

# MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE AGREEMENT ON THE CONSERVATION OF AFRICAN-EURASIAN MIGRATORY WATERBIRDS

**Second session  
Bonn, Germany, 25-27 September 2002**

## REPORT OF THE SECOND SESSION OF THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES

### Introduction

1. The second session of the Meeting of the Parties to the Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds (AEWA) was held at the International Congress Centre, Bundeshaus, in Bonn, Germany, from 25 to 27 September 2002 at the invitation of the Government of Germany. A list of participants at the Meeting is attached to the present report as annex I.

#### I. OPENING OF THE SESSION AND WELCOME ADDRESSES (Items 1 and 2)

2. A joint opening ceremony for the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) and the second Meeting of the Parties to AEWA took place at 9.30 a.m. on Wednesday, 18 September.

3. Opening statements were made by Mr. Jürgen Trittin, Federal Minister for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety of Germany; Ms. Bärbel Dieckmann, Lady Mayor of Bonn; Mr. Demetrio L. Ignacio, Undersecretary for the Environment and Natural Resources of the Philippines and Chair of the Standing Committee of CMS; Mr. Yousoof Mungroo, Director of the National Parks and Conservation Service of Mauritius, Chairman of the Technical Committee of AEWA; Mr. Claude Martin, Director of the World Wide Fund for Nature, representing of the community of non-governmental organizations; and Mr. Shafqat Kakakhel, Deputy Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), representing Mr. Klaus Töpfer, Executive Director of UNEP. A message from HRH Prince Charles of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland was delivered by Mr. Arnulf Müller-Helmbrecht, Executive Secretary of CMS.

4. Mr. Trittin said that his Ministry was willing to contribute a total of €1 million over the period 2004 to 2008 to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbird Flyways project aimed at creating a network of habitats for African-Eurasian waterbirds, which AEWA had developed with the Bureau of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat, Wetlands International and BirdLife International. He said that the Ministry would strive to secure the inclusion of funding for this project into the German budget.

5. Mr. Mungroo said that the growing number of Parties was clear evidence of the mounting recognition of the important role of CMS and AEWA. The number of Parties to AEWA had doubled since the first Meeting of the Parties, in 1999. He urged all Range States to CMS and AEWA to join the agreements as soon as possible.

6. The opening plenary of the second Meeting of the Parties to AEWA took place on 25 September. The Chair of the Technical Committee presided over the meeting pending the election of a chairperson for the Meeting of the Parties.

7. The representative of Germany welcomed participants to Bonn and explained the history of the Congress Centre. He recalled the joint opening ceremony for CMS and AEWA held on 18 September. He drew attention to a report to be circulated at the Meeting on the protection of migratory species in the Federal Republic of Germany.

8. The Chair of the Technical Committee welcomed participants and thanked the host Government and the Secretariat.

9. The Executive Secretary of CMS expressed greetings from CMS to the largest agreement under the Convention. He said the seventh Conference of the Parties to CMS had been a great success, adopting many far-reaching decisions. Of special interest to AEWA Parties were resolutions on wind turbines, by-catch, and the CMS Information Management Plan, which stressed links with the Global Register of Migratory Species (GROMS), an important new tool developed with the support of Germany and other cooperating institutions. He said that AEWA now had the opportunity to share in the advantages of the new headquarters agreement signed by the German Government, the United Nations and the CMS Secretariat.

10. Mr. Robert Hepworth of UNEP, speaking on behalf of Mr. Klaus Töpfer, commended AEWA for offering a living example of collaboration between different environmental agreements through the co-located secretariats of CMS, AEWA, the Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans of the Baltic and North Seas (ASCOBANS) and the Agreement on the Conservation of Populations of European Bats (EUROBATS).

11. He reminded participants that this was the first time the Parties to AEWA had met since the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg, which had called for a significant reduction in loss of biological diversity by 2010. The Summit had also called for international support for the preservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and the protection of endangered species, and had urged that developing countries and countries with economies in transition should be helped with the resources needed for conservation and environmental protection.

## II. ORGANISATIONAL MATTERS (Items 3 to 6)

### A. Adoption of the rules of procedure

12. The Meeting adopted the draft rules of procedure, as contained in document AEWA/MOP2.3.

### B. Attendance

13. The following Contracting Parties to the Agreement attended the session: Benin, Bulgaria, Congo, Croatia, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Guinea, Jordan, Kenya, Mali, Mauritius, Monaco, Netherlands, Niger, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Senegal, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United Republic of Tanzania.

14. The following States not Party to the Agreement were represented by observers: Algeria, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belgium, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Mauritania, Morocco, Nigeria, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

15. Observers from the following United Nations bodies, convention secretariats and intergovernmental and international and national non-governmental organisations were also present:

(a) United Nations bodies: United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), UNEP Mediterranean Action Plan and UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre;

(b) Convention secretariats: Secretariat of the Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans of the Baltic and North Seas, Secretariat of the Agreement on the Conservation of Populations of European Bats, Secretariat of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals and Bureau of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat;

(c) Intergovernmental organisations: Regional Organisation for the Conservation of the Environment of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden and World Conservation Union (IUCN);

(d) Non-governmental organisations: BirdLife International, International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC), Federation of Associations for Hunting and Conservation of the European Union (FACE), Wetlands International, World Wide Fund for Nature, British Association for Shooting and Conservation, Fédération Nationale des Chasseurs (France), International Fund for Animal Welfare (Germany), Naturschutzbund (NABU) (Germany), Oiseaux Migrateurs de Paléarctique Occidental (France) (OMPO), Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (United Kingdom), Society for the Lesser White-fronted Goose (Germany) and Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust (United Kingdom).

### C. Election of officers

16. The following officers were elected by acclamation:

Chair: Germany (Mr. Michael von Websky)  
Vice-Chair: Senegal (Mr. Mbareck Diop)

### D. Adoption of the agenda and work programme

#### 1. Adoption of the agenda

17. The Meeting adopted the following agenda based on the provisional agenda contained in document AEWA/MOP2.2/Rev.1.

1. Opening
2. Welcome addresses
3. Adoption of the Rules of Procedure
4. Election of officers
5. Adoption of the agenda and work programme
6. Establishment of the Credentials Committee and sessional committees
7. Admission of observers
8. Opening statements

9. Reports of:
  - (a) Secretariat;
  - (b) Technical Committee;
  - (c) Depositary
10. Amendments to the Agreement and its Action Plan
11. Report on the African-Eurasian Flyway GEF project
12. Review of the implementation of the Agreement
  - (a) International implementation priorities of AEWA
  - (b) Phasing out lead shot for waterbird hunting
  - (c) Synthesis of Party reports
  - (d) UNEP support for the harmonization of national reporting and information management for biodiversity-related treaties
  - (e) Cooperation with other bodies
13. Adoption of conservation guidelines
14. Review and approval of new projects for inclusion in the Register of International Projects
15. International Single Species Action Plans:
  - (a) Sociable Plover
  - (b) Great Snipe
  - (c) Dark-bellied Brent Goose
  - (d) Black-winged Pratincole
  - (e) Format for AEWA species action plans
16. Development of the Action Plan for the Central Asian-Indian Flyway
17. Institutional arrangements:
  - (a) Headquarters agreement and juridical personality
  - (b) Standing Committee
  - (c) Technical Committee
18. Financial Arrangements:
  - (a) Adoption of the budget for 2003-2005

