

Meeting of the AEWA Technical Committee dd. 23 October 2000

Bundesministerium für Umwelt- Naturschutz und Reaktorsicherheit (BMU), Heinrich-von-Stephan Straße, Bonn, 23-24 October 2000

1. Opening

Jan Willem Sneep (Netherlands) assumed the role of provisional chairman and introduced himself to the meeting as a long standing representative at CMS and CMS related Agreements, including AEWA. He mentioned the importance of migratory birds in culture and legend and that modern interest in the phenomenon might be said to have started with the first bird-ringer, Mortensen. As conservation of migratory waterbirds was a common responsibility of all countries, AEWA needed more parties. Resolution 1.8 adopted at Cape Town established the Technical Committee, which was meeting for the first time.

2. Welcoming Addresses

Douglas Hykle (Deputy Executive Secretary of CMS) welcomed the committee members on behalf of the parent Convention, CMS. He apologised on behalf of Arnulf Müller-Helmbrecht who was unable to attend the TC. He stressed the important role that the TC would have in developing the Agreement in its formative years. It was vital that the members took this role seriously. AEWA was important for CMS, as AEWA was a flagship Agreement. Mr Hykle reported that he had just returned from Japan where national representatives had been discussing how to address flyway issues in the Eastern Asia-Western Pacific region and had opted to adopt a non-binding strategy. The Americas had adopted a site-based approach for the Western Hemisphere Shorebird Network. When the range states of the Central Asian-Indian flyway met to consider their options, they would have three models, and AEWA owed it to itself to prove that the path it had followed was the best.

Gerhard Adams (Germany) welcomed the delegates on behalf of the host government. Germany was honoured that the TC had decided to hold its first meeting in Bonn. He mentioned the recent move of the AEWA Secretariat from its interim location in The Hague to its permanent seat in Bonn alongside the CMS Secretariat. He also looked forward to the MOP2, which would be held back-to-back with CMS COP7 at the Hotel *Maritim*. Mr Sneep added his thanks to the hosts from the chair.

Bert Lenten (Secretariat) added his gratitude to the Federal Environment Ministry for their assistance when the Secretariat moved from The Hague to Bonn. Mr Lenten pointed out that he was currently the only member of staff employed by the Secretariat, although he hoped to be in a position to appoint an assistant/secretary by January 2001. The TC, established under Article 7 of the Agreement had the task of animating the Agreement and overseeing its proper implementation. He hoped that the members of the Committee would take the opportunity of getting to know each other. He extended the apologies of a number of members who were unable to attend, Mr Seydou (Niger), Mr Aloklah (Jordan), Mr Mungroo (Mauritius, the provisional Chairman), and Dr Boere (Netherlands) who had now left the Dutch Ministry to work for Wetlands International.

On behalf of the Depositary, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, Mr Sneep announced that AEWA now had 27 Parties (14 in Eurasia and 13 in Africa) and that the Agreement was now closed for signature, meaning that any range state wishing to become a Party to the Agreement would now have to deposit instruments of accession. At Mr Sneep's suggestion, a *tour de table* was held allowing all the delegates present to introduce themselves.

3. Adoption of the Agenda, Work Programme and Rules of Procedure

The provisional agenda and work schedule were both adopted unamended.

With regard to the rules of Procedure, Mr Lenten pointed out that there was a need for action on two points. He pointed out that the Rules provided for the appointment of alternate members of the Committee, both for regional representatives and experts. No alternate experts had been appointed, and Mr Lenten suggested that the Committee might consider abolishing expert alternates. Mr Adams (Germany) citing Article 7, said that this decision should be made by the MOP and therefore suggested that the Secretariat should prepare a proposal to amend Article 7 of the Rules.

Mr Lenten reported that a situation had arisen for which the Rules made no provision, namely the replacement of a member of the Committee who had resigned (Dr Boere having left the Dutch Ministry could no longer continue to serve as the representative for North and South-western Europe). The Rules would have to be amended to allow for by-elections.

The Committee having noted the comments of the Secretariat adopted the Rules of Procedure.

