

ASSESSMENT OF THE MERITS OF A CMS INSTRUMENT COVERING MIGRATORY RAPTORS AND OWLS IN THE AFRICAN – EURASIAN REGION

.....

REPORT ON THE CONSULTATION EXERCISE

16th May 2005

.....

Prepared by NatureBureau Ltd
36 Kingfisher Court, Hambridge Road
Newbury RG14 5SJ

On behalf of the
Global Wildlife Division
Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
United Kingdom

Contract Ref: GWD4/01

CONTENTS

1	BACKGROUND TO THE CONSULTATION	3
2	SURVEY RESULTS	3
3	ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES	5
3.1	Status Report conclusions	5
3.2	Desirability of a CMS instrument for migratory African-Eurasian raptors	5
3.3	Preferences for a CMS instrument for migratory African-Eurasian raptors	5
4	CONCLUSIONS and RECOMMENDATIONS	8
ANNEX 1		
	Response Form	9

1 BACKGROUND TO THE CONSULTATION

In January 2005, a study on the desirability of a new CMS instrument for migratory African-Eurasian raptors (including owls) was commissioned from NatureBureau by the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra, UK), following on from resolutions passed at the VI World Conference on Birds of Prey and Owls (Budapest, Hungary, 18-23 May 2003). The study is intended to ascertain whether range states in the African-Eurasian region would consider it worth exploring the establishment of an appropriate international instrument under the Bonn Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) to conserve migratory raptors and owls. The exercise was endorsed by the CMS Scientific Council in April 2004, and the results will be reported to the next Conference of Parties to be held in Nairobi, 16-25 November 2005.

As part of this study, a consultation document, status report and response form (see Annex 1 for the latter) were circulated to range state governments, CMS focal points and relevant NGOs (especially the BirdLife International partnership) during March and April 2005. The results from the consultation survey are contained in this report.

2 SURVEY RESULTS

By the time the consultation exercise closed, on 10 May, 60 responses had been received. Of these, 57 could be attributed to 35 range states (see Table 1), with three others not having complete information for categorisation. This result met the survey objectives of obtaining at least 50 responses, of which at least 20 should come from ministries or government agencies with a good geographic coverage and hosting a significant number of the species covered.

Table 1: Summary of Responses by Range State and Type of Respondent

	Country / Region	Ministry	Gov. Agency	Research Institute	NGO	Other
1	Botswana				1	
2	Bulgaria	1	1			
3	Burkina		1			
4	Congo DR		1			
5	Congo		1			
6	Croatia			1		
7	Egypt	1				
8	France	1	1			
9	Germany		1	2	1	
10	Gibraltar				1	
11	Hungary	1		1	1	
12	Israel		1	1		
13	Italy			2		
14	Jordan				1	
15	Kenya			1		
16	Monaco	1				
17	Morocco	1				
18	Netherlands	1	1		1	
19	Nigeria				1	
20	Portugal				1	
21	Romania			1		
22	Russia			1		
23	Saudi Arabia		1			
24	Senegal	1				
25	South Africa	1	1	1	1	
26	Spain		1			
27	Sweden	1				
28	Switzerland				1	
29	Tanzania	1				
30	Turkey				1	
31	UAE				1	
32	Uganda					1
33	UK			1	3	1
34	Ukraine	1		1		
35	Zimbabwe				1	
	"Africa"				1	
	"Europe"				2	
	Sub-totals	12	11	13	19	2
	TOTAL					57

3 ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

3.1 Status Report conclusions

The first two questions in the response form sought feedback on the conclusions in the status report about the raptor and owl species known to be in unfavourable conservation status. The results were:

Question	Yes (%)
Do you agree with the general conclusion of the status report that few migratory owls have an unfavourable conservation status at present?	89
Do you agree with the general conclusion of the status report that a high proportion of migratory raptors have an unfavourable conservation status at present?	98

Some respondents (most of whom did not agree with the propositions) sent comments to support their views. The main concerns were that there are insufficient data to exclude owls and other African raptors might also be found to have unfavourable status if more recent data were available.

3.2 Desirability of a CMS instrument for migratory African-Eurasian raptors

The third question in the response form asked:

Do you believe that a new international instrument under CMS covering migratory raptors would lead to improved conservation action for those species having an unfavourable conservation status?

Some 90% of the respondents supported the proposition. Of the remaining 10% who did not favour a new CMS instrument for migratory raptors, only 3% represented ministries or government agencies. The main reasons for not supporting the proposition concerned problems with implementing existing conventions, and therefore the addition of a further instrument would be of little value and may even deflect actions from existing agreements. Furthermore, the length of time that it takes to agree new CMS Agreements was also a concern for some respondents.

3.3 Preferences for a CMS instrument for migratory African-Eurasian raptors

The consultation paper described several options for types of CMS instruments to improve the conservation of migratory African-Eurasian raptors. These were:

- Action plan only
- Memorandum of Understanding (with Action Plan)

- Agreement under Article IV(4), for selected species and key Range States
- Agreement under Article IV(3) for all migratory raptors and all Range States
- Expansion of AEWA to cover raptors (if not all other birds)

Respondents were asked (in Question 4 of the response form) to rank these options in order of preference. The overall results for first preference for all respondents are given in Table 2.

