



---

**REPORT OF THE 10<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF THE AEW A TECHNICAL COMMITTEE<sup>1</sup>**  
*12 – 16 September 2011, Naivasha, Kenya*

**Contents**

Agenda item 1. Opening.....	2
Agenda item 2. Welcome address.....	2
Agenda item 3. Adoption of the Agenda and Work Programme.....	2
Agenda item 4. Admission of Observers.....	2
Agenda item 5. Adoption of the Minutes of the 9 <sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Technical Committee.....	3
Agenda item 6. Report by the Chair.....	3
Agenda item 7. Reports by the National Representatives.....	3
7. 1 Northern Africa.....	4
7. 2 Western Africa.....	6
7. 3 Southwestern Africa.....	6
7. 4 Eastern Africa.....	7
7. 5 North and Southwestern Europe.....	8
7. 6 Central Europe.....	8
Agenda item 8. Report of the Secretariat.....	9
Agenda item 9. Intersessional Process regarding the Future Shape of CMS and the CMS Working Group on Flyways.....	11
9.1 Future Shape of CMS.....	11
9.2 CMS Working Group on Flyways.....	11
Additional Agenda item: Demonstration of the newly developed CMS Reporting System.....	12
Agenda item 10. AEW A International Reviews (as per paragraph 7.4 of the AEW A Action Plan).....	12
Agenda item 11. AEW A Single Species Action Plans (SSAPs) and Species Management Plan (SMP)....	13
Agenda item 12. Other plans, reviews and guidelines.....	16
Agenda items 13. - 15. Concurrent workshops of TC Working Groups 1-8 (excl. WG7)	
Agenda item 16. Recapitulation of workshops of TC Working Groups 1-8 (excl. WG 7).....	18
Agenda item 17. TC Working Group 9 (Extractive industries).....	23
Agenda item 18. TC Working Group 10 (Emerging Issues).....	24
Agenda item 19. TC Working Group 7 (International Implementation Tasks [IIT]).....	25
Agenda item 20. Other draft resolutions for MOP5.....	26
Agenda item 21. Date and venue of the next Technical Committee meeting.....	27
Agenda item 22. Any other business.....	27
Agenda item 23. Closure.....	27
<b>Annex I</b> Final List of TC10 Participants.....	29
<b>Annex II</b> Background document on the proposal by Sweden for amendment of the LwfG SSAP, summarising the comments and recommendations by the TC.....	34
<b>Annex III</b> Communication to the CMS intersessional Working Group on taxonomy regarding taxonomic classification in the case of AEW A.....	37
<b>Annex IV</b> List of TC10 decisions and actions.....	40

---

<sup>1</sup> Adopted after consultation by the Technical Committee, via the TC Workspace, in August 2012.

## **Agenda item 1. Opening**

1. On behalf of the Technical Committee (TC), the Chair, Ms Jelena Kralj welcomed the participants to the Kenya Wildlife Service Training Institute in Naivasha and expressed her deep gratitude to the Government of Kenya, the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) and to Professor George Owiti, Principal of the Kenya Wildlife Service Training Institute (KWSTI), for hosting this meeting. She went on to welcome Mr Marco Barbieri, Acting Executive Secretary of the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat and the Secretariat Team as well as the TC Members and Observers, particularly those attending a meeting of this committee for the first time.

2. Ms Kralj underlined the importance of this meeting as it was the last meeting of the Technical Committee before the 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Parties to AEWA (MOP5) in La Rochelle, France in May 2012 and a significant number of documents, resolutions and recommendations would have to be prepared for endorsement by the 7<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the AEWA Standing Committee in Bergen, Norway in November 2011 and subsequently for MOP5 in May 2012. Many of those present had been working hard on the numerous tasks given to the TC by MOP4 intersessionally and six Regional Representatives would be stepping down at the end of the present term of service.

3. Professor George Owiti welcomed all those present to the KWSTI on behalf of the Director and the staff of the Institute and expressed his pleasure at being able to host this meeting. He went on to explain that the KWSTI in Naivasha is one of two KWS Training Institutions, where the focus is very much on the importance of ecological integrity. He stressed Kenya's leading role in wildlife conservation, including the implementation of measures towards the protection of migratory waterbirds. He finished by wishing all the participants an enjoyable visit to the Lake Nakuru National Park and a pleasant stay at the Institute. He declared the meeting officially open.

## **Agenda item 2. Welcome addresses**

4. Mr Marco Barbieri thanked the Chair and Professor Owiti and went on to welcome all those present to Kenya on behalf of the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat, particularly in the light of the TC meeting which had been scheduled to take place in Naivasha in 2007 and had to be cancelled because of security concerns. As a newcomer, Mr Barbieri was extremely impressed by the workload dealt with by the TC and its effectiveness as an advisory body to the Agreement. He thanked the hosts for the warm welcome, congratulating them on the excellent facilities at the Institute and acknowledging the beauty of the surroundings. He looked forward to a productive meeting.

There were no further addresses.

## **Agenda item 3. Adoption of the Agenda and Work Programme**

5. Ms Kralj introduced document TC 10.2 Rev. 2 *Provisional Annotated Agenda* and Doc TC 10.3 Rev. 2 *Provisional Work Programme*. She suggested moving Agenda item 20. *Other draft resolutions for MOP5* from Friday to Monday afternoon, to give delegates sufficient time to consider the issues addressed. An additional Agenda item was proposed; if time allowed, Mr Dereliev would give a short demonstration of the newly developed Online Reporting System, which was in the last stages of preparation before being launched for the very first time for the AEWA MOP5 reporting cycle.

*Decision: The Meeting adopted the Agenda and Work Programme with the above-mentioned amendment and addition.*

## **Agenda item 4. Admission of Observers**

*Decision: The Meeting agreed to admit the Observers present (see Annex I - document TC Inf. 10.2 Final List of Participants) and welcomed them to the meeting.*

## **Agenda item 5. Adoption of the Minutes of the 9th Meeting of the Technical Committee**

6. Ms Kralj introduced document TC 10.4 *Draft Minutes of the 9<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Technical Committee*. She explained that the TC9 Draft Minutes had been available on the Technical Committee Workspace (TCWS) for the last two years and all comments received had been incorporated in the current version. She suggested that, in future, it would be more effective, if the Secretariat could finalise the minutes within a couple of months after the meeting.

7. The Meeting felt that outcomes, in form of decisions and action points were important for the intersessional work of the committee and should be easily accessible, i.e. in a separate document whereas the minutes should contain all the issues expressed and addressed, however in a slightly more compact form than those of TC9.

8. Mr Stroud raised a point in connection with the TC regional representation and the European Union (EU). Geographically, the EU Member States occur in the areas of four of the regional representatives but the EU is not noted as being a Contracting Party in Annex 1 to the Modus Operandi. The question which of the regional representatives is responsible for representing the EU should be clarified.

*Action:*                *The issue of which of the regional representatives is responsible for representing the EU within the TC should be brought forward to the StC and MOP.*

*Decisions:*        -        *The Chair summarised that, in future, the minutes should be comprehensive but shorter and that decisions and action points should be clearly indicated both in the main document and as an annex to the main document. The draft minutes would be made available on the TCWS six weeks after the meeting and the TC would be given a further six weeks to submit any comments; the Secretariat would adjust the minutes accordingly and finalise them. The final minutes would be posted on the TCWS and on the AEWA website ca. four months after the meeting.*

-        *The Meeting adopted the Minutes of the 9th Meeting of the Technical Committee.*

## **Agenda item 6. Report by the Chair**

9. Ms Kralj reported on the activities of the Technical Committee since April 2009, which can also be followed up on the TCWS. She had been in close communication with the Secretariat on various issues related to the work of the TC. She had attended the AEWA 15th Anniversary Symposium in The Hague, the Netherlands, 14 – 15 June 2010. She had also attended the subsequent 6th meeting of the AEWA Standing Committee and 16th meeting of the CMS Scientific Council held in Bonn in June 2010. The most relevant items discussed were global bird flyways (to be discussed under the Agenda item 9 of the current meeting) and taxonomy and nomenclature of bird species (Doc TC 10.35).

10. Ms Kralj represents the AEWA TC in the CMS Flyways Working Group, which is an open-ended working group set up at COP9 within the framework of the CMS Scientific Council. The task of the group is to review scientific and technical issues for the conservation of migratory birds and their habitats and relevant international instruments, as the basis for future CMS policy on flyways, and thus also contributes to the work of the CMS Future Shape Working Group. She took part in the preparations for three reviews and attended the first meeting of the Flyways Working Group held in February 2011 in Edinburgh, which was also attended by several TC members, enabling an ad hoc meeting on the progress of ongoing TC tasks. Ms Kralj leads TC Working Group 8 on Conservation Guidelines.

## **Agenda item 7. Reports by the Regional Representatives**

11. The Chair introduced this Agenda item, requesting the TC Regional Representatives to report on the implementation of AEWA in their respective regions.

## 7.1 Northern Africa

12. Mr Azafzaf reported on the implementation of AEWA in the Northern Africa region.

### Number of Contracting Parties in the region:

13. The Northern Africa region of AEWA consists of seven countries namely Algeria, Madeira (Portugal), Canaries (Spain), Egypt, Libya, Morocco and Tunisia. To date, six of these countries namely Algeria, Madeira (Portugal), Canaries (Spain), Egypt, Libya and Tunisia have ratified or acceded to AEWA. Morocco signed the Agreement, but has not ratified it yet.

### Activities to implement the Single Species Action Plans relevant to the region:

14. The majority of the Northern African countries monitor migratory waterbirds. In most of these countries, particularly globally threatened and Near Threatened species are monitored, such as White-headed Duck *Oxyura leucocephala*, Ferruginous Duck *Aythya nyroca*, Black-tailed Godwit *Limosa limosa*, Eurasian Spoonbill *Platalea leucorodia* and Northern Bald Ibis *Geronticus eremita*.

In Tunisia legal protection for these species (and other waterbird species) is provided through the annual hunting decree.

In Algeria and Tunisia legal protection of most of the key sites for White-headed Duck, Ferruginous Duck, Eurasian Spoonbill and Black-tailed Godwit was maintained during the reporting period. The same is the case for the Northern Bald Ibis colonies in Morocco.

In some cases, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) in the region have started to draft national species action plans to be presented to national authorities and stakeholders for discussion (Tunisia: White-headed Duck and Marbled Teal *Marmaronetta angustirostris*).

### Emergency situations that have happened and affected waterbirds and/or their habitats and response to them:

15. Emergency situations were reported from Tunisia, Egypt and Libya related to social and political unrest during the Arab Spring Revolution starting in January 2011 and which are still impacting on key habitats and bird populations. Actions taken with regard to threats: in Tunisia the national BirdLife Partner in collaboration with other NGOs established a national network for rapid detection of new threats which aims to enable timely action by authorities and civil society. There is currently no information available for Egypt and Libya.

### Activities on eradication or other types of action regarding alien species:

The occurrence of alien waterbird species is generally insignificant in the whole region. However, during site and species monitoring, special attention is paid to the potential presence of the Ruddy Duck *Oxyura jamaicensis*.

### New or major ongoing activities on habitat (site) inventory, conservation or restoration and rehabilitation of waterbird habitats:

The most recent and important work in this field is the identification of key wetlands and the establishment of a wetlands inventory for Libya. This project is carried out by the Environment General Authority (EGA) of Libya and the Regional Activities Centre for Specially Protected Areas (UNEP/MAP-RAC/SPA), in collaboration with a team of international experts (Tunisia, Italy, France, Malta and the UK) and with financial support from several donors. Resulting from this work, the publication of an Atlas of Libya's wintering waterbirds is actually ongoing.

13. The majority of the Northern Africa countries are involved in the partnership network, the Mediterranean Wetlands Observatory. The Observatory was initiated by Tour du Valat at the sixth meeting of the MedWet Committee<sup>2</sup> in 2004. The aim of the Observatory is to become a major regional tool for the long-term assessment of the conservation status and trends of wetlands in the Mediterranean wetlands.

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.medwet.org>

14. All countries in the region participated in the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) Mediterranean Hotspot Ecosystem profiling process in 2010 and 2011 and the development of CEPF's investment strategy in the region. During the process, four strategic directions were identified, among which two include action relating to wetlands in Northern Africa: promoting civil society involvement in Integrated Coastal Zone Management to minimise the negative effects of coastal development in the Cyrenaican Peninsula and Mountains, Plateaus and Wetlands of Algerian Tell and Tunisia corridors and establish the sustainable management of water catchments and the wise use of water resources in the Atlas Mountains corridor.

New or major ongoing research and monitoring activities on waterbirds and waterbird habitats:

15. Most countries (Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Libya and Egypt) reported mid-winter waterbird counts (IWC) and monitoring of waterbird species in SPAs and IBAs.

Lesser Crested Tern (*Sterna bengalensis*) breeding colonies were monitored in Libya (2009 and 2010) and in Egypt (2009). During the surveys in Libya (which already started in 2006) about 500 nestlings were colour-ringed and since 2010 observation data for these birds are reported. These surveys were continued in the framework of a PhD and completed by genetic research comparing the most important breeding populations in Libya and Egypt.

In 2009 a full census of breeding White Storks (*Ciconia ciconia*) was carried out in Tunisia.

Intensive monitoring of waterbird populations (wintering and breeding) at selected key sites was reported by Tunisia (wetlands of the Cape Bon, Ichkeul National Park, Salines de Thyna and desert wetlands in South Tunisia).

In November/December 2010, a survey of wintering Eurasian Spoonbill (*Platalea leucorodia*) was carried out in Tunisia in collaboration between the Hungarian Spoonbill Colour Ringing Project and Association "Les Amis des Oiseaux" (AAO), the BirdLife International Partner in Tunisia. This survey aimed to underpin the importance of the area for Eurasian Spoonbills and the need for much more detailed surveys in future.

In the framework of the international search for the Slender-billed Curlew (*Numenius tenuirostris*) in 2010 and 2011, three countries reported specific surveys on the species: Tunisia (January 2010), Libya (January/February 2010) and Morocco (February 2011). These surveys allowed monitoring of an important number of wetlands, including those not regularly visited.