4. Election of the Chair and Vice-Chair

During the MOP1, only a limited number of the members of the Technical Committee were present. These members decided to appoint Mr Mungroo, being the Alternate for Southern Africa, as the provisional Chairman. Furthermore it was decided that at the first meeting of the Technical Committee the election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman should take place. In the absence of the provisional Chairman, Mr Mungroo, the meeting had to elect a new Chairman. Regarding the election, it was suggested that if the Chairman represented Eurasia, then the Vice-Chairman should represent an African country or *vice versa*. The Secretariat had contacted Mr Taylor (South Africa) prior to the meeting and he had indicated his willingness to serve. Mr Munteanu (Romania) was elected Vice-Chairman, and assumed the Chair until Mr Taylor's arrival.

5. Election of Representatives for North & South Western Europe and the Alternate for South Western Asia

Mr Lenten reported that Dr Boere (Netherlands) had resigned from the Committee and his alternate, Dr Moser (United Kingdom) was unable to take over. Mr Sneep had contacted the other Parties in the North and South-western Europe region to seek suggestions for a replacement. It was noted that the MOP would have to confirm any new appointment. It was proposed that Olivier Biber (Switzerland) should serve as observer/quasi representative. He accepted the nomination and confirmed that he had clearance from his employers to dedicate the required time.

The South West Asia region had only one party (Jordan), and so a non-Party state would have to

provide the alternate. Having spoken to Mr Alokiah (Jordan), the Secretariat proposed nominating Saulat Sakenov of Kazakhstan, who was known to be willing to serve. The Committee agreed to this proposal.

6. Admission of Observers

The Committee was invited to approve the participation of representatives from UNEP-WCMC, BirdLife International, FACE and Tour de Valat as observers. It was pointed out that Article 7 of the Rules of Procedure limited the number of observers to four, but this referred to observer organisations; all parties to AEWA were entitled to send observers to the Committee.

7. Report by the Secretariat

Mr Lenten presented the Secretariat's report concentrating on developments since the MOP in Cape Town in November 1999.

Completing financial aspects of MOP had been time-consuming, as deadlines for invoices had to be met and various Ministries and organisations were involved in the arrangements. The English version of the Proceedings had been published. Changes of personnel in UNEP Nairobi had caused delays in the translation of the French version, which would be ready for publication shortly. The French version in circulation was only provisional and needed to be checked against the English text.

The Secretariat had moved from its interim home in the Dutch Agriculture Ministry in The Hague to the UN Premises in Bonn in June and July 2000. Disruption had been kept to a minimum thanks to the assistance of the German authorities and CMS.

A job description had been written for the post of Executive Secretary and the recruitment exercise had been carried out, resulting in the confirmation of the interim secretary as the Executive Secretary. The Trust Fund had been established and contributions from Parties had been solicited to ensure that the Secretariat was solvent. Work was progressing on the appointment of an assistant/secretary and the new member of staff should be in post at the start of 2001.

Organising and preparing for the TC almost single-handed had been a challenge. Mr Lenten apologised for the fact that some documents had been produced in English only.

Mr Lenten had visited Kampala, Uganda to attend the Pan-African Ornithological Congress and the IUCN World Conservation congress in Amman. The latter was useful for networking, particularly regarding the Arabic world. Probably early next year an outreach workshop for the GEF AEWA Flyway project would be organised in Bahrain, which would also give the possibility to promote the Agreement.

Regarding the Trust Fund (Doc1.11), there was a large balance remaining. Some Parties had paid their contributions on time, but others had still not paid. UNEP's Finance Department had sent invoices to the Parties via their representatives at UNEP. The Secretariat had sent copies of the invoices direct to the Focal Points in the hope of speeding procedures up. It was estimated that the amount of money spent by the Secretariat was US\$ 80,000, mainly on salaries, translation

services, travel and arrangements for the TC. The current estimate for the end of year balance was

US\$ 268,000, US\$ 200,000 of which should be held back as a buffer to cover expenditures during the first six months of 2001, in case contributions were not received by the Trust Fund.

