

### RESOLUTION 3.3

#### DEVELOPING GUIDELINES FOR INTERPRETATION OF CRITERIA USED IN TABLE 1 OF THE AWEA ACTION PLAN

---

---

*Recalling* Resolution 2.1 and the call of the Meeting of the Parties upon the Technical Committee to develop guidance for the interpretation of the term “significant long-term decline” in the context of Table 1 of the AWEA Action Plan,

*Noting* that there are more criteria used to classify species in various categories in Table 1 of the AWEA Action Plan for whose application no clear guidance exists.

*The Meeting of the Parties:*

1. *Adopts* the guidance presented to MOP3 by the Technical Committee on the interpretation of the term “significant long-term decline” (attached to this resolution as Appendix 1) in the context of Table 1 of the AWEA Action Plan;
2. *Calls upon* the Technical Committee to develop guidance for interpretation of other criteria used in Table 1 of the Action Plan, notably:
  - the degree of concentration on a small number of specific sites at any stage of annual cycle;
  - the dependence on a habitat type which is under severe threat; and
  - the extent of extreme fluctuations in population size or trend.

## Appendix 1

### Guidance for interpretation of the term “significant long-term decline” of waterbird populations

#### Definition

A population in 'significant long-term decline' is one where the best available data, information or assessments indicate that it has declined by at least 25% in numbers or range over a period of 25 years or 7.5 generations, whichever is the longer.

#### *Guidance for the application of this definition*

1. Where there are only poor quantitative assessments of trends at the international scale, international trends should be assessed on the basis of best expert knowledge and other available information bearing in mind the scale of decline indicated in the definition above.
2. Where one biogeographical population shows different trends in different countries, a decline of at least 25% in numbers or range over a period of 25 years or 7.5 generations in over half the countries for which information is available indicates that the population is in significant long-term decline. If for certain populations information is available for a period of more than 25 years this would be preferred.
3. Trend information for biogeographical populations at international scales is not always available over 25 year periods or 7.5 generations. In such situations, equivalent rates of decline may be used over shorter periods, but not shorter than 9 years, and based on a sustained decline of at least 1 % per year.
4. The delimitation of decline rates resulting from natural fluctuations should be based on the best expert knowledge, including information on the availability of suitable habitats.
5. Care is needed in applying this definition to monitoring data uncritically. There may be instances where a change of a population's range or distribution results in a decrease in numbers of a population counted, as a consequence of a greater proportion of the population now occurring in areas where there is less monitoring. Lower thresholds may be appropriate for decreasing range where it is accompanied by population decrease. Raw count data will always need expert interpretation.
6. The geometric mean of population size ranges should generally be taken as the basis of population trend calculations. Following IUCN Red List criteria definitions, generation length is the average generation length of parents of the current population. Each significant long-term decline revealed by the above-mentioned calculations will be examined, analyzed and approved by the Technical Committee.

Where the size of a population is known to be low (<100,000), expert judgments as to trend status should be undertaken on precautionary basis. This is especially important given recent findings of a low genetic variation of a number of waterbird populations - the implication being that the effective population size is much (possibly by a factor of 10) smaller than observed population size. In these cases, a population may become long-term unviable (owing to vulnerability to changing environmental events) at a higher population sizes than previously thought.