

Draft Minutes of the Fourth Meeting of the AEWA Technical Committee

12 – 13 May 2003, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

1. Opening

1. Bert Lenten, Executive Secretary of the AEWA, opened the meeting, welcoming all participants and thanking the Government of Uzbekistan for hosting this meeting and the excellent support given in this respect. On behalf of all participants, he thanked the host for organising the excellent excursion on the previous day, which was a good opportunity to see a great diversity of birds and landscape.

2. Mr Lenten gave the floor to Kalilulla Sherimbetov, Chairman of the State Committee for Nature Protection of the Republic of Uzbekistan, who officially opened the fourth Meeting of the Technical Committee and delivered a welcome address informing the meeting on the activities of the Uzbek government in the area of environmental protection during the last years. He raised hopes that the Uzbek government would sign the AEWA Agreement within 2003. His opening remarks are attached as Annex 1.

3. Mr Lenten mentioned the names of TC members who could not attend and had sent apologies: Mr Yousoof Mungroo (Chairman of the TC Meeting), Mr Sherif Baha-El Din (North Africa), Mr Ikonga Jérôme Mokoko (Central Africa), Mr Mariano Giminez-Dixon (IUCN) and Mr Elijah Danso (Expert Rural Economics). The depositary (The Netherlands) had also sent apologies and had indicated that they would not attend TC meetings in future. Instead, they would be represented at the Standing Committee meetings.

2. Welcome addresses

4. Nobody made use of the opportunity to deliver a welcome address.

3. Adoption of the Rules of Procedure

5. Mr Lenten pointed out in accordance with Rule 9, *'The members of the Committee shall elect a Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson from their regional representatives of the Parties, for terms corresponding to those of the Meetings of the Parties. This election will normally take place immediately before the Meeting of the Parties, and the newly elected officers shall assume their functions at the conclusion of the corresponding Meeting of the Parties'*.

Yousoof Mungroo had been elected as Chair at the previous TC meeting in Arusha, Tanzania. Mr Lenten proposed to elect the Vice-Chair at the beginning of this meeting. Olivier Biber proposed to re-elect Dan Munteanu as Vice-Chair. Charles Mlingwa seconded this proposal, and the Meeting agreed to re-elect Mr Munteanu.

6. In the absence of the Chair, Mr Munteanu took over the Chair of the meeting, thanking the Government of Uzbekistan for organising the event. He expressed his hope that, given the importance of AEWA in Central Asia, the TC Meeting would be held in this region more often.

7. Mr Biber proposed to amend Rule 1 by including the following words: *The Technical Committee established in accordance with Article VII of the Agreement provides, **in coordination with the***

Standing Committee, scientific and technical advice and information to the Meeting of the Parties, and through the Agreement Secretariat to the Parties. Its functions are defined in Article VII paragraph 3.

8. Mr Lenten proposed to wait for the new rules and procedures of the Standing Committee (StC) and therefore postpone these issues until the following TC meeting.

9. Ward Hagemeyer proposed to develop stronger links with the Ramsar Convention and to include a representative, preferably of the STRP, from the Ramsar Convention as an observer in the TC. Christoph Zöckler seconded this idea.

10. David Stroud suggested taking on a pragmatic approach, since both Mr Zöckler and he himself represent the STRP of Ramsar. A formal Ramsar delegate should be invited to TC meetings when necessary.

11. Mr Lenten answered that a delegate of the Ramsar Convention could not become a permanent member of the TC because this was not in line with Article VII of the Agreement. To change this Article, all Parties should ratify its amended text. However, in accordance with this Article, the Chair might admit a maximum of four observers from specialised inter-governmental and non-governmental organisations. Amongst others, the Ramsar Bureau had been invited for this meeting, but unfortunately, no response had been received.

12. After this discussion the Rules of Procedure (doc. AEWA/ TC 4.3) were adopted.

4. Adoption of the Agenda and Work Programme

13. The Chairman presented the Provisional Work Programme (doc. AEWA/ TC 4.4) and asked for comments.

14. On the request of Mr Hagemeyer the following topics were added to the agenda:

- Agenda item 17: Role of the TC
- Agenda item 18: Role of AEWA in the conservation/restoration of the Mesopotamian wetlands in Iraq
- Agenda item 19: Global Flyway Conference in 2004
- Under agenda item 20 'Any other business':
 - Report on Capacity Building in Central Asia
 - Report on the Meeting on the Aquatic Warbler
 - A call for suggestions for agenda items to be discussed at the forthcoming Specialist Group meeting of Wetlands International, in Wageningen end of May 2003. This could include items the TC would like to get support on.
 - CIC general assembly and a proposed resolution of non-toxic shot
 - Miscellaneous

15. Mr Lenten proposed to establish two working groups: one to deal with scientific/ technical matters and one to deal with the more general issues. He proposed that the two working groups should meet that afternoon at 14.00 hrs and finish at 17.30 hrs to enable everybody to participate in the dinner given by the Government of Uzbekistan scheduled that evening at 19.00 hrs..

16. Rachelle Adams asked whether working groups were necessary to discuss the topics.

17. Mr Biber supported the idea of working groups but requested that all of them finish by 17.30 hrs.

18. Elena Kreuzberg offered to hold a presentation on Capacity-building in the region related to CMS and AEWA. This presentation was accepted by the Meeting under agenda item 21 a.

19. Taking into account the proposed amendments the Meeting adopted the Agenda and the Work Programme (doc. AEWA/ TC 4.2 and doc. AEWA/ TC 4.4).

5. Admission of Observers

20. Mr Lenten welcomed Guy-Nöel Olivier (OMPO), Mr Stroud (UK), Eric Wiedmer (Switzerland) and Dr Petri Nummi (Finland).

21. He explained that other observers that had been invited by the Secretariat could not make it to the TC and that Mr Arnulf Müller-Helmbrecht (CMS) and Mr John O'Sullivan (BirdLife) had sent apologies for not being in a position to attend this meeting.

6. Adoption of the Minutes of the third Meeting of the AEWA Technical Committee

22. The Chairman asked the delegates to adopt the minutes of the third Meeting of the AEWA Technical Committee (doc. AEWA/ TC 4.5).

23. Mr Mlingwa asked for two corrections to be made in the minutes: to change the name *Wildlife Research Centre* to *Wildlife Research Institute* (para. 1) and to delete his name in the last line of para. 2, which deals with observers present.

24. Mr Hagemeyer requested to generally include BirdLife International in the names of observers stated in para. 2.

25. With reference to para. 27, Mr Hagemeyer referred to an earlier decision of the TC to include a list of action points in the Minutes. Mr Lenten promised that this would be done from now on (see Annex 5)

26. Ms Adams requested to change the word *revised* into *reviewed* in para. 126.

27. Mr Hagemeyer suggested amending the paragraphs 176 and 177 of the Draft Minutes of the Third Meeting of the AEWA Technical Committee, adding that *both Committees* [the TC and the StC] *should report to the MOP under the coordination of the AEWA Secretariat.*

28. Mr Hagemeyer brought forward that he had several more comments on the minutes, some of which included important changes to the contents, while others were mainly editorial changes. He maintained that it would take too much time to go through all these comments in the plenary. In addition, some of the more substantial points would be better dealt with by offering an alternative formulation in writing. He offered to process his comments into a new version of the minutes of the third Meeting of the AEWA Technical Committee, collect any amendments from other TC members and include these changes in the process. He would present them to the TC in written form the following day.

29. The following day Mr Hagemeyer presented the revised document. The Meeting adopted the proposed changes. Mr Lenten promised to send the revised version of the minutes of the third Meeting of the AEWA Technical Committee including the track changes for comments to the delegates. The Secretariat would subsequently prepare the final version (as attached as Annex 2).