In Libya, the programme of monitoring wintering waterbirds allowed to identify new major waterbird habitats: Ajdabia Sewage Farm, Sebkhet Um Elgendil and Sebkhet Asouihat.

A first training course on waterbirds and waterbird census was organised in November 2008 in Benghazi (Libya). Government and NGO representatives from five Northern Africa countries (Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Libya and Egypt) and Syria participated in the training. The course was organised by RAC/SPA, EGA and the Conservatoire du Littoral (France).

Tunisia reported the preparation for the designation of a further 20 Ramsar sites.

New or major ongoing education and information activities on waterbirds, waterbird habitats and the Agreement:

16. The Slender-billed Curlew identification leaflet "A toolkit for finding Slender-billed Curlews" initially published in English, was translated into French and Arabic and widely disseminated in the region. An information and awareness-raising day on the Slender-billed Curlew and wetlands in Tunisia was organised by the BirdLife Partner Association "Les Amis des Oiseaux" (AAO) on 12 December 2009 in Tunis.

Libya reported broadcasting several radio and TV programmes on conservation of wetlands and waterbirds.

Several countries organised events specific to waterbirds and wetlands during World Migratory Bird Day in 2009 (Egypt, Libya, Morocco, Tunisia), 2010 (Morocco and Egypt) and 2011 (Egypt).

Equally, World Wetlands Day was celebrated by several countries during this reporting period.

Problematic cases threatening waterbirds or their habitats:

17. A potential threat to migratory waterbirds is emerging in Tunisia with plans to enhance the use of wind energy.

Tunisia reported damages to the floodgate of Lake Ichkeul in February 2011. The resulting lower water levels are likely to impact on the productivity of the lake and its capacity to host wintering waterbirds in winter 2011/2012.

Illegal waterbird hunting is increasing in the eastern part of Libya.

In the majority of the countries legislation for the protection of waterbirds and their habitats exists, but weak law enforcement is compromising conservation efforts. In Tunisia, the situation has worsened since the unrest of spring 2011 and the almost total lack of authority. This is probably also the case in Egypt and Libya.

## **7.2 Western Africa**

18. Mr Mshelbwala regretted not being able to report for his region due to institutional changes and a heavy workload. He explained that he would have to step down as regional representative for Western Africa as he was no longer in a position to fulfil the role.

The Chair took note of this and expressed her sympathy for his position, while thanking him for all his past efforts.

## **7.3 Southwestern Asia**

19. Mr Jaradi reported that in the Southwestern Asian region, the number of Contracting Parties to AEWA has not increased since the last TC meeting, the Contracting Parties in the region are Lebanon, Syrian Arab Republic, Jordan, Israel, Uzbekistan and Cyprus. Information on the implementation of AEWA is easier to come by from Jordan and the Syrian Arab Republic as the respective Focal Points are responsible for other Agreements or Conventions and more frequently take part in workshops and events than the other countries.

20. In the Syrian Arab Republic, interest in ornithology grew after the re-discovery of the colony of Northern Bald Ibises, a matter which encouraged the Syrian Arab Republic to produce the first bird book for Syrian birds. Jordan and Lebanon regularly update their annotated lists of birds, mainly through published papers in the journal *Sandgrouse* published by the Ornithological Society of the Middle East (OSME). All the Contracting Parties to AEWA in the Southwestern Asia region are also Contracting Parties to Ramsar, CBD, CITES and CMS, except for Lebanon, which has not ratified CITES and CMS to date. Mr Jaradi is currently preparing a document, elaborating the most important reasons for accessing CITES and CMS, on request of the Lebanese Government. Also it is worth noting that Lebanon's Ministry of Environment profited from the species lists of AEWA to prosecute some illegal hunters of waterbirds.

21. The updated hunting Law of Lebanon resembles the law of 1952 but it offers synergies with the draft framework law on protected areas as well as the draft law on "Access and Benefit Sharing" and recognises the heritage value of wild fauna as well as advocating measures to ensure sustainability, in line with the objectives of the EU Birds Directive. For example, the new law prohibits hunting and trapping of internationally threatened bird species (including the species listed by AEWA) and all species during spring migration, as well as the breeding and nesting seasons. Important application decrees are still missing including a decree on mandatory insurance for hunters (not drafted yet) and a decree to establish formal hunting schools (drafted but awaits approval by the next ministerial council). In Jordan and the Syrian Arab Republic, there is a need to update the hunting laws especially with respect to bird-taking methods as these laws are not stringent enough.

22. Cyprus, the Syrian Arab Republic, Jordan and Lebanon have not yet developed a national red data book for species occurring in their countries; research has been conducted by the National Council for Scientific Research since 2010. The introduction of waterbird species is not a priority in Jordan, the Syrian Arab Republic and Lebanon.

23. In addition to the SSAP of the Northern Bald Ibis which was being tracked and monitored in the Syrian Arab Republic, another SSAP is being given attention – that for the Sociable Lapwing *Vanellus gregarius* which appears to be a migrant in the Syrian Arab Republic and an occasional guest in Lebanon and Jordan.

24. Finally, the regional project “mainstreaming conservation of migratory soaring birds into key productive sectors along the Rift Valley/Red Sea flyway” is ongoing and produced application decisions to the Law of hunting in Lebanon, highlighted the social and economic values of birds in the region. It appears that the social values play an important role in the conservation of birds whether the latter are raptors, soaring birds or waterbirds.

#### **7.4 Eastern Africa**

25. Mr Oliver Nasirwa reported that the Eastern Africa region of AEWA now consists of ten countries and territories namely Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, Sudan, South Sudan, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Réunion (territory of France) and Mayotte (territory of France). To date, since the last report, the number of Contracting Parties has increased from six to seven. Contracting Parties are now: Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Sudan, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Réunion and Mayotte (French territories). Ethiopia is the new Contracting Party. The two countries yet to accede are Eritrea and Somalia. The other development to note is the addition of the new country of South Sudan as a Range State.

26. Despite contact with the AEWA Technical Focal Points for Eastern Africa on the official AEWA workspace, no feedback was received for the purposes of this report.

27. The National Lesser Flamingo Single Species Action Plans (SSAP) for Tanzania and Kenya have been drafted but the documents have not yet been published. The International SSAP for the Madagascar Pond Heron to which some Eastern Africa countries are Range States has been completed and published. Initiatives to develop an International SSAP on the Shoebill *Balaeniceps rex* are ongoing.

28. Drought has been a problem in the region causing rivers to dry and wetland habitat to shrink. There is increased conflict between agricultural communities and pastoralists mainly over water and grazing areas.

29. There is pressure from the private sector pushing to invest on energy and agriculture developments i.e. biofuel and sugarcane, including oil and gas exploration. Most of the areas attracting these developments are wetlands, i.e. migratory waterbird habitats. Water seems to be the most critical element that is driving these companies to prospect near and around wetland areas. The construction of dams and wind turbines is also still being planned with some in areas critical to migratory waterbirds.

30. Misuse of pesticides to directly kill migratory waterbirds and other wildlife to resolve human-wildlife conflict is still reported from the region. *Furadan* was withdrawn from the Kenyan market, but there are reports that a substance similar to it is being brought in from unknown sources through neighbouring countries.

31. Threatened sites for migratory waterbirds are wetlands on the River Nile (oil exploration), Lake Natron (soda mining), Tana Delta (biofuel and commercial agriculture), Lake Naivasha, Yala Swamp (commercial agriculture) and Lake Turkana (Damming of River Omo).

32. Inventories and waterbird monitoring: this work has been mainly ongoing under the African Waterbird Census and Important Bird Area programmes.

Waterbird species re-establishment, reintroductions or supplementation as well as habitat restoration and rehabilitation have not been reported in the region. Also no progress has been reported in the steps to phase out the use of lead shot for hunting in wetlands.

## 7.5 North and Southwestern Europe

33. Mr Stroud reported on developments in the region since 2008, noting that most of the Contracting Parties within the region are also EU Member States, so EU policy heavily dominates aspects of implementation of AEWA in this region.

34. One key issue is that of the further classification of Special Protection Areas (SPA), where progress had been made in the last two years. A new development under the EU Birds Directive, in cooperation with BirdLife International, is the development of a new and revised system of reporting not only national population sizes and trends, but which will also give a better understanding of the content of national networks of SPAs. This new reporting process is based on a six-year cycle and the next report is due in 2014. The impact of transport infrastructure on protected sites is an ongoing problem although the economic crisis is limiting this to some extent. A recent joint report published by the European Environment Agency (EEA) and the Swiss Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN) on landscape fragmentation in Europe stresses the potentially serious consequences for flora and fauna across the continent.

35. A dominant influence on the status of many waterbirds is the impact of the EU Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) which is currently being revised and will hopefully have beneficial implications for a number of breeding waterbirds currently being impacted by the intensification of agriculture throughout Europe. Lead continues to be a major issue where a clear policy line from the European Commission is still pending. Regarding the Ruddy Duck, the most recent trend in the UK indicates an almost complete eradication of this alien invasive species. Trends in other European countries were however on the increase; the Sacred Ibis *Threskiornis aethiopicus* is also a species which was highlighted at MOP4 in this context.

36. With regard to climate change, a major UK study is to be published soon which deals with the impacts of climate change in connection with various scenarios due to distributional shifts and implications for protected site networks. The results of this study are worrying and clearly show that there is an urgent need for a wider assessment and guidance to Contracting Parties on this issue. The current public debt crisis and resulting major implications on government expenditure also have an indirect impact on waterbird conservation; many countries have been finding it difficult to maintain basic conservation programmes in this situation.

37. One example of good practice in an emergency situation was during the extreme cold weather last winter in the UK and other countries when waterbird shooting was suspended. This serves as a good example of how to address an emergency situation which should be shared with other Contracting Parties.

38. Positive reports on implementation in the region included the efforts in many countries to implement SSAPs, the considerable work on the Ruddy Ducks in the UK and that Canada is striving to maintain monitoring activities despite considerable budget cuts.

## 7.6 Central Europe

39. Ms Kralj reported on the implementation of the Agreement in Central Europe. The region of Central Europe consists of 18 Range States, ten of which are Contracting Parties. Nine countries responded, two of them being non-Contracting Parties (n-CP): the Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia, Italy, Romania, Slovenia, Croatia, Poland (n-CP) and Serbia (n-CP).

40. Activities to implement the Single Species Action Plans were mostly reported from the EU Member States (the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, and Italy). Activities include agri-environmental schemes, paying compensations, restoration of hydrological regime and restoration of wetland habitats, monitoring activities and ringing or colour-ringing projects. Several countries reported the classification of new Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and identification of Important Bird Areas (IBAs), or the protection of other waterbird habitats, including Ramsar Sites and production of site inventories.

41. As for the emergency situations, the extreme weather conditions (extremely wet spring 2010 and extremely dry spring 2011) were unfavourable for breeding waterbirds in some parts of the region (especially herons, storks and Eurasian Spoonbill). Floods in 2010 destroyed broods in heron breeding colonies as well

as in stork nests. The red sludge spills in early October 2010 had disastrous effects on riparian meadows and bogs along the Torna and Marcal rivers, and had a long-lasting impact on the water quality of these rivers and even, for a shorter time, the river Danube. However, the impact was not noticeable on waterbird populations, as the Torna and Marcal rivers do not play an important role for waterbirds, and the impact was fairly minimal on the river Danube.

42. Following the unsuccessful White-headed Duck reintroduction project in Italy (1998 to 2006), a workshop was held in June 2010. It was agreed to start the new reintroduction project, with the cooperation of Spanish ornithologists. The only activity on eradication has been reported from Hungary, where the keeping of Ruddy Duck *Oxyura jamaicensis* has been prohibited since 1 July 2010.

43. A legal ban on the use of lead shot for hunting waterfowl in wetlands was introduced in May 2010 in Croatia and at the beginning of 2011 in the Czech Republic. However, it still has to be widely implemented. The legislative provisions were adopted by the new hunting law in Slovakia, but the force of the provision on phasing out the use of lead shot for hunting in wetlands has been postponed until 1 January 2015. That issue was discussed in Poland, although no legislation provision is presently in power. In Slovenia, the study on the effect of lead shot is planned. Italy intends to launch a national campaign against the use of lead ammunitions in all terrestrial and aquatic habitats.

44. There were no specific education and information activities related to the Agreement itself, but various activities related to waterbirds were reported from all over the region, including ornithological camps in important wetland sites, an education programme for school children, “bird fair”, etc. World Migratory Bird Day was celebrated in several countries, including some non-Parties (such as Greece).

45. The use of AEWA Guidelines was reported from Hungary where bird monitoring follows the AEWA Guidelines for a waterbird monitoring protocol and the Guidelines on the Preparation of National SSAPs for Migratory Waterbirds will be taken into consideration during the preparation of the Lesser White-fronted Goose (*Anser erythropus*) National SSAP.

46. Ms Kralj went on to comment on the format of the regional reporting template and its length. Other delegates concurred and felt that the focus should be on problem areas where the TC could provide guidance and that the template should be revised.

*Action: Mr Stroud and Mr Azafzaf agreed to draft a revised regional reporting template.*

### **Agenda item 8. Report by the Secretariat**

47. Mr Barbieri introduced document TC 10.5 *Report of the Secretariat*. He started by reporting that fundraising remains one of the main activities of the Secretariat and that since 2009, the Secretariat had accrued a total of over 1.5 million Euros in the form of voluntary contributions. Amongst others, he highlighted the cooperation agreement, established with the RWE Rhein-Ruhr Netzservice GmbH (RWE RR NSG), a daughter company of the Rheinisch-Westfälisches Elektrizitätswerk (RWE), one of the largest energy companies in Europe. This represents the first cooperation of this kind with the private sector and he hoped that it could be an example for further partnerships of this kind in future.

48. With regard to new accessions, since 2009, Ethiopia had become a Contracting Party and it is expected that Chad and Montenegro will both become Parties as of 1 November 2011. For several other countries, the process of joining the Agreement is reported to be at an advanced stage.

49. Cooperation with other organisations includes the MoC signed between the Secretariat and the main partners of the Wings Over Wetlands (WOW) UNEP-GEF African-Eurasian Flyways Project in order to build on the WOW project and consolidate its outputs. A further MoC is in the pipeline between the Secretariat and the CAFF<sup>3</sup> Secretariat to provide a framework of cooperation with regard to the conservation of seabirds and arctic birds as well as their habitats.