- (b) Consideration of accepting contributions to the budget of the Agreement in kind in lieu of cash
  - (c) Establishment of a small conservation grant fund for the Agreement
19. Report of the sessional committees
  20. Adoption of resolutions and amendments to the Agreement and its Annexes
  21. Date and venue of the third session of the Meeting of the Parties
  22. Adoption of the report of the meeting
  23. Any other business
  24. Closure

## 2. Work programme

18. The meeting adopted the draft work programme prepared by the Secretariat contained in document AEWA/MOP 2.4.

### E. Establishment of the Credentials Committee and sessional committees

19. A Credentials Committee was elected, comprising representatives from Denmark, Kenya, Mali (Chair), the Netherlands and the United Republic of Tanzania.

20. The meeting decided to establish two sessional groups, a Working Group on Administrative and Financial Matters and a Working Group on Technical Matters. The representative of Mauritius was elected to chair the Working Group on Administrative and Financial Matters and the representative of Senegal was elected to chair the Working Group on Technical Matters.

## III. ADMISSION OF OBSERVERS (Item 7)

21. At the 1st plenary meeting, on 25 September, the Meeting of the Parties admitted as observers representatives of intergovernmental organisations, as well as international and national non-governmental organisations that met the criteria set out in paragraph 4 of article VI of the Agreement, listed in paragraph 15 above.

## IV. OPENING STATEMENTS (Item 8)

22. Introducing agenda item 8, the Chair reminded participants that opening statements from Contracting Parties should not be presented orally. Written statements would be circulated and compiled for inclusion in the report of the meeting. He thanked delegates for their understanding in that regard. Non-Parties, however, were invited to make brief statements on the position of their Government with regard to accession to AEWA.

23. Brief statements were made by delegates from a number of States not Party to the Agreement. The observer for Algeria said that he hoped to be able to convince his authorities to sign the Agreement. The observer for Burundi said that documentation had been submitted for adherence to the Agreement, and that he hoped the instruments would have been concluded by the time he returned home following the current meeting. The observer for Chad said that he hoped that the process of ratification of the Agreement would be completed by the end of December 2002. The observer for Comoros said that measures were under way for ratification of the Agreement. The observer for Côte d'Ivoire said that his country had begun the process of ratification and hoped to be a Party by the time of the next Meeting. The observer for the Democratic Republic of the Congo said that his Government had firm intentions to sign the Agreement. The observer for

Djibouti said that he hoped that ratification of AEWA would be completed within the coming weeks. The observer for Estonia said that legislation for ratification of the Agreement was expected to be passed early in 2003, and that he hoped his country would be a Party by the next Meeting. The observer for Ethiopia said that AEWA would be ratified by his Government in the very near future. The observer for Gabon said that by the next Meeting, his country would officially be a Party to the Agreement. The observer for Ghana said that he hoped that the Agreement would be ratified by the end of 2002. The observer for Guinea-Bissau said that work on conservation of waterbirds had been started in 1995 and that his country would participate in AEWA projects to a greater extent in the future. The observer for Hungary informed the Meeting that the Hungarian Parliament had ratified a decision to join AEWA in September 2002. The observer for Ireland said that he was confident that Ireland would ratify the Agreement within the next few months. The observer for Kazakhstan said that he hoped that his country would join CMS by the end of the year, and that the following step would be to join AEWA. The observer for Lebanon said that the Agreement had been ratified on 13 June 2002. The observer for Nepal said that, while Nepal was not party to AEWA, national legislation was in place to support the conservation of migratory species of waterbirds. The observer for Nigeria said that accession to AEWA was at an advance stage and instruments of accession were being prepared. The observer for Norway informed the Meeting that Norway expected to become a full member during 2003. The observer for Rwanda said that his Government was working to adhere to the Agreement in the near future. The observer for Sierra Leone said that efforts were under way for the Agreement to be signed as soon as possible. The observer for Ukraine stated that his country had ratified the Agreement on 1 July 2002. The observer for Uzbekistan said that he hoped that his country would become a Party to the Agreement during 2003. The observer for Zimbabwe said that the bureaucratic process to sign the Agreement was well under way.

24. The representative of Togo, noting that his Government had signed the Agreement in 1996, reiterated its commitment to the protection of migratory waterbirds.

25. The Chair welcomed the fact that non-Parties were overcoming administrative and other obstacles, and that many of them were close to becoming signatories to the Agreement.

## V. REPORTS (Item 9)

### A. Secretariat

26. At the 1st plenary meeting, the Executive Secretary introduced his report (AEWA/MOP2.6) covering the three-year period since the first Meeting of the Parties, and gave a brief PowerPoint presentation. He informed the meeting that there were currently 33 Parties to the Agreement, with six more Parties due to become members in the very near future. He reported on three major areas of activity: (a) voluntary fund-raising, through which \$50,000 had been secured in the first year and \$250,000 in the second as well as in the third year, which was the level at which voluntary contributions were expected to remain; (b) development of the "African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbird Flyways" project under GEF, which would be submitted to GEF by the end of the year for anticipated funding of \$12 million, for which matching funds would have to be secured; and (c) development of the AEWA web site.

27. The Chair welcomed the focused and precise report of the Secretariat, and congratulated the Executive Secretary on the progress achieved, as well as on his good relations with GEF.

### B. Technical Committee

28. Also at the 1st plenary meeting, the Chair of the Technical Committee introduced a report on the activities of the Technical Committee (AEWA/MOP2.7) covering the intersessional period, during which the Committee had met three times. Issues considered by the Committee included implementation priorities for the period 2001-2004; amendments to the AEWA Action Plan; conservation guidelines; phasing out of lead shot in wetlands; guidelines for the acceptance of contributions in cash and in kind; development of GROMS; draft budget proposals; and the GEF African-Eurasian Waterbird Flyways project. He said that considerable time had been spent on administrative and financial matters, and he therefore hoped that the Meeting of the Parties would decide to establish a Standing Committee in order to allow the Technical Committee to concentrate on scientific issues.

### C. Depositary

29. Also at the 1st plenary meeting, the representative of the Netherlands, as Depositary for the Agreement, presented an oral report. A written report was subsequently distributed in document AEWA/MOP2.8. He said that the Agreement had entered into force on 1 November 1999. It now had 33 Parties: 19 from Eurasia and 14 from Africa. The thirty-fourth Party would be Israel, effective 1 November 2002. He welcomed the new Parties to the Agreement, and invited other Range States to join.