7. Report of the Chairman

30. Due to the absence of the Chairman, and in absence of his written report, Mr Lenten reported on the Chairman's activities. There had been regular contacts between the Chairman and the Secretariat, particularly regarding financial and administrative matters. The Chairman had also played a very active role, especially during MOP 2.

8. Report of the Secretary

8a General information

31. Mr Lenten announced that the Report of the Secretary (doc. AEWA/ TC 4.5) would be used to inform both the TC and the StC. Of course, depending on the intervals between these meetings, whenever necessary, the report would be updated. On behalf of the German Government, Mr Biber supported this idea.

32. Mr Lenten started reporting on the forthcoming move to the new premises, "Langer Eugen", in 2005/06. The Langer Eugen will be part of the new UN Campus in Bonn, which is located at the "Bundeshaus". The Secretariat was discussing requirements with other Bonn-based UN organisations.

33. Furthermore, Mr Lenten continued reporting on the Agreement Unit with which the Secretariat worked closely together. As an example, he mentioned the development and production of a common exhibition on CMS and the Agreements that had been arranged by Dirk Hendricks, a former consultant to CMS. He did however also refer to some problems from time to time due to the immense workload of the shared Administrative Unit.

34. Mr Lenten commented on the recruitment of consultant Ms Marie-Therese Kämper (Germany) as temporary Assistant to the Executive Secretary. She would support the Secretariat for a period of six months in finalising the proceedings in French and English of MOP 2 and other work related to the publication of MOP 2 documents, including finalising the Action Plan 2003-2005, working on the Conservation Guidelines and supporting the organisation of this TC Meeting, etc. Furthermore, Dirk Hendricks (Germany) had been recruited to work for a period of two months on the development of an exhibition on AEWA. He would also be writing the minutes of this TC Meeting. Mr Kim Liffers (Germany) had been contracted for updating and developing the AEWA Website. Unfortunately, not all of this was to the satisfaction of the Secretariat, so that the decision had to be taken not to extend the contract of this Webmaster. Recruitment of a new Webmaster is therefore necessary.

35. Mr Lenten was sad to announce that Ms Mirna Maya had decided to resign as of 8 July 2003 as Assistant to the Executive Secretary. This meant that a replacement for Ms Maya had to be recruited in the coming months.

36. Mr Hagemeyer suggested that the TC members formally thank Ms Maya for her efforts and excellent job.

37. Mr Lenten reported that Mr Sherimbetov had signed the Host Government Agreement on 9 May 2003. This Agreement will give the members of the TC meeting all immunities and privileges of the United Nations during their stay in Uzbekistan.

38. Mr Lenten continued reporting on the publication of two special editions of the AEWA Newsletter. One was on the MOP 2 Meeting and the other on Non-toxic shot.

39. Mr Lenten gave a brief summary on the production of a DVD film on the activities of AEWA. The film was being produced step by step depending on the financial resources available. The first parts deals with flamingos in Africa and geese and swans migrating from Siberia to the Netherlands.

40. Mr Lenten reported that a Joint Work Programme (JWP) had been concluded between Wetlands International, CMS and AEWA. A first consultative meeting to discuss the implementation of this JWP is scheduled to take place on 3 June 2003 in Wageningen, The Netherlands. Another JWP between the Ramsar Convention, CMS and AEWA was under preparation and, hopefully, could be concluded soon.

41. The Chairman asked Mr Lenten why the TC meeting was being held in Tashkent.

42. Mr Lenten repeated that the choice of Tashkent as a meeting place was to establish better contacts with Central Asian countries and to demonstrate interest in the region. The choice had been made easier by his excellent experience of the workshop on the GEF Flyway project held in Tashkent in August 2001 and also thanks to the initiative of Ms Kreuzberg, the representative of the region.

43. On behalf of the Swiss and German government, Mr Biber asked if CMS had to agree to AEWA's travel requests and how the relationship between CMS and its Agreements was in general. He suggested raising an MOU with CMS to clarify each other's responsibilities.

44. In addition to this, Mr Mlingwa asked whether the AEWA Secretariat was independent of CMS.

45. Mr Lenten answered that clear guidance for the relationship between CMS and its Agreement Secretariats did not exist. There was some guidance in Resolution 1.1., adopted by MOP 1. It was very difficult to keep the balance between cooperation and independence since UNON issues were channelled through the Executive Secretary of CMS. UNON, however, was not aware that the Agreements were independent. In general, the Secretariat were still in a learning process with regard to their relationship to CMS. With regard to travel requests, Mr Lenten reported that UNON could agree with his proposal that any of the authorising officers present could sign his travel request. His proposal was seconded by ASCOBANS and EUROBATS, but CMS did not agree. Therefore the problems are still pending.

46. On behalf of the Swiss and German government, Mr Biber raised the question for what reasons AEWA and the Ramsar Convention were involved in the Joint Work Programmes with UNCCD.

47. Mr Lenten repeated that wetlands were playing an important role in combating desertification. To identify issues of mutual interest to UNCCD, CMS and AEWA, he had proposed a pilot study in West Africa during a meeting with representatives of CMS and UNCCD. Although this idea was very much welcomed, no progress had been made so far.

8b. Instructions from MOP 2 to the TC (doc. AEWA/ TC 4.6)

48. Mr Lenten then moved on to doc. AEWA/TC 4.6 (Overview of instructions from MOP 2 to the TC), stating that that was an information document for the TC members giving them guidance from the Secretariat on how to proceed.

49. Mr Biber proposed to discuss Res. 2.4, para. 7 and Res. 2.9, para. 4 in the StC..

50. On the issue that was subsequently raised on how issues would be 'divided' between the StC and the TC, Mr Hagemeyer asked the Secretariat for coordination of and guidance on the roles of the TCI and StC.

51. Mr Hagemeyer commented on behalf of Wetlands International on Res. 2.3. para. 5 (Conservation Guidelines). He argued that these guidelines were one of the more tangible outputs of the agreements for Contracting Parties to work with. Although some components are still under development, the guidelines can be published in the stage they are currently in, at least on the Internet. A 'loose-bound' system had been suggested into which new components could be added at any time and in which revised parts could be replaced. Mr Hagemeyer therefore suggested publishing the existing guidelines as soon as possible,

starting with publication on the Internet. In the meantime, completion of additional components and revision of others should continue. Mr Hagemeyer maintained that this was a matter of urgency, since the existing guidelines had been ready for many years and should be made available to the CP's.

52. Mr Lenten announced that the guidelines would be published on the AEWA website as soon as possible. He added that the Secretariat had sent letters to the Contracting Parties with regard to Res. 2.5, para.7.

53. On behalf of the German government, Mr Biber asked if the comments of the BfN had been included in Res. 2.3 and in doc. AEWA/ TC 4.16 (Guideline on avoidance of introduction of non-native waterbird species). The German government suggested discussing several items of the *Report of the Secretariat* during the Standing Committee.

9. Report on the Activities of the Working Groups

9a. Report on the Activities of the Working Group on the Brent Goose Management Plan

54. Mr Lenten reported on the outcomes of the Working Group on the Dark-bellied Brent Goose that had been held briefly before the AEWA MOP 2 in September 2002. The members of the working group had tried to amend the text according to the received comments. The revised document had been circulated as draft 5 among the members of the TC in the morning.

55. Mr Biber made a remark on behalf of the German government (Gerhard Adams) stating that the German government had no longer been able to comment on the fifth version of the draft action plan for the Dark-bellied Brent Goose since it had received it too late. However, it had sent the comments of the German delegate of the Brent Goose Working Group, Mr Martin Stock. Mr Adams wanted to know if these comments had been received by the Secretariat.

56. Mr Lenten said that that was the case.

57. Preben Clausen announced that he had no mandate to adopt any changes made to the Action Plan for the Dark-bellied Brent Goose since the document had arrived too late at the ministry.