8. Review of the Regions used for the Technical Committee

Mr Lenten introduced Document 1.5 concerning the review of the regions used by AEWA and invited the Committee to consider whether it was desirable to reallocate some countries to different regions. With regard to Africa, AEWA followed the model used by the Pan-African Ornithological Conference; but there was no model, which could be taken over from another forum covering the whole of AEWA's range that appeared entirely suitable.

Mr Mokoko (Congo) raised the cases of Rwanda, Burundi and Chad. The first two were sometimes considered to be Central Africa and sometimes East Africa. Chad seemed to vary between Western and Central African.

Mr El-Din (Egypt) asked whether the basis of the regions was scientific, geographic or political, or a combination of the three. He suggested that it might make sense to create a Mediterranean region, straddling Eurasia and Africa.

Ms Adam (Environmental Law Expert) questioned whether the Agreement actually required the Range to be divided into nine regions, as the text only called for nine experts representing different areas. Mr Gimenez-Dixon (IUCN) suggested that the Range could be divided into two areas, Eurasia and Africa, with four and five representatives respectively, and it could be left to the two regions to ensure as broad a geographic representation as possible. He also raised the case of Israel, which Ramsar treated as being part of Asia but this led to political difficulties. Mr Adams (Germany) followed from the text of the Agreement, the text of Resolution 1.8 and from the discussion at previous meetings that division of the Agreement area in nine regions was required.

Mr Lenten (Secretariat) felt that the Committee should not at this stage concern itself with a major overhaul of the principles of the representation, but should merely undertake some fine-tuning where necessary. In view of the discussion, Chad would be moved from West to Central Africa.

9. Review of the National Reports

Mr Lenten explained that at MOP1 the format of the United Kingdom's report, based on its report to Ramsar Convention, had been adopted as a model. This model had been followed on a trial basis by Switzerland and Togo.

Mr Biber (Switzerland) commented that he thought that the template was most suitable and had no proposals for deleting sections or adding new ones. He did raise the question of the format's compatibility with reporting requirements for other biodiversity-related conventions. Mr Zöckler (UNEP-WCMC) explained that WCMC was working closely with CMS on a project to develop a CMS template as part of the process of harmonising reporting requirements, and a meeting was scheduled for later in October to discuss the way forward. Mr Adams (Germany) agreed that it was most helpful to see actual examples provided by the UK, Switzerland and Togo. He stressed the importance of reporting progress while recognising that it was a time-consuming task and

urged that the reporting requirements should be kept to the minimum necessary. He suggested

that the “targets” section might be deleted. It was agreed that this section would be made optional.

10. Implementation of the International Implementation Priorities 2000-2004

The MOP had adopted the priorities for 2000-2004 set out in a document drafted by Mike Moser. The Secretariat had contacted potential partners and donors to help implement the necessary actions. AEWA was working with Wetlands International on a GEF project (see agenda item 22). The French Government, although it had not yet ratified the Agreement, had offered to pay voluntarily an amount equivalent to what its contribution would be, which might enable some funds to be sent to Senegal to help solve the problems with invasive aquatic species at the Djoudj National Park. The German voluntary contribution would finance the update and enhancement of the AEWA website.

Simon Delany (Wetlands International) presented an overview of the priority actions and progress achieved so far (Annex 1). Wetlands International was conducting a questionnaire-based survey on lead shot in wetlands, for which further funding was necessary in order to bring it to completion. In the framework of the International Waterbird Census 2002-3, a large special gap filling study should take place. A large study was being prepared to identify gaps. The estimated cost would be US\$1 million. The initial feasibility study was being carried out already. A Conservation Status Report, led by Derek Scott, represented a core piece of research, but would probably be delayed because of slower than expected progress with the related Waterbird Population Study.

The Technical Committee agreed to re-allocate the left-over of the budget for 2000 being US \$ 68,000 for implementation of the International Implementation Priorities 2000-2004. Furthermore it was decided to give priority to finalising ongoing projects and for project where the Secretariat already secured co-funding.