### VI. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGREEMENT AND ITS ACTION PLAN (Item 10)

30. Agenda item 10, on amendments to the Agreement and its Action Plan, was considered at the 1st plenary meeting, on 25 September. The Meeting had before it document AEWA/MOP2.9, containing a report prepared by Wetlands International on proposed amendments to the Action Plan. Mr. Derek Scott, a consultant for Wetlands International and author of the report, said that it contained a discussion of three proposals for amendment to the Action Plan. These were (a) a proposal by South Africa to add 11 species to Annex 2 of the Agreement and Table 1 of the Action Plan; (b) a proposal arising out of Resolution 1.9 of the first Meeting of the Parties to add six species; and (c) a proposal from the AEWA Secretariat, in discussion with various Parties, to add 48 species, in order to include all species of regular occurrence in the AEWA area. Since the report had been submitted, a vast amount of new information had become available in the context of work on the third edition of *Waterfowl Population Estimates* on populations and trends, to be published by Wetlands International in November 2002. The new information would imply changes to 95 of the 500 populations and 237 species listed in the revised version of Table 1. Although in many cases the changes would be relatively minor, in 35 populations the new information would result in a change to their conservation status. Details had been summarized and would be provided to the Working Group on Technical Matters.

31. Further discussion on the amendments to the Annexes was referred by the Chair to the Working group on Technical Matters.

32. The Chair of the Working Group on Technical Matters, reporting to the 3rd plenary meeting, on 26 September, said there was so far no consensus on the desirability of adding further wetlands-dependent birds, such as birds of prey and passerines, to the Action Plan. On the one hand it was argued that if a species was wetlands-dependent it qualified under the text of the Agreement; on the other hand it was argued that listing all qualified species might dilute attention given to species already listed.

#### Resolution 2.1: Amendments to the Annexes to the Agreement

33. At its 4th plenary meeting, on 27 September, the Meeting of the Parties considered revised draft resolution 2.1 (AEWA/Res.2.1/Rev.2), submitted by the Working Group on Technical Matters, on amendments to the Annexes of the Agreement. The Chair of the Working Group informed the Committee that the Group had held detailed discussions on the draft resolution, including on the definition of long-term decline, potential change in status for the Mallard, Eider and Pintail Ducks, development of action plans, and census activities. He thanked representatives of Wetlands International for their assistance during the deliberations of the Working Group.

34. During the discussion, a number of amendments were proposed. In operative paragraph 4, a reference to an apparent decline in the Northern Europe/West Mediterranean populations of *Anas platyrhynchos* was added to the first line, and the word “three” was amended to read “four” in the fifth line of the English version. In operative paragraph 6, the words “and in close consultation with the relevant bodies of the Convention on Migratory Species” were inserted after the words “close cooperation with the Agreement Secretariat.” In Annex I, in Table 1 on the status of the populations of migratory waterbirds, the word “Coastal” was inserted before the words “Southern Africa” under the listing for *Phalacrocorax carbo lucidus* (page 9 of the English text); the conservation status of the Northern Europe/West Mediterranean population of *Anas platyrhynchos platyrhynchos* was changed from category 2c under column B to category 1 under column C (page 14 of the English text); and the word “Coastal” was added before the words “Southern Africa (excluding Madagascar)” under the listing for *Larus cirrocephalus poiocephalus* (page 23 of the English text).

35. The Meeting of the Parties adopted Resolution 2.1, as orally amended, on amendments to the Annexes to the Agreement, contained in annex II to the present report

## VII. REPORT ON THE AFRICAN-EURASIAN FLYWAY GEF PROJECT (Item 11)

36. At the 1st plenary meeting, Mr. Chris Baker, GEF Coordinator for Wetlands International, gave a presentation on the GEF project “African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbird Flyways”, outlining the status of the project and the remaining requirements. The goal of the project was a substantial improvement in the conservation status of African-Eurasian waterbirds as an important component of biodiversity, by enhancing and coordinating catalytic strategic measures to conserve the critical network of sites those birds required to complete their annual cycle. The project was intended to support both AEWA and the Ramsar Convention. There were three linked components to the project: establishing a network of sites, enhancing technical capacity, and improving communication and coordination. Project activities included development of the network of sites through surveys, training and knowledge base development; a training and awareness raising programme; demonstration projects for best practices, which aimed at showing practitioners how to manage sites in a sustainable manner; and communications, including web-based resources, a project newsletter, and publications.

## VIII. REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AGREEMENT (Item 12)

### A. International implementation priorities of AEWA

37. At the 2nd plenary meeting, on 25 September, introducing item 12 (a), Mr. Ward Hagemeyer (Wetlands International) gave a brief presentation on the progress made in the implementation of the international implementation priorities. He drew attention to the report on the performance of the AEWA international implementation priorities plan (AEWA/MOP2.10), the introduction of which gave the background to the activities under way. Referring to the overview of projects in that document, he said that of the 33 activities planned, funding had been secured for 12; 11 activities had been included in the GEF African-Eurasian Flyways project; and only 10 projects remained for which no funding had been found at all.

38. Concerning the proposals for implementation priorities 2003-2007 (AEWA/MOP2.19 (Rev.1), there were 16 new activities proposed, in addition to those activities which had not been implemented from the previous period, giving a total of 41 proposed activities. The report also indicated where linkages existed with the GEF African-Eurasian Flyways project.

39. In answer to a query, the Chair confirmed that, following the recent successful replenishment negotiations on GEF, the Facility was indeed in good financial shape. Noting that its procedures could be complex, and access to its funds could be complicated, he recommended that those seeking further information should seek it in the Working Group on Technical Matters.

### Resolution 2.4: International implementation priorities for 2003-2004

40. The Chair proposed, and the Meeting agreed, that draft resolution 2.4 (AEWA/Res.2.4) would be submitted to the Working Group on Technical Matters for consideration, which would report to plenary on the results of its deliberations.

41. At the 4th plenary meeting, on 27 September, the Chair of the Working Group on Technical Matters reported on the proposed international implementation priorities for 2003-2007 (AEWA/Res.2.4/Rev.1). He said that with the greater number of AEWA Contracting Parties there was a greater need for waterbird censuses at the national level. The Working Group had added a specific reference to the importance of supporting the further development of the international waterbird census in Africa, the Middle East and Central Asia.

42. The Meeting of the Parties adopted Resolution 2.4, submitted by the Working Group on Technical Matters, on international implementation priorities for 2003-2007, contained in annex II to the present report.



## B. Phasing out lead shot for waterbird hunting

43. Introducing the item at the 2nd plenary meeting, Ms. Nienke Beintema (Consultant), referred to the background document to draft resolution 2.2 (AEWA/Res.2.2) on phasing out lead shot for hunting in wetlands (AEWA/MOP2.11), and described the problems caused by lead shot, even though cheap and effective alternatives were available. Section 4.1.4 of the AEWA Action Plan specifically addressed the issue and called upon Parties to endeavour to phase out use of lead shot for hunting in wetlands by the year 2000. To date, only six AEWA Range States plus the United States of America had done so.