58. Mr Lenten explained that the document had been received rather late from the relevant working group.

59. Mr Stroud announced that he could not adopt the Dark-bellied Brent Goose Action Plan since the comments to the 4th draft version made by the UK government had not been included in the fifth version.

60. Taking into account that some key countries need more time to comment on the 5th draft of the Brent Goose Management Plan, Mr Lenten proposed to postpone the discussion in the TC on this Plan. Instead of this he proposed to organise a meeting of the working group to review all comments received and whenever necessary to amend the current management plan (MP). The revised version of the MP will be submitted to the TC members with the request to comment on it before a set deadline. Depending on the outcome of this, the final version could be submitted to the StC for formal adoption.

9b. Report on the Activities of the Working Group on GROMS

61. Mr Hagemeyer reported on the activities of the working group on GROMS. At TC3 in Arusha, it had been decided that TC (working group) would wait for information from CMS on its plans for the future development of GROMS. Such information had not been received. The working group had therefore not undertaken any action since the TC3 meeting. Since the Executive Secretary had requested the working group to report to the committee about the current state of the work it was decided to summarise the prevailing view of TC.

62. Therefore Mr Hagemeyer drafted a report on behalf of the working group, after consultation with Mr Zöckler of WCMC, as inserted below. Dr Mariano Gimenez Dixon and Dr Klaus Riede could not be consulted on this report before it was presented at this meeting. They would be presented with it after the meeting and asked to endorse it.

GROMS is a database system storing data on migratory species. For several species groups / taxa other than migratory waterbirds, this system provides information in addition to what is available from other sources. As such it meets a need for taxa for which authoritative databases are underdeveloped or not available.

There are parallels between GROMS and the Species Information System as initiated by CMS.

For birds in general and migratory waterbirds in particular, authoritative and long-standing databases have been developed by Wetlands International, BirdLife International, and, for breeding birds in Europe, by the European Bird Census Council. Each of these databases has been developed from its own perspective and contains large amounts of valuable information crucial to the underpinning and development of AEWA (and other initiatives).

It is realised that large added value could be reached by integrating the information from these databases, linking to further site databases (e.g. Ramsar Sites database) and other databases. GROMS can be seen as one of the databases of this latter category.

The information in the integrated set of databases as a whole will cover the data needs of AEWA:

- *identifying key sites (as part of a network)*
- *assessing population sizes*
- *monitoring population developments*
- *species specific information*
- *analyzing / presenting important ecological features of species*

(this includes the data needs of the secretariat and servicing potential data needs of parties and site managers).

AEWA, endorsed by MOP2, has decided to invest in the above-mentioned integration of databases by supporting the GEF Flyways project (along with other major contributors, including the German government). As one of its components, this project undertakes to improve the quality and integration of waterbird and site data and facilitate access to it. Following and implementing modern thinking in database management (and following the BCIS principle), this will NOT be done by creating another central database, but by providing central access to all sources via one hub (in the internet or on a CD). The individual dispersed databases will remain under their custodians for updating and maintenance.

GROMS has value to add to this data-net, but as one of its nodes rather than as the central database. And in terms of new, complementary information, it has much less to offer than the databases of WI, BLI and EBCC.

Financial involvement in GROMS by AEWA would be seen to be of lower importance than potential financial support of the databases of WI and BLI, which are crucial to AEWA and would yield more added value to it.

Therefore, financial participation by AEWA in GROMS is currently not a strategic priority.

63. Mr Mlingwa supported the conclusion of the Working Group.

64. Mr Hagemeyer promised to submit the report (statement) of the Working Group to the Secretariat as soon as he would have consulted the other members of the working group and Klaus Riede.

65. Mr Lenten asked the delegates how the working group on GROMS should continue.

66. Mr Hagemeyer and Mr Zöckler recommended to maintain the working group and to wait for the CMS

plans on how to proceed with GROMS, before the position would be discussed again.

67. Mr Lenten promised to pass any information on CMS's plans for GROMS on the delegates as soon as he would receive it.

10. Update of the GEF project

68. In the afternoon of the first day, Mr Hagemeyer gave a PowerPoint presentation on the GEF Flyway project. He reported that DGIS had not granted a proposal for support worth of 12 million US\$ for the capacity building component of the GEF Flyways project. This had come as a big disappointment because the proposal had been developed in close consultation with DGIS and apparently, it had not been turned down because of the contents, but because of a change in procedures within DGIS. The loss of these potential funds had caused a need to redefine the training component of the project, building in a focus on Africa. This increased the problem of finding funding for these activities in Central Asia and the Middle East, resulting in a financial gap of around 5 million US\$. Wetlands International was now looking for other co-financing options.

69. Mr Biber commented that financial issues were subject to the StC. He criticised the lack of detailed information on the GEF Flyway project and its modifications, in particular a lack of detailed proposals and budgets for demonstration projects within the GEF project. He raised the question how the project that had originally had a financial volume of 12 million US\$ could grow to 26 million US\$.

70. Mr Hagemeyer regretted to hear that the information that was available on the project was perceived to be inadequate. He apologised for Mr Biber's not having received the detailed information he had asked for at TC3. He indicated that he had transmitted Mr Biber's request to Chris Baker and promised to liaise with Mr Baker in order to provide Mr Biber with further information.

71. Mr Hagemeyer and Mr Lenten explained that at the inception of the project in 1999-2000, its full cost had roughly been estimated at the level of twelve million US\$. At that stage, GEF had pledged a potential contribution of 50% with a maximum of six million US\$.

72. Mr Biber suggested that the financial participation of Ramsar in the GEF project should be increased to become compatible with the contribution of AEWA.

73. Mr Zöckler supported his idea of strengthening the involvement of the Ramsar Convention. He stressed the importance of highlighting the relationship of sustainable development, poverty elevation and biodiversity conservation in the GEF Flyway project proposal.

74. Mr Hagemeyer responded that the Ramsar Convention had not shown a commitment similar to AEWA in the GEF project. As a result, budget allocations had not been made and financial contributions were not possible. He furthermore responded that the mentioned link with poverty alleviation and sustainable development had been strongly presented in the proposal.

75. Mr Biber pointed out that a partnership with the Ramsar Convention as well as with other international agreements such as CMS could provide more synergies and more visibility, which might lead to more support in general.

76. Ms Kreuzberg suggested using regional meetings for fund-raising.

77. Mr Stroud asked whether the existing money could be secured.

78. Mr Lenten answered that this would happen in the forthcoming months if co-funding could not be secured.

79. Mr Hagemeyer added that it was planned to split the current GEF Flyway project in two projects – one with secured funding and one planned – if co-funding could not be arranged until the GEF deadline. The disadvantage would be that they would both need to go through the whole GEF process again. It was agreed to focus the efforts on fund-raising for the GEF Flyway project as a whole.

80. Mr Stroud suggested gaining financial support from international water companies.

81. Mr Zöckler requested the TC meeting to urge the Ramsar Convention for a stronger engagement in the GEF Flyway project; which would support the need for additional funding.

82. Mr Biber requested rapid action so that Swiss Agencies could examine possibilities to help gathering funds.

83. The Chairman closed the discussion on the GEF Flyway project agreeing to send a letter to the Ramsar Convention to urge for a stronger engagement in the GEF project. Furthermore he suggested enhancing personal contacts between the Ramsar Bureau and the AEWA Secretariat to strengthen cooperation between both Secretariats.

11. Implementation of the International Implementation Priorities 2003 - 2007

84. After the report of the Secretariat, Mr Lenten asked the delegates for their comments on doc. AEWA/TC 4.8 (Update on the current situation of the Implementation priorities).

85. Mr Biber commented on behalf of the German government on project number 24 (Report on status and trends of populations for the Meeting of the Parties at its third session) suggesting larger intervals for updating and/or reviewing the status and trends. He supported this suggestion of the German government of longer intervals but proposed triennial reports on important changes such as emergency situations. Mr Lenten responded that the question of updating the report on status and trends of populations for MOP3 should be discussed in Working Group I that had to be set up for the afternoon.