In order to order the priority actions among the other projects, Mr Delany had prepared a questionnaire which he distributed to participants and asked that the award points to each project (3 for high, 2 for medium and 1 for low priority), so that the collective view of the Committee could be gauged. He pointed out that 14 of the 33 projects were already underway or had funding in place, so it was only necessary for the Committee to comment on the remaining 19. The criteria for assessing the projects were: urgency; the number of countries affected; the benefits for local populations and capacity building elements. The suggestion to add cross-cutting benefits was not taken up.

Presenting the results of the survey the following day, Mr Delany first emphasised that the findings should be regarded as a guideline, as he had not had the opportunity to analyse the findings in great detail and, as this had been the first time that the questionnaire had been used, the methodology of weighting the questions might need to be refined. Indeed, he pointed out that respondents appeared to have used different approaches; some having provided scores for each criterion and others giving only an overall mark. While it was no surprise that regional training for Africa received the highest mark, it was not clear why the impact on marine fisheries should have come second. As the questionnaires had been submitted anonymously, it was not clear whether there was a Eurasia-Africa divide, but this possibility should be born in mind.

Mr O’Sullivan (BirdLife International) asked what discretion the TC had to reorder the priorities,

which had been identified by the MOP. The Executive Secretary agreed that funding should be found for all the projects but it was nonetheless helpful guidance to know which activities should be funded first and which projects to present to potential sponsors.

Mr Gimenez-Dixon asked who the main actors were in the projects and whether AEWA would assume a leading role in all projects. He also urged that some enquiries be made to ensure that related work was not being undertaken in other fora.

Mr Lecocq (FACE), referring to the Lead Shot project, stated that a workshop had been organised some time ago in Brussels and the subject had been discussed at the IUCN meeting in Amman. He felt that the discussion needed to progress from establishing the extent to which lead shot in wetlands was a problem and the percentage of birds affected, on to the promotion of alternative ammunition. Those maintaining that lead shot was not a problem probably meant that they were unaware of the extent to which it was a problem. He suggested a further workshop, possibly in Bulgaria or Romania, should be organised. His organisation had the time to prepare the meeting but would need financial support.

Mr Biber (Switzerland) announced that his Government had a small sum (SFr 20,000) which could be made available for completing a current project, but the money would have to be claimed by the end of November.

Mr Lenten announced that the FAO Office in Dakar was willing to contribute US\$20,000 to the project relating to agro-chemicals in Africa and the impact on migratory birds. This meant that for this project additional funding of US\$40,000 was still needed.

11. Introduction of the “Colonial Waterbird Atlas” project

Christian Perennou (Tour de Valat) gave a presentation on the “Colonial Waterbird Atlas”. While his organisation’s intention was to concentrate on building up data on a dozen key bird species important to the Tour de Valat, links to the work of AEWA and others had become apparent, and means were being sought to improve coordination and harmonisation of data handling. The atlas project was aiming at an audience of scientists, managers, organisations and decision-makers as well as promoting understanding of conservation concerns to the general public.

The Atlas had links to the web sites of other organisations such as BLI, Wetlands International, the IUCN and AEWA. The information was divided across categories such as taxonomy, feeding areas, breeding areas, migration, nesting areas, habitat, distribution and numbers. A hierarchy of maps indicated migration routes and range states, and the viewer, by clicking on individual countries, could find out about range and particular breeding sites. More work still had to be done to complete the management aspects of the Atlas, but at least five AEWA priorities were addressed: the identification of internationally important sites; areas requiring further study; areas needing better protection; actions for colonial birds and production of waterbird monitoring manuals. Research undertaken and data gathered by AEWA could also be fed into the Atlas.

Tour de Valat was working on keying in available data on its targeted species (nine herons, two pelicans and one flamingo). Less information was available on sub-Saharan species, although Mr Taylor (Chairman) suggested that the African bird census would produce some useful new data. Little data was held centrally anywhere on African species, but it was possible that national data was kept in individual countries.