44. Concerning recent AEWA activities on the issue, she noted that document AEWA/MOP2.11 also described the outcome of a review of the experiences of those countries that had phased out lead shot, carried out by Wetlands International with financial support from the AEWA Secretariat and the United Kingdom Joint Nature Conservation Committee. The report had been published in July 2001, and she outlined some of its conclusions and recommendations. In October 2001, an International Non-Toxic Shot Workshop, organized by FACE and the AEWA Secretariat, had been held in Bucharest, and it was hoped to hold a similar workshop in Italy in early 2003. A special edition of the *AEWA Newsletter*, on lead poisoning in waterbirds, had been issued in September 2002 and was available as document AEWA/Inf.2.2.

45. Despite the measures taken to date, it was clear that much still needed to be done and compliance also needed to be enforced. The Meeting had before it draft resolution 2.2 on the phasing out of lead shot in wetlands, which had been discussed by the Technical Committee at its meeting in Arusha, where, in cooperation with FACE, amendments to the draft had been agreed. She concluded by summarizing the content and aims of draft resolution 2.2.

46. The Chair underlined the importance of AEWA measures to deal with the issue within the context of a harmonized phase-out of lead shot for hunting. He underlined the importance of lobbying hunters to achieve such a phase-out.

47. The representative of Sweden said that his country should be included in the list of Parties that had phased out lead shot use in wetlands. He also reported that Sweden was aiming for a total national phase-out of lead shot from 2006. The representative of Denmark, speaking on behalf of the European Community member States, stressed that the extent of mortality of waterbirds from lead poisoning was unacceptable and serious initiatives were needed to ensure phase-out of lead shot. He expressed full support for draft resolution 2.2.

48. The observer for CIC drew attention to a poster exhibition on the issue arranged by his organization and displayed at the current Meeting.

49. The observer for Norway, expressing particular thanks to Wetlands International for its work on the issue and for the *AEWA Newsletter*, said that the issue was also one of animal welfare in general. Evidence in his country had shown that 72 per cent of the lead in the environment was due to hunting, and it had been controlled by use of pollution control legislation governing lead, rather than by environmental legislation. Such a course of action could have an impact on how to formulate actions for the phasing out of lead for hunting.

50. The representative of Senegal, noting that in his country some hunting areas were adjacent to designated national parks, called for a close and detailed examination of the question and expressed support for draft resolution 2.2.

51. The Chair proposed, and the Meeting agreed, that draft resolution 2.2 would be submitted to the Working Group on Technical Matters for consideration, which would report to plenary on the results of its deliberations.

### Resolution 2.2: Phasing out of lead shot for hunting in wetlands

52. At the 4th plenary meeting, on 27 September, draft resolution (AEWA/Res.2.2/Rev.1), submitted by the Working Group on Technical Matters, was introduced by the Chair of the Working Group. He said that the recommendations of the Technical Committee in its lead poisoning review had been added to operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. In addition, as decided by the Technical Committee at its meeting in Arusha, no dates for phase out of lead shot had been specified.

53. The Meeting of the Parties adopted Resolution 2.2 on phasing out of lead shot for hunting in wetlands, as contained in annex II to the present report.

#### C. Synthesis of Party reports

54. Introducing item 12 (c) at the 2nd plenary meeting, on 25 September, the Executive Secretary explained that, to date, the Secretariat had received reports from only 10 countries, 8 of which were Parties. Moreover, they had not been received in time to allow any meaningful synthesis to be carried out for submission to the current Meeting. He proposed, and the Meeting agreed, that the Secretariat would wait until it had received further reports from the countries, and then prepare a synthesis for dissemination after the current Meeting of the Parties.

#### D. UNEP support for the harmonization of national reporting and information management for biodiversity-related treaties

55. Introducing item 12 (d) at the 2nd plenary meeting, Mr. C. Zöckler (UNEP-WCMC) drew attention to document AEWA/Inf.2.18, which described UNEP support for the harmonization of national reporting and information management for biodiversity-related species. Reporting on progress made, he said that pilot projects facilitated by UNEP were being carried out in Ghana, Indonesia, Panama and Seychelles to test information management concepts in the context of national reporting to the five biodiversity-related conventions. Document AEWA/Inf.2.18 reported on the current status of those projects.

56. Concerning harmonization of the Action Plan, he underlined the need for further harmonization and streamlining of the reporting on migratory species. The species information database for CMS had already been implemented, and the Parties to CMS had been invited to participate in the process of adopting the new reporting format to facilitate data entry. In conclusion, he pointed to web sites where participants could see the results of such harmonization of information.

57. The Chair drew the attention of the Meeting to the harmonization process under way within the national reporting process under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).

#### E. Cooperation with other bodies

58. At the 2nd plenary meeting, the Executive Secretary noted that the Secretariat comprised one Professional and one General Service staff member and said that, within its possibilities, it strove to cooperate with other intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, with which institutional linkages were desirable. These included but were not limited to CBD; the Ramsar Bureau; the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification and Drought, especially in Africa; Wetlands International; BirdLife International; WWF, OMPO; CIC; and FACE. Such cooperation would include joint work programmes, either already in place or to be concluded.

59. The Secretariat already had joint activities with FACE and close cooperation with CIC. Work had progressed to develop a tripartite joint work programme with the Ramsar Bureau and the CMS Secretariat which, it was hoped, would be endorsed at the Conference of the Parties to the Ramsar Convention later in the year. Some progress had been made in the development of a joint work programme with Wetlands International, which might also be finalized later in the year.

60. The Executive Secretary of CMS reported on the joint work programme between CMS and CBD, which had been endorsed by the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CBD, in April 2002, and by the recently concluded seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CMS, in its Resolution 7.5. That programme signified important synergies between the two Conventions and proved that CMS was completely complementary to the implementation of CBD, and set specific targets for all stakeholders. It also meant that where a country was Party to both Conventions, the national focal points for the respective conventions would liaise. Resolution 7.5 of the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CMS, in its operative paragraph 2 (d), invited “the decision-making and advisory bodies of the Agreements concluded under the auspices of CMS to expeditiously consider, endorse and implement the CBD-CMS joint work programme, as appropriate”. The matter was thus referred to the current Meeting for its attention.

61. The representative of Senegal underlined the importance of cooperation also with regional conventions and bodies in particular the Bern Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats, the Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy and especially the Pan-European Ecological Network. The Executive Secretary of CMS said that there was considerable potential for such cooperation, which the Secretariat was trying to promote. The Executive Secretary of AEWA, noting that currently no memorandum of cooperation with the Bern Convention had been concluded, said that a number of the Action Plans were however being carried out in cooperation with that body. The issue would be further considered under item 15 of the agenda of the current Meeting.

62. The Chair noted that there was broad consensus on the usefulness of cooperation with other conventions, and that AEWA and CMS had a number of programmes in place to further such cooperation.

63. The observer for BirdLife International, drawing attention to document AEWA/Inf.2.4 (Rev.1), containing the draft joint work plan between the Ramsar Convention and CMS and between the Ramsar Convention and AEWA, stressed that, while the agreement was concluded between secretariats, the synergy went far beyond that, reaching to regional and national administrations. He underlined the fact that, in its paragraph 9, the draft joint work plan stated that it was “anticipated that subsequent phases of joint work will focus more on implementation by Contracting Parties and Range States at the national and international level”.

