



FIRST MEETING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE

24 - 25 November 2003, Bonn, Germany

PROGRESS REPORT ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE COMMUNICATION STRATEGY FOR AEWA

INTRODUCTION

The Meeting of the Parties adopted at its first session (November 1999, South Africa) Resolution 1.4 regarding the International Implementation Priorities (IIP) 2000-2004. Among the 33 projects listed as IIP one was focussing on the development and implementation of a Communication Strategy for the Agreement. The short description given in the IIP reads as follows: *'A communication strategy for the Agreement should be developed as a priority. This should plan to communicate the objectives and requirements of the Agreement to appropriate target audiences (decision-makers, conservation professionals, those living around or using key sites donors). The strategy will be most effective if it can facilitate communications activities at national and local level. Particular attention will need to be given to disseminating materials in appropriate local languages, and at the appropriate level. A top priority will be to translate and disseminate the Conservation Guidelines in Arabic and Russian language versions. The strategy should result in a clear set of costed actions'*.

In 2002 a grant was received from the Government of the UK for the preparation of the communication strategy. Since then steps have been undertaken by the Secretariat to contract out the work to a Consultant that has experiences in developing such strategies for Multilateral Environmental Agreements and /or for NGO's working in the environmental field. It was noted that not many Consultants are available with the required knowledge and experience.

Early 2003 a number of Consultants were approached by the Secretariat and requested to submit a project proposal including a quote for the development of a communication strategy for AEWA. The most elaborate project proposal was submitted to the Technical Committee for review. During TC4 meeting this proposal was reviewed thoroughly and based on this the proponent was requested to revise his proposal. This was done to the satisfaction of the TC. As follow up the Secretariat contracted out the development of the communication strategy to SPAN Consultants.

The first step taken by SPAN Consultants was to do a quick scan among contracting parties, range states and relevant organisations, into the perception of AEWA, its functions and benefits, obstacles in its implementation, and its communications approach. The results of the quick scan, which can be found from the following pages of the document onwards, are intended as input to a communication strategy for the Agreement. A representative of SPAN Consultants will introduce the results of the quick scan during the Standing

ACTIONS REQUESTED FROM THE STANDING COMMITTEE

The Standing Committee is requested to take noted of the results of the quick scan. Furthermore any advice and/or guidance regarding further development of the communication strategy for the Agreement will be welcome.

Development of a Communication Strategy for the Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds (AEWA)

QUICK SCAN - Analysis of results

SUMMARY

A quick scan, using desk research, questionnaires and interviews among AEWA Contracting Parties, other Range States and relevant organisations, has given insight in the motivations for countries to support AEWA, obstacles to accession, their perception of the Agreement and their expectations of it. This has resulted in the identification of those issues that can be addressed by a communication strategy. For example:

- The added value of AEWA compared to other international conservation agreements can be communicated more effectively, so that it will trigger range state to become part of the Agreement and to provide Contracting Parties with the benefits that they expected.
- Interested range states would benefit from better guidance during the accession procedures.
- The active involvement of, and interaction between, the Technical Committee, the Standing Committee, the Contracting Parties *in-between* official meetings could be enhanced.

After presentation of the results of this quick scan to the AEWA Secretariat and Standing Committee, whose comments will be incorporated in the final version of this report, the communication strategy will be drafted and worked upon by a group of stakeholders to be identified by the Secretariat. The communication strategy will provide tools and plans to answer to the communication goals identified in this report.

Report prepared by:

Gwen van Boven

SPAN Consultants

Bezuidenhoutseweg 1

2594 AB The Hague

The Netherlands

vanboven@span.nl



= CONTENTS =

SUMMARY	3
1. INTRODUCTION	5
1.1. Objectives of the Secretariat	5
2. METHODS.....	5
2.1. Desk research	5
2.2. Quick scan.....	5
2.3. Assumptions	6
3. RESULTS.....	7
3.1. Questionnaire results: Non Contracting Parties.....	7
3.1.1. Interest in AEWA	7
3.1.2. Reasons to join	7
3.1.3. Obstacles to join AEWA	7
3.1.4. Added value.....	8
3.1.5. Communication.....	8
3.2. Questionnaire results: Contracting Parties.....	10
3.2.1. Reasons to join	10
3.2.2. Obstacles to join AEWA	10
3.2.3. Benefits	10
3.2.4 Current focus of AEWA	11
3.2.5. Future focus of AEWA	11
3.2.6. Whom else to involve?	11
3.2.7. Communication.....	12
3.3. Interview results.....	13
3.3.1. Background of the respondents	13
3.3.2. Role of AEWA	13
3.3.3. Added value of AEWA & expectations	13
3.3.4. Obstacles to become a Party	14
3.3.5. Reasons to join AEWA	14
3.3.6. Priority focus	14
3.3.7. Communication.....	15
4. DISCUSSION.....	17
4.1 Accession	17
4.2. Implementation.....	17
4.3 Communication.....	18
4.4. Conclusion.....	18



1. INTRODUCTION

Negotiations to create an international agreement on the conservation of migratory waterbirds along the African-Eurasian flyway have started in the late eighties. In 1999, AEWA, the Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds, has come into force. AEWA is one of the Agreements developed under the aegis of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS). However AEWA is an independent international Agreement with currently 43 Contracting Parties and 4 signatories¹ out of 117 Range States. AEWA has evolved rapidly since its conception and is recognized as a practical, relevant Agreement along the entire flyway.

At its first session the Meeting of the Parties adopted the International Implementation Plan AEWA 200-2004. One of the priorities listed in this Plan was the need to develop a communication strategy for the Agreement. In 2002 a voluntary counterpart contribution was received for the development of such a strategy.

The Secretariat and the Contracting Parties have expectations of the benefits the Agreement will bring them. Are these expectations in line with each other? Are the results and approaches communicated clearly and effectively? A supporting communication strategy can help answering these questions, increasing understanding of the different interests and managing expectations among the different players; ultimately increasing the effectiveness of the Agreement itself.

This report analyses the results of a quick scan among contracting parties, range states and relevant organisations, into the perception of AEWA, its functions and benefits, obstacles in its implementation, and its communications approach. These results are intended as input to a communication strategy for the Agreement.

The results of this quick scan will be presented to the AEWA Standing Committee meeting in Bonn in November 2003, to incorporate feedback of the meeting. The communication strategy and action plan will thereafter be drafted in such way as to ensure the outputs to become true working documents with felt ownership by the AEWA Secretariat and Parties.

1.1. Objectives of the Secretariat

As the AEWA is a young agreement, the Secretariat at this moment sees visibility of the Agreement as a priority, aiming to achieve two main objectives:

- “ 1. Recruitment of Range States to become Contracting Party to AEWA*
- 2. Acknowledgement of the role of AEWA in the conservation of Migratory Waterbird Populations, its unique position among other biodiversity related conventions and its unique approach per species at flyway level”*

The Secretariat expects these objectives to be at least partly met until the next Meeting of Parties (MOP3) in 2004, when it is expected that approximately 50 % of the 117 Range States have become Contracting Parties to the Agreement.