Mr Perennou sought confirmation that the Atlas was relevant to AEWA and guidance on how it could be amended or adapted to fit in better with AEWA's work. It was possible that the Atlas could be extended to serve as a model for species other than colonial waterbirds, but if extended, guidance was required about how further work should be conducted, where the data should be kept and who would be responsible for maintaining it.

Mr Zöckler (WCMC) thought that the Atlas and its link to AEWA was potentially very interesting, but stressed the importance of avoiding duplicated effort. Different sites should establish links and seek to complement each other. Mr Perennou stressed that there were opportunities to amend the maps to achieve greater harmony. Mr Gimenez-Dixon (IUCN) felt that the host of any site should be an organisation with the greatest expertise and enthusiasm for the subject as they would be most motivated to maintain the data.

Mr Adams (Germany) mentioned the work of GROMS (the Global Register of Migratory Species), the first phase of which had been completed and the second phase of which should be well progressed by the time of MOP2/COP7 in 2002. Mr Lenten stressed that CMS, Ramsar Bureau, Wetlands International, AEWA and GROMS were already working closely together to ensure maximum efficiency. Mr Zöckler (WCMC) mentioned Wetland International's *anatidae* digital atlas with data on 70 different species and agreed that the leading specialist group was the best depository for information. Mr Delany (Wetlands International) made the observations that long term funding was difficult to secure, so research had to be carried out piecemeal and that often his organisation was dependent on third parties to pass on information; this was often not done regularly and presented copy-right problems. The copyright issue was familiar to IUCN, and Mr Gimenez-Dixon said that IUCN was involved in a consortium - BCIS - with twelve partner organisations, which dealt with intellectual property rights.

12. Review and approval of new projects for inclusion in the Register of International Projects

The MOP requested the TC to continue the review of projects to be entered on the register. Mr Lenten advised the Committee that no new projects had been notified to the Secretariat. It was pointed out that the register was not made up of projects financed by AEWA or in which AEWA was directly involved (although these could be included), but merely a list of projects relevant to AEWA's work.

Mr Biber (Switzerland) announced that a satellite-tracking project concerning white storks was about to be launched. This would also involve following the birds on the ground to discover the threats and dangers faced by the birds. The project was being privately funded by an NGO, but government endorsement was being sought.

13. Guidelines for the acceptance of contributions in cash and contribution in kind

MOP had again delegated this question to the TC to consider. Now that AEWA was part of the UNEP family, the rules and regulations of UNEP had to be observed, and the Secretariat would have to consult closely with the CMS Administration and Fund Management Officer. Cash flow problems might arise if too many parties decided to pay their contributions in kind, so there was a need to set ground rules. AEWA had to be careful not to set precedents which other Conventions would prefer not to follow. Mr Lenten undertook to consult with CMS and UNEP and come back to the next TC with a proposal.

Mr Gimenez-Dixon (IUCN) said that IUCN had examined this issue and would be willing to contribute to AEWA's deliberations.

14. Establishment of a Small Conservation Grants Fund

The MOP had also asked the TC to consider the implications of establishing a small grants fund. The Ramsar Convention had such a fund and it had proved quite time-consuming. Delegating the task of running such a scheme to an NGO might prove difficult under the UNEP regulations. Mr Lenten undertook to come back to the next TC meeting with a proposal.

Mr Mlingwa (United Republic of Tanzania) welcomed the idea of a small fund to support projects but recognised that there was a danger of overburdening the Secretariat and agreed that other options should be pursued. Mr O'Sullivan (BirdLife International) reported that the Ramsar Standing Committee would be discussing their small grants fund and confirmed that passing the administration of it to an NGO was proving a problem. He also pointed out that MOP2 was the deadline for making recommendations on a small grants fund, not establishing it.

15. Amendments to the Action Plan

The MOP had adopted the Action Plan as an integral part of the Agreement. Perennial questions still had to be settled, such as whether the corncrake (*Crex crex*) was a waterbird and eligible for inclusion on the AEWA appendices. Questions regarding current population estimates were raised about the jack snipe (*Lymnocyptus minimus*). Mr Kalchreuter (CIC) explained analysis of bag data as well as ringing data organized by the Woodcock and Snipe Specialist Groups of Wetlands International may provide most useful information on the size of the population of such secretively living species. Mr Lenten asked Mr Kalchreuter as coordinator of the WSG to organize such information, while Mr Taylor offered to submit his African Jack Snipe data. Both species needed to be discussed with consultants and proposals drawn up for the next meeting of the TC.