#### IX. ADOPTION OF CONSERVATION GUIDELINES (Item 13)

64. At the 2nd plenary meeting, on 25 September, the Chair drew attention to documents AEWA/MOP2.12 on draft conservation guidelines on national legislation for protection of migratory waterbird species and their habitats, AEWA/MOP2.13 on draft conservation guidelines on avoidance of introduction of non-native migratory waterbird species, AEWA/Inf.13 containing nine sets of various conservation guidelines prepared by Wetlands International and AEWA/Res.2.3 containing a draft resolution on conservation guidelines. He invited participants to consider how draft resolution 2.3 should be used at the national and international levels, by multilateral donors and by the Secretariat.

65. The representative of Denmark, speaking on behalf of the European Community member States, welcomed the guidelines, which were in keeping with developments in international environmental law. He particularly welcomed the inclusion of guidelines on non-native, invasive species, which should be seen in the context of other sets of guidelines such as those adopted under CBD.

#### Draft conservation guidelines on national legislation for protection of migratory waterbird species and their habitats

66. At the 2nd plenary meeting, Ms. Tomme Young of the IUCN Environmental Law Centre (IUCN-ELC) gave a Powerpoint presentation on the draft conservation guideline on national legislation for protection of migratory waterbird species and their habitats, contained in document AEWA/MOP2.12 which she introduced. The document had been drafted in furtherance of the AEWA international implementation priorities adopted by the first Meeting of the Parties. A bibliography would be attached to the document at a later stage. All the national legislation which had been consulted, from over 90 countries, was available in hard copy through the IUCN-ELC library.

67. The IUCN Commission on Environmental Law had been consulted in the drafting of the guidelines, whose purpose was to offer suggestions on how to approach gathering and using information so that the legislative process could be effective in achieving conservation objectives, with the emphasis on conservation and enforcement. However, they deliberately did not cover the setting of penalties and the nature of punishments for infractions; the question of liability for causing harm to wildlife and habitats and compensation for harm done by protected species or national protective measures; or the question of rights over genetic resources, traditional knowledge and related issues. Those issues were socially and culturally complex, and the last set of issues was being discussed under CBD and elsewhere. Whether those three sets of complex issues should be covered was a decision for the Parties.

68. Nor did the draft guidelines contain any model legislation, even though the international implementation priorities had included a request for case studies. The reasons were given under subsection 2, on page 8 of the document. However, Burkina Faso was recommended as a possible subject for a case study, as IUCN-ELC had been active in its legislative revision process and much of the information was therefore available to it. Also, no other country had been identified which came as close to meeting all the criteria for a successful case study. She expressed the hope that Burkina Faso would join AEWA, which would reinforce the IUCN-ELC recommendation.

#### Non-native species

69. At the 3rd plenary meeting, on 26 September, Mr. Myrfyn Owen (Just Ecology) presented the draft Conservation Guideline on Avoidance of Introduction of Non-native Waterbird Species in the Agreement Area, based on the review of the status of introduced non-native waterbird species in the Agreement area (AEWA/Inf.2.17) prepared by the British Trust for Ornithology. He said there were 113 known non-native species in the area, of which about 5 represented a high degree of risk because of competition with native species for food and breeding sites, hybridisation or the fouling of water by high-density populations. There were no known examples where they had introduced disease, but that was also a possible threat. Leading examples included the Canada goose (*Branta canadensis*), the Ruddy duck (*Oxyura jamaicensis*) and the Mallard (*Anas platyrhynchos*). Trials had shown that control measures could greatly reduce populations, but were expensive and subject to political and practical considerations.

#### Resolution 2.3: Conservation guidelines

70. The Meeting agreed that the draft resolution on conservation guidelines (AEWA/Res.2.3) would be discussed in the Working Group on Technical Matters.

71. At the 4th plenary meeting, on 27 September, the Chair of the Working Group on Technical Matters presented a revised draft resolution submitted by the Working Group (AEWA/Res.2.3/Rev.2) in which the Working Group had added a reference in the preamble to a decision taken at the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CBD.

72. The Working Group had also discussed the terminology used in addressing “the avoidance of introduction of non-native migratory waterbird species”. It was suggested that standard CBD terminology should be used. It was agreed that because the guidelines were in draft form those issues should be borne in mind during finalization.

73. The Meeting of the Parties adopted Resolution 2.3 on conservation guidelines, contained in annex II to the present report.

### X. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF NEW PROJECTS FOR INCLUSION IN THE REGISTER OF INTERNATIONAL PROJECTS (Item 14)

74. At the 2nd plenary meeting, the Executive Secretary reported that the Register of International Projects (contained in document AEWA/MOP2.14) had been reviewed and amended by the Technical Committee at its 3rd meeting. Shortly before the current Meeting of the Parties, all the Parties had been contacted and asked to provide information on the current status of projects. He requested Parties to provide

relevant information about projects to the Secretariat. The Technical Committee would keep the Register up to date and improve it as much as possible intersessionally. He stressed that the purpose of the Register was to avoid duplication of effort.

## XI. INTERNATIONAL SINGLE SPECIES ACTION PLANS (Item 15)

### A. Sociable Plover

#### D. Black-winged Pratincole

75. The action plans for the Sociable Plover and the Black-winged Pratincole, under agenda item 15 (a) and (d), were considered jointly, at the 2nd plenary meeting. Mr. Umberto Gallo-Orsi (BirdLife International) gave detailed PowerPoint presentations and introduced documents on the draft international action plans for the Sociable Lapwing (*Vanellus gregarius*), also known as the Sociable Plover (AEWA/MOP2.15), and the Black-winged Pratincole (*Glareola nordmanni*) (AEWA/MOP2.18). The two draft international action plans had been produced by the same method and the same group, and the ranges, habitats and problems facing the two species were somewhat similar, although the Sociable Plover was by far the rarer, with only 200-600 breeding pairs reported in Kazakhstan and the Russian Federation, and a single known wintering locality in India with 50 individuals. He particularly highlighted the lack of firm knowledge about the two species, the problems of ensuring they had the habitat they needed and the difficulty of determining what their equilibrium level might be. In connection with the Sociable Plover, he touched on an initiative with IUCN and WWF to reintroduce wild ungulates to abandoned grazing land in the Central Asian part of the species' range in order to rehabilitate their habitat. In connection with the Black-winged Pratincole, he stressed that the rate of decline was very steep in the Russian Federation part of the range, down to between 10,000 and 15,000 breeding pairs, a 60 per cent decline. Given the similarities between the two species, a joint working group, the Threatened Steppe Waders (ThreSWa) Working Group, had been sent up to handle conservation and related matters.

76. The Chair noted that the Meeting of the Parties was requested to review and take note of the draft international action plans under the agenda item, whereas Range States were invited to implement them. A resolution on the action plans was subsequently adopted by the Meeting of the Parties (see paras. 75 and 76 below and annex II).