After MOP3, the Secretariat expects a shift in focus from promotion of the Agreement itself, towards actual implementation.

2. METHODS

2.1. Desk research

In preparation, desk research on AEWA, its background and related documentation was conducted. The Secretariat of AEWA in Bonn was visited, and discussions were held with its staff, as well as staff from the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS), its mother convention, and ASCOBANS, another CMS Agreement. Wetland International was consulted in relation to the GEF Flyway project, the draft proposal of which was made available as well.

2.2. Quick scan

Do the Contracting Parties share the Secretariats' objectives? Do the key players agree with this focus in direction? What obstacles prevent Range States from becoming a signatory party to the convention? Is the current communication effort effective? What could be improved?

To obtain answers to these questions, a quick scan was conducted using a combination of a questionnaire and semi-

¹ Signatories are Range States that have signed the Agreement but where ratification is still pending.



structured interviews. Two types of questionnaires were developed. The version for Contracting Parties (CPs) was sent to the AEWA Focal points in 472 countries and focussed on topics around accession to the Agreement, the Implementation of AEWA and Communication. The other version was sent to representatives of the remainder of 70 Range States that are Non-Contracting Parties (NCPs), and dealt with accession and communication. Examples of the two questionnaires can be found in Annexes 1 and 2.

Respondents were asked to rank their answer in order of importance. The different tables on the next chapter generally give the first and second most important answers according to this ranking. However, in some cases several people did not rank but just check the options. Hence the last column in some tables: ‘Total’ stands for the total number of times that a certain answer was mentioned, regardless of rank. This explains why even when no 1st and 2nd choices have been given, the last column could still show a figure.

In addition to the questionnaire, a selection of representatives of Range States as well as relevant organisations was interviewed to obtain more in-depth information. These interviews were conducted in person or through telephone, and were semi-structured. The guiding format can be found in Annex 3.

2.3. Assumptions

From experience with similar quick scans (SPAN Consultants) it can be assumed that a questionnaire will yield a response of around 10-15%.

As those countries that are already contracting parties to AEWA are more involved and have higher interest in the success of the Agreement, it was expected that a higher response would come from them compared to the other range states.

It was assumed that among the respondents from non- contracting parties there would be a bias towards having a certain level of interest in the Agreement. Those range states that are not considering accession were not expected to be likely to respond.

A list of the respondents to the quick scan can be found in Annex 4.

2 For the purpose of this quick scan, the 43 Contracting Parties and the 4 signatories have been pooled together, as the process for ratification is advanced.



3. RESULTS

The tables in this chapter summarise the results derived from the questionnaires and the interviews conducted as part of the quick scan.

3.1. Questionnaire results: Non Contracting Parties

Out of the 70 range states that have not (yet) joined the agreement, 7 have responded to the questionnaire: a score of 10%.

3.1.1. Interest in AEWA

They all indicate to know AEWA, that their government is interested in the Agreement and is considering accession to the agreement (Table 1.1).

This corresponds with the assumption that those who are currently not considering accessing AEWA would not be interested in responding to the questionnaire. Further research would be needed into their motives and perceptions, but that would reach beyond the scope of this project. This advice will be taken forward to the communication strategy.

3.1.2. Reasons to join

Looking at reasons to join AEWA, the respondents were asked what they considered to be the main advantages of becoming a Party to AEWA (Table 1.2). The promotion of the flyway concept in itself is not considered to be the main advantage by any of the respondents, but rather a secondary one. Conservation of migratory birds would be the main reason, followed by international cooperation.

Table 1.1: Interest in AEWA

Non-Contracting Parties (N=7)

Do you know AEWA?

Yes	7
No	0

Is your government interested in signing?

Yes	7
No	0

Is your government considering to become a Party to AEWA?

Yes	7
No	0

Table 1.2: Reasons to join AEWA

Non-Contracting Parties (N=7)

What do you consider advantages for your country of becoming a Party to AEWA?

	1 st	2 nd
Conservation of Migratory Water bird Populations	4	1
Promotion of flyway concept	0	3
International cooperation	2	2
No answer	1	1
Other, namely:		

3.1.3. Obstacles to join AEWA

All respondents have indicated their interest to become a Party to AEWA. For what reason are countries hesitating to actually do so? What is preventing them from taking the decision to access? Respondents were asked to rank their answer in order of importance. Table 1.3 gives the first and second most important obstacles according to this ranking, plus the total number of times a certain answer was given. Hence the last column in the table: ‘Total’ stands for the total number of times that a certain obstacle was mentioned, regardless of rank.

Table 1.3: Obstacles to join AEWA
Non-Contracting Parties (N=7)

What factors do you perceive as obstacles, if any, for your country to sign AEWA?	1st	2nd	Total
We do not know about AEWA		1	3
We are not familiar with the flyway concept			3
We do not feel the need for flyway conservation			2
We are not sure of the added value of AEWA compared to related Conventions	2	1	4
Our neighbour countries have not joined either		1	2
We are interested, but had no guidelines how to proceed with accession	1	1	4

The respondents tell us two things: one related to concept and understanding, and one related to procedures and guidance. Related to the concept of AEWA, the key issue for several people, the respondents indicate that the added value of the Agreement is not clear to them. They indicate limited knowledge of the Agreement, as well as of the concept of flyway conservation that is at the core of it.

In addition, the procedures for accession are complex, and a need is felt for further guidelines on how to proceed with accession.



3.1.4. Added value

The respondents were asked to describe in their own words what the added value of AEWA is:

“AEWA is an Agreement on conservation of Migratory Species in international manner.”
“AEWA is an Agreement developed under CMS. It covers species dependent on wetlands for at least part of their annual cycle. It provides for coordinated and concerted actions to be taken by Range States throughout the migration system. Main actions are finalized to: species and habitat conservation, management of human activities, research & monitoring, education & information”
“AEWA is an International agreement to protect all migratory waterbirds in the Africa-Europe system”
AEWA stands for cooperation between the countries which try to conserve the habitats of migratory species”
“AEWA works on transboundary cooperation in the conservation and management of the shared natural resource”

3.1.5. Communication

Table 1.4 describes which of the communications by the Secretariat the respondents receive. The majority receives the newsletter and email. The website and the ½ yearly letter³ have not been accessed or received by almost half of the respondents. This is also reflected by the fact that none of the respondents finds these latter two materials the most effective. This information is reflected in Table 1.5, which gives the first and second most effective communications, and in the last column shows the total number of times that a certain material was mentioned, regardless of rank.