---

<sup>3</sup> [http://www.arctic-council.org/working\\_group/caff](http://www.arctic-council.org/working_group/caff)

50. Information management activities include the regular AEWA E-newsletter<sup>4</sup>, which keeps the entire AEWA network informed about all the important developments and activities in connection with the Agreement. The Secretariat took the lead in developing the CMS Online Reporting System in close cooperation with the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) and the customised online reporting format for AEWA will be put into use for the MOP5 reporting cycle for the first time. The next important step will be to develop an analytical tool linked to this system – this will be a fundraising priority for the Secretariat. The AEWA website continues to develop however the technology is outdated and the Secretariat would need a mandate from the Parties to develop a new, perhaps a common CMS-family website in the long-term, to improve outreach activities.

51. World Migratory Bird Day (WMBD)<sup>5</sup> is one of the major outreach activities of the CMS and AEWA Secretariats, whereby AEWA has taken the lead in the organisation of this global event and the development of the WMBD website in the past. The campaign always takes place on the second weekend in May and in 2012, it will clash with MOP5, so the UNEP/CMS Secretariat will take the lead. Responding to a request for earlier communication of the dates and theme to enable organisations to prepare well in time, the Secretariat noted that it would urge the CMS colleagues to disseminate this information as soon as possible. The resources necessary for managing this campaign are significant and various options are under consideration on how to manage it in the long-run. Other websites developed in-house are those for the Species International Working Groups (IWGs)<sup>6</sup>, predominantly that of the Lesser White-fronted Goose IWG, where a workspace has been developed for the IWG members, where they can communicate and discuss relevant issues similarly to the TCWS.

52. The seven SSAPs, adopted at MOP4 have been published as well as guidelines and other publications, most of which can be downloaded or ordered from the Secretariat at:  
<http://www.unep-aewa.org/publications/index.htm>.

53. A total of ten projects from the list of International Implementation Tasks (IIT) has been implemented and the *Wings Over Wetlands (WOW) UNEP-GEF African-Eurasian Flyways Project* has come to a close after delivering a number of valuable outcomes. The UNEP/AEWA Secretariat has supported the implementation of this project throughout and will continue doing so by supporting the maintenance of the Critical Site Network Tool (CSN).

54. Mr Nagy added that BirdLife International will continue to provide Important Bird Area (IBA) data and data from the International Waterbird Census (IWC) as well as other sources of information, while the AEWA Secretariat will contribute to the maintenance of the tool. This issue will be discussed in relation to the IIT and the relevant costing and prioritisation questions will have to be defined.

55. Thanks to the generous support from France for the African Initiative, a Coordinator was able to be recruited and activities got off to a good start including the launch of the first cycle of the AEWA Small Grants Fund for Africa in 2010, which supported a total of five projects financed by a contribution from the core budget and voluntary contributions from France and Switzerland. The 2011 cycle is already underway, however currently limited to 20.000 Euro foreseen in the core budget.

56. The project on *Strengthening waterbird and wetland conservation capacities in North Africa (WetCap)* launched in 2009, focussed on capacity building and waterbird conservation in North Africa. Due to a change in priorities of funding by the donor, the Spanish Development Cooperation Agency (AECID), the continuation of this project seems unlikely.

57. Mr Barbieri finished by reporting that the preparations for MOP5 were well underway. More information is available on the AEWA website.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> [http://www.unep-aewa.org/news/e\\_newsletter\\_archive.htm](http://www.unep-aewa.org/news/e_newsletter_archive.htm)

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.worldmigratorybirdday.org/>

<sup>6</sup> [http://www.unep-aewa.org/activities/wg\\_index.htm](http://www.unep-aewa.org/activities/wg_index.htm)

<sup>7</sup> [http://www.unep-aewa.org/meetings/en/mop/mop5\\_docs/mop5.htm](http://www.unep-aewa.org/meetings/en/mop/mop5_docs/mop5.htm)

58. Responding to an enquiry about the progress made with regard to the accession of the Russian Federation, the most important country for breeding waterbirds in the Agreement area, Mr Dereliev regretted that communication with the relevant state authorities was continuing to prove challenging, despite an accession workshop held in 2010 with the support of the Dutch Government. The issues raised by the Russian side are complex and require close attendance. The Secretariat endeavours to maintain communication and it is hoped that progress can be made in the next triennium with the help of further funds.

59. Ms Kralj congratulated the Secretariat for successfully carrying out such an outstanding list of projects and activities.

## **Agenda item 9. Intersessional Process regarding the Future Shape of CMS and the CMS Working Group on Flyways**

60. Mr Biber, the Chair of the CMS Intersessional Working Group of the Future Shape (also member of the CMS Working Group on Flyways) presented the outcomes of these two processes and their implications for AEWA.

### **9.1 Future Shape of CMS**

61. Mr Biber explained that the mandate of the Working Group on future strategies and structure of the CMS and the CMS Family consisted of three phases; the first was to assess the current situation and the second was to define actions for improvement; using as a basis the outcomes of the first two phases, the third phase consisted in developing three distinct options (whereby there was some flexibility of activities between the options) for the future development of the CMS family, to be submitted to the 10<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP10) to CMS. The process was at an advanced stage, with the three options having been formulated by the Working Group: the first of these options summarised activities that would lead to essential changes and possible savings, whereas the other options outlined changes with heavier financial and legal consequences. The Working Group had developed a relevant draft resolution<sup>8</sup>, on which comments from the AEWA TC were welcome.

*Action: The Meeting was requested to submit any comments on the draft resolution to Mr Biber by 20 September 2011 so that they could be incorporated in time for submission to CMS COP10.*

### **9.2 CMS Working Group on Flyways**

62. Mr Biber explained that the establishment of this Working Group is also the consequence of a decision by COP9, whereby three reviews were carried out about the assessment of the current knowledge of bird flyways and the gap analysis and identification of conservation priorities. Figures show that a total of 1.600 species of land birds migrate across a broad front of continents and 550 species of waterbirds with regular flyways migrate along a chain of habitats that need to be conserved. There are about 160 soaring birds (raptors, storks etc.) for which bottlenecks are main problems along their routes and a total of 14% of all migratory species are threatened by extinction. AEWA is considered to be a model for dealing with the flyway approach; however implementation of all the existing instruments must be enhanced (this also relates to Option 1 of the CMS Future Shape proposals). The protection of key sites is a priority, but the coverage of taxa, (i.e. seabirds and land birds) must also be improved. The Working Group had included the main findings and recommendations of the reviews in a draft Resolution on Global Flyways<sup>9</sup>, for the consideration of CMS COP10.

63. Conclusions of these reviews particularly relevant for AEWA included: improving the site inventory of important habitats by drawing on the example of WOW; and that AEWA could serve as a model for flyways in regions such as Asia or for a land birds MoU. AEWA could also help the process of finalising the Raptors MoU to progress, as this had seemingly come to a standstill, a situation, which was very much regretted by

---

<sup>8</sup> [http://www.cms.int/bodies/COP/cop10/draft\\_res\\_and\\_rec/res10\\_09\\_futureshape\\_e.pdf](http://www.cms.int/bodies/COP/cop10/draft_res_and_rec/res10_09_futureshape_e.pdf)

<sup>9</sup> [http://www.cms.int/bodies/COP/cop10/draft\\_res\\_and\\_rec/res10\\_10\\_global\\_flyway\\_e.pdf](http://www.cms.int/bodies/COP/cop10/draft_res_and_rec/res10_10_global_flyway_e.pdf)

those present and this issue should be stressed in the resolution. Finally the CMS Working Group on Flyways considered it wise to continue working on this issue for a further triennium.

*Action: The TC was invited to submit any comments on the draft resolution to the Secretariat for forwarding to CMS by 20 September 2011.*

#### **Additional agenda item: Demonstration of the newly developed CMS Online Reporting System (ORS)**

64. Mr Dereliev gave a short demonstration of this new internet-based tool developed in close cooperation with UNEP-WCMC which Parties will be able to use to submit their National Reports for the first time during the MOP5 reporting cycle. This new format is expected to substantially facilitate the collection, analysis and use of the information contained in the National Reports. The system is ready for use but will still be improved, also with regard to its speed. The UNEP/AEWA Secretariat will continue to work closely with UNEP-WCMC to eliminate any initial problems. This is a generic system developed for adaption to all MEAs so respondents may, in future, find themselves in charge of a number of questionnaires. The system still lacks an appropriate analytical tool, for which funding is being sought; this will cost up to ca. 150.000 Euros.

65. Mr Dereliev acknowledged the advantages of synchronising and aligning reporting with e.g. the conservation status review and site network report for more efficiency and confirmed that the potential for using the tool for all kinds of purposes is there and that the TC is welcome to think about ways of optimising reporting for the Contracting Parties by using the online reporting tool.

66. An important aspect of national reporting and particularly in conjunction with the new, more detailed, reporting template is the analysis; for this purpose, Mr Dereliev suggested that a group of volunteers join him in designing the analyses, which would probably be contracted out, due to the extent of the work involved.

*Action: Mr Stroud, Ms Lewis, Mr Clausen, Ms Crockford and Mr Mondain-Monval agreed to join the drafting group. The draft produced by the group (by mid- December 2011) would be consulted with the whole of the TC via the TCWS.*

#### **Agenda item 10. AEWA International Reviews (as per Paragraph 7.4 of the AEWA Action Plan)**

##### Conservation Status Report 5<sup>th</sup> edition (CSR5)

67. Representing Wetlands International, Mr Nagy introduced documents TC 10.6 *Draft report on the conservation status of migratory waterbirds in the agreement area (5<sup>th</sup> edition/CSR5)*, 10.6(a) *Summary of recommended amendments to Table 1 of the AEWA Action Plan* and 10.6(b) *Table 1 of the AEWA Action Plan (with recommended amendments)*. Wetlands International had been commissioned to produce this conservation status report, which is the most important report of the triennium, under paragraph 7.4 of the AEWA Action Plan. He reported on the main changes in the approach used in compiling this report, particularly in comparison to the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> editions, i.e. that the analyses were based on flyways and not on regions of Europe, which was biologically more sensible. This report also assessed the threats affecting waterbird populations listed under AEWA and their relation to various habitat types as well as including a more comprehensive review of seabird populations. Apart from other minor structural changes, the main report had been compiled using the factsheet approach.

68. The ensuing discussion focussed mainly on methodology, format, data, assessment and recommendations. The Meeting generally welcomed the new factsheet format and the move away from the regional to the flyway analysis. Various aspects of the methodology and conclusions were questioned with respect to inconsistencies concerning particular species, most of which Mr Nagy was able to clarify. He confirmed that, where necessary, appropriate corrections or amendments would be made, particularly with regard to goose trend figures, which he acknowledged were incorrect or misleading.

69. Mr Nagy provided feedback on the discussions on CSR5 held in the margins of the meeting; he reported that one of the major conclusions was a planned amendment of Annex 1, which provides justification for

changes in Table 1. It was decided to delete columns referring to CSR 1, 2 and 3 and to retain CSR 4 and 5 and to add flags to show whether the population size or trend has been updated compared to previous editions.

70. Ms Kralj requested the TC to submit their comments on CSR5 by the end of September via the TCWS to enable Wetlands International to incorporate and submit a revised version by the end of October. After approval by the TC, the revised version of the CSR5 would be circulated to the Parties by the Secretariat giving them sufficient time to study the report in readiness for the seventh Meeting of the Standing Committee in November 2011 and the fifth Session of the MOP in May 2012.

*Actions:*

- TC was requested to submit comments by the end of September 2011.
- Wetlands International will submit the final draft CSR5 to the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat by the end of October 2011.

71. Concerning the issues, which came up during the work on CSR5, in relation to the guidelines for significant long-term decline (document TC 10.8 *Proposal for the amendment of resolution 3.3 on developing guidelines for interpretation of criteria used in Table 1 of the AEWA Action Plan*), it was agreed that the amendments made in this document were appropriate and aligned to the Agreement with regard to the interpretation of the term “significant long-term decline” of waterbird populations.

*Decision:* No changes will be made to the proposal for amendment of Resolution 3.3 as presented in document TC 10.8 and to be submitted to StC and MOP for approval.

#### Site Network Report

72. The TC was requested to review and sign off a proposed prioritisation methodology for the designation and management of sites (Doc TC 10.7 *Report on the site network for waterbirds in the Agreement area: developing a prioritisation method for designation and management*) and a proposed methodology for assessing the comprehensiveness and the coherence of the site network (Doc TC 10.58 *Assessing the comprehensiveness and coherence of the site network*) to be used in the compilation of the 1st edition of the Review on International Network of Sites.

*Decision:* After discussing the issue, the Meeting decided that the proposed methodology provided a good basis for both aspects of this task.

*Action:* Mr Nagy will draft a resolution with regard to the CSR5 and the Site Network Report when the site network report conclusions are clear.

### **Agenda item 11. AEWA Single Species Action Plans (SSAPs) and Species Management Plan (SMP)**

#### a. Slaty Egret SSAP (Doc TC 10.9)

73. Mr Dereliev introduced document TC 10.9 *Draft International Single Species Action Plan for the Conservation of the Slaty Egret*. The Slaty Egret *Egretta vinaceigula* is an inter-African migrant and a priority species under the Agreement. The Government of Switzerland provided funding for this SSAP and Birdlife Botswana was commissioned to compile it. The Secretariat facilitated the workshop for this Action Plan earlier this year. He remarked that there is very little known about this species although this is one of the better-studied birds in Southern Africa. It is difficult to monitor due to its similarity to the Black Egret. Out of all the Range States only South Africa is Party to the Agreement. Hopefully South Africa can help to encourage the other Range States such as Namibia, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Botswana and others to ratify the Agreement.

74. Mr Hughes, who had played a major role in revising and standardising the format for AEWA SSAPs, remarked that all of the SSAPs presented were excellent with good and thorough results sections although

the results were duplicated in the executive summaries in some cases. With regard to the Slaty Egret SSAP, he noted that there was no prioritisation or assessment of the threats, which should be dealt with.