### B. Great snipe

77. At the 2nd plenary meeting, Mr. Gallo-Orsi (BirdLife International) gave a detailed Powerpoint presentation and introduced document AEWA/MOP2.16 on the draft international action plan for the Great Snipe (*Gallinago media*). While the species was not as endangered as either the Sociable Plover or the Black-winged Pratincole, having a total population of over 250,000, little was known about it and there was an apparent decline in a number of countries. The species had two different populations with a variety of habitats. The aim of the draft plan was to keep the species off the IUCN Red List. He mentioned poisoning from lead shot as a suspected hazard for the species, which might require establishment of special protected areas.

#### Resolution 2.13: International action plans on the Sociable Plover, the Blackwinged Pratincole and the Great Snipe

78. At the 4th plenary meeting, on 27 September, the Chair of the Working Group on Technical Matters introduced a draft resolution, submitted by the Working Group, on international action plans on the Sociable Plover, the Blackwinged Pratincole and the Great Snipe. (AEWA/Res2.13/Rev.1).

79. The Meeting of the Parties adopted Resolution 2.13 on international action plans on the Sociable Plover, the Blackwinged Pratincole and the Great Snipe, as orally amended to correct the Latin name of the Great Snipe, contained in annex II to the present report.

### C. Dark-bellied Brent Goose

80. At the 2nd plenary meeting, a representative of the Netherlands introduced document AEWA/MOP2.17 on the draft international action plan for the Dark-bellied Brent Goose (*Branta bernicla bernicla*). There had been controversy about the equilibrium level for the species (present or absent mortality from hunting), and a population model was required. He addressed a plea to participants for funding to be allocated to the development of such a model; much was not known, although it was suspected that the decline was attributable to a lack of reproductive success which was conditioned by the status of the species' breeding grounds. In that connection, he drew the attention of participants to document AEWA/MOP2/Inf.20 containing the report of the Brent Goose Working Group at its second meeting (Bonn, 24 September 2002).

81. He recalled that of the six Range States, two, France and the Russian Federation, were not Parties to AEWA.

#### Recommendation 2.1: International action plan on the Dark-bellied Brent Goose

82. At the 4th plenary meeting, on 27 September, the Chair of the Working Group on Administrative and Financial Matters introduced a revised draft recommendation on an international action plan on the Dark-bellied Brent Goose. (AEWA/Rec.2.12/Rev.1).

83. On the proposal of the Secretariat, operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution was amended to read "*Authorizes the Standing Committee, in close cooperation and consultation with the Technical Committee, to adopt the Action Plan on an interim basis so as to allow the Dark-bellied Brent Goose Working Group to continue its activities;*".

84. The Meeting of the Parties adopted Recommendation 2.1 on an international action plan on the Dark-bellied Brent Goose, contained in annex II to the present report.

### E. Format for AEWA species action plans

85. At the 2nd plenary meeting, Mr. Gallo-Orsi (BirdLife International) introduced document AEWA/MOP2.20, on the format for AEWA single species action plans. He noted that using tables where possible had the effect of keeping the documents short, easy to read and to the point. The aim had been to develop a format which used internationally agreed standards to define threats and appropriate actions and which facilitated monitoring and evaluation. It should not differ too significantly from existing formats, and should be easily adopted as a common format. The proposed format included sections on biological assessment; available key knowledge; threats; relevant policies and legislation; a framework for action; activities by countries; and implementation measures.

## XII. DEVELOPMENT OF THE ACTION PLAN FOR THE CENTRAL ASIAN-INDIAN FLYWAY (Item 16)

86. At the 2nd plenary meeting, Mr. Hagemeyer (Wetlands International) reported that the Parties involved had agreed that the proposed Central Asian-Indian flyway should henceforth be referred to as the Central Asian-South Asian flyway. In connection with the flyway, he introduced documents AEWA/MOP2.21 and AEWA/Inf.2.16. He noted that migratory species along the flyway faced a number of alarming hazards, the most serious of which was shortage of water, resulting from human water allocation choices, drought and water pollution.

87. India was taking the lead in the project, and a workshop would be held on the flyway in India in 2003, involving the Range States. AEWA would need to wait for the results of that expert workshop before deciding how to proceed on the matter of the Central Asian-South Asian flyway.

88. The Executive Secretary introduced his note on the three options for concerted international action in the region (document AEWA/MOP2.21). As described, the region could decide between a legally binding or non-legally binding instrument. Also, on behalf of CMS, the Executive Secretary informed the meeting that

if the wish of the Range States of the Central Asian-South Asian flyway was to have a legally binding Agreement, the position of CMS and AEWA was to include the flyway in AEWA. He stressed that to cover the Central Asian-South Asian flyway, either AEWA must expand its geographical range; a new CMS Agreement must be reached; or the flyway should be covered by the Asian Pacific Migratory Waterbird Conservation Strategy (APWCS). The Secretariat preferred the first option, but, in keeping with the general understanding of the Meeting of the Parties, would await the outcome of the workshop in India in 2003.

### XIII. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS (Item 17)

#### A. Headquarters agreement and juridical personality

89. A representative of Germany introduced document AEWA/MOP2.22 on the provisions of the new headquarters agreement signed by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Nations represented by UNEP, and the CMS Secretariat. The headquarters agreement allowed another agreement which had administratively integrated its Secretariat with the CMS Secretariat to choose to be covered by the same headquarters agreement by its own unilateral act, should the Meeting of the Parties adopt draft resolution 2.11.

90. He explained that the documentation must be read in conjunction with the 1995 United Nations Volunteer Programme (UNV) headquarters agreement between the Federal Republic of Germany and UNV, and in conjunction with an exchange of notes on the new headquarters agreement, copies of which were made available to participants.

91. The advantages of the agreement included diplomatic status for officers of the Secretariat, including those of grade P-4, who were granted such status under other headquarters agreements. Also, dependants of Secretariat staff members of non-European Community States would not need work permits to work in Germany.

92. The headquarters agreement extended diplomatic immunity to those travelling on official business. Participants in meetings who had been unable to apply for visas in advance could receive provisional visas at their point of entry into Germany.

93. The agreement with CMS was in force as a provisional agreement and was expected to be formally ratified by the Federal Parliament in about a year.

94. The Executive Secretary strongly recommended that the Meeting of the Parties should approve the headquarters agreement.

#### Resolution 2.11: Headquarters agreement for and juridical personality of the Agreement Secretariat

95. At the 4th plenary meeting, on 27 September, the Chair of the Working Group on Administrative and Financial Matters introduced a revised draft resolution on the headquarters agreement for and juridical personality of the Agreement Secretariat. (AEWA/Res.2.11/Rev.1).

96. The Meeting of the Parties adopted Resolution 2.11 on the headquarters agreement for and juridical personality of the Agreement Secretariat, contained in annex II to the present report.