86. With regard to project number 10 (Review of the use of non-toxic shot for waterbird hunting) Mr Biber asked what relationship was there between AEWA and ONCFS and what the role of AEWA was during the meeting in Dakar. Mr Lenten reported that there had been only communication between AEWA and ONCFS and that the workshop held in SENEGAL was not organised by AEWA. However, AEWA was willing to participate in the workshop and to cover the travel and subsistence cost of one or two AEWA representatives.

87. Mr Hagemeyer reported that ONCFS also approached Wetlands International with a request for support to this workshop. He said he considered this to be a good example of implementation of AEWA-type activities in the African region and announced that Wetlands International is willing to give some support in kind by involving the Dakar office in the organisation free of charge. He furthermore suggested that this workshop would be important for AEWA to be involved in and proposed to take a more positive and active attitude towards it.

88. Mr Biber had envisaged support from Switzerland to AEWA or Wetlands International in organising the workshop, but would have difficulties in finding support from ONCFS, being a French Governmental Organisation.

89. Mr Biber asked whether projects mentioned in the Implementation Priority list without a remark implied that there had been no progress made or that no funding had been made available.

90. Mr Lenten confirmed that that was the case.

91. Mr Biber was concerned about the number of implementation priorities in general and raised the question of setting priorities and what criteria should be used for making priorities.

92. Mr Clausen supported the idea of developing a list with top priorities.

93. Mr Lenten confirmed that the list of international implementation priorities was indeed very ambitious, but that a longer list would allow donors to choose their priorities.

94. Petri Nummi suggested a grouping of the projects for easier management.

95. Mr Zöckler proposed to set up a small working group on project priorities within the TC assessing how projects could be linked to other international organisations in order to create synergies and secure funding.

96. Valentin Serebryakov supported his idea and suggested setting up country groups for securing funding and implementation.

97. Mr Hagemeyer mentioned the origin of doc. AEWA/TC 4.8, reminding the delegates that the implementation priorities had been assessed in a consultative process: a questionnaire had been sent to the Parties and other stakeholders asking for their project proposals. The existing list had been compiled out of the suggestions received.

98. Mr Biber also supported Mr Serebryakov's idea and proposed to include the name of the country that had suggested the project in brackets behind the project name in order to secure further funding.

99. Mr Lenten supported Mr Hagemeyer's position, stating that there was no need to ask the countries again for their proposals. He did not support the idea of attaching the country's name that had proposed the project to the project name. However, he suggested setting up a small working group assessing priorities regarding projects that no funds had been earmarked for yet. The group could consist of three persons. Unfortunately, no names were suggested.

100. The Chairman summarised the discussion as follows:

- The list of IIP 2003-2007 should be reviewed regularly;
- A working group on assessing the top priorities among the list of IIP 2003-2007 projects and on the development of criteria for future IIP projects needed to be established.

The Chairman reminded the delegates that this was an important issue for the TC.

11a. Pilot Study / Review of Potential from Waterbird Ringing Recovery Analysis for the Agreement

101. This topic was discussed in Working Group I, comprising the following participants: Mr Olivier, Herby Kalchreuter, Mr Mlingwa, Mr Clausen, Ms Kreuzberg, Mr Stroud, Mr Zöckler, Momodou Lamin Kassama, Mr Serebryakov, Mr Biber, Mr Lenten, Marie-Therese Kämper and Petri Numi (partly). Mr Hagemeyer chaired the group.

102. As Chairman of Working Group I, Mr Hagemeyer reported to the plenary that its delegates had not accepted the pilot study in its current form. Acceptance was subject to the completion of the following:

- specify goal and objectives
- specify why this is important for AEWA
- better reflect priorities identified in IIP2003-2007
- regarding species selection include good cross cut of data handling issues
- stick to metal ringing but identify shortcomings of this approach and indicate where other methods are needed

103. Mr Lenten asked how to proceed with this pilot study.

104. Mr Hagemeyer clarified that the Secretariat should consult the contractor and point out that a new proposal should be submitted taking into account the recommendations made above.

105. Mr Lenten promised that the Secretariat would follow up this topic. As soon as the consultant has submitted a revised version of the project proposal it will be forwarded to the TC members with the request to provide their comments/remarks for a given deadline.

106. The Plenary adopted the report/amendments made by Working Group I.

11b. Coordination of waterbird ringing schemes (doc. AEWA/TC 4.10)

107. Mr Hagemeyer continued to report the results of Working Group I. He confirmed use of the name 'AFRING' in future for the African ringing schemes.

108. Mr Hagemeyer stated that the delegates of Working Group I had not accepted the pilot study in its current form. Acceptance was subject to the completion of the following:

- specify goal and objectives
- specify why this is important for AEWA
- relates to IIP-project 21 not IIP project20
- reference to East African ringing scheme (Nairobi) is missing
- indicate how AFRING will be sustained after initiation

109. The Plenary adopted the report/amendments made by Working Group I.

11c. Publication of data on Long-tailed Duck and additional research on King Eider (doc. AEWA/TC 4.11)

110. Mr Hagemeyer summarised that Working Group I had rejected the request for support for the publication on the Long-tailed Duck and additional research on the King Eider since they were not priority species. Furthermore, AEWA was 'problem-oriented' and not an institution to support science. Granting support for publication of data on these species would set an undesirable precedent.

111. On behalf of Working Group I he proposed to develop criteria and guidelines for the acceptance of proposals. This should be discussed in a separate working group that would meet outside the TC meetings. It would consist of the following TC members: Mr Biber, Mr Hagemeyer and Mr Stroud. The Secretariat would take the lead.

112. The Plenary adopted the report/amendments made by Working Group I.

11d. Development of a communications strategy for AEWA (doc. AEWA/TC 4.12)

113. This topic was briefly discussed in Working Group II in the afternoon that had been composed of the following participants: Mr Wiedmer, Petri Numi (partly), Mr Lenten (partly) and Dirk Hendricks. Ms Adams chaired the group.

114. Next morning, Ms Adams gave a brief summary on the discussion of this topic from the previous afternoon to the plenary. She stressed the need to define the goals of the proposed communications strategy more precisely.

115. Mr Lenten gave an overview on the recent developments with regard to a communications strategy for AEWA. The United Kingdom had granted US\$ 10,000 for the development of a communications strategy focusing on policy-makers, decision-makers and experts, but not on the general public. The strategy should primarily address external communication. The question was how the communication of outcomes TC, StC and MOP meetings and Range States could be communicated between these subsidiary bodies, MOP and Range States. The communications strategy was very necessary and important for AEWA because not all ministries and/ or international organisations were aware of AEWA.

116. Mr Lenten reported that the Secretariat had asked for three quotes and had so far received two proposals, one of them from a Dutch company, that had been handed out to the delegates as document 4.12. The Dutch company had already had experience with international organisations such as IUCN, the Ramsar Convention and the European Centre for Nature Conservation.

117. Mr Lenten asked the plenary for comments and further input to document 4.12.

118. Mr Mlingwa requested a more detailed communications strategy.

119. Mr Olivier suggested extending the communications strategy to the general public in order to raise further awareness.

120. Mr Lenten promised to make contact with the proponent and to ask him for a revised proposal. He would then send it to the TC members.

121. The Plenary adopted the report/amendments made by Working Group II.

11e. Report on status and trends of populations for MOP 3 (doc 4.13)

122. Mr Hagemeyer continued to report the results of Working Group I. He stressed that the working group had focused on the request of MOP 2 to look into adapting the reporting on status and trends for MOP 3.