*Action: The amendments to the Slaty Egret SSAP were noted by the Secretariat and will be forwarded to the compiler.*

b. Bewick's Swan SSAP (W Siberian & NE/NW European population) (Doc TC 10.10)

75. Mr Nagy, who was the chief compiler introduced document TC 10.10 *Draft International Single Species Action Plan for the North West European Population of the Bewick's Swan*. The SSAP for Bewick's Swan *Cygnus columbianus bewickii* was developed under the framework of the Long Journey Project supported by the Dutch Government (BBI-MATRA Programme) and the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs and is part of an attempt to demonstrate the practical application of flyway conservation including three components, i.e. the SSAP, a site management plan and efforts towards creating a more permanent relationship between west European and Russian experts dealing with the species and creating a species working group. The background to the SSAP was a long-term decline of the species over 25 years. The SSAP identifies the actions which relate to protecting the population against both potential threats, such as petro-chemical transportation, and actual threats. This is an example of long distance migrants being dependent on a sound network of critical sites to maintain their populations. The SSAP makes recommendations as to which actions are needed at breeding places, stopover sites and wintering areas.

The TC welcomed this plan and it was thought to be an excellent example.

*Action: Mr Nagy noted proposals for amendments to this SSAP, which he would incorporate in the final draft to be submitted to the Secretariat.*

c. Greenland White-fronted Goose SSAP (Doc TC 10.11)

76. Mr Stroud, who was the chief compiler of this SSAP introduced document TC 10.11 *International Single Species Action Plan for the Conservation of the Greenland White-fronted Goose*. The population breeds in Greenland and migrates through Iceland to Ireland and Scotland. It has been monitored since the early 1980s and knowledge on this species is widespread as it was the focus of much conservation attention in the past. Since 1999 there has been a rapid decrease noted due to the increasing competition with the expanding population of Canada Geese on the breeding grounds or climate change or a combination of the two. He reported that the version of the SSAP tabled had already been distributed for comments and included those of the TC and the European Commission.

77. The summary (Annex 7), which is an overview of the legal regime provided by the EU Birds and Habitats Directives and implications for Greenland White-fronted Geese *Anser albifrons flavirostris* resulting from a comment made by the European Commission, was highlighted as being particularly useful. This format could be agreed upon with the European Commission for any future EU-related plans.

*Action: Mr Stroud noted the suggested amendments to this SSAP for incorporation into the final draft.*

d. Red-breasted Goose SSAP (Doc TC 10.12)

78. Mr Dereliev introduced document TC 10.12 *Draft International Single Species Action Plan for the Conservation of the Red-breasted Goose*. This SSAP for Red-breasted Geese *Branta ruficollis* was first initiated by the European Commission as a revision for the EU Member States of the previous plan produced in the mid-1990s and has now been extended to a flyway action plan under AEW. It was commissioned to BirdLife International and sub-commissioned to WWT. The original expert Red-breasted Goose Working Group has now been transformed into an intergovernmental AEW International Species Working Group. The main issues to be addressed with this species are agricultural but also hunting, particularly around roosting sites. Around the end of the 1990s ca. 90,000 birds were recorded and this number crashed to 33,000 within a short period of time. There is no strong scientific research on this species so knowledge gaps need to be filled urgently.

*Action: The Secretariat noted some minor comments for incorporation into the final draft.*

e. Lesser White-fronted Goose SSAP (Swedish proposal for amendment Doc TC10.56).

79. On behalf of the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA), Mr Per Sjörgen-Gulve joined the Meeting per telephone and introduced document TC 10.56 *Swedish Proposal to amend the International Single Species Action Plan for the Conservation of the Lesser White-fronted Goose*. He explained that Sweden had submitted the proposal to amend the SSAP to correct and up-date the information on the Swedish Lesser White-fronted Geese *Anser erythropus* (LWfG) population in the SSAP and to ensure that this is scientific-evidence based. He went on to elaborate the issues raised in the proposal.

80. During the ensuing discussion, the relevant terminology and the status of the Swedish breeding population of LWfG was discussed at length. It was pointed out that it is not clear that the released birds joined an existing population as the definition of ‘supplementation’ (proposed by Sweden) requires, and that they were led to a ‘new’ south-westerly migration route to the Netherlands thereby implying an ‘introduction’. Also the fact that the species has never been formerly declared as being extinct was questioned. The Meeting felt that clarification on this issue should be sought from the IUCN Reintroduction Specialist Group and that the Action Plan should be amended accordingly during the next scheduled revision.

*Action: The Secretariat will contact the IUCN Reintroduction Specialist Group in order to seek advice towards the clarification of the terminology and status of the above-mentioned population of the LWfG.*

81. The Chair thanked Mr Sjörgen-Gulve for his report, commenting that Sweden had in fact accepted this SSAP in 2008 when it was endorsed by MOP4, she expressed her appreciation for the efforts made with regard to this proposal and underlined that the Meeting had considered all the aspects involved and that many of those present had been involved in this issue for some time. She concluded that the proposal had not been accepted by any of those present.

*Decision: The Meeting did not accept the Swedish proposal.*

82. The TC produced a document (see Annex II) providing background information and summarizing the issues raised in the Swedish proposal together with the comments and recommendations made by the Committee.

*Action: The Secretariat will distribute this document (Annex II) to the Members of the Committee on Captive Breeding, Reintroduction and Supplementation of Lesser White-fronted Geese (LWfG) in Fennoscandia (RECAP) and report on the issue to the up-coming 7th Standing Committee Meeting.*

Sociable Lapwing SSAP (revision of the 2002 plan) (Doc TC 10.13)

83. Mr Dereliev introduced document TC10.13 *Draft International Single Species Action Plan for the Conservation of the Sociable Lapwing* and reported that the first SSAP had been approved by MOP2 in 2002 - at the time only 600 birds had been thought to exist and the species was listed as being Critically Endangered in the IUCN Red List. Under two projects funded by the UK’s Darwin Initiative and implemented by the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB), it became clear that the population was larger and through the use of satellite telemetry its stop-over and wintering areas were identified. The eastern flyway has been added to this revised SSAP, which includes India, therefore this is a joint Action Plan between AEWA and CMS. Ten years after this first Action Plan much more information is available and it is known where the bottlenecks are i.e. predominantly illegal hunting targeted by local hunters and foreign hunting parties as well as the high density of livestock, endangering the nests. He went on to thank RSPB for leading the work on the Sociable Lapwing during the last decade and added that RSPB had agreed to organise the coordination for the AEWA Sociable Lapwing International Working Group.

Pink-footed Goose Flyway Management Plan (Svalbard/NW Europe population)  
(Doc TC 10.14 Rev. 1)

84. Mr Dereliev introduced document TC10.14 Rev 1. *International Flyway Management Plan for the Svalbard Population of the Pink-footed Goose*. One of the targets of the AEWA Strategic Plan for the

Secretariat is to develop Adaptive Harvest Management Plans (AHMP) for two quarry populations. This Plan is for a population of Pink-footed Geese *Anser brachyrhynchus* not considered threatened, but causing agricultural damage, particularly in Norway; thus the focus is not on conservation but on sustainable management. The compiler, Jesper Madsen, who worked very closely with the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat, raised the necessary funds, which were kindly supplied by Norway. The kick-off workshop for the production of this plan last year had been hosted by Denmark and was attended by a number of those present as well as a North American expert. The current draft has been agreed upon by the Range States. Due to the fact that this is a quarry population in Norway, yet is a protected population in Belgium and the Netherlands, the differing interests have to be carefully considered. There will be a steering group guiding and monitoring the implementation of the Plan and it is hoped that this approach will prove useful for all stakeholders and that more Action Plans of this type can be produced and implemented in future.

85. Mr Krabbe, speaking on behalf of Denmark, very much welcomed this whole concept of developing an action plan for a quarry species, which is inspired by the North Americans. He informed the Secretariat that Denmark's position was not yet final and that various aspects were still to be examined, but that he would inform the Secretariat by the deadline, which was the end of September.

86. The Meeting discussed the concept of setting population levels and the different approach used here, i.e. not starting with the problem of why a population is declining but which potential management problems arise in relation to sustaining a population and the reactions of non-involved Parties. It was considered that this Plan is a pioneering element in the AEWA region and should be highlighted. Examples of SSAPs such as the LWfG, the successful implementation of which is being pushed forward due to the financial backing of Norway should also be highlighted and presented to the non-Parties as examples of successful collaboration between countries, despite differing interests, in order to encourage them to join the Agreement.

*Action:*                *Comments on terminology were noted by Mr Dereliev and will be incorporated (change the title of the plan from Flyway Management Plan to Species Management Plan).*

*Decision:*            *All five International Species Action Plans and the Flyway Management Plan were approved for transmission to the Standing Committee and MOP subject to the incorporation of the discussed amendments.*

87. The Meeting commended the work of the Secretariat and all the stakeholders involved in the production process and agreed that the format and quality of the AEWA Single Species Action Plans were excellent.

#### h. Draft Resolution on Single Species Action Plans and Management Plans (Doc TC 10.15)

88 Mr Dereliev introduced document TC 10.15 *Draft resolution 5.XX Adoption and implementation of International Single Species Action Plans and Species Management Plan* mentioning that there were some new points added to this standard resolution. The mandate referring to the SMP is included and also the progress made in establishing International Species Working Groups (IWGs) (Doc TC 10.38 – gives an overview of the current stage of IWGs). Five SSAPs and one SMP are listed and IWG coordinators have been recruited for eight action plans for species with a poor conservation status. All these activities are, of course, linked to the capacity and resources of the Secretariat as the coordination requires consistent coaching and mentoring, for which funding is urgently needed.

89. There was a discussion on the terminology used with regard to action plans and it was suggested that para 4.3.4 of the AEWA Action Plan, which refers to populations 'causing significant damage' is amended to refer to 'species management plans' rather than single species action plans, which are recovery plans and covered by AEWA Action Plan para 2.2. It was stressed that the terminology decided on should be consistent from now on, particularly because the term currently being used is 'international flyway management plan'.

*Decision:*            *The Secretariat will draft a proposal for amendment to the AEWA Action Plan as follows: Para 4.3.4 'Parties shall cooperate with a view to developing species management plans for populations which cause significant damage, in particular to crops and to fisheries'.*

## **Agenda item 12. Other plans, reviews and guidelines**

### a. African Plan of Action (Doc TC 10.16) and Draft Resolution (Doc TC 10.17)

90. Ms Moloko introduced document TC 10.16 *Plan of Action for Africa 2012-2017*, explaining the background of the document and why it is based on the AEWA Strategic Plan 2009-2017, which is one of the guiding documents for the Agreement. Complementing actions, targets and the expected results had been developed, some of which may seem to be ambitious; however she stressed the fact that the East Atlantic Flyway holds the largest number of declining AEWA populations and that the Afrotropical region holds the largest number and proportion of AEWA populations belonging to the species on the IUCN Red List. Widespread illegal hunting of waterbirds in Africa is another major cause for concern. Some of the activities are already ongoing and progressing well, such as the recruitment of Parties. Capacity building and training as well as habitat conservation projects are the focus of the Plan of Action. Cooperation with other Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) and partner organisations are envisaged. Comments from the TC on the first draft of the Plan of Action had already been incorporated in the version presented here and the TC was invited to make further comments.

91. Ms Courouble, representing France, which is the donor supporting this work, confirmed that there were many positive aspects to the Plan of Action, however she questioned the use of this methodology of adhering too closely to the AEWA Strategic Plan and felt that this might be limiting the initiative in the African countries because the socio-economic aspect is not sufficiently highlighted. Increasing knowledge and awareness-raising should be the first step and communities should be involved in the conservation of waterbirds and their habitats. She suggested starting with an analysis of the current situation and establishing, which positive initiatives already exist and which could provide a basis for further activities. The budget should be calculated on the basis of activities and objectives and perhaps be moved to the end of the document. Creating an African Committee, could also be a way forward, perhaps in cooperation with experts from the region.

92. Mr Mshelbwala referred to the initial objective of the African Initiative discussed at MOP4, i.e. that sub-regional groupings such as the African Union are involved so that governments can make decisions at their respective levels. He stressed the importance of a realignment of the Plan of Action to reflect the initial idea from MOP4.

93. Mr Barbieri remarked that the structure of the Plan of Action was chosen in order not to compete with the other guiding documents of the Agreement but rather to complement them. The document could be rearranged to some extent, if this was felt necessary.

94. There were other suggestions regarding the structure and the budget, which could be adjusted and broken down into objectives and activities; this would be very useful for donors and a better partnership approach was underlined.

95. The Chair encouraged the Members and Observers from Africa present at the meeting to take this opportunity to provide valuable input to this Action Plan, which was tailor-made for their region.

96. Ms Lutsch of South Africa reported that a lot could be achieved in Africa because of already well-established partnerships and that many tools are available and the scientific community is very advanced. She suggested that the African delegates consult on the Plan of Action with their governments and then give their feedback.

97. Ms Moloko explained that the next step will be a consultation process with the African Parties. She stressed that a completely new document should be avoided for all the reasons mentioned above.

98. A Working Group was formed to discuss the issue further and to decide the best way forward. The Working Group developed two questionnaires to get direct feedback from the African AEWA Focal Points and potential donors. It was decided that the Secretariat should also try to take advantage of the CMS pre-COP in Uganda at the end of October to consult Focal Points and other stakeholders on the issue.

99. Mr Pouplier suggested a simplified and much shorter text for the questionnaire, which was welcomed by the Meeting.

*Action: Ms Moloko noted the comments and suggestions made by the Meeting for incorporation in the questionnaires. The final questionnaires would be circulated together with the revised draft Action Plan for Africa to the Parties and potential donors.*

b. Adverse effects of agrochemicals on migratory waterbirds in Africa (Doc TC 10.18) and Draft Resolution (Doc TC 10.19)

100. Mr Dereliev reported that this document has been available on the TCWS for over a year. The original project dates back to the 1990s; it had been commissioned to an Institute in Senegal, which had to close so that a final report was never actually compiled. The Secretariat has established cooperation with the University of Bonn, whereby a student, who had already been stationed on community farms in Africa, took up this topic for his Master's thesis, jointly supervised by the University and the Secretariat, where he was provided with a work station. Some comments had already been provided by the TC and incorporated in the revised version, which also has a slightly different structure. The resolution relating to this issue was drafted on the basis of this paper.

