.1) reporting in 2016.</p>	
6.3. Prepare the Terms of Reference for the revision of CGs No.1 on national SSAPs (Resolution 5.3 & IIT No. 29)	No TC capacity or funding to develop these.	
6.4. Finalise the guidelines on Hunting and trade legislation <sup>12</sup> , including a synthesis of existing migratory waterbird conservation legislation and measures currently in place within Contracting Parties and to present the guidelines to MOP6 for consideration and to propose procedures through which they may be kept up-to-date and thus continue to reflect best and current practice after MOP6 (Resolution 5.25)	Guidelines on National Legislation for the Protection of Migratory Species of Migratory Waterbirds and their Habitats (i.e. not only on hunting & trade legislation) were finalised. Resources were not available to prepare a full synthesis of existing migratory waterbird conservation legislation and measures currently in place within Contracting Parties - however, examples from the national legislation of some Parties have been incorporated into the Guidelines.	AEWA/MOP 6.XX
<b>7. Climate change</b>		
7.1. Review and summarise, with contributions from the National TC Focal Points, relevant studies and policies related to climate	No TC capacity or funding to undertake comprehensive review involving engagement with National TC Focal	AEWA/MOP 6.XX

<sup>11</sup> The logic for three cycles is the balance between too frequent need for activity and the risk that much longer periods are likely to result in Guidelines becoming significantly dated

<sup>12</sup> Separate draft guidelines on *Hunting and trade legislation* do not exist, but both issues have been covered in the draft Conservation Guidelines on National Legislation for the Protection of Migratory Waterbirds and Their Habitats which CG will need to be finalised for submission to the MOP.

Issue/Working Group	Actions undertaken	Relevant MOP6 documents
change and migratory waterbird conservation and management, especially with respect to the creation and management of networks of protected and managed sites and other adequately managed sites, and to bring such an overview to MOP6 (Resolution 5.13)	Points, but the AEWA adopted framework for climate change and adaptation measures for waterbirds (Resolution 5.13) has been updated and submitted to MOP6.	
7.2. Prepare the Terms of Reference for the project on identification of important sites vulnerable to climate change (Resolution 5.3 & IIT No. 4)	No TC capacity or funding to take forward as an AEWA initiative, but a major Wetlands International project proposal under development (especially focussing on Africa) will provide significant relevant information if funding is successful.	
7.3. Work collaboratively with both the Ramsar STRP and the CMS ScC, on issues of common concern related to impacts of climate change on wetlands and their dependent migratory waterbirds so as to develop common guidance for the Contracting Parties, whenever possible (Resolution 5.13)	Contact maintained with Ramsar STRP but no significant initiatives developed.	
<b>8. Renewable energy and migratory waterbirds</b>		
8.1. Identify, in liaison with relevant industry bodies and other interested parties, key knowledge gaps and/or deficiencies in guidance related to the impact of renewable energy production and migratory waterbirds, and make proposals as to how these might most effectively be filled (Resolution 5.16)	Work undertaken through a major collaboration between AEWA, CMS and the International Renewable Energy Association (IRENA) which developed guidance which has been adopted by CMS COP11 (Resolution 11.27 <a href="http://www.cms.int/en/document/renewable-energy-and-migratory-species-1">http://www.cms.int/en/document/renewable-energy-and-migratory-species-1</a> ) and is also being submitted to MOP6.	AEWA/MOP 6.XX
8.2. Prepare the Terms of Reference for the preparation of guidelines on avoiding/mitigating the impacts of wind energy developments on waterbirds (Resolution 5.3 & IIT No. 12)	As for Task 8.1	
<b>9. Disturbance</b>		
9.1. Elaborate definitions, to be proposed to the MOP, of the terms "disturbance" and the "significant" nature of any disturbance that may negatively affect the conservation of waterbirds, at the	Definitions developed and submitted to MOP6 for potential adoption as guidance in the context of the application of the	AEWA/MOP 6.XX