Table 1.4: Received communication Non-Contracting Parties (N=7)	
Which of the following communication do you receive from AEWA?	
1/2 yearly letter	4
Website	4
Newsletter	6
Email	5
Interpersonal contact	3
Other, namely:	0

Table 1.5: Most effective communication Non-Contracting Parties (N=7)			
Which sources on AEWA do you find most effective?	1st	2nd	Total
1/2 yearly letter		2	5
Website		2	3
Newsletter	2	3	7
Email	4		6
Interpersonal contact	1	1	5
Other, namely:			0

³ Twice a year, the AEWA Secretariat sends a letter to all Range States that have not yet become Contracting Party to the Agreement.



Knowing what the respondents receive and find most effective, it is interesting to learn what they would like to have access to in the future. Table 1.6 indicates that the majority would like to see email as the first means of communication in the future, followed by the newsletter. When looking at the total number of times a material was checked, regardless of priority, it becomes clear that the website and the ½ yearly letter would be highly appreciated, too.

Table 1.6: Preferred future sources <i>Non-Contracting Parties (N=7)</i>			
In which way would you prefer to receive information on AEWA in the future?	1st	2nd	Total
1/2 yearly letter		3	5
Website	1	1	5
Newsletter	2	4	7
Email	5		5
Interpersonal contact			4
Other, namely:			0

With regard to languages, most respondents do not consider the official languages of the Agreement, English and French, to be a problem (Table 1.7). When asked what would be the first choice, two indicate Russian, and all indicate English as a first (4) or a second (3) choice (Table 1.8).

Table 1.7: Languages a problem? <i>Non-Contracting Parties (N=7)</i>	
The official Agreement languages are English and French. Does this in any way hamper the communication with the Secretariat for you?	
Yes	1
No	6

Table 1.8: Preferred languages <i>Non-Contracting Parties (N=7)</i>			
In which language would you prefer the Secretariat to communicate with you?	1st	2nd	Total
English	4	3	7
French	1		1
German			0
Russian	2		2
Arabic			0



3.2. Questionnaire results: Contracting Parties

At the time of writing, there are 47

Contracting Parties to AEWA, of which 4 have not fulfilled all procedures yet and currently have signatory status.

Out of these 47 Parties, 12 or 25% have responded to the questionnaire that was sent to them.

3.2.1. Reasons to join

Most respondents (83%) indicated that the conservation of migratory birds was the main reason to become a Contracting Partner to AEWA (Table 2.1). In second instance, most (67%) state that the international cooperation aspect was a major reason to join.

Without ranks, this difference would not be noticed (last column).

Three respondents indicated other reasons to join the Agreement, namely:

- It is species oriented, and as such complementary to Ramsar (1st reason)
- It helps to strengthen national conservation laws (4th reason)
- The sustainable use (ecotourism) aspect (3rd reason)

**Table 2.1: Reasons to join AEWA
Contracting Parties (N = 12)**

What was the main reason for your country to sign AEWA?	1st	2nd	Total
Conservation of Migratory Water bird Populations	10		11
Promotion of flyway concept		2	9
International cooperation		8	10
Other, namely:	1		3

**Table 2.2: Obstacles to join AEWA
Contracting Parties (N = 12)**

What was the main obstacle, if any, for your country to become a Contracting Party to AEWA?	1st	2nd	Total
We did not know enough about AEWA	2		2
We were not familiar with the flyway concept		2	2
We did not feel the need for flyway conservation			1
We were not sure of the added value of AEWA compared to related Conventions	2	1	4
We felt it was no use, as long as our neighbour countries had not joined			0
We were interested, but had no guidelines how to proceed with accession		1	4
Other, namely:	2		2
None	4		4

guidelines to proceed with accession once it had become clear the country was interested to join.

Two respondents mentioned another obstacle:

- Procedures for ratifying AEWA (or any other convention) are lengthy
- Constraints of national law: amended to allow for ratification

3.2.2. Obstacles to join AEWA

A third of the respondents indicated that no major obstacles had hampered the accession of their country to AEWA (Table 2.2).

The main reasons (1st choice) seem to be related to know-how of the concept and the Agreement, as they relate to uncertainty about what AEWA entails, what its added value is, and the flyway concept (2nd choice).

A minor reason, but nevertheless mentioned by one third of the respondents, is the need for further

3.2.3. Benefits

It is clear that most respondents perceive the conservation of migratory species as the main benefit of being a Party to AEWA (83%, table 2.3). In second instance, the possibilities for international cooperation are most valued as benefit of AEWA by a majority of the respondents.

This corresponds with their original reason to join the agreement (see 3.2.1.).

**Table 2.3: Main benefit of being Party
Contracting Parties (N = 12)**

What do you perceive as the main benefit for your country of being a Contracting Party to AEWA?	1st	2nd	Total
Conservation of Migratory Water bird Populations	10		12
Promotion of flyway concept		2	10
International cooperation	1	8	11
Other, namely:			1



One respondent indicated a fourth benefit of being a Party, namely the promotion of the sustainable use concept.

3.2.4 Current focus of AEWA

Most respondents have the impression that the current focus of AEWA in the first place is on implementation of the Agreement, or on a combination of implementation and recruitment of new parties (table 2.4).

Table 2.4: Current focus of AEWA?			
<i>Contracting Parties (N = 12)</i>			
Recruitment of new Contracting Parties			4
Implementation of AEWA	7	1	8
A combination of recruitment and implementation	5	5	10
Enlargement of the scope of the Agreement (Range and species)		2	4
Other, namely:			0

3.2.5. Future focus of AEWA

Asked what the focus of AEWA should be in the coming few years, the majority of the respondents indicated that it should remain a combination of recruitment and implementation (Table 2.5). Quite a few indicated interest in enlargement of the scope of the area, though not as a priority.

Table 2.5: What should be future focus?			
<i>Contracting Parties (N = 12)</i>			
What, in your opinion, should be the main focus of attention for the Secretariat in the coming 3 years?	1st	2nd	Total
Recruitment of new Contracting Parties	1		4
Implementation of AEWA	4	1	5
A combination of recruitment and implementation	5	4	9
Enlargement of the scope of the Agreement (Range and species)		1	5
Other, namely:			1*

* One respondent ('other', not ranked) remarked that AEWA should pay more attention to equipping the AEWA Focal Points in the countries.

Table 2.6: Parties to be closer involved	
<i>Contracting Parties (N = 12)</i>	
Name the organisations/countries/people that, in your opinion, should be stronger involved in the implementation of AEWA.	
Related international conventions (CMS, Ramsar, CBD, Cites) and their National Focal Points	2
EU, and affiliates (Ornis Committee)	2
Neighbouring countries	3
Other range states (Africa)	2
National Government (Wildlife departments, Environmental Authorities, Forestry etc)	2
Local Development Authorities	1
International NGOs	4
Local NGOs	4
Academic organisations, musea	2
Specific stakeholder groups (hunters)	1

3.2.6. Whom else to involve?

In response to the question which parties should be stronger involved in the implementation of AEWA, several respondents have indicated that NGO's, either local/national or international, should be stronger involved.