Mr Delany pointed out that the species mentioned in Doc AEWA/TC 1.7 (*Oxyura maccoa*, *Sarothrura ayresi*, *Crex crex*, *Glareola ocularis*, *Glareola nuchalis* and *Rhynchops flavirostris*) were just six of nineteen species subject of a review being carried out by Derek Scott. He asked whether the Committee should consider including all of them. Mr Lenten explained that the Committee's mandate from the MOP was restricted to the six species mentioned.

Mr Biber (Switzerland) asked whether the cost implications of redrafting the Action Plan had been assessed. Mr Lenten had not calculated the costs, but as it was only a question of relatively minor changes, the cost would be far less than the original work. The MOP2 budget line could be used to finance the work.

Mr Munteanu (Romania) reminded the Committee of the need to inform all Parties of any changes to the appendices so that appropriate action could be taken to amend national implementing legislation. Mr Gimenez-Dixon (IUCN) passed on a copy of the IUCN Red List in CD format, as listing in the Red Book was often a criterion for listing on Conventions' appendices. Mr Lecocq (FACE) questioned the need to amend the appendices so soon after the Agreement had come into force as such changes might lead to confusion and it would be more sensible to concentrate on existing priorities. *Crex crex* was in any case the subject of various studies and actions in other fora.

Mr Lenten pointed out that the current action plan would remain in force until 2002, and it was reasonable for the TC to start looking ahead to the next period.

16. Review of the Conservation Guidelines

Mr Delany opened the discussion on the Conservation Guidelines, describing them as a crucial element of the Action Plan. They were designed to provide guidance to national conservation agencies on how to implement project work. They covered a range of activities, including species conservation, habitat management and interactions with human activities. There were no guidelines on the themes of education and capacity building. The discussions held at the 1998 Dakar workshop had been particularly helpful in providing African input into the development of the guidelines.

At MOP1 a number of amendments had been suggested to the draft guidelines and the TC was asked to give further consideration at its first meeting to ensure that the guidelines were as complete as possible. The majority of the amendments proposed were minor drafting changes, and Mr Delany's view was that there was no reason to delay progress. He suggested setting a deadline for final comments in May 2001, so that the text could be finalised and circulated to the TC, the Parties and other interested organisations in the summer of 2001. Being non-binding and flexible, guidelines tended to be dynamic documents subject to frequent updating to take account of new experience. They would have to be reviewed at MOP2.

In the light of the toxic waste spill in the Tirza and Danube, it was felt that a new guideline on how to respond to international emergencies was required in addition to the guideline on national disasters. It was suggested that a group of four Committee members be established to draft this additional guideline; Ms Adam, Mr Zöckler, Mr Lecocq and Mr Mlingwa agreed to serve. Other guidelines yet to be drafted covered: legal measures; combating non-native species; minimising human impacts and dealing with colonial waterbirds.

Mr Gimenez-Dixon (IUCN) urged those drafting the guidelines to ensure that they were kept as simple as possible. He also suggested that each draft or version should be clearly dated. It might also be helpful to give the guidelines a limited period of validity, to ensure that they were regularly reviewed.

Mr O'Sullivan (BirdLife International) pointed out that the page numbers referred to in Document AEW/TC Inf 1.9 did not correspond with the page numbering in the version of the Guidelines distributed for the meeting (AEWA/MOP 1.8). Mr Biber (Switzerland) pointed out that those delegates using the French version of the Guidelines were at a disadvantage because the amendments were in English only.

Guideline 2

A separate section of this guideline dealing with *international* emergencies was required.