Issue/Working Group	Actions undertaken	Relevant MOP6 documents
individual and population levels, in the context of applying the AEWa Action Plan (Resolution 5.24)	Action Plan.	
<p>9.2. Prepare the Terms of Reference for commissioning</p> <p>1) a synthesis of scientific knowledge of disturbance, including activities that are significant and widespread sources of disturbance, and dealing both with the effects of disturbance and with the possible mechanisms of adaptation, mitigation and compensation, and where relevant, summarising those studies that have evaluated the short-term effects of disturbance and its long-term impact on bird productivity and survival, both at the individual and population levels;</p> <p>2) simple but comprehensive guidance on the management of disturbance in a form that may be widely translated and disseminated, and submit the synthesis and the guidance to MOP6 for consideration (Resolution 5.24)</p>	<p>1) Terms of Reference developed for review of knowledge but lack of funding has meant that it has not been possible to commission this work.</p> <p>2) A structure and format for a simple guide to understanding and managing disturbance issues for wetland managers has been prepared in a format that could be readily translated into multiple languages. Lack of TC capacity has meant that it has not been possible to draft this. Funding permitting this will be undertaken next triennium. If funding remains limited, the Committee see management guidelines as a higher priority than the scientific review in that it has scope to directly influence site management and thus waterbird status.</p>	
<b>10. Emerging issues</b>		
<b>10.1. Extractive industries</b>		
<p>a. work with the Ramsar STRP and other interested parties to develop guidance for assessing the significance of cumulative impacts of multiple wetland losses along species' flyways, and the implications for EIA, SEA and other assessment processes (Resolution 5.14)</p> <p>b. working with the Ramsar STRP to finalise the Guide to Guidance on Extractive Industries and to disseminate this to Contracting Parties (Resolution 5.14, Resolution 5.3 &amp; IIT No. 11)</p> <p>c. continue to collaborate with the Ramsar STRP on these issues, in particular jointly working with other interested organisations to</p>	<p>a. Lack of TC capacity has meant that it has not been possible to develop this further but discussion at TC12 identified possible ways to develop this in the next triennium, hopefully in association with other interested parties.</p> <p>b. Ramsar STRP has collated a spreadsheet with links to 169 published guidances on aspects of the extractive industries, but lack of TC capacity has meant that it has not been possible to develop with further as a product (as a Guide to Guidance) for MOP6. TC capacity permitting,</p>	

Issue/Working Group	Actions undertaken	Relevant MOP6 documents
<p>further develop geospatial analytical tools for identifying those areas where potential conflicts may arise regarding impacts of extractive industry processes on wetlands of importance for migratory waterbirds (Resolution 5.14)</p>	<p>this will be developed further for possible submission to MOP7.</p> <p>c. Continued liaison occurs with Ramsar STRP on this and other related issues.</p>	
<p><b>10.2. Power lines</b></p>		
<p>Monitor the implementation of Resolution 5.11 in consultation with the CMS ScC which is in charge of monitoring the CMS Resolution 10.11 and to provide further guidance when relevant new developments on reducing the impact of power lines on birds become available, such as improved mitigation techniques (Resolution 5.11)</p>	<p>a. The monitoring of implementation of Resolution 5.11 is now part of the national reporting process and summary of feedback received from the Parties is provided in the synthesis of National reports to MOP6.</p> <p>b. No new guidance on power-lines is proposed. The priority is seen as implementation of the existing guidance both as adopted by AEWA and CMS. In this regard, the call from CMS COP11 to convene a multi-stakeholder Task Force on Reconciling Selected Energy Sector Developments with Migratory Species Conservation (the Energy Task Force) is significant as hopefully this will encourage best practice through the energy-distribution industry. As of April 2015, the Task Force has yet to be convened.</p> <p>The anticipated wide-scale development of electricity distribution grids through Africa (including through the US-funded Power Africa initiative provides an important and urgent need to ensure best practice (bird-friendly power infrastructure) is adopted at the design stage – where additional costs to reduce impacts on birds is minimal.</p>	<p>AEWA/MOP 6.XX</p>
<p><b>10.3. Poisoning &amp; agrochemicals</b></p>		
<p>Collaborate with the CMS Scientific Council Working Group on poisoning of migratory birds, on issues of mutual concern</p>	<p>Contributed to the work of the CMS Poisoning in birds Working Group – established by the CMS Scientific</p>	