Neighbouring countries and other range states are also mentioned, indicated an interest in regional cross-boundary cooperation.

Specific stakeholder groups are mentioned only once, in this case hunters associations. Table 2.6 lists the parties mentioned in this regard.



3.2.7. Communication

Currently, most respondents (75%) feel that they are being kept sufficiently informed by the Secretariat (Table 2.7). Two people would like to receive more information.

With regards to Table 2.8: access to information, most respondents have just listed the sources of information they have access to, without ranking the answers. The options ‘first choice’ and ‘second choice’

Table 2.7: Received information Contracting Parties (N = 12)	
Do you feel the information you receive from the Secretariat is:	
Sufficient	9
Too much	
Too little	2
Other:	

therefore do not give us much information. From the last column in Table 2.8 (Total) it can be derived that most respondents have access to all communication materials that are being produced by the Secretariat, with 100% receiving the AEWA Newsletter.

Table 2.8: Access to information Contracting Parties (N = 12)

To which of the following sources of information on AEWA do you have access?	1st	2nd	Total
Meetings	1	1	9
Mailings with minutes of meetings & reports	1	1	9
Website		2	10
Newsletter	1	1	11
Email	1	2	9
Interpersonal contact	1		6
Other, namely:			0

Looking at which sources are most used (Table 2.9), a slightly different picture can be drawn. Email is most used by the respondents, followed by the website and the mailings of official minutes of meetings and reports. Only one respondent feels to make actual use of personal contact.

Table 2.9: Most used sources Contracting Parties (N = 12)

Which sources of information on AEWA do you use most?	1st	2nd	Total
Meetings			1
Mailings with minutes of meetings & reports	1	1	8
Website			3
Newsletter	3	2	7
Email	4	1	9
Interpersonal contact			1
Other, namely:			0

Looking at what the respondents would wish for the future, as a first choice again email is mentioned most (Table 2.10). However, as not all have ranked their choices, looking at the total number of times that options are mentioned tells us that the newsletter and the mailings are not to be missed either.

Table 2.10: Preferred future sources Contracting Parties (N = 12)

In which way would you prefer to receive information on AEWA in the future?	1st	2nd	Total
Meetings		1	8
Mailings with minutes of meetings & reports	2	2	10
Website			6
Newsletter	1	1	10
Email	4	2	9
Interpersonal contact		1	3
Other, namely:			1*

One respondent makes alternative suggestions as to:

- Improve communication between and within the Technical Committee, the Standing Committee, and the regional representatives
- Initiate and facilitate an electronic list server: an email list moderated by the Secretariat



3.3. Interview results

Table 2: What is your perception of the role of AEWA?
Interview response (N=11)

were found willing to participate.

3.3.1. Background of the respondents

The respondents represent organisations such as IUCN, Wetlands International, CIC, OMPO, and Birdlife International, as well as some governments among the range states.

Seven of them are involved as members or observers to the Technical Committee or the Standing Committee (Table 3.1).

Four of the respondents have been involved in conceptualising the Agreement from its very beginning. Also, a representative of the Netherlands government, the depositary of the Agreement, was interviewed.

3.3.2. Role of AEWA

Most respondents (8) see the Agreement primarily as a tool for cooperation, mainly internationally, but they also feel that the Agreement gives more weight during negotiations internally in their country between departments and institutions (Table 3.2, and see also the next section 3.3.3.).

A. Cooperation tool	8
International cooperation	5
Instrument for internal negotiations	1
Joint responsibility	2
B. Conceptual	4
Flyway concept/interdependency	3
Species list: adds on to Ramsar	

3.3.3. Added value of AEWA & expectations

Going deeper into the discussion, the respondents were asked about the added value of AEWA (Table 3.3a). Their responses can be divided into three main groups: a cooperation tool, the conceptual aspects, and the contents of the Agreement. With even more emphasis the added value in (inter) national cooperation is mentioned as unique about AEWA. Three respondents mention the added weight being a Party to AEWA gives when dealing with negotiations between departments or internally. In follow up to that, the respondents indicated whether this perceived added value corresponds

Table 3.3a: What do you feel is the added value of AEWA?
Interview response (N=11)

A. Cooperation tool	12
exchange of expertise	4
International cooperation	3
Joint	2
tool in internal negotiations	3
B. Conceptual	4
Scale: flyway level	2
Sustainability perspective	1
Practical	1
C. Contents	5
The AEWA species list	2
awareness raising tool	2
lead bullets	1

Table 3.3b: Did you expect more/less/differently?
Interview response (N=11)

As expected, it is going well	4
Develops faster than expected	3
We underestimated the challenge (it's different, but not negative)	1
Need to show more progress in implementation	3

visible what progress is being made in the implementation of the Agreement.

with the expectations they had at the beginning (Table 3.3b). Most respondents (64%) were satisfied or even positively surprised by the progress the Agreement has made and is making, feeling it is developing faster than expected (27%). 3 people state that although some of the expectations were being met, it should be made more



3.3.4. Obstacles to become a Party

Most obstacles that people feel could hamper the accession of countries to AEWA have to do with uncertainties around the contents or relevance of AEWA (table 3.4). 5 people mention ‘convention exhaustion’: there are so many environment-related conventions. It is obvious that possible accession to AEWA raises questions pertaining to possible conflicts with national or regional policies, about relevance and priority setting. These are issues that could be targeted with communication.

Furthermore, problems pertaining to the complexity of procedures, long processes and lack of guidance, in combination with the limited internal capacity in the departments, are perceived as an important obstacle to accession. In 3 cases people stipulate that obtaining approval at the political level turned out to be less of a problem than getting the civil servants to arrange all further requirements for sending the documents to AEWA.

Almost half of the respondents mention financial considerations as an important obstacle to join AEWA.

Table 3.4 What are obstacles to become a Party to AEWA?
Interview response (N=11)

A. Content / relevance	17
Convention exhaustion (Why AEWA?)	5
Conservation is no priority	2
Relevance	1
Fear of hidden agenda initiators	1
Perceived rewards may not come	1
Conflict with national policy	3
Conflict with EU directives?	1
Obligation to join CMS as well?	1
Hunters lobby / other reluctant stakeholders	2
B. Procedures / capacity	11
Internal capacity	5
Complicated procedures	3
Long process of accession	2
Guidance needed	1
C. Financial considerations	5

Table 3.5: What are reasons to become a Party?
Interview response (N=11)

A. Cooperation aspect	10
Closer contact with neighbours & wider on certain species	4
Transboundary cooperation	2
Exchange of experiences, info, learning	4
B. Access to resources	3
Access to financial assistance	2
Access to technical assistance	1
C. Practical reasons	
Practical nature (action plans)	
Instrument to involve stakeholders	

3.3.6. Priority focus

None of the respondents feels that recruitment of new parties should be the priority focus for the coming years (Table 3.6). They feel mainly that implementation, or else a combination of recruitment and implementation should be the approach. One respondent states specifically that results of implementation should be emphasised going towards MOP3 in 2005. He and others argue that successful and well-promoted implementation will in a natural way trigger other range states to become party.