123. Mr Hagemeyer explained that in the opinion of the working group high-level summary information was needed focussing on changes in status in comparison with earlier reports and including overviews of all species listed in Column A (and perhaps B?), since the audience predominantly consisted of policy-makers. This summary information should be based on population trend analyses. Preferably, these analyses should be performed in a three-year cycle, and the trend data should be presented to the TC at least six months before the MOP. The TC should subsequently identify what message should be communicated in the summary report, based on the analyses. In addition to this three-year cycle, the Ramsar cycle should be followed for the publication of a full revision of the detailed status and trend report (once every nine years). It should be also linked in with the 2010 target of CBD. The emerging changes in population status and development should subsequently be used to set implementation priorities.

124. He suggested establishing a working group in order to discuss and enhance the analytical content of the summary and detailed publication. The working group would be composed of Mr Stroud, Mr Clausen, Mr Zöckler and Mr Hagemeyer. It would develop a proposal for such contents based on a proposal of Mr Stroud, who promised to circulate it to the TC members within the following months.

125. The Plenary adopted the report/amendments made by Working Group I.

12. Review and approval of new projects for inclusion in the Register of International Projects (doc. AEWA/TC 4.14)

126. Mr Lenten reported that the list of projects (doc. AEWA/ TC 4.14) was available on the AEWA website. He asked the plenary to review the list carefully, to add new projects and to remove completed or inactive projects.

127. Mr Biber asked what the origin of that document was.

128. Mr Lenten explained that the first list of projects had been presented to MOP 1. Before MOP2 contact had been made with all organisations mentioned in the list and responsible for the implementation of the project with the request to provide the Secretariat with an update. Based on that, a revised version of the Register of International Projects had been submitted to MOP2.

129. Mr Biber proposed to group the projects in two categories: projects in which AEWA was directly involved and projects of interest to AEWA. He suggested further to keep a longer list and delete projects only after an assessment.

130. Mr Stroud handed a list of comments and updates to the Secretariat.

131. Mr Hagemeyer suggested distinguishing between projects and programmes. He suggested establishing criteria to determine which projects should be added or removed from the list.

132. Mr Lenten pointed out that on the first page of the document (AEWA TC4.14), the criteria had been already given. He further suggested updating the list only for the MOP.

133. Several delegates questioned whether including a column with information on costs of the projects listed made sense. After the pros and cons had been discussed, the meeting agreed not to include such information in the register.

13. Amendments to the Action Plan

13a. Review of the following populations:

134. This topic was discussed in Working Group I. Mr Hagemeyer reported the following conclusions with regard to the Baltic Sea and Wadden Sea population of *Somateria mollissima*: Recently published information indicated that this population had serious problems. In addition, the latest information showed more problems with the continued outbreak of *Pastorella* disease and a change in sex ratio from 1 to 1 (male to female) to 1.22 to 1, indicating that female survival was down. In response to this information, Denmark was likely to reduce the length of the hunting period by one month for brown birds, which also includes moulting males, and by 0.5 months for males.

135. Mr Hagemeyer announced that the working group decided that this information sufficed to justify reclassification of the Eider in the Action Plan of AEWA.

136. Mr Hagemeyer continued to report that Mr Clausen had presented some information on two populations of *Anas platyrhynchos* to the working group in order to support the case that the Northwest European population and the Baltic-Mediterranean population of Mallard had not declined in numbers, other than it had been presented in WPE 3. This was partly based on breeding bird information and on winter bird counts using point counts.

137. With regard to *Anas Acuta*, Mr Olivier reported that OMPO worked with the Institute of Biology in Komi, Russia, on a research project on this bird under the supervision of Professor Meneev. The study would be finished by the end of 2003. OMPO would communicate it to the AEWA Secretariat.

138. Mr Olivier then drew the attention of the plenary to a study currently financed by OMPO. The study intended to evaluate the population status of *Lymnocyptes minimus*, including habitat selection and the density of breeding pairs in North-Eastern Russia. OMPO would communicate the results to the AEWA Secretariat at the beginning of 2004.

139. Mr Olivier also mentioned that OMPO had been working on Mallard populations in Eastern Europe and had found a complete shift of the distribution to the East. Results would be published by OMPO towards the end of 2003.

140. Mr Olivier further reported that not enough data was currently available on *Anas acuta* to support an authoritative analysis of Pintail population trends. OMPO supported work on Pintails of Mr Meneev Sr. and Mr Meneev Jr. in Northern Russia.

141. According to Mr Hagemeyer, the working group requested further analysis of these populations in other regions of Europe and Europe as a whole based on the population trend information that Wetlands International would produce in 2003.

142. The Plenary adopted the report/amendments made by Working Group I and included comments in the document.

13b. Review further development of the Agreement by including additional species of wetland birds and species traditionally considered as seabirds

143. Mr Hagemeyer reported that Working Group I had discussed arguments both pro and contra inclusion of additional species such as wetland passerines, raptors and seabirds. A decision was however deferred to the next TC where the issue would be brought up again for the TC to decide based on a discussion paper.

144. On behalf of the working group, Mr Hagemeyer suggested creating a working group discussing the issue on an inter-session basis and reporting back to the TC via a discussion paper. The group would be composed of Mr Zöckler, Mr Biber, Mr Hagemeyer and Mr Lenten.

145. The Plenary adopted the report/amendments made by Working Group I.

13c. Develop guidelines for the interpretation of long-term decline in the context of Table 1 of the Action Plan

146. Mr Hagemeyer reported that Working Group I had discussed this issue only briefly due to the lack of time. The issue had subsequently been deferred to the next TC.

147. Mr Hagemeyer mentioned that Mr Stroud had announced a website with developments in this field from the UK and promised the delegates of the TC to circulate the web-address and the password to access this information. Mr Stroud had suggested that the TC members look at this information and feed back comments using the available web form.

148. Mr Hagemeyer announced the establishment of a working group that would prepare a discussion paper on this topic and present it back to TC. The working group would consist of Mr Clausen and Mr Stroud.

149. The Plenary adopted the report/amendments made by Working Group I.

13d. Provide clarification on the procedures used to delimit bio-geographical populations of waterbirds

150. Mr Hagemeyer reported that Working Group I had identified a need to perform ringing data analyses to assess the accuracy of the currently used delimitations. The current identification of populations in WPE was based on the *Handbook of the Birds of the World*. Similarly, delimitation for ducks in the *Anatidae atlas* was based on that. As a project and in order to address the topicality of the discussion concerning the situation regarding the Pintail and the Mallard, the working group had proposed to focus on these species of duck and to include, in addition, one or more goose and wader species. An analytical tool had to be developed to delimit populations.

151. Mr Clausen presented an interesting example on this subject based on an analysis of recovery of ringed *Anas Crecca*. The wide geographical range of recoveries pointed to a broad-front migration from north-east to south-west as for many song birds is the case. This fact did not support the arbitrary delimitation of small-scale sub-populations.

152. He announced that he and Mr Stroud would select these species and report back to the TC.

153. The Plenary adopted the report/amendments made by Working Group I.

14. Review of the Conservation Guidelines

14a. Guideline on avoidance of introduction of non-native species of Waterbirds (doc. AEWA/ TC 4.16) and the draft of the special brochure on this issue (doc. AEWA/ TC 4.17)

154. This issue had been discussed in Working Group II. The members of the working group had discussed a number of changes and amendments suggested by Mr Wiedmer, who also proposed that CBD terminology be used throughout the document.

155. Mr Wiedmer presented the new draft of doc. AEWA/TC 4.16 to the plenary the following day. He also raised the question of including the topic *awareness raising* in the guidelines.

156. The Plenary agreed to that and adopted the report/amendments made by Working Group II and included comments in the document. The revised document is attached as Annex 3.

157. Mr Zöckler requested to crosscheck the listing of waterbirds (p. 8 of the document) with the CITES Appendix.

158. A discussion on Dutch legislation arose after a contradiction in the document had been found (p.12, para. 2 and p. 13, last para.). The plenary requested the Secretariat to ask for clarification.