Issue/Working Group	Actions undertaken	Relevant MOP6 documents
(Resolution 5.12)	Council - which lead to the adoption of CMS Resolution 11.15 on Preventing Poisoning of migratory birds ( <a href="http://www.cms.int/en/document/preventing-poisoning-migratory-birds">http://www.cms.int/en/document/preventing-poisoning-migratory-birds</a> ) and associated guidance ( <a href="http://www.cms.int/en/document/review-and-guidelines-prevent-poisoning-migratory-birds">http://www.cms.int/en/document/review-and-guidelines-prevent-poisoning-migratory-birds</a> ).	
<b>10.4. Regional multi-species declines</b>		
Explore how multi-species and regional-scale declines (such as Baltic seaducks) might be addressed through a combination of appropriate national and international measures (Resolution 5.6)	No significant conclusions. Initial discussions at TC12 and further work anticipated (capacity permitting) in the next triennium.	
<b>10.5. Taxonomy &amp; nomenclature</b>		
As a follow up of the work on this issues in 2009-2012, contribute to the CMS Scientific Council intersessional work on bird taxonomy and nomenclature (Resolution 4.11) ( <u>carried over from Work Plan 2009-2012</u> )	Contributed generally to work on this topic over the course of the triennium, and in the light of decisions taken by CMS COP11 (Resolution 11.19 <a href="http://www.unep-awea.org/en/document/unepcms-resolution-1119-taxonomy-and-nomenclature-birds-listed-cms-appendices">http://www.unep-awea.org/en/document/unepcms-resolution-1119-taxonomy-and-nomenclature-birds-listed-cms-appendices</a> ), TC12 recommended that AEWA should formally adopt the same taxonomy.	AEWA/MOP 6.XX
<b>10.6. Breeding &amp; pre-nuptial migration periods</b>		
Continue providing relevant information on African species, as mentioned in Appendix 1 of Resolution 5.10, as knowledge of these improves through the implementation of the Action Plan for Africa and bring elaborated guidance to a future session of the Meeting of the Parties (Resolution 5.10)	Issue generally kept under review. No significant new knowledge requiring the need for elaborated guidance to be brought to MOP6.	
<b>10.7. Invasive aquatic weeds</b>		
Compile a guide to the available guidelines on the issue ( <u>carried over from Work Plan 2009-2012</u> )	No progress.	

Issue/Working Group	Actions undertaken	Relevant MOP6 documents
<p><b>10.8. Traditional knowledge and harvest</b></p> <p>Finalise the delayed review on this issue (<u>carried over from Work Plan 2009-2012</u>)</p>	<p>No further work on this subject area, but issue has been identified as a high priority for the next triennium.</p>	
<p><b>10.9. Emerging diseases</b></p> <p>Participate in the new CMS Scientific Council WG on wildlife diseases (<u>carried over from Work Plan 2009-2012</u>)</p>	<p>Continued to participate in the CMS Working Group on wildlife diseases as needs require. Contributed to statements from the WG issued at the time of highly pathogenic avian influenza H5N8 in late 2014 and early 2015: <a href="http://tinyurl.com/kyce4j8">http://tinyurl.com/kyce4j8</a>.</p>	
<p><b>10.10. Consumptive harvest and sustainability</b></p> <p>Check with FAO about their review of consumptive hunting (<u>carried over from Work Plan 2009-2012</u>)</p>	<p>This issue has been generally subsumed within work to develop new guidelines on sustainable harvesting.</p>	
<p><b>10.11. Seabird bycatch</b></p> <p>Establish and maintain contact with ACAP, BirdLife Seabird Programme, Albatross Task Force (<u>carried over from Work Plan 2009-2012</u>)</p>	<p>The TC Chair was able to attend the eight meeting of the ACAP in 2014 and explore areas of liaison with the ACAP Secretariat and others. These will be taken forward in the course of the next triennium.</p>	
<p><b>10.12. Transnational corporations:</b></p> <p>Establish contact with them (awareness raising, fundraising) (<u>carried over from Work Plan 2009-2012</u>)</p>	<p>No actions undertaken. In any case this would be an action better implemented by either the Secretariat or Contracting Parties.</p>	