Two respondents specifically state that no energy should be spent on expansion of the range area of the Agreement. None of the others see it as a priority either, although some argue that it will automatically become a larger part of the discussions in the coming years.

Table 3.7 illustrates as well that over half of the respondents feels that better use could be made of the successes and results that have been achieved under the Agreement.

3.3.5. Reasons to join AEWA

Reasons to join AEWA have mainly to do with the aspect of international cooperation on the conservation of migratory waterbirds (Table 3.5). The related exchange of information and experiences and learning is important in this regard. People also mention access to financial and technical resources as a reason to join.

Table 3.6: What should be the priority focus of the Secretariat in the coming years?
Interview response (N=11)

Recruitment	0
Implementation	6
Both	4
Balance is not good	2
No expansion	2
Dissatisfaction yet:	no
	yes

Table 3.7: Do you feel that the Secretariat/Parties have done a good job to capitalise on the results?
Interview response (N=11)

Yes	4
No	6



3.3.7. Communication

Two respondents feel that AEWA has an obvious problem with its visibility in the crowded landscape of international agreements and conventions: “AEWA needs to market itself” (Table 3.8). Pertaining to range states, they state: “People do not know about species list”, perceiving that as a motivating benefit of the Agreement.

Table 3.8: Is the visibility an issue?		Over half relate that it is not a problem, but that more could be done to increase the visibility. They relate: “AEWA is an identity in itself”; “Agreements are the success of CMS. That relation should always be mentioned. The independent profile is important, but AEWA should not take more distance”; “AEWA needed to define a niche, not to compete”; “AEWA is a leader, it has a niche”; “Although AEWA is small it gets a lot of exposure. The species and birds niche is taken”. Concerning the logo of AEWA, one respondent states
Table 3.10: Can you mention 2-3 key improvements?		
<i>Interview response (N=11)</i>		
A. Website & electronic media	6	
website enhancement	5	
Promotion website	2	
E-discussion opportunities/fora	4	
B. Exchange, contact	4	
Exchange TC-SC, preparatory meetings	3	
Facilitate cooperation	1	
C. Other	5	
Popularised versions of reports & info	2	
Regularity newsletter	2	
Logo	1	

that it is unclear. Another argues that the CMS logo should always remain connected with that of AEWA, being the mother convention of the Agreement,

Table 3.9: What should be the means to be used?

Interview response (N=11)

website	8
e-media/fora/discussion groups	5
newsletter	5
ambassadors	1

A vast majority feels that in order to increase this visibility, the website would be the most appropriate means (Table 3.9). Many would like to see a more interactive use of electronic media such as e-fora and discussion groups that would keep the cooperation alive in-between Meetings of Parties. People also praise the newsletter and one of the respondents, whose organisation has been asked to function as an official ambassador of AEWA and as such assist in its promotion, feels that such ambassadorships should be used more widely and frequently.

In line with the expressed ideas on which media should be used, the area where improvements are desired lie in the same field of the website and electronic media (table 3.10). Being seen as the most appropriate means, many people also indicate that the website needs considerable enhancement in order to become truly effective. One respondent states that in doing so “countries could use AEWA as a portal”.

Specific remarks and suggestions regarding produced materials include (not in order of importance):

Electronic media

- The site is not very accessible (address, as well as set up: where to find what?)
- It is strong on history, needs more focus on is being done and on what to achieve
- Could be more communicative, more “sexy” (more info, more user friendly, more advertising for AEWA)
- Daily updates: otherwise it is not effective to check it regularly
- The site needs promotion, promote changes on it with e-mail to other servers, e-mail bulletin etc.
- Involve a good webmaster
- Make it interactive. Let people ask questions: email/web exchange, list server, message board
- Facilitate discussions: in real life, and web-based
- A good example are the Mountain Fora
- Take a good look at Ramsar’s site
- Create more links to other sites

Print

- Print remains necessary
- The newsletter and its special issues are widely appreciated
- Publish the newsletter more regularly, keep current quality
- Publish more frequent newsletters (2-3 pages, don’t wait for enough information to publish a thicker issue). No need to be glossy, but should be printed



- Combine printed materials with a CD-Rom in business card format
- Clear, small pocket size brochures with recent achievements (updates)

Exchange

- Create more exchange in-between meetings (MOPs, TC meetings, etc)
- Develop more informal, active culture in-between MOPs
- Create exchange between the Technical Committee, the Standing Committee: they are two hands of the same body, and should feed into each other
- The composition of the TC is an issue. The regional representation does not yield much input, which we need more
- Secretariat can enhance capacity by co-operating more with other secretariats, make more use of outsourcing, of volunteers.

Contents

- Include part that reflects contribution of member states: info from the ground
- Daily reactions to developments at practical level, such as natural disasters: what do these floods mean for birds?
- Create awareness on added value of species list
- Promote that it is an executive agreement, more specific and with stronger obligations than Ramsar. Ramsar is good for wise use but is more flexible from an ecological point of view
- Cherish the example function (now reflected in the revival of the Algiers convention)
- Use country commitment (faces, names, signatures)
- Include a “shopping list” for donors
- Improve the logo

Asked whether the Agreement would be communicated more effectively with a diversified communication approach, different reactions were noted (Table 3.11).

Table 3.11: Should the approach be diversified?		
Interview response (N=11)		
Yes:	Regionally	5
	methods/products/content	3
	Language	3
No:	It should remain at flyway level	4

Several respondents (4) strongly argued against it, as they feel it would undermine the conceptual basis of the Agreement as working at Flyway level. On the other hand, all other respondents felt that more targeted attention to regional aspects would certainly make AEWA seem more relevant to countries, especially those that would benefit greatly from cooperation at a regional

level. Others felt that language diversification would also be a factor of importance, especially for the Russian speaking Range States.

Table 3.12: Any concerns/challenges/ remarks?	
Interview response (N=11)	
A. Benefits not visible	8
regional benefits not clear (score with success)	5
Added value not clear	3
B. Finances & capacity	4
Finances	2
Overhead/growth secretariat	2
C. Other	2
hidden agenda issue*	1
ambassadors	1

Finally, the respondents were asked whether they had any concerns or remarks, or what they felt would be the main challenges for AEWA in the coming years (Table 3.12). Most (8) feared the benefits or added value of the Agreement are not visible enough, and should be better promoted. Four respondents see financial constraints, hampering growth of the Secretariat and thus limiting its capacity to focus more on implementation, as a concern.