#### B. Technical Committee

#### C. Standing Committee

97. With the agreement of the Chair to take the two subitems together, the Chair of the Technical Committee outlined the Committee's recommendation on the establishment of a Standing Committee (AEWA/MOP2.23). A small Standing Committee could take over intersessional financial and administrative tasks under article VI, subparagraph 9 (e), of the Agreement, allowing the Technical Committee to concentrate on scientific and technical matters. The proposal was embodied in draft resolution 2.6 (AEWA/Res.2.6).

98. The suggested composition of the Standing Committee was seven members: five regional representatives, one each for Europe, Central Asia including the Russian Federation, the Middle East and North Africa, Western and Central Africa, and Eastern and Southern Africa; a representative of the host country of the next Meeting of the Parties; and a representative of the Depositary. The Chair of the Technical Committee would be invited to attend as an observer.

99. The Chair of the Technical Committee said that if a Standing Committee was established, the Meeting of the Parties might wish to review the given tasks of the Technical Committee. The proposals of the Technical Committee in that regard were embodied in draft resolution 2.5 (AEWA/Res.2.5).

#### Resolution 2.5: Institutional arrangements – Technical Committee

100. At the 4th plenary meeting, on 27 September, the Chair of the Working Group on Administrative and Financial Matters took up the subject of the altered role and rules of the Technical Committee in the light of the adoption earlier in the same session of Resolution 2.6, which established a Standing Committee and would permit the Technical Committee to dedicate itself primarily to scientific issues. The Working Group had considered a draft resolution on institutional arrangements for the Technical Committee and had made some changes of language (AEWA/Res.2.5/Rev.1). The Working Group had also discussed what was meant by “suitably qualified technical expert” in the context of the request that Parties should nominate such a person as a contact point for the Technical Committee. The United Kingdom, the only country that had nominated its technical focal point so far, had appointed its senior ornithological advisor.

101. An editorial correction was made to the draft resolution.

102. The Meeting of the Parties adopted Resolution 2.5 on institutional arrangements for the Technical Committee, contained in annex II to the present report.

#### Resolution 2.6: Institutional arrangements – Standing Committee

103. At the 4th plenary meeting, on 27 September, the Chair of the Working Group on Administrative and Financial Matters reported that the Working Group had supported the proposal that a Standing Committee should be established to guide the Secretariat on administrative matters, as contained in revised draft resolution AEWA/Res.2.6/Rev.1, so that the Technical Committee could dedicate itself primarily to scientific issues. It recommended that the Standing Committee should meet at least once between sessions of the Meeting of the Parties.

104. The draft resolution was orally amended by inserting the words “*administrative matters*” after the words “*financial and*” in the fourth preambular paragraph. Furthermore it was agreed to specify clearly in the operative paragraphs that the region of Europe and Central Asia would have two delegates and the other regions only one.

105. The Meeting of the Parties adopted Resolution 2.6 on the establishment of a Standing Committee and its institutional arrangements, as orally amended, contained in annex II to the present report.

#### Nomination of members of the Technical Committee

106. At the final plenary meeting, the Chair recalled that members of the Technical Committee had been appointed by the Meeting of the Parties at its first session to serve six-year terms, as representatives of their regions rather than their countries, until the third session of the Meeting of the Parties, unless they stepped down earlier. He called for nominations to fill the vacancies on the Committee which had arisen as a result of resignations.

107. The Meeting of the Parties confirmed the following nominations to the Technical Committee:

Game management expert: Mr. Preben Clausen (Denmark);  
North and South-Western Europe: Mr. Olivier Biber (Switzerland), member; Mr. Sami Niemi (Finland), alternate;



Western Africa: Mr. Momodou L. Kassama (Gambia), member, Mr. Mohamed Abdoulaye (Benin) alternate;

Southern Africa: Mr. Yousoof Mungroo (Mauritius), member, Mr. Les Underhill (South Africa) alternate.

108. The representative of Uganda expressed concern that over such a long term of office, a member of the Technical Committee whose performance was unsatisfactory could do damage to the interests of his region. Although the decision of the Meeting of the Parties at its first session in that regard must stand, the Meeting of the Parties should consider a mechanism for dealing with the problem at its third session.

109. It was agreed that the remaining vacancies would be filled through consultations within the regional groups. Their nominations would be circulated by the Secretariat when received.

#### Nomination of members for the Standing Committee

110. At the final plenary meeting, the Chair stressed that, although when serving on the Standing Committee members would be representing their countries rather than their regions, they should engage in consultations with their regional colleagues both before and after meetings of the Standing Committee and bring to it a sense of what their regions' views were. The Meeting of the Parties approved the following nominations to membership of the Standing Committee:

Western Africa: Senegal (member);

Europe and Central Asia: Germany and Romania (members), Spain and Slovakia (alternates)

Eastern and Southern Africa: Tanzania (member) and South Africa (alternate);

Middle East and North Africa: Egypt (member) and Jordan (alternate).

111. In response to a question raised by the representative of the Sudan, the Chair clarified that consultations within regional groups should confirm the region to which a particular country belonged. The Secretariat would issue clarification of the membership of each group once information in that connection was received from the regional groups.

### XIV. FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS (Item 18)

#### A. Adoption of the budget for 2003-2005

112. At the 3rd plenary meeting, on 26 September, the Executive Secretary introduced a report on financial and administrative matters (AEWA/MOP2.24/Rev.1 and its addendum) and gave an outline of the draft budget. He said the budget for the past triennium had been very modest, about \$385,000 a year. It had supported only a very small Secretariat, which was facing an increasing workload. The Secretariat hoped for a realistic budget that would provide for more staff and allow funding for activities. That depended, however, on the number of Parties that subscribed to the Agreement and the size of their contributions under the United Nations scale of assessment.

113. He also noted that a time consuming process was required each time a new Party subscribed to the Agreement, with the contributions of the existing Parties being consequently recalculated. The Secretariat proposed that the contributions of present Parties should be frozen from 1 January 2003 until 31 December 2005, and that the contributions of new Parties up to the next triennium should go into the Trust Fund. Withdrawals from the Trust Fund should be used to reduce the budget to be shared among the Parties.

114. The Chair drew attention to the fact that if draft resolution 2.6 was adopted, the costs of a Standing Committee would have to be provided for in the budget.

115. The meeting agreed that further discussion would be held in the Working Group on Administrative and Financial Matters.

## Resolution 2.7: Financial and administrative matters

116. At the 4th plenary meeting, on 27 September, the Chair of the Working Group on Administrative and Financial Matters reported that the draft budget had been amended in the light of advice received from UNEP regarding the use of the Trust Fund and the treatment of contributions expected from Parties yet to ratify the Agreement, as well as in the light of comments made by some of the Parties. He introduced draft resolution AEWA/Res.2.7/Rev.1, which was submitted by the Working Group.

117. The draft budget recommended by the Working Group showed an 8.3 per cent increase in the level of the Parties' contributions in comparison with the previous triennium. The levels of contribution shown in the annex to the resolution were, however, indicative, since the number of new Parties to the Convention would not be known until the 31 October deadline for the submission of instruments of ratification/ accession.