159. It was agreed that the Secretariat should complete and revise the document. It should then send out the new draft including the track changes to other Secretariats such as the CBD and CMS Secretariats and ask for their input. After that, it should be sent to the TC delegates within one month.

160. On behalf of the Swiss government, Mr Wiedmer also commented on the draft AEWA brochure on control of non-native species. Switzerland welcomed this brochure but suggested to submit it to a major revision. He criticised that the brochure might be too high-level and too technical for private owners of captive waterbirds, especially concerning the definition of terms and the references to international agreements other than the AEWA. He suggested adding the Egyptian goose (*Alopochen aegyptiacus*) as a further example and reformulating the chapter *what can an owner/breeder do to prevent introductions* from the point of view of an owner/breeder.

161. Mr Stroud proposed to omit the chapter on poison since it contradicted the AEWA Agreement text.
14b. Guideline on national legislation on the protection of waterbirds and their habitat (doc. AEWA/ TC 4.18)

162. The plenary expressed the need for an inter-session working group consisting of Mr Stroud, Mr Lenten and Ms Adams given the large number of changes and amendments proposed. The working group should ensure to arrange the guidelines as user-friendly as possible as well as to adapt the format of the document to those of the other guidelines.

163. Ms Adams promised to send the revised guidelines including track changes to the delegates within the next four weeks for their input and comments. The Secretariat promised to include any further comments. The new draft document is attached as Annex 4.

164. Mr Stroud mentioned that the Ramsar Convention had developed a Handbook on 'Reviewing Laws and Institutions to promote the conservation and wise use of Wetlands. He proposed to create synergies.

165. Ms Kreuzberg pointed out that the main problem was that of harmonising national legislation, which had not been done so far.

166. Mr Biber thanked Ms Adams for taking over this task and requested including the Swiss analysis of the AEWA Conservation guidelines as a case study in the document.

167. Mr Clausen raised concern about the large number of technical details in the document text and wondered whether the states beginning to develop such legislation would not be overwhelmed by the document.

168. Ms Adams supported his concerns.

169. The Chairman pointed out that it was much easier to amend and/or complete existing law than to draft a new law.

170. Ms Adams answered that it was important to use existing law and build smart planning on it.

14c. Draft Guideline on international emergency situations

171. Mr Hagemeyer reported about the development of guidance on the international aspects of emergency situations, one of the outstanding 'conservation guidelines'. He reported that Wetlands International proposed not to draft a new guideline but to amend the existing one on emergency situation by including international aspect in the existing guideline wherever needed. He mentioned some minor changes in substance and spelling. Wetlands International had also added a new aspect to the document: coordination between countries.

172. Mr Lenten asked the delegates for written comments and promised to send out the revised document including track changes to the TC members. Based on their comments, the Secretariat would prepare another draft including the received comments.

173. Mr Lenten asked the plenary for guidance on when AEWA should start responding to international disasters such as oil spills and on the role of the TC in such a case. He further asked what particular value AEWA action could add to national and international efforts.

174. Mr Stroud suggested that AEWA could provide expertise.

175. Mr Biber proposed to develop criteria on how and when AEWA should become active. The results of

this assessment should be included in the guidelines on international emergency situations.

176. Mr Zöckler suggested providing necessary information, e.g. which species exist in the area of concern, to those who act on the spot for rapid assessment and immediate action. The manner in which AEWA should respond to international emergency situations should also become part of the communications strategy.

177. Mr Lenten asked whether AEWA should also become active at national level.

178. Mr Hagemeyer suggested a coordinating role for AEWA, providing means for countries concerned to cooperate effectively. In addition, AEWA could facilitate the mobilisation of expertise, both at the national and the international level.

179. Mr Zöckler added that it was important to consider the action/measures of other international organisations and to look for a niche in which AEWA could add some value. In this case, it could become important to liaise with other international organisations.

15. Development of the Action Plan for the Central Asian-South Asian Flyway

180. In response to the title of this agenda item, 'Central Asian-South Asian Flyway', which differed from names used so far, Mr Hagemeyer reported that an agreement on the name of the flyway had not been reached yet. He suggested that TC members use 'Central Asian Flyway' for the time being, until the Range States had decided on the definitive name to be used. He reported that not very much progress had been made since the TC3 because funds for the project, executed by Wetlands International, had been frozen by the donor in 2002. From 1 January 2003 onwards, funds had again been released to the project. Since then the focus had been on gathering information on the status of wetlands and migratory waterbirds in the Central Asian region. A considerable number of IWC surveys had been performed with support of the project in Central Asian states, Southern Russia and in the Caucasus states. For 2003, the focus would be on elaborating the Action Plan and working towards the identification of an implementation framework. Furthermore, additional fieldwork would be facilitated in January 2004. The project will end in April 2004.

181. A second workshop in the region to finalise and accept the Action Plan by the range states and to decide upon the implementation framework would be needed in 2004, but it was outside the scope of the current project. A follow-up project was foreseen, and the second workshop was tentatively proposed to be held in India towards the end of 2004.

182. With regard to the framework of the Central Asian Flyway, Mr Hagemeyer reported on three options: The Central Asian Flyway could be included in AEWA, concluded as a (stand-alone) agreement under CMS or become a part of the non-legally binding Asian Pacific Migratory Waterbird Conservation Strategy. In first instance it would be up to the region to decide on this. If the AEWA option was preferred, the MOP would have to take a decision on this, too.

183. Mr Lenten added that the leading role was with CMS. AEWA and CMS had agreed that if the countries involved wanted to use a legally binding instrument, the common position of CMS and AEWA was to extend the AEWA Agreement area instead of developing a new agreement in order to avoid substantive overlaps. This option would also save much time and money since AEWA could simply extend its Agreement area as laid down in Annex 1 by decision of the MOP. As a first step, a workshop, as indicated above by Mr Hagemeyer, needed to be organised in order to consult the Range States if they preferred a legally or a non-legally binding agreement.

184. Mr Biber supported the idea of increasing the AEWA range but warned that it might be difficult to develop a communication strategy if the name of the AEWA were to change within two years.

185. Mr Lenten repeated that an extension of the Agreement area would not require a new ratification

procedure. In addition, the name could remain.

186. He agreed that it was necessary to harmonise the use of the name for the new Flyway between the CMS and AEWA Secretariat in order to avoid confusion. He requested the TC to define the new regions and to assess the overlaps in species.

187. Mr Biber suggested leaving the name of the flyway open.

188. Mr Zöckler pointed out that the name and its abbreviation CAF could be confused with the abbreviation CAFF (Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna).

189. Mr Hagemeyer and Mr Zöckler stated their opinion that the Central Asian Flyway was an entity in itself.

190. Mr Biber suggested using the plural version of the word flyway, i.e. 'flyways'. He asked where the border should be in the East.

191. Mr Clausen asked where the western border of the Asian-Pacific Flyway was.

192. Mr Hagemeyer answered that a border had been drawn tentatively as presented in the current version of the Action Plan and that this had been endorsed by the first workshop in Tashkent in 2001. He suggested that defining the eastern border and overlaps with the Asian-Pacific Flyway needed as much deliberation as the western border.

193. Mr Zöckler suggested asking the respective Range States for their opinion.

194. Ms Kreuzberg stressed the need for an analysis of the two different flyways. She reported on a programme on migratory species in that region that had been carried out towards the end of the 1980s. The data collected was still not analysed. She suggested using that data as a base.

195. Mr Hagemeyer and Mr Serebryakov supported her suggestion and stressed the need for an analysis. Mr Hagemeyer reported that this had been one of the outcomes of the Tashkent workshop.

196. On behalf of the TC, Mr Biber summarised that the TC did not see any problems at scientific and technical level to extend the AEWA Area by inclusion of the Central Asian Flyway.