* One respondent stated that, as the Netherlands has played such a strong role in initiating AEWA, it might have the objective of imposing its strong national directives and legislation on all AEWA Contracting Parties, forming an obstacles for accession.



4. DISCUSSION

The response to the questionnaires was satisfactory: 10% among the non-contracting parties, and 25% of the contracting parties submitted a questionnaire. The interviews worked well to get better insight in background and motivations of different stakeholders, including the view of organisations relevant to AEWA.

An overall impression is that AEWA is highly appreciated as a tool for conservation and cooperation. Many respondents valued the fast rate with which the Agreement has grown into one of the most active international tools for conservation, and the only one that works with such scope and scale.

Another impression is the positive image of the Agreement Secretariat and its communications. People acknowledge and understand the limited capacity in which a small secretariat in a bureaucratic setting has to operate, and given that context value the effort and outputs that have been delivered so far.

In the next paragraphs, the suggestions and conclusions that will be taken forward as an input to the communication strategy will be shown in *italics*.

4.1 Accession

Countries, both contracting parties and non-contracting parties, indicate that the conservation aspect is the main reason for them to become a contracting party to AEWA. In the interviews, cooperation between neighbouring states and internationally more strongly comes forward as an important motivator. The cooperation is seen as a major benefit, through exchange of information and experiences, as well as access to financial or technical assistance that could be facilitated by the Agreement.

The results derived from the quick scan also give us insight in the obstacles that countries encounter when considering accession to AEWA. These can be found in two fields: the first one related to the understanding of AEWA and its underlying concepts. Countries indicate that they did (do) not have enough insight in what AEWA exactly stands for, what its objectives are, and what its achievements are. Although the current communication materials are developed to address these issues, the results of the questionnaires show that there is a role to play for communication:

to increase knowledge and understanding about AEWA.

In addition to limited knowledge, “convention exhaustion” is a hurdle for the AEWA Secretariat to cross. In the international convention arena, some countries perceive AEWA as “yet another agreement”, and do not see enough benefit in joining. There is another communication challenge:

to promote the added value of AEWA more clearly, and to promote AEWA’s achieved successes more strongly.

The second type of obstacles deals with the complicated and lengthy procedures to become a contracting party to AEWA. Partly, these obstacles are to be seen in the context of the limited capacity of the responsible departments in the ministries dealing with the international conventions. Others, such as the complicated nature of the procedures, can be targeted with communication by the AEWA Secretariat, by

providing clear guidelines and guidance on accession.

The interviews confirm these findings, and add one important obstacle: the financial considerations. Limited budgets prevent countries from signing yet another Agreement. Other than further expressing the benefits of AEWA and its relevance for national policy, this obstacle is beyond the scope of communication interventions.

4.2 Implementation

The respondents all acknowledge and have appreciation for the fast growth of the Agreement, and see the need to grow towards a balanced representation of range states in the list of contracting parties. A majority feels that it is now time to shift focus from recruitment as an objective per se towards a focus on the practical implementation of the Agreement. The argumentation is two fold: people feel that implementation should continue to be combined with active recruitment. On the other hand, many respondents expect that when the results of the implementation will be communicated effectively, new countries will become interested to access the agreement themselves. A few respondents feel that the balance is not good at the moment, and that they expect dissatisfaction to grow among contracting parties. One person feels that is already the case. Communication support here could be directed at:

communicating the successes of the Agreement, to keep parties informed and to trigger interest among other range states.

Respondents feel that in order to maximise the benefits of cooperation, regional, for example species oriented initiatives could be developed between countries that share similar habitats or together provide important resources



for certain species. It is felt that the Secretariat could:
facilitate such exchange and cooperation, and communicate its results, more effectively

4.3 Communication

In general, the respondents feel well informed and they appreciate the effort the current information flow orchestrated by the Secretariat. Language is not perceived as a problem; most respondents feel that English and French, the current official AEWA languages, are sufficient. Some prefer Russian as a language, and also suspect that that might trigger Russian speaking countries to become member, or more actively involved. As this is an important objective of the Secretariat, it is recommended to:

provide regular communication in Russian, not only in official communication but also in (sections of) popular materials .

With regards to materials, the produced printed materials are highly valued. The newsletter, and especially its special issues on lead bullets and on the results of MOP2, were very much appreciated and used. The respondents generally agree that

the printed media will remain necessary, and can be improved by working on their regularity and level of involvement of stakeholders.

Currently, people feel they do not optimally use electronic media, although they feel that email and the website would be the most effective ways of being kept informed.

The website should be improved and made more user-friendly, more up-to-date, and more interactive.

There is also a clearly expressed need for more discussion possibilities as a means to keep parties more involved in-between meetings, in a more regular and informal way. As part of the communication support, the Secretariat is suggested to:

develop an e-mail list, web-based discussion fora and/or working groups.

There is also an expressed need to see how the Secretariat could improve the functioning of the different supporting bodies, especially the Technical Committee. People perceive it as a formal body which does not function well in-between its meetings. The recent formation of a Standing Committee is considered to be a good development but not the complete solution. Participants to meetings spend too much time catching up, as continuous exchange between members in-between meetings is limited. The regional representation is not perceived to yield much input, whereas it is considered as much needed.

Through communication support, the Secretariat could facilitate exchange between the Secretariat, the Technical Committee, the Standing Committee, and the Focal Points, to feed into each other for more exchange in-between meetings (MOPs, TC meetings, etc).

Secretariat can enhance capacity by co-operating more with other secretariats, make more use of outsourcing, of volunteers.

Visibility of the Agreement is not perceived as an issue as such. Respondents feel that it could be improved, but that generally AEWA has taken its niche in the arena of international conservation agreements. Improvement could be achieved by cooperation between (secretariats of) the relevant conventions, and this could be formalised through Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs). The respondents perceive such MoUs as part of that natural process of finding a niche, and help in creating visibility. They are encouraged by the secretariats recent efforts toward this end, although not all are aware of that fact. Communication could help in:

Raising awareness of the Secretariats current efforts to sign Memoranda of Understanding with related international conservation conventions and agreements

The contents of the current communications are in general well received. The flyway approach is well reflected and therefore diversification per region is by some seen as a loss of that special aspect of the Agreement. Others, a majority, however, feel that the Agreement would be perceived as more relevant when it would facilitate more regional cooperation and initiatives. In this context, they argue that:

communication would be more effective if it would more strongly reflect contributions from member states and regional achievements

4.4. Conclusion

The desk research, questionnaire and interviews among AEWA Contracting Parties, other Range States and relevant organisations, has given insight in the motivations for countries to support AEWA, their perception of the Agreement and their expectations of it. This has resulted in communication goals that are clear and fit to feed into a communication strategy.