Table 2: The number of times each CMS option was ranked of highest importance

Ranking	Action Plan only	MoU	IV(4) Agreement	IV(3) Agreement	AEWA expansion
1 st preference	8	15	8	7	11
Only option proposed	0	1	0	3	1
Total	8	16	8	10	12

However, separate examination of the responses from ministries / government agencies on the one hand and NGOs / research organisations / others on the other hand (Table 3) indicates that the preference for an MoU is much stronger amongst the latter group. Amongst the ministries / government agencies an expansion of AEWA is the most frequent 1st preference, although an MoU was still given 1st choice by a significant proportion of respondents.

Table 3: The percentage of times each CMS option was ranked of highest importance (i.e. 1st preference or only option proposed) according to organisation type

Organisation type / responses	Action Plan only	MoU	IV(4) Agreement	IV(3) Agreement	AEWA expansion
Ministry / government agency (n = 21)	13.6%	22.7%	13.6%	18.2%	31.8%
NGO, research and other (n = 31)	15.6%	34.4%	15.6%	18.8%	15.6%

Analysis of the overall scores (i.e. taking into account average perceived importance of all options) also indicates a fairly clear preference for an MoU (Table 4). Furthermore, this preference is consistent amongst respondents from ministries / government agencies and NGOs / researchers / others (Table 5). It is notable that there appears to be particularly low support for the preparation of a IV(4) or IV(3) Agreement amongst ministry / government agency respondents.

Table 3: Overall scores for each CMS instrument option and ranking

Ranking	Action Plan only	MoU	IV(4) Agreement	IV(3) Agreement	AEWA expansion
---------	------------------	-----	-----------------	-----------------	----------------

1	8	15	8	7	11
2	9	8	7	9	10
3	9	9	11	11	7
4	6	11	10	10	6
5	13	4	11	9	13
Sum (excluding missing scores)	142	122	150	143	141
Valid Responses ^{*1}	45	47	47	46	47
Ratio of sum : valid responses	3.16	2.60	3.19	3.11	3.00
Rank (1 = highest preference)	4	1	5	3	2

*1 Excluding scores from respondents that did not rank all options.

Table 4: Option scores for each CMS instrument according to organisation type

Organisation type	Action Plan only	MoU	IV(4) Agreement	IV(3) Agreement	AEWA expansion
Ministry / government agency	3.18	2.42	3.16	3.28	2.74
Rank (1 = highest preference)	4	1	3	5	2
NGO, research and other	3.14	2.71	3.21	3.00	3.18
Rank (1 = highest preference)	3	1	5	2	4

4 CONCLUSIONS and RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 The responses from the consultation exercise, while neither comprehensive nor official, strongly support the findings of the Status Report (i) that few migratory owls have an unfavourable conservation status at present, (ii) that a high proportion of migratory African-Eurasian raptors have an unsatisfactory conservation status and (iii) they would benefit from a CMS instrument to improve their conservation status.

4.2 However, some reservations were expressed about the exclusion of owls from any CMS instrument, and also that the list of raptors identified as most threatened would probably increase if better data on intra-African migrants were available.

4.3 The general preference among respondents on the form of the CMS instrument is for a Memorandum of Understanding (accompanied by an Action Plan). The second preferences differ among organisation types: governmental bodies tend toward an expansion of AEWA while the research and non-governmental bodies favour an Article 4(3) Agreement. This suggests that there would be some support for moving from an MoU to a stronger stand alone instrument having its own administrative structures (either through AEWA or a new Agreement) if it is found to be necessary in the future.

4.4 As a result of these findings, the consultants **recommend**:

- A draft MoU with Action Plan should be prepared for further consideration by the CMS Meeting of Parties;
- The Action Plan should focus on the raptor species identified in the Status report, but also mention the need to carry out further investigations as a matter of priority on migratory owls and intra-African migratory raptors.

ANNEX 1

ASSESSMENT OF THE MERITS OF A CMS INSTRUMENT COVERING MIGRATORY RAPTORS AND OWLS IN THE AFRICAN – EURASIAN REGION

RESPONSE FORM

Name		Organisation Type: <input type="checkbox"/> Ministry <input type="checkbox"/> Government Agency <input type="checkbox"/> Research / Academic Institution <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Government Organisation <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Position		
Organisation		
e-mail address		
Telephone		

1. Do you agree with the general conclusion of the status report that few migratory owls have an unfavourable conservation status at present?
 - Yes
 - No – please state reasons:

2. Do you agree with the general conclusion of the status report that a high proportion of migratory raptors (see Table 1) have an unfavourable conservation status at present?
 - Yes
 - No – please state reasons:

3. Do you believe that a new international instrument under CMS covering migratory raptors would lead to improved conservation action for those species having an unfavourable conservation status?
 - Yes
 - No – please state reasons:

4. If yes to Question 3, please indicate what type of CMS instrument (see Table 3) do you think would be most appropriate to develop in the near future, in order of importance (1 highest to 5 lowest):

Potential CMS Instrument	Importance (Rank 1 – 5)
Action plan only	
Memorandum of Understanding (with Action Plan)	
Agreement under Article IV(4), for selected species and key Range States	
Agreement under Article IV(3) for all migratory raptors and all Range States	
Expansion of AEWA to cover raptors (if not all other birds)	

Many thanks for your kind attention.

If you have any further information, references or other comments please send them to us as well.

Disclaimer

The information provided in this response form is to be used solely for the purposes of the consultation exercise. The responses will not be construed as representing the official views of the organisation concerned nor any commitment on their part concerning any conclusions that may be made.

Please return this form by

email simon.green@naturebureau.co.uk

online at www.naturebureau.co.uk/cmsraptors

fax +44 1635 550 230