101. There were a number of comments and suggestions regarding the draft resolution so that the Chair suggested that a small working group should meet in order to re-draft this resolution and produce a revised version.

*Decision: The draft resolution was approved with the incorporation of the discussed amendments.*

c. Review of the conflict between migratory birds and electricity power grids in the African-Eurasian region (Doc TC 10.20), and

d. Guidelines for mitigating/avoiding the conflict between migratory birds and electricity power grids in the African-Eurasian region (Doc TC 10.21), and

e. Draft CMS Resolution on power lines and migratory birds (Doc TC 10.22)

102. Mr Dereliev reported that the first drafts of these documents were only recently made available, according to the agreed time plan. They had been commissioned to a consortium in the Netherlands, supported by a grant from AEWA's cooperation partner, RWE RR NSG. The project also covers the CMS Raptors MoU, i.e. 130 Range States in all. Unfortunately the response to the related questionnaire had been disappointing. The review and guidelines will be submitted to the CMS COP10 in November 2011 together with a draft resolution.

*Actions:*

- *Comments made during the Meeting were noted by the Secretariat; further comments on the draft resolution must be submitted by 20 September 2011 via the TCWS\**
- *Comments on the review and guidelines should be submitted by 30 September 2011 via the TCWS\*.*

*Decision: The AEWA resolution on power lines will be based on that approved by the CMS COP10. Mr Dereliev will inform the TC of the approved text after COP10.*

*\* Observers to the Meeting can be given access to the TCWS upon request.*

**Agenda item 16. Recapitulation of workshops of TC Working Groups 1-8 (excl. WG 7)**

103. The TC Working Groups reported on the tasks given to the TC by MOP4 and the outcome of their intersessional work and discussions at the present meeting.

## **TC Working Group 1**

104. Ms Lehmann gave a brief presentation summarising the outcomes of the work of WG1.

All outcomes relating to amendment proposals are reflected in Document TC 10.55 Rev 3 *Summary of Proposals for Amendments to the AEWA Action Plan*

### WG1 Task 1a): Effects of the use of lead fishing weights on waterbirds and wetlands and the use of lead shot in terrestrial habitats

105. Document TC10.23 Rev 1 *Threat to waterbirds from lead poisoning caused by fishing weights.*

*WG1 Decision:* to propose a prohibition on the use of certain lead fishing weights for inclusion in para 4.1.4 of the Action Plan and to draft a relevant resolution via the TCWS.

Document TC 10.24 *List of AEWA species using terrestrial habitats*

*WG1 Decision:* Scientific evidence is needed in order to be able to assess the impact of lead poisoning of waterbirds in ecosystems other than wetlands; it was decided to wait until after the CMS COP10 to see if a study on this subject could be included in the framework of recommendations on the poisoning of migratory waterbirds.

### WG1 Task 1b): Hunting asterisk populations

106. Document TC 10.25 *Conditions for allowing in exceptional cases hunting of populations listed on Column A, categories 2 and 3.*

*WG1 Decision:* The new conditions, replacing the current condition of hunting being permitted where hunting ‘of such populations is a’ long-established cultural practice’, which is difficult to define, were agreed and an appropriate amendment of the Action Plan was proposed.

### WG1 Task 1c): Exemptions from hunting

107. Document TC10.26 *Definition of the term “overriding public interests”.*

*WG1 Decision:* It was agreed to propose to amend para 2.1.3 of the Action Plan by adding a much more detailed text referring to concrete public interests.

### WG1 Task 1d): Look-alike species

108. FACE and CIC had been requested by TC9 to examine the possibilities of drafting guidelines, however these were not developed. OMPO had started work on such a document which would be translated into English and shared with the TC via the TCWS. Time and resources will be required to finalize these guidelines.

### WG1 Task 1e): Pre-nuptial migration

109. Document TC 10.28 *Justification for proposing an amendment to para 2.1.3 of the AEWA Action Plan.* The task was to review para 2.1.2 (a) “if the taking has an unfavourable impact on the conservation status of the population concerned”.

*WG1 Decision:* The WG decided not to delete or make any changes to this paragraph but to propose an International Implementation Task (IIT) project on harvest data collection as well as a project on AEWA sustainable harvest guidelines so that, in the long term, countries are enabled to assess if their taking has an unfavourable impact on the conservation status of the population concerned.

WG1 Task 1f): To review the periods during which huntable bird populations of conservation concern covered by the Agreement return to their breeding grounds and, if needed, to provide further guidance on the implementation of para 2.1.2 (a)

110. Document TC 10.29 *Defining periods of breeding and pre-nuptial migration for migratory African-Eurasian waterbirds*. There were no comments on the current version of the guidance paper. In the ensuing discussion it was suggested that sustainable use guidelines would require further consultation and this would be a task for TC11, however the current guidance document could be shared with the Parties at MOP5 together with an addition to a resolution to urge Parties to use this guidance when they are implementing the Action Plan with respect to huntable species.

WG1 Task 1g): Modes of taking

111. Document TC 10.30 *List of modes of taking of birds to be banned or regulated and a draft resolution/justification for proposing an amendment to the AEWA Action Plan*. The Meeting discussed a point raised by Mr Biber with regard to the list in Annex 4 of the Bern Convention and that a comparison should be made, which was done by Ms Lewis. She reported that all the modes in the list were also included in Annex 4 of the Bern Convention apart from the ‘motorised vehicles being driven at a speed exceeding 5km p/h’. The descriptions used in the Bern Convention list were more detailed in places and the WG1 list would be aligned to those, where appropriate.

*Decision:* *To add a detailed list of prohibited modes (as in document TC 10.55 rev 3) of taking to para 2.1.2 (b) of the AEWA Action Plan.*

WG1 Task 1h): Limits of taking

112. Document TC 10.31 *Discussion paper on how bag limits are to be established*.

*WG1 Decision:* *The WG decided that there was no need for amendment in this case but that guidance on the term and possibilities of “limits of taking” could be added to the to the sustainable harvest guidelines, when they are re-drafted, whereby the term “taking of limits” covers quantitative, spatial, temporal and practical limits.*

WG1 Task 1i): Non-native species

113. Document TC 10.32 *Justification for proposing an amendment to para 2.5 of the AEWA Action Plan*. The task was to review para 2.5 of the Action Plan and to provide advice on whether the term “if they consider it necessary” should be deleted from the text or amended in order to bring it in line with Article III 2 (g) of the Agreement Text.

*WG1 Decision:* *To amend the Action Plan text and to align it to the Agreement Text together with some further changes to the wording.*

WG1 Task 1j): Specific hunting requirements for Column C populations

114. Document TC 10.33 Corr. 1 *Implications of equalling columns B and C of the AEWA Table 1*.

*WG1 Decision:* *As there are no specific hunting requirements for Column C populations, there is thus noneed to amend the AEWA Action Plan.*

**TC Working Group 2 - Re-establishment**

115. Mr Dereliev reported that MOP4 had decided that guidelines and a reporting structure on re-establishment projects should be developed. The example of the lengthy discussions on the LWfG underlined the importance of providing clear guidelines. In the meantime funding for this project had been kindly provided by the Government of Switzerland. A draft will be posted on the TCWS and finalised by February 2012 so that the guidelines can be translated into French and subsequently included in a draft resolution for approval by MOP5.

**TC Working Group 3 – AEWA Annexes 2 and 3**

116. In her capacity as facilitator of this group, the Chair distributed two papers relating to the WGs tasks and reported on the work of the WG both intersessionally and during the discussions at the present meeting.

WG3 Task a): To review the ornithological data on the Little Tern *Sterna albifrons* for a better delineation of the Mediterranean populations.

117. This task had already been finalised intersessionally and the result, i.e. the new population, was now included in 5<sup>th</sup> edition of the CSR report.

WG3 Task b): To review the definitions of geographical terms used in range descriptions of populations in Table 1.

118. WG3 Decision: *After discussion, it was decided that the wording was clear enough so that there was no need of amendment, however Mr Stroud suggested the following amendment to the second sentence, in order to make the meaning even clearer: ‘The range descriptions used have no political significance, and are for general guidance only. For concise, mapped summaries of waterbird ranges, practitioners...’*

WG3 Decision: *To include the above-mentioned amendment in range descriptions of populations in Table 1.*

WG3 task c): To review the applicability of the Near Threatened IUCN Category to the listing of populations in Table 1

119. Document TC 10.34 *Options for highlighting the status of Near Threatened species on the AEWA Table 1.* Ms Lewis reported on the outcomes of the discussion of the WG on this task, which was to review the applicability of the threat criteria, especially the Near Threatened IUCN Category, to the listing of populations in Table 1 and to present options for the amendment of Table 1 to be considered at MOP5.

WG3 Decision: *To add a 4<sup>th</sup> category to Column A for Table 1 for species, with the text ‘Category 4: Species, which are listed as Near Threatened on the IUCN Red List of Threatened species (as reported in the most recent summary by Birdlife International), but do not fulfil the conditions in respect of Category 1, 2 or 3 as described above’ and to allow hunting of category 4 populations on a sustainable use basis, providing that such hunting is conducted within the framework of an international single species action plan. Table 1 and para 2.1.2 will be amended accordingly.*

The Meeting considered that all the proposed amendments to the AEWA Action Plan, including that on lead fishing weights should be presented to MOP5 in one resolution.

Action: *The resolution including all the proposed amendments to the AEWA Action Plan would be drafted by the Secretariat.*

WG3 Task d): To review taxonomic classifications of birds and suggest the most appropriate classification for the purposes of the Agreement.

120. Document TC 10.35 *Update on the CMS process of reviewing the taxonomies and nomenclature of birds listed on its appendices.*

The Chair introduced document TC 10.35 which presents the conclusions of the CMS intersessional Working Group on Taxonomy regarding Dickinson and BirdLife taxonomies. The conclusion was that apart from birds listed under the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP), CMS should follow Dickinson.

120 bis. The Committee’s conclusions on the issue of taxonomy for the Agreement are outlined in Annex III.

WG3 Decision: *WG3 considered all the aspects of taxonomic classifications in the case of AEWA species and although there would be obvious advantages in aligning the taxonomy used by CMS and AEWA, and, despite the possible disadvantage noted by the CMS WG that the BirdLife nomenclature is not printed, it considered BirdLife taxonomy to be more appropriate. The WG had compiled a communication to the CMS WG to this effect including a table outlining the pragmatic and financial reasons.*

121. The Meeting discussed the issue of how the BirdLife taxonomy is published and it was confirmed that as well as being available on the internet an archive of previous classifications is available with references to other taxonomic lists so that a hard copy is not necessary. A close collaboration with BirdLife on this was encouraged.

WG3 Task e) To draft a proposal for amendments to the AEWA Action Plan to deal with tackling the effects of aquatic invasive non-native species on waterbird habitats.

122. *WG3 Decision: The WG proposed a further amendment to the AEWA Action Plan by adding a second sentence to para 3.3 as follows:*  
AEWA Action Plan Para 3.3:  
*‘Parties shall endeavour to rehabilitate or restore, where feasible and appropriate, areas which were previously important for the populations listed in Table 1. This shall include areas that suffer degradation as a result of the impacts of factors, such as climate change, hydrological change, agriculture, the spreading of aquatic invasive non-native species, natural succession, uncontrolled fires, unsustainable use, eutrophication, and pollution’.*

#### **TC Working Group 4 - Table 1 criteria**

123. Mr Stroud presented document TC 10.37 *Guidance on interpretation of the term ‘extreme fluctuations in population size or trend’ applicable to AEWA Table 1* and reported that initial discussions on this issue had already been carried out in the last triennium.

This draft had been posted on the TCWS early in 2011 and the comments included.

*WG 4 Decision: The WG had agreed on the text in document TC 10.37 with the addition of a short extra text clarifying that some populations of waterbirds may appear to be fluctuating, but could simply be using different breeding sites or moving location. This would need to be appended to a resolution*

*Action: The Secretariat would draft a short resolution including this recommendation together with that for the definition of a ‘long-term decline’. This will be posted on the TCWS for comments and finalising.*

#### **TC Working Group 5 – Climate change**

124. *WG 4 Decision:* Mr Stroud reported that the WG had reached the conclusion that there was still a significant amount of work to be done on this task and envisaged a short resolution to introduce the issue supplemented by annexes summarizing information on likely changing distributions of AEWA-listed waterbirds from existing sources in particular the BirdLife International/Durham University *Climatic Atlas for European breeding birds*.

#### **TC Working Group 6 – AEWA International Single Species Action Plans**

125. Document TC 10.38 *Summary of the current state of Single Species Action Plan production and coordination*. Mr Dereliev summarised the conclusions of the Working Group which took note of the summary document and made a few suggestions for amendments, which were incorporated. The document will be presented to MOP5 as an information document. Regarding the related resolution, Document TC 10.15 *Draft resolution on Single Species Action Plans and Management Plan*, changes were made to accommodate the need to focus on the establishment of AEWA Species Working Groups for globally threatened species, the need of establishment of alternative coordination mechanisms for species that are not globally threatened and the need to revise the priority list on the current table of priority populations for action planning after each MOP.

*Action: Mr Hughes will draft Terms of Reference for Species Working Groups for non-threatened species based on the AEWA Species Working Group Terms of Reference to serve as guidance for Range States and organisations.*

126. Responding to the suggestion to include a summary of the impact of the Action Plans, Mr Dereliev noted the review on the subject, submitted to MOP4 and that the next review including an analysis on the implementation of SSAPs is scheduled to be produced for MOP6. He went on to clarify that using the new online reporting format, countries will be asked to provide information on the production of national single species action plans, so that an overview will be available after every MOP reporting cycle.

### **TC Working Group 8 - Conservation Guidelines**

127. The Chair reported that WG8 had revised the following three guidelines: *Guidelines on identifying and tackling emergency situations for migratory waterbirds*, *Guidelines on regulating trade in migratory waterbirds* and *Guidelines on avoidance of introduction of non-native waterbird species* (Documents TC 10.52, 53 and 54). The TC was invited to submit comments on the revised drafts by 30 September 2011 via the TCWS and comments from the meeting observers should be sent directly to Ms Kralj.