After presentation of the results of this quick scan to the AEWA Secretariat and Standing Committee, whose comments will be incorporated in the final version of this report, the communication strategy will be drafted and worked upon by a group of stakeholders to be identified by the Secretariat.

What will finally be part of the communication strategy will then be a natural consequence of these different steps taken. It will answer to the communication goals stated in this report and give concrete, strategic advice on tools to develop in an efficient and effective way, taking the time, human resources, and budgetary context into account.



AEWA Quick Scan - Questionnaire for Contracting Parties

Dear Madam/Sir [name],

Your country is a Contracting Party to the African-Eurasian Water Bird Agreement (AEWA), which is a spin-off from the Convention of Migratory Species and came into effect in 1999. AEWA is a problem-oriented agreement, and is aimed at addressing problems that influence species survival in an international context.

The UNEP / AEWA Secretariat has expressed the need to increase the visibility and understanding of the Agreement among international stakeholders, wishing to increase the number of Contracting Parties and to strengthen the active participation and commitment of current contracting parties. In their meeting last May 2003, the Technical Committee has agreed to the development of a communication strategy.

In connection with this, the Secretariat has engaged SPAN Consultants to conduct a quick scan among the Contracting Parties, to learn more about their perception of AEWA, about the role of AEWA in their conservation policy, and what would be possible motivations or obstacles to successful implementation of the Agreement. The results of the quick scan will be used as inputs towards a more strategized communication approach under the Agreement.

It would be highly appreciated if you could take 3-5 minutes of your time to answer a few questions. Kindly send your answers before 1 September 2003 to Ms. Gwen van Boven at SPAN Consultants, *preferably via email* (vanboven@span.nl). To facilitate using e-mail the attached table with questions can be filled in using the computer.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Yours sincerely,

Bert Lenten
Executive Secretary AEWA



Quick scan AEWA - Contracting Parties

Please give a ranking to one or more answers to each question, by placing a number in the shaded boxes, using a 1 for your first choice, 2 for the second etcetera. If your choice is not among those alternatives provided, please write own answer.

Country:	Organisation:	Name:	Position	AEWA Focal Point: Yes/No
----------	---------------	-------	----------	-----------------------------

A. Accession

A. 1) What was the main reason for your country to sign AEWA?					
	Conservation of Migratory Water bird Populations	Promotion of flyway concept	International cooperation		Other, namely:
A. 2) What was the main obstacle, if any, for your country to become a contracting party to AEWA?					
	We did not know about AEWA	We were not familiar with the flyway concept	We did not feel the need for flyway conservation		We were not sure of the added value of AEWA compared to related Conventions
	We felt it was no use, as long as our neighbour countries had not joined		We were interested, but had no guidelines how to proceed with accession		Other, namely:
A. 3) What do you perceive as the main benefit for your country of being a Contracting Party of AEWA?					
	Conservation of Migratory Water bird Populations	Promotion of flyway concept	International cooperation		Other, namely:
A. 4) In your own words: what is the added value of AEWA?					
Remarks (section A: Accession):					

B. Implementation of AEWA

B. 1) What do you perceive to be the current focus of AEWA?					
	Recruitment of new Contracting Parties	Implemen-tation of AEWA	A combination of recruitment and implementation		Enlargement of the scope of the Agreement (Range and species)
	Other, namely:				
B. 2) What, in your opinion, should be the main focus of attention for the Secretariat in the coming 3 years?					
	Recruitment of new Contracting Parties	Implemen-tation of AEWA	A combination of recruitment implementation		Enlargement of the scope of the Agreement (Range and species)
	Other, namely:				
B. 3) Name organisations/countries/people that, in your opinion, should be stronger involved in the implementation of AEWA. Also rank them in order of importance:					
Remarks (section B: Implementation):					



C. Communication

The Secretariat has the task to keep you informed about relevant developments under the Agreement. This is done by sending you official documents such as minutes of meetings and reports, as well as through newsletters and the website, and direct personal contact.

C. 1) Do you feel the information you receive directly from the Secretariat is:

Sufficient	Too much	Too limited	Other, namely:
------------	----------	-------------	----------------

C. 2) To which of the following sources of information on AEWA do you have access?

Meetings	Mailings with minutes of meetings & reports	Website	Newsletter	Email	Interpersonal contact
Other, namely:					

C. 3) Which sources of information on AEWA do you use most?

Meetings	Mailings with minutes of meetings & reports	Website	Newsletter	Email	Interpersonal contact
Other, namely:					

C. 4) In which way you would prefer to receive information on AEWA in the future?

Meetings	Mailings with minutes of meetings & reports	Website	Newsletter	Email	Interpersonal contact
Other, namely:					

Remarks (section C: Communication)

Please note: the results of this quick scan will be used to improve the communication approach of the AEWA Secretariat. All suggestions will be taken into consideration. The Secretariat reserves the right to prioritise certain suggestions over others.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONTRIBUTION!

Send your answers (preferably by e-mail) before 1 September 2003 to:

SPAN Consultants Attn. Ms. Gwen van Boven vanboven@span.nl Tel: +31 (0)30 2753090	Hooghiemstraplein 173 3514 AZ Utrecht The Netherlands Fax: +31 (0)30 2753099
--	---



AEWA Quick Scan - Questionnaire for Non-Contracting Parties

Dear Madam/Sir,

The African-Eurasian Water Bird Agreement (AEWA) is a spin-off from the Convention of Migratory Species and came into effect in 1999. AEWA is a problem-oriented agreement, and is aimed at addressing problems that influence species survival in an international context.

The Secretariat has expressed the need to increase the visibility and understanding of the Agreement among international stakeholders, wishing to increase the number of signatory parties and to strengthen the active participation and commitment of current contracting parties.

In connection with this, the Secretariat has engaged SPAN Consultants to conduct a quick scan among non-contracting parties in its cover range, to learn more about their awareness of AEWA, about how the agreement is perceived, and what would be possible motivations or obstacles to become a signatory to the Agreement. The results of the quick scan will be used as inputs towards a more strategized communication approach under the Agreement.

It would be highly appreciated if you could take 3-5 minutes of your time to answer a few questions. Kindly send your answers before 1 September 2003 to Ms. Gwen van Boven at SPAN Consultants, *preferably via email* (vanboven@span.nl). To facilitate using e-mail the attached table with questions can be filled in using the computer.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation,

Bert Lenten
Executive Secretary AEWA



Quick scan AEW A Non- Contracting Parties / Range States

Please choose the most appropriate answer provided by checking the shaded box. If your choice is not among those alternatives provided, please write own answer.