118. The representative of Germany suggested that the budget estimates should rank, by priority, the projects to be funded from contributions of new Parties that acceded to the Agreement after 1 January 2003. If the contributions were less than anticipated, the funding of projects listed higher would take precedence over those listed below. He suggested that the highest priority should be given to the funding of regional meetings, followed by matching funds for the development of international species action plans, support for the implementation of GEF projects, consultancies regarding research/surveys, and finally informational material.

119. Representatives of Denmark, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and the United Republic of Tanzania said that ranking of the funding priorities might result in lower listed projects receiving no funds at all. It was pointed out that following the adoption of Resolution 2.6, the Secretariat would have the help of the new Standing Committee in assessing priorities for funding.

120. The Meeting agreed that the holding of regional meetings was of primary importance and that, if insufficient funds were available for that purpose, the Secretariat should call upon the guidance of the Standing Committee.

121. At the 4th plenary meeting, on 27 September, the Meeting of the Parties adopted Resolution 2.7, contained in annex I to the present report, as orally amended.

### B. Consideration of accepting contributions to the budget of the Agreement in kind in lieu of cash

122. At the 3rd plenary meeting, on 26 September, the Executive Secretary introduced discussion of a report on guidelines for accepting contributions in kind in lieu of cash (AEWA/MOP2.25) and a draft resolution on the subject (AEWA/Res.2.8). He recalled that the idea had been raised at the final negotiation meeting held in The Hague in June 1995 and that in Resolution 1.6 the first session of the Meeting of the Parties had instructed the Secretariat to develop guidelines. He said there was no precedent for, or experience of, accepting in-kind contributions under any known international agreement or convention. As examples of possible in-kind contributions, he said that a Party that had difficulty paying cash might offer to host a meeting or to carry out printing work.

123. The representative of Sierra Leone asked how the cash value of contributions in kind would be determined and whether there should be an upper limit.

124. The Meeting agreed to continue the discussion in the Working Group on Administrative and Financial Matters.

## Resolution 2.8: Guidelines for the acceptance of contributions in kind in lieu of cash to the budget of the Agreement

125. At the 4th plenary meeting, on 27 September, the Chair of the Working Group on Administrative and Financial Matters introduced a revised draft resolution on acceptance of contributions in kind (AEWA/Res.2.8/Rev.1).

126. The Meeting of the Parties adopted Resolution 2.8 on the acceptance of contributions in kind in lieu of cash, contained in annex II to the present report.

### C. Establishment of a small conservation grand fund

127. At the 3rd plenary meeting, on 26 September, the Executive Secretary introduced discussion of a report (AEWA/MOP2.26) on establishment of a fund for small conservation grants mandated by the Meeting of the Parties at its first session (Resolution 1.7) and a proposal (AEWA/Res.2.9) to develop the fund. He said that no funds earmarked for that purpose had yet been received and no separate fund had been created. He cited the experience of the Ramsar Convention, which had such a fund. The Ramsar Bureau considered that the fund had had a valuable impact on the accession of Parties. However, the Ramsar Bureau had also found that it was difficult to obtain contributions for such a fund and consequently in some cases expectations had been raised only to be followed by disappointment.

128. The Meeting agreed to continue the discussion in the Working Group on Administrative and Financial Matters.

#### Resolution 2.9: Future development of the small conservation grants fund for the Agreement

129. At the 4th plenary meeting, on 27 September, the Chair of the Working Group on Administrative and Financial Matters introduced a revised draft resolution, submitted by the Working Group, on the future development of the small conservation grants fund for the Agreement (AEWA/Res.2.9/Rev.1). He drew attention to the fact that a paragraph had been included to request that the 13 per cent programme support costs should be reinvested in the fund.

130. The Meeting agreed that efforts should be made to ensure that the fund under AEWA and the similar fund under the Ramsar Convention were mutually supportive and that there was good cooperation between the two secretariats.

131. The Meeting of the Parties adopted Resolution 2.9 on the small conservation grants fund, contained in annex II to the present report.

## XV. REPORT OF THE SESSIONAL COMMITTEES (Item 19)

### Report of the Credentials Committee

132. At the 4th plenary meeting, the Chair of the Credentials Committee reported that the Credentials Committee had reviewed the credentials of the 32 Contracting Parties registered for the second session of the Meeting of the Parties, of which 21 had been accepted. The credentials of three Contracting Parties had not been accepted as they had not been provided in original form or were not in one of the two working languages of the Meeting. The Chair encouraged those Parties that had not presented acceptable credentials to the Meeting to forward them to the Secretariat within the following two weeks, in order to ensure that the list of participants for the Meeting included all legitimate participants and observers.

### Report of the Working Group on Technical Matters

133. The Chair of the Working Group on Technical Matters, Mr. Mungroo, thanked all delegates for their full collaboration in the Working Group. The Group had reviewed a number of draft resolutions and documents and had had extremely fruitful deliberations. The introduction of individual draft resolutions by the Chair of the Working Group appears under the relevant agenda items in the present report.

### Report of the Working Group on Financial and Administrative Matters

134. The Chair of the Working Group on Financial and Administrative Matters, Mr. Diop, thanked all delegates, together with the representatives of UNEP and the CMS Secretariat, for their contributions to the work of the Group. The introduction of individual draft resolutions by the chair of the Working Group appears under the relevant agenda items in the present report.

XVI. ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS AND AMENDMENTS TO THE AGREEMENT  
AND ITS ANNEXES (Item 20)

Resolution 2.12: Tribute to the organizers

135. At the 4th plenary meeting, on 27 September, the Chair of the Working Group on Administrative and Financial Matters introduced a revised draft resolution submitted by the Working Group paying tribute to the organizers of the second session of the Meeting of the Parties. (AEWA/Res2.12/Rev.1).

136. The Meeting of the Parties adopted Resolution 2.12 paying tribute to the organizers of the second session of the Meeting of the Parties, contained in annex II to the present report.

Resolution 2.10: Date, venue and funding of the third session of the Meeting of the Parties

137. At the 4th plenary meeting, on 27 September, the Chair of the Working Group on Administrative and Financial Matters introduced a draft resolution submitted by the Working Group on the date, venue and funding of the third session of the Meeting of the Parties (AEWA/Res.2.10/Rev.1). It was noted that no offers to host the third session has been received.

138. The Meeting of the Parties adopted Resolution 2.10 on the date, venue and funding of the third session of the Meeting of the Parties, contained in annex II to the present report.

XIX. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE MEETING

139. The present report was adopted at the 4th plenary meeting, on Friday, 27 September, on the basis of the draft report circulated in document AEWA/MOP2/L.1 and on the understanding that the finalization of the report would be entrusted to the Secretariat taking into account the oral amendments proposed during the meeting.

XX. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

140. No other matters were raised.

XXI. CLOSURE

141. After the customary exchange of courtesies, the Secretariat presented a coffee-table book on migratory bird species to the Head of the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany as a token of appreciation for their contribution to the success of the meeting.

142. The Chair declared the Meeting closed at 3.30 p.m. on Friday, 27 September 2002.