*Decision WG 8: Two further Conservation Guidelines: Conservation Guideline 5 - Sustainable harvest and Conservation Guideline 1 - Preparation of national SSAPs will be re-drafted for which funds will be needed (IIT projects).*

128. With regard to the subject of the Technical Committee Workspace, which had proved to be a very valuable and helpful tool for the work of the Technical Committee, the Chair wondered if this could be extended for the use of the National Focal Points to enable easier communication and dissemination of information. Mr Dereliev confirmed that working with the TCWS had been extremely positive but that this system, which had been produced entirely in-house, had its limitations and that funding was urgently required, not only for its maintenance, but also for adding additional features. The proliferation of such systems must be recognised by the governing bodies as increasing the effectivity of the work and that financial support is needed for their up-keep.

129. The Meeting discussed several options for the development of such systems, e.g. sharing the costs with other MEAs, which was theoretically possible. The Meeting felt that although work effectivity had greatly improved, more TC Members and Observers should participate in the discussions and provide input in order to use it to its full potential.

*Decision WG8: WG 8 had recognized the importance of this issue and would consult the StC as to the possibility of securing continuous financing for this, i.e. through the core budget.*

### **Agenda item 17. TC Working Group 9 (Extractive industries)**

130. Document TC 10.41 *Wetlands and Extractive Industries* together with Draft Resolution Document TC 10.42 *Draft resolution on the impact of extractive industries* (1<sup>st</sup> draft distributed during meeting). Mr Stroud gave a short presentation, stressing that world commodity prices for minerals were on the increase, particularly gold and copper, which are being used in the technology sector. Contracting Parties need guidance to be able to regulate extractive activities by using Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) processes on a flyway scale, particularly when considering cumulative impacts of multiple wetland losses along a waterbird's flyway. The Ramsar Convention's Scientific and Technical Review Panel (STRP) and the AEWA TC have joined forces to collate and summarise available technical guidance on assessing, avoiding, minimising and mitigating the direct and indirect impacts of extractive industries on wetlands during all phases of development and to produce a guide to this guidance, including best practices from the rehabilitation of sites. A great deal of guidance was already available, notably from North America and Australia.

131. The Meeting discussed various aspects of the guide to guidance and some suggestions were made, including the involvement of AEWA and Ramsar Partner organisations with contacts to the industrial sector and following the recent example of UNESCO by involving extractive companies in reducing their impacts on biodiversity by funding projects. The issue of the protection of seas for seabirds should also be taken to a future MOP. Also the impact of agricultural developments, particularly in Africa, was stressed, which is a huge issue. Another suggestion was to disseminate this information to development agencies, which could also provide funding.

*Action: Ms Lutsch offered to provide the TC with guidelines on the impact of mining on biodiversity in South Africa, which are currently being revised.*

*Decision: The TC agreed to the approach of collaborating with the Ramsar Convention to produce a Guide to Guidance on Extractive industries and approved the related draft resolution, which had been tabled during the meeting.*

#### **Agenda item 18. TC Working Group 10 (Emerging issues)**

132. Mr Dereliev introduced the outcomes of this WG, which dealt with issues other than those requested of the TC by the MOP. This WG would be set up each triennium to consider issues which should be dealt with in line with the TC's advisory role to the MOP.

##### Invasive alien aquatic weeds on waterbird habitats in Africa

133. Mr Dereliev introduced document TC 10.43 *Study on the impact of invasive alien aquatic weeds on waterbird habitats in Africa* as well as the relevant resolution, document TC 10.44 *Draft resolution on the impact of invasive alien aquatic weeds on waterbird habitats in Africa*. The study represents the findings of the report by IUCN from 2006 and based on case studies on Lake Naivasha, Kenya and the Kafue Flats in Zambia, which are still relevant. The resolution is based on the report and additional references. It had been posted on the TCWS and comments from the TC had already been incorporated.

*Decision: Regarding the report, it was decided to provide the executive summary only (16 pages) as an information document for MOP5.*

*Decision: The Meeting approved the draft resolution, which had been re-worded during the meeting together with some comments referring to the mentioned findings outlined in the report, which would be checked by the Secretariat and amended where necessary.*

##### Renewable energy impacts

134. Referring to document TC 10.45 *Draft resolution on renewable energy and migratory waterbirds*, Mr Dereliev reported that Ms Nina Mikander, Lesser White-fronted Goose Coordinator based at the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat had drafted the draft resolution, which was based on a number of sources. The document had been posted on the TCWS and comments were incorporated.

135. There were a number of suggestions for amendments and additions to the draft resolution including working with the industrial sector and sharing post-construction reports and lessons learnt.

*Decision: It was decided that the explanatory note would be revised by the Secretariat and references added. Other comments from the Meeting would be collected and the draft resolution revised.*

136. One of the comments related to the importance of including biofuel production and its impacts on wetlands in this resolution, and a Ramsar resolution for COP10 on the subject of biofuels was suggested as a possibly useful cross-reference as well as a review on the implications of different energy centres on wetlands being prepared by the Ramsar STRP for COP11 together with a resolution on energy and wetlands.

*Action: The Secretariat will make a reference to both these draft resolutions and the revised versions would be circulated on the TCWS for approval by the TC.*

#### **Agenda item 19. TC Working Group 7 (IIT)**

137. Mr Dereliev introduced document TC 10.46 *List of International Implementation Tasks (IIT) 2009-2016 and corresponding draft resolution* requesting the Meeting to review them and amend as necessary for submission to MOP5. The Meeting went through the IIT projects one by one, deciding which could be

deleted and which should be up-dated and by whom. Particular attention was paid to an alignment of tasks with the African Plan of Action.

*Decision:*

*The following projects will be updated by the end of September 2011 and submitted to the Secretariat:*

*IIT 10 - Mr Middleton;*

*IIT 12, 1, 14 – Mr Stroud;*

*IIT 3, 6, 15, 16, 17+18, 19, 20, 24, 25+28– Mr Nagy; and*

*IIT 9 – Mr Mondain-Monval.*

*The following projects will be deleted:*

*IIT 4, 5, 21, 22, 23, 27, 29 and 31.*

138. The participants were asked to make suggestions for further priority projects to be added to the IIT list 2009-2016, some of which had evolved from the outcomes of the TC Working Groups and discussions during the meeting.

1. Ms Crockford suggested the establishment of national implementation working groups, perhaps involving the Ramsar Convention and CMS with mutual guidance documents to help those groups. The focus of the project should be to get a higher level of on-the-ground implementation.

*Action: Ms Crockford would submit a draft to the Secretariat.*

2. Referring to adaptive management schemes, Mr Stroud suggested a monitoring project leading to a better understanding of productivity dynamics on a flyway scale for certain species.

*Action: Mr Stroud will submit a draft.*

3. One of the outcomes of WG8 was the necessity of the revision of *Conservation Guideline 5- Sustainable harvest* and *Conservation Guideline 1- Preparation of national SSAPs*, which would require funding for the next triennium.

*Action: WG 8 will work on the relevant drafts.*

139. In this context, the suggestion was made to focus more on investing in translating documents (official documents and guidelines) into French, Arabic and Russian to ensure that all the AEW Range States have access to the guidance documents and can implement them accordingly. The Secretariat is aware of this and the original translation of the Agreement text into Arabic has already been revised and improved. The suggestion was made to perhaps approach this in the framework of the WOW Partnership and use the project network for that purpose. Mr Stroud stressed that it was important that the initial costings for IITs included the costs of the eventual translation of outputs. It would be easier to ensure translation if this was seen as a fully integral component of the work undertaken, rather than seen as an additional 'extra' for which further funding is needed after project completion.

*Action: Mr Nagy will compile ideas and a possible approach and submit it to the Secretariat.*

140. On behalf of Switzerland as a donor country, Mr Biber pointed out that there is a certain cycle for funding and that it can only be granted for the year for which it is applied and not for future years; the Secretariat should endeavour to submit a choice of project proposals as early in the year as possible to ensure better chances of receiving funds for that particular year.

The Chair thanked all the TC Working Groups for their active participation and contributions, both intersessionally, via the Technical Committee Workspace and during the Meeting.

## **Agenda item 20. Other draft resolutions for MOP5**

### 1. Draft Resolution on AEWA's contribution to delivering the Aichi 2020 Biodiversity Targets (Doc TC 10.47)

141. The first draft of this resolution had been revised due to some contributions submitted throughout the meeting and the revised version was tabled.

*Action: The Meeting made some comments, which were noted by Mr Stroud who will post the draft on the TC Workspace for the purpose of finalising the draft by the end of September 2011.*

### Draft Resolution on the promotion of twinning schemes between the natural sites covered by AEWA and Ramsar (Doc TC 10.48)

142. This draft resolution was presented by Ms Courouble.

*Action: One amendment regarding Parties to AEWA, which are not already Parties to Ramsar to ratify the Convention, was suggested by Mr Clausen he agreed to formulate it and send it to the Secretariat after the meeting.*

### Draft Resolution to encourage greater joint implementation of AEWA and the Ramsar Convention (Doc TC 10.49)

143. Ms Courouble went on to introduce this draft resolution. The Meeting discussed the level of coordination within the CMS family, which would be the first step with regard to the reporting system then the next step could be to harmonise the reporting format with Ramsar. There was also some discussion on the wording and translation from French into English, which was misleading in places. Ms Courouble noted the suggested amendments.

*Action: Mr Clausen would word a paragraph regarding AEWA Parties having to be Ramsar Parties and would send it to the Secretariat.*

### Draft Resolution on legal and scientific clarifications on the notion of disturbance, useful for appropriate implementation of the AEWA Action Plan (Doc TC 10.50)

144. The Meeting had some discussion and suggestions regarding content, context and wording, which would be sent to Ms Courouble. There was some doubt that the Secretariat would be able to provide the *legal definitions* mentioned. It was ascertained that this resolution refers to recreational activity and disturbance. It was suggested that the title would need amendment and the scope of the resolution should be amended. Also a link could be added to the extractive industries issue.

### Draft Resolution on support for reinforcing capacities with a view to improving laws and policies in favour of waterbirds and the participation of non-EU States party to AEWA decisions (Doc TC 10.51)

145. Mr Middleton made a reference to the Council of Europe charter on hunting and biodiversity, which should be mentioned in this context. Mr Dereliev commented that the activity mentioned in the first paragraph corresponds to one (guidance for countries on how to implement the Agreement), which is already in the pipeline and being prepared by Ms Lehmann. Some further comments were noted by Ms Courouble:

*Action: All comments will be submitted to Ms Courouble, who will revise the draft resolutions and submit final drafts to the Secretariat.*

## **Agenda item 21. Date and venue of the next Technical Committee meeting**

146. Mr Dereliev observed that two intersessional meetings would take place and in order to have sufficient time to compile the tasks given to the TC by MOP5 and to develop the TC Work plan, the first of the two meetings would probably take place in the second half of 2012. Possibilities for the venue would be explored with Parties and new TC Members and decided in due course.

## **Agenda item 22. Any other business**

### Organisation of MOP5

147. Ms Courouble requested those present to submit suggestions for side-events so that ideas could be discussed at the next organisational meeting on 26 September 2011. Those suggested were: *a side event on cold weather and policy measures on shooting, harvesting, illegal shooting of Bewick's Swans, a real-life presentation of the use of environmental assessment, a side-event on threats to Lake Natron, Lake Naivasha and the Tana River Delta and on a joint venture between Wetlands International and the Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust on creating a network for migratory waterbirds and people including visitor's centres.* Ms Courouble went on to show a short presentation of the conference venue.

### Deadline for the delivery of meeting documents – change to the TC Modus Operandi

148. Mr Stroud raised the point of a submission deadline for Parties on issues to be considered by the TC (to be included in the TC Modus Operandi), which would have to be adopted by the MOP.

*Action: This could be discussed and decided on via the TCWS.*

## **Agenda item 23. Closure**

149. The Chair expressed her deep gratitude to the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) for hosting the meeting and the unforgettable excursion to Lake Nukuru, which had been an absolute highlight. She thanked Mr James Njogu and Ms Jenipher Olang from KWS for all their help and support before and during the meeting. All the participants have enjoyed their stay tremendously.

150. She went on to thank the delegates for their hard work and active participation during the meeting and for sharing their knowledge and expertise and taking part in additional meetings in the evenings in order to discuss issues in more depth and to finalise drafts. She also expressed warm thanks to the Secretariat Team for all the hard work involved in the preparations before and during the meeting. Finally she thanked everybody present for contributing to the warm, friendly and positive atmosphere, which is typical for the meetings of the AEWATC.

151. Finally Ms Kralj thanked the four delegates whose terms of office were coming to an end: Mr Sergei Khomenko (regional representative for Eastern Europe- not present), Mr Oliver Nasirwa (regional representative for Eastern Africa), Mr Ghassan Ramadan Jaradi (regional representative for Southwestern Asia); her own term of office as regional representative for Central Europe and Chair would also expire. She also thanked those who have had to step down prematurely because of work pressures, i.e. Mr John Mshelbwala (regional representative for Western Africa) and Mr Mark Anderson (regional representative for Southern Africa- not present). Personally, Ms Kralj had enjoyed her term of office, both as regional representative for Central Europe and as Chair and had learnt a great deal. She felt that it was a good thing to replace regional representatives occasionally to allow for fresh ideas and expertise. She thanked the UNEP/AEWATC Secretariat and particularly the Technical Officer, Mr Sergey Dereliev, for all his support throughout the duration of her term of office.

152. Mr Barbieri, for whom this was the first TC meeting, remarked that this meeting would, no doubt, remain in the memories of all those present, particularly from an ornithological point of view. He thanked everybody from KWS and KWSTI for the great hospitality received. Last but not least, he thanked the Technical Committee; he was extremely impressed by the quality and output of this meeting, particularly with regard to the volume of work being handled. He expressed special thanks to Ms Kralj for her valuable contributions on all levels and that she would be missed by all those present. He reiterated his thanks and appreciation to Mr Njogu and Ms Olang who had guided the smooth running of the meeting and ensured that everything had gone to plan, while contributing to the friendly atmosphere throughout.

153. Mr Barbieri finished by presenting all those leaving with a personal message and a book as a token of appreciation on the part of the Secretariat. He also presented Mr Njogu and Ms Olang with gifts and a promise to keep up the close cooperation with Kenya.