197. However, Mr Zöckler requested that the respective Range State decide independently. He asked the Secretariat to obtain their opinion and to present it to the TC.

198. Mr Lenten agreed to do so and added that another decision on that matter would be taken during the next MOP. The statement of the TC on this matter would be passed on to the Standing Committee.

16. Developments on International Species Action Plans: Draft Action Plan for the Dark-bellied Brent Goose

198. This issue was postponed until the next TC because, already at the beginning of the meeting, a number of key countries expressed that they had not had enough time to study the last draft and/ or had noted that not all their comments had been taken into account in amendment of the previous draft.

17. Role of the TC (Inf. Doc. AEWA/ TC 4.4)

199. Mr Biber commented on Inf. Doc. AEWA/ TC 4.4 that it described the role of the TC with respect to

the evaluation and quality control of AEWA international projects very well. He proposed some minor changes in the text.

200. A lively discussion was held on the question of whether the TC would like to see all projects and project proposals sent to the AEWA Secretariat. It was agreed that the Secretariat should send them via email to the TC members. The TC delegates promised to comment on them within a short time.

201. Mr Zöckler mentioned that the TC would play a reactive role. He asked whether the TC should play an active role within AEWA. He suggested developing a strategy on where the TC wants to see AEWA go.

202. Mr Stroud suggested elaborating the next TC Work Programme within a working group.

203. Ms Adams offered to take the lead in this working group. The participants of the working group are Ms Adams, Christoph Zöckler and Mr Lenten.

18. Role of AEWA in the conservation of the Mesopotamian wetlands in Iraq

204. Mr Hagemeyer had suggested discussing the potential role of AEWA in the interest of reconstructing of the Mesopotamian wetlands in Iraq. He mentioned that this was a good example of an emergency situation, with respect to a very important wetland in the flyways of many migratory species in the AEWA region. He suggested that the TC look at the role of AEWA and assess whether AEWA should become active. He mentioned that both Wetlands International and BirdLife International were involved in discussions about activities to be undertaken in relation to these Iraqi wetlands. Establishing the baseline situation was one of the urgent activities that WI and BLI were interested in.

205. Mr Lenten announced that he wanted to liaise with CMS and with UNEP in order to assess opportunities to be involved in Iraq. He promised to bring the topic on the agenda of the workshop on the Joint Work Programme of CMS, AEWA and Wetlands International on 3 June 2003.

206. Mr Biber requested rapid support for monitoring in Iraq. He suggested forwarding a message on that via UNEP and the General Assembly. He asked whether there was a budget line within AEWA for these kinds of activities.

207. Mr Lenten said that that was not the case.

208. Mr Zöckler proposed to look into the activities of UNEP/DEWA in Geneva and other UN organisations in order to assess how AEWA could complement their activities and to avoid both duplication of efforts and conflict with those organisations.

19. The Conference on Waterbirds Around the World, hosted by Wetlands International in Edinburgh from 3-8 April 2004

209. Mr Hagemeyer shortly introduced the initiative by Wetlands International to organise the Global Flyway Conference in April 2004 in Edinburgh and stressed that the event would be an excellent opportunity for AEWA to provide an overview of its activities, promote its ideas, showcase its successes and present these as a good example of how a legal framework agreement can provide flyway conservation. He suggested developing contributions for the Edinburgh conference, such as an AEWA workshop during the event.

210. Mr Stroud added that the work programme of the conference was still a draft and that it was still possible to influence the contents of the agenda. He proposed to choose a topic that should be promoted during the conference and to develop some ideas to promote it until October 2003.

211. Mr Lenten asked the TC delegates to send their suggestions of topics to the Secretariat, which would collect them and pass them on to Mr Mlingwa, member of the Scientific Committee. He reported that the AEWA Secretariat would be present during the conference with its new exhibition. In addition, an AEWA newsletter on its fifth anniversary would be published. CMS would also be present.

20. Date and venue of the meeting of the Technical Committee

211. On behalf of the UK, Mr Stroud announced that TC 5 was to be held in North Berwick, close to Edinburgh, from 31 March to 2 April 2004, two days before and in conjunction with the Global Flyway Conference.

212. Mr Lenten added that the Secretariat had offered support to the Global Flyway Conference organisers by funding participation in the conference of TC members who would be in Edinburgh anyway for the TC5 meeting.

21. Other business

21a. Report on Capacity Building in Central Asia

213. Ms Kreuzberg held a presentation on capacity building in the region related to CMS and AEWA.

21b. Report on the Meeting on the Aquatic Warbler

214. Mr Lenten reported briefly on the outcome of the meeting on the occasion of the signing of the Aquatic Warbler MOU under CMS that had been held in Minsk, Belarus, from 29 to 30 April 2003. He mentioned that the Secretariat had recently sent out the press release and the concluded MOU to the TC delegates by email. Germany and The Netherlands had suggested including the Aquatic Warbler in the AEWA agreement but had decided not to block the signing of the MOU. The Aquatic Warbler is one of the species included in the group of wetland dependant birds that is considered for future inclusion in AEWA.

215. On behalf of the German government, Mr Biber read a German comment to doc. AEWA/ TC 4.6 (Overview of instructions from MOP 2 to the TC). With regard to Res. 2.1, para. 6, the German government was of the opinion that the AEWA and its Action Plan would provide enough instruments for both waterbirds and birds that were dependent on wetlands. The German government suggested including the Aquatic Warbler on the AEWA Appendix and therefore substituting the CMS MOU on the Aquatic Warbler that had recently been concluded in Minsk, Belarus. After inclusion of the species in Annex 2 of AEWA the Action Plan attached to the MOU could be treated as an international species Action Plan under AEWA.

216. Mr Hagemeyer asked how AEWA related to the concluded MOU on the Aquatic Warbler.

217. Mr Lenten responded that a MOU was soft law merely committing the Signatories to voluntary action. The Action Plan attached to the concluded MOU would be taken over by AEWA in case of inclusion of the Aquatic Warbler in the species group under AEWA.

21.c Call for suggestions for agenda items to be discussed at the forthcoming Specialist Group meeting of Wetlands International, end of May 2003 in Wageningen, The Netherlands

218. Mr Hagemeyer announced that a meeting of the Wetlands International / IUCN Specialist Groups would be held in Wageningen, The Netherlands, at the end of May. TC delegates could forward any issues

for the meeting to him.

21d. CIC general assembly and a proposed resolution of non-toxic shot

219. In relation to the item, tabled by Mr Hagemeyer, on the CIC general assembly and a resolution on non-toxic shot, Mr Lenten reported that the EU planned a general ban on the use of lead shot. In reaction on this the CIC would propose a resolution for banning lead shot in wetlands only.

21e. Miscellaneous

220. Mr Serebryakov thanked Mr Olivier for organising an OMPO workshop on population status and management of migratory waterbird populations in Central and Eastern Europe in the Ukraine on behalf of the delegates of certain Eastern European countries that had attended the workshop.

221. Mr Lenten also asked whether the delegates accepted the idea of splitting the TC meeting in working groups. Ms Adams preferred to discuss issues in plenary. Mr Serebryakov stated that the Secretariat should be flexible in planning. The Meeting generally appreciated working in group dealing mainly with technical and scientific issues.

22. Closure

222. The Executive Secretary thanked the government of Uzbekistan for the impressive support, for hosting the meeting and organising the excellent excursion on the Sunday. He handed over some small gifts to the representative of the Government.

223. The Chairman thanked all the delegates for their cooperation and contributions as well as the Secretariat for having organised and financially supported the TC meeting.