Country:	Organisation:	Name:	Position:
----------	---------------	-------	-----------

A. Accession

A. 1) Do you know AEW A?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
A. 2) Describe in your own words what AEW A is:					
A. 3) Is your government interested in signing AEW A?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
A. 4) What factors do you perceive as obstacles, if any, for your country to sign AEW A? Please give a rank (1 = most important obstacle, 7 = least important obstacle)					
We do not know enough about AEW A	We are not familiar with the flyway concept	We do not feel the need for flyway conservation	We are not sure of the added value of AEW A compared to related Conventions		
Our neighbour countries have not joined either	We are interested, but have no guidelines how to proceed with accession	Other, namely:			
A. 5) What do you consider advantages for your country of becoming a Contracting Party of AEW A? Please give a rank (1 = most important advantage, 4 = least important advantage)					
Conservation of Migratory Water bird Populations	Promotion of flyway concept	International cooperation	Other, namely:		
A. 6) Is your government considering to become a party to AEW A in the future? Why (not)?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
A. 7) In your own words: what is the added value of AEW A?					
Remarks (section A: Accession):					



B. Communication

The AEWA Secretariat in Bonn is regularly sending information to all range states of AEWA.

C. 1) Which of the following communications do you receive from AEWA?

Half yearly letter	AEWA Newsletter	Direct email	From the AEWA website	Interpersonal contact
Other, namely:				

C. 2) Do you feel the information you receive from the Secretariat is:

Sufficient	Too much	Too limited	Other, namely:

C. 3) Which sources of information on AEWA do you find most effective?

Please give a rank (1 = most effective, 4 = least effective)

Half yearly letter	AEWA Newsletter	Direct email	From the AEWA website	Interpersonal contact
Other, namely:				

C. 4) In which way you would prefer to receive information on AEWA in the future?

Please give a rank (1 = most preferred, 4 = least preferred)

Half yearly letter	AEWA Newsletter	Direct email	From the AEWA website	Interpersonal contact
Other, namely:				

C. 5) The official Agreement languages are English and French. Does this in any way hamper the communication with the Secretariat for you?

Yes No

C. 6) In which language would you prefer the Secretariat to communicate with you?

Please give a rank (1 = most preferred, 6 = least preferred)

English	French	German	Russian	Arabic
Other, namely:				

Remarks (section B: Communication):

Please note: the results of this quick scan will be used to improve the communication approach of the AEWA Secretariat. All suggestions will be taken into consideration. The Secretariat reserves the right to prioritise certain suggestions over others.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONTRIBUTION!

Send your answers (preferably by e-mail) before 1 September 2003 to:

SPAN Consultants Attn. Ms. Gwen van Boven vanboven@span.nl	Hooghiemstraplein 173 3514 AZ Utrecht The Netherlands
--	---



AEWA Quick Scan - Interview questions

What is your connection with AEWA?

What is your perception of the role of AEWA?

What is your perception of the added value of AEWA?

What are obstacles for countries to become Party to AEWA?

What were your expectations from AEWA?

Now that you have seen some progress/results: do they answer your expectations?

What should be the priority focus of the Secretariat in the coming years (given limited resources): recruitment of new Parties, implementation, expansion of range area, other...

Has the Secretariat/Parties done a good job to capitalise on the results?

Communication:

What communication do you receive from the Secretariat?

Are you satisfied with it?

Can you mention 2-3 key improvements on existing products?

What should be the communication means to be used in the future?

Should the approach be diversified? In terms of regions, cultures, languages...

Can you mention 2-3 key topics/themes that should be dealt with in the near future?

Is AEWA's visibility an issue?

Concerns/obstacles?

Do you have final remarks or questions?



AEWA Quick Scan - List of Respondents

	Country	Name	Affiliation	AEWA connection	Response
1	Albania	Dedej, Z.	Government	CP	Questionnaire
2	Azerbaijan	Aliger, I.	Government	Non-CP	Questionnaire
3	Belarus	Korenchuk, V.	Government	Non-CP	Questionnaire
4	Canada	Wendt, S.	Government	Non-CP	Interview
5	Czech Republic	Vlasáková, L.	Government	Non-CP	Questionnaire
6	Eritrea	Bein, E.	Government	Non-CP	Questionnaire
7	France	Olivier, G.	OMPO	Observer to T.C.	Interview
8	Gambia	Kassama, M.	Government	CP	Questionnaire
9	Guinea	Sagno, C.	Government	CP	Questionnaire
10	Hungary	Böhm, A.	Government	CP	Interview
11	Hungary	Wolscheid, K.	CIC	Permanent member of T.C.	Interview
12	Ireland	Merne, O.	Government	CP	Questionnaire
13	Italy	Dupre, I.	Government	Non-CP	Questionnaire
14	Kenya	Koyo, A.	Government	CP	Questionnaire
15	Lebanon	Sanaha, L.	Government	CP	Questionnaire
16	Lithuania	Klovaite, K.	Government	Non-CP	Questionnaire
17	Malawi	Bhima, R.	Government	Non-CP	Questionnaire
18	Mauritius	Mungroo, M.	Government	CP	Questionnaire
19	Netherlands	Baker, C.	Wetlands International	GEF Flyway project	Interview
20	Netherlands	Boere, G.	Wetlands International	Conception	Interview
21	Netherlands	Hagemeijer, W.	Wetlands International	Permanent member of T.C.	Interview
22	Netherlands	Sneep, J.	Ministry of LNV	CP/ Depository; S.C.	Interview
23	Senegal	Demba, M.	Government	CP	Questionnaire
24	Slovakia	Pilinsky, P.	Government	CP	Questionnaire
25	South Africa	Underhill, L.	Avian Monitoring Unit	Consultant	Interview
26	Spain	Areces Maqueda, J.	Government	CP	Questionnaire
27	Switzerland	Gimenez-Dixon	IUCN	Permanent member of T.C.	Interview
28	Syria	Darwish, A.	Government	CP	Questionnaire
29	UK	Williams, A.	Government	CP	Questionnaire
29	United Kingdom	Stroud, D.	Joint Nature Conservation Committee	Scientific Focal Point	Interview
30	U.K.	Sullivan, J.	Birdlife International	Observer to T.C.	Interview
31	Zimbabwe	Mundy, P.	Former Govt.	Non-CP	Questionnaire
32	Belgium	Martens, E.	Government	CP	Interview*
33	Germany	Adams, G.	Government	CP/ SC	Interview*
34	Syria	Darwish, I.	Government	CP	Interview*
35	Zimbabwe	Mundy, P.	Former Govt.	Non-CP	Interview*
36	Switzerland	Hails, S.	Ramsar	IGO	Interview*

* Agreed to participate; interview not yet conducted