The Chair declared the meeting closed.

ANNEX I

**10<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF THE AEWA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE  
FINAL LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

***REPRESENTATIVES OF THE REGIONS***

**CENTRAL EUROPE**

Dr. Sci. Jelena Kralj (Chair)  
Institute of Ornithology  
Croatian Academy of Arts and Science  
Gundulićeva 24  
10000 Zagreb  
CROATIA

Tel.: +385 1 4825 401  
Fax: +385 1 4825 392  
E-mail: zzo@hazu.hr

**EASTERN AFRICA**

Mr Oliver O. Nasirwa  
Regional Waterbird Officer  
Wetlands International  
P.O. Box 3502  
00100 Nairobi  
KENYA

Tel.: +254 (0) 20 8562246  
Fax: +254 (0) 20 8562259  
E-mail: oliver.nasirwa@birdlife.or.ke

**NORTHERN AFRICA**

Mr Hichem Azafzaf (Vice chair)  
President  
Association "Les Amis des Oiseaux"  
(BirdLife Partner in Tunisia)  
11 Rue Abdou el Alla el Maari 2080  
Ariana  
Tunis  
TUNISIA

Tel. : +216 23 207 238  
Fax : +216 71 701 664  
E-mail : azafzaf@gnet.tn

**NORTH AND SOUTH WESTERN EUROPE**

Dr. David Alan Stroud  
Senior Ornithologist  
UK Joint Nature Conservation Committee  
Monkstone House  
City Road  
PE1 1JY Peterborough  
UNITED KINGDOM

Tel.: +44 1733 866810  
Fax: +44 1733 555948  
E-mail: David.Stroud@jncc.gov.uk

**SOUTHWESTERN ASIA**

Professor Ghassan Ramadan Jaradi  
University of Lebanon, Faculty of Science  
P.O. Box 11-8281  
Bir Hassan/CNRS  
Beirut  
LEBANON

Tel.: +961 3 689840 / +961 1 644518  
Fax: +961 6 615 938  
E-mail: r-jaradi@cyberia.net.lb

**WESTERN AFRICA**

Mr John H. Mshelbwala  
Assistant Director (Wildlife Management)  
Federal Ministry of Environment  
PLOT 393/394  
Augustus Aikhomu Way, Utako District, PMB 468  
Garki, Abuja  
NIGERIA

Tel.: +234 9 80 33 28 70 39  
E-mail: johnmshelbwala2@yahoo.com

***REPRESENTATIVES OF ORGANISATIONS*****Wetlands International**

Dr. Szabolcs Nagy  
Biodiversity Programme Manager  
Wetlands International  
Horapark 9  
6717 LZ Ede  
NETHERLANDS

Tel: +31 318 660 935  
Fax: +31 318 660 950  
E-mail: Szabolcs.Nagy@wetlands.org

***EXPERTS*****ENVIRONMENTAL LAW**

Ms Melissa Lewis  
Environmental Law Expert  
University of Kwazulu-Natal  
8 Glenart Road  
3610 Kloof  
SOUTH AFRICA

Tel.: +27 74 22 8011  
Fax : +27 31 76 74 857  
E-mail : lewism@ukzn.ac.za

**GAME MANAGEMENT**

Mr Jean-Yves Mondain-Monval  
ONCFS (Office national de la chasse et de la faune  
sauvage)  
Le Sambuc  
13200 Arles  
FRANCE

Tel.: +33 490 97 27 90  
Fax: +33 490 97 27 88  
E-mail: jean-yves.mondain-monval@oncfs.gouv.fr

***OBSERVERS FROM CONTRACTING PARTIES*****DENMARK**

Mr Jon Erling Krabbe  
Head of Section  
Danish Forest and Nature Agency  
Ministry of Environment  
Natur & Skov  
Haraldsgade 53  
2100 Copenhagen OE  
DENMARK

Tel.: +45 725 42507  
Fax: +45 3927 9899  
E-mail: [ekr@sns.dk](mailto:ekr@sns.dk)

**KENYA (Host Country)**

Dr. James Gichiah Njogu  
Head of Conventions and Research Authorization  
Kenya Wildlife Service  
P.O. Box 40241  
00100 Nairobi  
KENYA

Tel.: +254 (020) 6000800  
Fax: + 254 (020) 6003792  
E-mail: jgichiah@kws.go.ke

Ms. Jenipher Olang  
Kenya Wildlife Service  
P.O. Box 40241  
00100 Nairobi  
KENYA

Tel.: +254720840041 / 2546000800 Ext. 2177  
Fax: +254 (020) 6003792  
E-mail: conventions@kws.go.ke

**ESTONIA**

Mr Üllar Rammul  
Senior Officer  
Ministry of the Environment  
Narva Mnt 7A  
15172 Tallinn  
ESTONIA

Tel.: + 372 6262881  
Fax: + 372 6262801  
E-mail: yllar.rammul@envir.ee

**SOUTH AFRICA**

Ms Wilma Lutsch  
Director Biodiversity Conservation  
Department of Environmental Affairs  
P.O. Box X447  
Pretoria 0001  
SOUTH AFRICA

Tel.: + 27 12 310 3694  
Fax: +27 12 320 2844  
E-mail: wlutsch@environment.gov.za

Mr Peter Pouplier  
Head of Department  
Danish Ministry of the Environment  
Rentemestervej 8  
DK 2400  
Copenhagen  
DENMARK

Tel.: + 45 2295 2031  
Fax: + 45 3587 5051  
E-mail: ppo@kms.dk

Dr. Preben Clausen  
Senior Scientist  
Department of Bioscience  
Aarhus University  
Grenaavej 14  
DK-8410 Roende  
DENMARK

Tel.: +45 2334 4767  
Fax: + 45 8920 1514  
E-mail: pc@dmu.dk

**FRANCE**

Ms Marianne Courouble  
Chargée de mission – affaires internationales –  
Ministère de l'écologie, du développement durable,  
des transports et du logement  
(MEDDTL)  
DGALN/DEB/PEM  
Arche Sud 92055  
La Défense cedex  
FRANCE

Tel.: +33 1 40 81 31 90  
Fax: +33 1 40 81 74 71  
E-mail: Marianne.courouble@developpement-  
durable.gouv.fr

**SUDAN**

Dr. A. Abdalla Elmakki Mohamed  
Director of Wildlife Conservation  
Wildlife Conservation General Administration  
Elmfiedy Street  
P.O. Box 336  
Khartoum  
SUDAN

Tel.: + 24 991 239 1671  
Fax: +24 918 352 2109  
E-mail: abdalbagialmakki@yahoo.com  
Wildlife\_sudan@yahoo.com

**SWITZERLAND**

Dr. Olivier Biber  
Head International Biodiversity Unit  
Swiss Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN)  
CH-3003 Bern  
SWITZERLAND  
Tel.: +41 323 0663  
Fax: +41 324 7579  
E-mail: Olivier.biber@bafu.admin.ch

***OBSERVERS***

**BirdLife International**

Ms. Nicola Crockford  
International Species Policy Officer  
Birdlife International  
RSPB, The Lodge  
Sandy SG19 2DL, Beds  
UNITED KINGDOM

Tel.: +44 1767 693 072  
Fax: +44 1767 683 211; +44 1767 692365  
E-mail: nicola.crockford@rspb.org.uk

**Federation of Association for Hunting & Conservation of the EU (FACE)/**

Mr Angus Middleton  
Director of Conservation  
Rue F. Pelletier 82  
1030 Brussels  
BELGIUM

Tel.: +32 2 732 69 00  
Fax: +32 2 732 70 72  
E-mail: angus.middleton@face.eu

**Oiseaux Migrateurs Du Palearctique Occidentale (O.M.P.O.)**

Mr Guy- Noël Olivier  
Expert  
5, avenue des Chasseurs  
75017 Paris  
FRANCE

Tel.: +33 1 44 01 05 10  
Fax : +33 1 44 01 05 11  
E-mail : guy-noel.olivier@ompo.org

**The Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust (WWT)**

Dr. Baz Hughes  
Head of Species Conservation Department  
WWT  
Slimbridge  
Gloucestershire, GL2 7BT  
UNITED KINGDOM

Tel.: +44 1453 891 175 / +44 (0) 7717 431689  
Fax: +44 1453 890 827  
E-mail: baz.hughes@wwt.org.uk

***OTHER CONTRIBUTORS***

**The British Association for Shooting and Conservation (BASC)**

Dr. John Harradine  
Director of Research  
BASC  
Marford Hill, Rossett  
Wrexham LL12 OHL  
UNITED KINGDOM

Tel.: +44 1244 573 016  
Fax: +44 1244 573 013  
E-mail: john.harradine@basc.org.uk

*SECRETARIAT*

**Secretariat for the Agreement on the  
Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory  
Waterbirds (AEWA)**

Mr Marco Barbieri, Acting Executive Secretary  
Mr Sergey Dereliev, Technical Officer  
Ms. Jolanta Kremer, Team Assistant  
Ms. Catherine Lehmann, Programme Officer  
Ms. Marie-Therese Kaemper, Administrative  
Assistant  
Ms. Evelyn Parh Moloko, Coordinator African  
Initiative

UN Campus  
Hermann-Ehlers-Str. 10  
53113 Bonn  
GERMANY

Tel: +49 228 815-2413  
Fax: +49 228 815-2450  
E-mail: [aewa@unep.de](mailto:aewa@unep.de)  
[www.unep-aewa.org](http://www.unep-aewa.org)

## ANNEX II

# PROPOSAL FROM SWEDEN TO AMEND THE INTERNATIONAL SINGLE SPECIES ACTION PLAN FOR THE LESSER WHITE-FRONTED GOOSE

(Document TC 10.56 examined under agenda item 11)

*Recommendation from the AEWA Technical Committee*

### BACKGROUND INFORMATION

#### *Status of Lesser White-fronted Goose in Sweden*

Formerly a common breeder in Sweden. Evidence recently presented in Anderson & Holmqvist (2010) suggested that very small numbers of Lesser White-fronted Geese were present (and some bred successfully) just prior to the release of captive bred birds in 1981. There are currently approximately 15-20 Lesser White-fronted Goose pairs (or 80-100 individuals) breeding in Sweden and migrating to the Netherlands.

#### *Origin of Lesser White-fronted Geese released in Sweden*

The Action Plan (with proposed Swedish amendments marked in Track Changes) states:

“A Lesser White-fronted Goose captive-breeding programme was established in Sweden by Lambart von Essen in the late 1970s and the first releases into the wild took place in 1981 (e.g. von Essen 1996). The breeding stock was built up mainly with birds and eggs originating from waterfowl collections in the UK and continental Europe and included 7 Swedish Lesser White-fronted Geese among the founders (Tegelström *et al.* 2001). During the period 1981 to 1999, 348 captive-bred and colour-ring-marked Lesser White-fronted Geese were released in Swedish Lapland. Barnacle Geese *Branta leucopsis* were used as foster-parents and the supplemented Lesser White-fronted Geese followed their foster parents to wintering grounds in the Netherlands.

In 1999, 30-40 Lesser White-fronted Geese of mostly Belgian origin were released in central Sweden and guided by ultra-light aircraft to Germany. Most were recaptured when they returned to the release site, but a few remained free-flying and have been observed in coastal areas of Finland (occasionally also in Denmark and Germany) mainly together with urbanised Barnacle Geese. No breeding by these birds has been reported (L. Kahanpää *pers. comm.*); there are recent observations of hybrid Barnacle and Lesser-White-fronted Geese in the urban population of Barnacle Geese in South-West Finland (T. Lehtiniemi *pers. comm.*)”.

#### *IUCN Reintroduction Criteria*

IUCN defines ‘re-establishment’ as a successful ‘re-introduction’, a successful ‘attempt to establish a species in an area which was once part of its historical range, but from which it has been extirpated or become extinct’. A re-introduction contrasts with a ‘translocation’, which is the ‘deliberate and mediated movement of wild individuals or populations from one part of their range to another’; a ‘reinforcement/supplementation’, which is the ‘addition of individuals to an existing population of conspecifics’; and a ‘conservation/benign introduction’, which is ‘an attempt to establish a species, for the purpose of conservation, outside its recorded distribution but within an appropriate habitat and ecogeographical area’ (IUCN/SSC RSG 1995).

## PROCESS AND TIMESCALE FOR ACTION PLAN UPDATE

### Comments from the AEWA TC

The responsibility for updating the International Single Species Action Plan for the Conservation of the Lesser White-fronted Goose (Western Palearctic population) *Anser erythropus* lies with the Lesser White-fronted Goose International Working Group. The preamble to the Action Plan states:

#### *Reviews*

This International Single Species Action Plan should be revised in 2013. An emergency review shall be undertaken if there are sudden major changes liable to affect the Western Palearctic Population.

### Recommendation from the AEWA TC

The changes to the Action Plan suggested by Sweden do not represent an issue likely to result in “sudden major changes liable to affect the Western Palearctic Population”. Therefore the suggested changes should be considered during the next revision in 2013.

## ISSUES RAISED IN THE PROPOSAL

- 1. The Swedish breeding population of Lesser White-fronted Goose should be recognised as “re-enforced or supplemented” and not “re-introduced”.**

### Comments from the AEWA TC

The IUCN guidelines (see above) provide no information regarding how the terminology relates to migratory populations and the authors have themselves recognised problems with the terminology used in the guidelines. Whilst the release of Lesser White-fronted Geese into Sweden during the breeding season might be viewed as a supplementation, it is not clear that the released birds joined an existing population as the supplementation definition requires. The released birds were led to wintering grounds by their Barnacle Goose foster parents and subsequently established a south-westerly migration route to the Netherlands. There is little evidence that such a migration route previously existed, although it is impossible to rule out the existence of such a migration route before records began (ref. Marchant, J.H. & Musgrove, A.J. (2011) Review of European flyways of the Lesser White-fronted Goose *Anser erythropus*. Research Report 595. British Trust for Ornithology, Thetford. Draft report prepared for the Committee on Captive Breeding, Reintroduction and Supplementation of Lesser White-fronted Geese in Fennoscandia ). With regards to the staging and wintering areas, the release of birds into this flyway could therefore be viewed as an introduction.