ANNEXE 1: (StC/ Inf. 1.4)

OPENING REMARKS BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE STATE COMMITTEE FOR NATURE PROTECTION OF THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN AT THE OFFICIAL OPENING OF THE FORTH TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING OF THE AFRICAN-EURASIAN MIGRATORY WATERBIRD AGREEMENT (AEWA)

Date: 12 May 2003, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is a great honor for me to welcome the members of the Technical Committee of AEWÀ on ancient Uzbek land, a territory with world cultural - historical values and unique natural resources. In 2001 the Workshop towards an Action Plan for the Central Asian Flyway was already held in Uzbekistan. The participants of this meeting have supported the idea of cooperation and interaction in the field of water birds protection. Therefore we can consider that the meeting of AEWÀ Technical Committee in Uzbekistan is a logic continuation of accepted initiatives.

Some days back the Assembly of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development took place in Tashkent, in which thousand visitors from many countries of the world - representatives of the largest banks, business structures have taken part. The President of Uzbekistan submitted to this Assembly the new investment policy of Uzbekistan, which is focussing on strengthening the international cooperation and promoting integration of Uzbekistan in World economy. The protection of biodiversity in regional and global aspect were mentioned both questions of ecological safety and expertise. It is a guarantee of steady economic development of Uzbekistan as open legal and democratic state with a high level of international cooperation in all spheres of activity.

Uzbekistan constantly improves the legislation with regards to nature protection.

By signing of the CBD in 1995 Uzbekistan declared the responsibility for protection of national biological resources. The further steps in this direction were:

1. Signing by Republic of Uzbekistan in 1997 of CITES Convention);
2. Signing in 1998 of the CMS Convention);
3. Signing in 2001 of the Ramsar Convention).

In frameworks of the CMS convention the following international agreements were signed:

" The Memorandums of Understanding concerning Conservation Measures for the Slender-billed Curlew and for the Siberian Crane.

Besides Uzbekistan participates in preparation of the new international agreements on protection Houbara bustard, falcons etc.).

We strongly hope to sign the AEWÀ this year.

One of significant events recently was the publication of the new edition of the Red book of Uzbekistan (2003), in which for the first time species were classified according to internationally accepted categories and criteria of IUCN. It is necessary to notice, that 26 species of water birds are included in this edition.

Let me present the Red Book of the Republic of Uzbekistan to the Secretariat of AEWÀ.

I would like to wish all members of Technical committee a successful and fruitful job, strong health and well being of their families. I am sure, that the meeting of Technical Committee will stimulate activity on preservation of migratory water birds and their habitats in the Central Asian region.

Thank you for your attention.

Mr. Kalilulla Sherimbetov

Acting Chairman of the State Committee for Nature Protection.

ANNEX 5: (StC/ Inf. 1.4)

LIST OF ACTION POINTS

Topic	What to do	Who	Deadline¹
Minutes of the 3 rd TC Meeting.	To send the revised version including the track changes and comments to the delegates and afterwards to prepare the final version.	Secretariat	
AEWA guidelines	To publish the Conservation Guidelines on the the AEWA website	Secretariat	
GROMS	To seek information from CMS and Dr Klaus Riede on future development of GROMS To pass any information on CMS's plans for GROMS on to the TC members	WG GROMS Secretariat	
Dark-bellied Brent Goose Management Plan	To organise a meeting of the D-b Brent Goose Working Group to review the comments received and when necessary to amend the text of the 5 th draft. To submit the revised version for comments to the TC members and depending on the outcome of this to submit the final draft to the StC for adoption.	Secretariat	1 November 2003
GEF Flyway Project	To send a letter to the Ramsar Bureau expressing the concerns of the TC regarding the level of involvement of the Ramsar Bureau in the GEF project.	Secretariat	
IIP 2003 – 2007	To establish a Working Group to set criteria for inclusion of new project in future IIPs and to assess priorities among the project of IIP 2003-2007 for which no funds have been earmarked yet.	TC	
IIP project 19: Ringing recoveries analysis for the Agreement Area.	To request the proponent to revised the project proposal taking into account the recommendation given by the TC. To submit the revised proposal to the TC members with the request to provide comments/ remarks for a given deadline.	Secretariat TC	
IIP project 21: Coordination of ringing schemes in Africa	To request the proponent to revised the project proposal taking into account the recommendation given by the TC. To submit the revised proposal to the TC members with the request to provide comments/ remarks for a given deadline	Secretariat TC	1 August 2003
Acceptance of project proposals	To develop criteria and guidelines for the acceptance of proposals for project to be funded by AEWA.	WG: OB, DS, WH, BL	

¹ Deadlines mentioned here are set by the Secretariat. In case no deadline is indicated the activity should take place as soon as possible.

Topic	What to do	Who	Deadline
Communication Strategy	To request the proponent to revised the project proposal taking into account the recommendation given by the TC. To submit the revised proposal to the TC members with the request to provide comments/ remarks for a given deadline	Secretariat TC	
Report on status and trends of populations for MOP 3	To discuss and enhance the analytical content of the summary and detailed publication To develop a proposal for such content and to submit it to the TC members	WG: DS, CZ, WH	1 February 2004
Further development of AEWA	To review further development of the Agreement by including additional species of wetlands birds and species traditionally considered being seabirds. To draft a discussion paper for the next TC meeting.	WG: CZ, OB, WH, BL	1 February 2004
Interpretation of the term long-term decline.	To develop a discussion paper on the interpretation of long-term decline in the context of Table 1 of the AEWA Action Plan and to present this at TC5. A website with developments in this field from the UK would be circulated to the TC members with the request to give some feedback using the available web-form.	PC; DS DS	1 February 2004
Delimitation of bio-geographical population of waterbirds.	To develop an analytical tool to delimit bio-geographical populations of Pintail, Mallard and one or two Goose and Wader Species and to report back to TC5.	PC, DS	1 February 2004
Guideline on avoidance of introduction of non-native species of Waterbirds	To complete and revise doc. AEWA/TC 4.16 (including CBD terminology; new topic: awareness raising; cross-checking the listing of waterbirds (p. 8) with CITES Appendix; clarify Dutch legislation (p.12, para. 2 & p.13, last para.) To send the new draft including track changes to other Secretariats and ask for their input.	Secretariat	Following month
Draft of the special brochure on this issue (doc. AEWA/ TC 4.17)	To submit the brochure to a major revision (including the Egyptian goose (<i>Alopochen aegyptiacus</i>) as a further example and to reformulating the chapter <i>what can an owner/breeder do to prevent introductions?</i> from the point of view of an owner/breeder; leaving out the chapter on poison.	Secretariat	
Guideline on national legislation.	To revise the Guideline on national legislation on the protection of waterbirds and their habitats (doc. AEWA/ TC 4.18). To ensure that this guideline will be user friendly and to adapt the format of the documents to those of the other guidelines. To include the Swiss analysis of the AEWA guidelines as case study. To submit the the revised guidelines to the TC members for comments.	DS, BL, RA	1 February 2004

Topic	What to do	Who	Deadline²
Draft Guideline on international emergency situations	To submit the revised version of the draft Conservation Guideline on international emergency situations to the TC members with the request to provide comments/ remarks. Based on comments/ remark received by then a new draft would be prepared.	Secretariat	
Role of the TC	To send all projects and project proposals received by the AEWA Secretariat to the TC members by e-mail. To comment on them within a short time To develop a strategy on the future of AEWA To elaborate the next TC Work Programme	Secretariat TC members TC RA, BL, CZ	
Mesopotamian wetlands in Iraq	To guide the role of AEWA and assess the question if AEWA should become active To liase with CMS and with UNEP in order to assess opportunities to be involved in Iraq and to prepare a report on the activities of UNEP/ DEWA and other UN organisations in Iraq.	TC Secretariat	
The Conference on Waterbirds Around the World	To develop an AEWA contribution e.g. workshop on special issue for the Conference and to send suggestion on topics for the agenda to the Secretariat. To collect suggestion and to pass them on to Charles Mlingwa.	TC Secretariat	Until October 2003

² Deadlines mentioned here are set by the Secretariat. In case no deadline is indicated the activity should take place as soon as possible.