**Table 3. Other Technical Committee Activities over the Past Intersessional Period 2012-2015**

1. The TC reviewed, commented on, and approved the drafts of International Single Species Action Plans for 7 waterbird species/populations for submission to MOP6.
2. The TC reviewed and approved the 6<sup>th</sup> edition of the Conservation Status Report (document AEWA/MOP 6.XX) and the proposed amendments to Table 1 of the AEWA Action Plan (document AEWA/MOP 6.XX).
3. The TC reviewed one possible Implementation Review Process case intersessionally and provided advice to the Standing Committee through the Secretariat.
4. The Environmental Law expert supported the Secretariat through her participation in an international workshop on Russian Federation's potential accession to AEWA (Moscow, August 2013).
5. The TC reviewed project proposals submitted to the Small Grants Fund intersessionally and provided advice on their funding to the Standing Committee through Secretariat.
6. The Chair of the Technical Committee participated actively in the 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> meetings of AEWA's Standing Committee held on 18-19 September 2013, Trondheim, Norway and 8-10 July, 2015, Kampala, Uganda respectively.
7. The Chair and some members of the Technical Committee participated actively in the CMS Scientific Council intersessional Working Groups on Flyways; on Preventing poisoning of migratory birds; and the Workshop to develop the Plan of Action to Address Bird Trapping Along the Mediterranean Coasts of Egypt and Libya (29 November 2013, Bonn, Germany).
8. The Chair and some members attended CMS COP 11 held from 4-9 November 2014 in Quito, Ecuador. The TC Chair led the birds contact group which debated a number of bird-related COP decisions, many with implications for AEWA.



## **Appendix 1. Guidance on conflicts of interest from Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change**

### **“Conflict of Interest**

- “11. A “conflict of interest” refers to any current professional, financial or other interest which could: i) significantly impair the individual’s objectivity in carrying out his or her duties and responsibilities for the IPCC, or ii) create an unfair advantage for any person or organization. For the purposes of this policy, circumstances that could lead a reasonable person to question an individual’s objectivity, or whether an unfair advantage has been created, constitute a potential conflict of interest. These potential conflicts are subject to disclosure.
12. Conflict of interest policies in scientific assessment bodies typically make a distinction between “conflict of interest” and “bias,” which refers to a point of view or perspective that is strongly held regarding a particular issue or set of issues. In the case of author and review teams, bias can and should be managed through the selection of a balance of perspectives. For example, it is expected that IPCC author teams will include individuals with different perspectives and affiliations. Those involved in selecting authors will need to strive for an author team composition that reflects a balance of expertise and perspectives, such that IPCC products are comprehensive, objective, and neutral with respect to policy. In selecting these individuals, care must be taken to ensure that biases can be balanced where they exist. In contrast, conflict of interest exists where an individual could secure a direct and material gain through outcomes in an IPCC product. Holding a view that one believes to be correct, but that one does not stand to gain from personally is not a conflict of interest.
13. The conflict of interest requirements in this policy are not designed to include an assessment of one's behaviour or character or one's ability to act objectively despite the conflict of interest.
14. This policy applies only to current conflicts of interest. It does not apply to past interests that have expired, no longer exist, and cannot reasonably affect current behaviour. Nor does it apply to possible interests that may arise in the future but that do not currently exist, as such interests are inherently speculative and uncertain. For example, a pending application for a particular job is a current interest, but the mere possibility that one might apply for such a job in the future is not a current interest.
15. Professional and other non-financial interests need to be disclosed only if they are significant and relevant. If in doubt about whether an interest should be disclosed, individuals are encouraged to seek advice from the appropriate IPCC body as defined in Annex A. Significant and relevant interests may include, but are not limited to, senior editorial roles, advisory committees associated with private sector organizations, and memberships on boards of non-profit or advocacy groups. However, not all such associations necessarily constitute a conflict of interest.
16. Financial interests need to be disclosed only if they are significant and relevant. These may include, but are not limited to, the following kinds of financial interests: employment relationships; consulting relationships; financial investments; intellectual property interests; and commercial interests and sources of private-sector research support. Individuals should also disclose significant and relevant financial interests of any person with whom the individual has a substantial business or relevant shared interest. If in doubt about whether an interest should be disclosed, individuals are encouraged to seek advice from the appropriate IPCC body as defined in Annex A “Implementation”.

17. To prevent situations in which a conflict of interest may arise, individuals directly involved in or leading the preparation of IPCC reports should avoid being in a position to approve, adopt, or accept on behalf of any government the text in which he/she was directly involved.”