### Recommendation from the AEWA TC

The population should be viewed as either “supplemented”, “reintroduced”, “introduced” or probably some combination of the three. Clarification on this issue should be sought from the IUCN Reintroduction Specialist Group and it should be taken into account during the next revision of the Action Plan.

- 2. It is erroneous to state that the Swedish population is “derived from captive-bred birds” and “created by the release of captive-bred birds”.**

### Comments from the AEWA TC

Given the evidence presented in von Essen (1996) and Tegelström *et al.* (2001) and summarised in the Action Plan (see above), especially the large numbers of birds released, high survival rate of released birds and use of Barnacle Goose foster parents, it seems likely that the population of birds migrating from Sweden to the Netherlands was largely derived and created from the release of captive-bred birds. It is unclear whether the released birds joined breeding birds in Sweden or established a new breeding population coincident with the extirpation of the wild population. Regardless, the Swedish population contains at least a

large proportion of birds descendent from captive-bred birds, and winters in the Netherlands as a result of the release programme using Barnacle Goose foster parents with wintering grounds in the Netherlands.

**Recommendation from the AEWA TC**

This issue should be considered during the next revision of the Action Plan.

- 3. There is no evidence indicating that the Swedish LWfG population is not wild. It is not a captive population.**

**Comments from the AEWA TC**

The extant Swedish Lesser White-fronted Goose population is unquestionably not a captive population. The population should be viewed as either “supplemented”, “reintroduced”, “introduced” or probably some combination of the three, depending on advice from the IUCN Reintroduction Specialist Group.

**Recommendation from the AEWA TC**

This issue should be considered during the next revision of the Action Plan.

- 4. The Swedish breeding population of Lesser White-fronted Goose should be recognised as part of the Fennoscandian population, not as a separate population – as implied by replacement of Action Plan text from four to three subpopulations.**

**Comments from the AEWA TC**

Given that birds breeding in Sweden migrate down a completely different migration route, they therefore represent a different biogeographic population to Norwegian birds.

**Recommendation from the AEWA TC**

The original text from the Action Plan is still appropriate – “Four subpopulations can be recognised, three of which are surviving components of the species’ formerly more extensive breeding range”. During the next revision of the action plan, the Lesser White-fronted Goose International Working Group should consider whether the term “Fennoscandian” subpopulation is still appropriate or whether a new terminology should be adopted, considering there are effectively two subpopulations breeding in Fennoscandia.

**WG3. Task d)- Drafted 13 September 2011****COMMUNICATION FROM THE AEWA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE TO THE  
CMS SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL INTERSESSIONAL WORKING GROUP ON  
BIRD TAXONOMY AND NOMENCLATURE**

The Contracting Parties through Resolution 4.11 instructed the AEWA Technical Committee to review taxonomic classifications of birds and suggest the most appropriate classification for the purposes of the Agreement. In relation to this task, the Technical Committee discussed the possible implications of the document '*Conclusions of the CMS Intersessional Working Group on Taxonomy*' produced by the CMS Scientific Council Intersessional Working Group on Bird Taxonomy and Nomenclature at its 10<sup>th</sup> Meeting held at Naivasha, Kenya, 12-16 September 2011.

Although the Technical Committee has taken note of the benefits of a harmonised taxonomy within the CMS family and beyond, it identified the following issues of concern in relation to the work of the Agreement:

- Application of the IUCN Red List status in relation to Category 1b of Column A;
- Assessment of conservation status of AEWA populations and their subsequent classification in Table 1 of the AEWA Action Plan and the reporting requirements established by Technical Committee for the Conservation Status Report pursuant to Art. 7.4a) of the AEWA Action Plan;
- The requirements related to the designation of internationally important areas pursuant to Art. 3.2.2 of the AEWA Action Plan and the relations in this respect to the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands;
- The future operations of the Critical Site Network Tool which was developed to support the AEWA Contracting Parties and Secretariat in implementing the Agreement.

The taxonomy used by AEWA in Annex 2 and in Table 1 of the Action Plan has been closely aligned with the one used by Wetlands International and through that with the one of BirdLife International. These organisations regularly produce reports for the Agreement such as the Conservation Status Report and maintain an information portal, the Critical Site Network Tool, which supports the implementation of the Agreement. The existing alignment of the taxonomy of AEWA, Wetlands International and BirdLife International presents information management benefits for the Agreement by allowing the linking of various data sources for integrated analyses. A potential change to another taxonomy may undermine these benefits.

Considering these facts, the Technical Committee has compared the consequences of using the taxonomy of Dickinson and of BirdLife International. It presented the summary of its findings in the attached table.

In conclusion and in relation to the pragmatic and financial reasons outlined in the table below, the Technical Committee see a number of disadvantages of the use of the Dickinson taxonomy for the purposes of the Agreement in comparison to the BirdLife one. Therefore, the Technical Committee request the Intersessional Working Group of the CMS Scientific Council to consider these implications in the course of formulating its final recommendations to the Scientific Council.

AEWA's needs	Dickinson taxonomy	BirdLife taxonomy	Implications of not meeting the AEWA needs
Correspondence of the AEWA taxonomy with the IUCN Red List taxonomy for the purpose of classification of populations under Column A1b.	Potential divergence in time.	It is the basis of the IUCN Red List Assessment.	Species not recognised by AEWA might be IUCN Red Listed, but will not be recognised in Column A1b.
Taxonomy of Table 1 corresponds with the information sources of the Conservation Status Report.	Because the taxonomy of sources underpinning the CSR are different from Dickinson, it will be complicated to link the AEWA Table 1 to data sources underpinning the CSR and Table 1 revisions for those taxa that do not correspond.	<p>WI has already adopted the BirdLife taxonomy in the Waterbird Population Estimates process (cf. joint work plan of Ramsar and AEWA).</p> <p>Analyses in the CSR are using the information stored in the BirdLife WBDB.</p>	<p>Production of the Conservation Status Report will be much more time consuming and, therefore, expensive.</p> <p><b>It</b> will be not possible to produce threat and habitat related analyses using the WBDB.</p>
According to Art. 3.2.2 of the AEWA Action Plan Contracting Parties Parties shall endeavour to give special protection to those wetlands which meet internationally accepted criteria of international importance. <i>Inter alia</i> , this refers to Criteria 2 and 6 of the Ramsar Convention. The former concerns endangered species (c.f. IUCN Red List), while the latter concerns sites holding more than 1% of a biogeographic population.	If taxonomy diverges, it will be complicated to use the Waterbird Population Estimates for applying the 1% threshold and the IUCN Red List for those taxa which do not correspond.	The 1% thresholds published in the Waterbird Population Estimates (using the BirdLife taxonomy) are recognised as the official basis for selecting sites of international importance under Ramsar Convention, the IDA and the SPA designation processes.	

<b>AEWA's needs</b>	<b>Dickinson taxonomy</b>	<b>BirdLife taxonomy</b>	<b>Implications of not meeting the AEWA need</b>
The Critical Site Network Tool supports the implementation of AEWA in relation to site designation, site report and therefore the taxonomy used in the CSN need to correspond to Table 1 of AEWA.	There will be no direct link between AEWA Table 1 and the information held in the CSN Tool for those taxa which do not correspond.	The CSN Tool is using the information stored in the BirdLife World Bird Database and layers are linked through the BirdLife taxonomy.	It will require more time to convert the information held in the underlying datasets, which will result in higher maintenance costs.

ANNEX IV

TC10 DECISIONS AND ACTIONS

AGENDA ITEM	DECISION	ACTION
<b>Agenda item 3. Adoption of the Agenda and Work Programme</b>	The Meeting adopted the Agenda and Work Programme with one addition and one amendment	
<b>Agenda item 4. Admission of Observers</b>	The Meeting agreed to admit the Observers present	
<b>Agenda item 5. Adoption of the Minutes of the 9<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Technical Committee</b>	The meeting minutes should be comprehensive but shorter than in the past. They should be made available on the TCWS six weeks after the Meeting and the TC given a further 6 weeks to submit comments. The final draft should be posted on the TCWS and AEWA website ca. 4 months after the Meeting	The issue of which of the regional representatives is responsible for representing the EU within the TC should be brought forward to the StC and MOP.
<b>Agenda item 7. Reports by the National Representatives</b>		Mr Stroud and Mr Azafzaf agreed to draft a revised regional reporting template.
<b>Agenda item 9.1 Future Shape of CMS</b>		The Meeting was requested to submit any comments on CMS draft resolution 10.09 to Mr. Biber by 20 September 2011 and on 10.10 to the Secretariat by 20 September 2011.
<b>Additional Agenda item: Demonstration of the newly developed CMS Online Reporting System (ORS)</b>		A drafting group for designing the analyses (by mid-December 2011) of national reporting was formed, consisting of Mr Stroud, Ms Lewis, Mr Clausen, Ms Crockford and Mr Mondain-Monval. The final draft would be consulted with the whole of the TC via the TCWS
<b>Agenda item 10. AEWA International Reviews (as per paragraph 7.4 of the AEWA Action Plan)</b>	<u>CSR5</u> No changes would be made to the proposal for amendment of resolution 3.3 as held down in document TC 10.8, to be submitted to the StC and MOP for approval.	The TC was requested to submit comments on the draft CSR5 by September 2011. Wetlands International will submit the final draft of CSR5 to the Secretariat by the end of October 2011.
	<u>Site Network Report</u> After discussing the issue, the Meeting decided that the proposed methodology provided a good basis for both aspects of this task.	Mr Nagy will draft a resolution with regard to the CSR5 and the Site Network Report when the site network report conclusions are clear.
<b>Agenda item 11. AEWA Single Species Action Plans (SSAPs) and Species Management Plan (SMP)</b>	<u>Slaty Egret SSAP</u>	The amendments to the Slaty Egret SSAP were noted by the Secretariat and will be forwarded to the compiler.
	<u>Bewick's Swan SSAP</u>	Mr Nagy will incorporate proposals for amendments to this SSAP in the final draft to be submitted to the Secretariat.
	<u>Greenland White-fronted Goose SSAP</u>	Mr Stroud noted the suggested amendments for incorporation into the final draft.

AGENDA ITEM	DECISION	ACTION
	<u>Red-breasted Goose SSAP</u>	The Secretariat noted some minor comments for incorporation into the final draft.
	All five International Species Action Plans and the Flyway Management Plan were approved subject to the incorporation of the discussed amendments	
	<u>Lesser White-fronted Goose SSAP</u> The Meeting did not accept the Swedish proposal for amendment.	The Secretariat will contact the IUCN Reintroduction Specialist Group in order to seek advice towards the clarification of the terminology and status of the respective population of the LWfG.
		The Secretariat will distribute this paper to the Members of the Committee on Captive Breeding, Re-introduction and Supplementation of Lesser White-fronted Geese (LWfG) in Fennoscandia (RECAP) and report on the issues to the up-coming 7 <sup>th</sup> Standing Committee Meeting.
	<u>Pink-footed Goose Flyway Management Plan (Svalbard/NW Europe population)</u>	Comments on terminology were noted by Mr Dereliev and will be incorporated (change the title of the plan from Flyway Management Plan to Species Management Plan).
	<u>Draft Resolution on Single Species Action Plans and Management Plans</u> The Secretariat will draft a proposal for amendment to the AEWA Action Plan as follows: Para 4.3.3 'Parties shall cooperate with a view to developing <i>species management plans</i> for populations which cause significant damage, in particular to crops and fisheries.	
<b>Agenda item 12. Other plans, reviews and guidelines</b>	<u>African Plan of Action</u>	Ms Moloko noted the comments and suggestions made by the Meeting for incorporation into the questionnaires. The final questionnaires would be circulated together with the revised draft Action Plan for Africa to the Parties and potential donors.
	<u>Adverse effects of agrochemicals on migratory waterbirds in Africa</u> The draft resolution was approved with the incorporation of the discussed amendments.	
	<u>Review and guidelines for mitigating/avoiding the conflict between migratory birds and electricity power grids in the African-Eurasian region</u> The AEWA resolution on power lines will be based on that approved by the CMS COP10. Mr Dereliev will inform the TC of the approved text after COP10.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Comments made during the Meeting were noted by the Secretariat; further comments on the draft resolution must be submitted by 20 September 2011 via the TCWS</li> <li>- Comments on the review and guidelines should be submitted by 30 September 2011 via the TCWS.</li> </ul>

AGENDA ITEM	DECISION	ACTION
<b>Agenda item 16. Recapitulation of workshops of TC Working Groups 1-8 (excl. WG 7)</b>	<i>Decisions and actions relating to all the individual tasks of the Working Groups are specified on pages 19 – 23 of the report.</i>	
<b>Agenda item 17. TC Working Group 9 (Extractive Industries)</b>	The TC agreed to the approach of collaborating with the Ramsar Convention to produce a Guide to Guidance on Extractive Industries and approved the related draft resolution, which had been tabled during the meeting.	Ms Lutsch offered to provide the TC with guidelines on the impact of mining on biodiversity in South Africa, which are currently being revised.
<b>Agenda item 18. TC Working Group 10 (Emerging Industries)</b>	<u>Invasive alien aquatic weeds on waterbird habitats in Africa</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Regarding the report, it was decided to provide the executive summary only (16 pages) as an information document for MOP5</li> <li>2. The Meeting approved the draft resolution, which had been re-worded during the meeting together with some comments referring to the mentioned findings outlined in the report, which would be checked by the Secretariat and amended where necessary.</li> </ol>	The Secretariat will make a reference to both these draft resolutions and the revised versions would be circulated on the TCWS for approval by the TC
	<u>Renewable energy impacts</u> It was decided that the explanatory note would be revised by the Secretariat and references added. Other comments from the Meeting would be collected and the draft resolution revised.	
<b>Agenda item 19. TC Working Group 7 (IT)</b>	<i>Decisions and actions referring to this agenda item are outlined on page 25 of the report.</i>	
<b>Agenda item 20. Other draft resolutions for MOP5</b>	<i>Decisions and actions referring to this agenda item and the five resolutions discussed are outlined on page 26 of the report.</i>	
<b>Agenda item 22. Any other business</b>	<u>Deadline for the delivery of meeting documents – change to the TC Modus Operandi</u>	This point would be discussed and decided on via the TCWS.