It was agreed that there was a pitfall in trying to include an up-to-date list of countries, which had legislation in place, because the guidelines would be inaccurate as soon as another country brought in new laws. It was not clear why the list referred to "England" rather than "the United Kingdom". Legislation was in place in Flanders, although Belgium was listed among the countries still to enact legislation. The Swiss law had entered force.

Guideline 4

Both amendments proposed (for Steps 5 and 7) were accepted.

Guideline 5

In Step 2, references to the harvest should read “any international harvest”.

Mr O’Sullivan (BirdLife International) questioned why the requirement to report on derogations was to be deleted from Step 4. It had apparently be considered over-bureaucratic to require derogations to be reported to *AEWA parties*. As a compromise, it was suggested derogations should be reported to the *AEWA Secretariat*.

In Step 6, it was agreed that the wording in the amendment “It is the responsibility of the governing body and/or hunting clubs to ensure that individual hunters are proficient and well trained” should be modified along the lines of “Hunting clubs should endeavour...”.

In Step 7, the new text proposed for the end of paragraph 1 would be better placed at the beginning on the sub-section headed “minimising disturbance”. The new text proposed for the heading “Stocking” needed to be revised, as it appeared contradictory; at least it was not clear to what the word “these” referred to in the last sentence (either “such birds” or “Habitat protection and improvement”).

Guideline 8

There was a discussion about the new wording proposed for Step 3, as many present felt that it was difficult to assess when measures have failed, but it was agree that there should be some burden of proof that efforts had been made.

Ms Adam sought clarification of the term “refuge” as she was confused at suggestions that hunting should be allowed in such areas. It was explained that refuge did not imply 100% prohibition on hunting although seasonal bans might apply and the term was a biological one rather than a legal one. Hunting in voluntary refuges was especially important in Africa, to give the landowner some economic interest in maintaining the site. Hunting could be prohibited in refuges if it had an adverse effect on the site’s carrying capacity for the target species.

17. Review of the Brent Goose Management Plan

Mr Sneep presented a paper on the Brent Goose Management Plan. He explained that this species depended both on semi-natural and agricultural land at different stages of its migration cycle (rape seed fields in the winter in the UK and salt marshes in the Wadden Sea in the spring). The population had risen from 40,000 in the 1950's to between 250,000 and 300,000 today, although it was still subject to some fluctuation. In 1994 at the Second Wadden Sea conference, the governments of Germany, the Netherlands and Denmark agreed to continue conservation work for the species.

The current management plan had been developed in conjunction with the CMS. Its objective was to bring the population of the species into equilibrium with the habitat available to it. A number of Range States, both Parties to CMS and AEWA and non-Parties were participating. It was intended to carry out a review of the plan after three years.

The TC was asked to endorse the principles of the Brent Goose Action Plan; to consider adopting it as a model for further management plans on other species; to establish a Brent Goose Working Group and to appoint one or more members of the TC to serve on it. The AEWAs Secretariat would be asked to help service the Working Group; to prepare Terms of Reference; to communicate with Range States; to help complete the third version of the Management Plan and distribute it to the Working Group; to stimulate coordinated actions between the Working Group and to help develop a population model for the species.

Because the geese were an attraction for eco-tourists, one issue was the geese's behaviour when disturbed. The geese were quite adaptable and soon grew accustomed to disturbance.

Regarding the use of the Plan as a model for future activities of a similar nature, the Secretariat sought guidance on the level of detail to be included. Members of the Committee asked whether other plans were available so that a comparison could be made, and the best features of different styles could be identified. Mr Madsen (Denmark) suggested looking at the North American model, which had adopted a flexible and dynamic approach. Mr Gimenez-Dixon (IUCN) said that while IUCN adopted a multi-species approach, the Bern Convention might provide useful examples of single species plans, having had years of experience.

Mr El-Din (Egypt) thought that the TC should weigh up the advantages and disadvantages of the single species approach compared with the multi-species approach. He also asked what provisions were made to ensure that the plan was implemented, particularly what financial resources were available. Mr Taylor (South Africa) thought that the multi-species approach might suit Africa better, as it was preferable to ensure the widest possible benefits for the large amount of time invested in research and studies. Although there were usually knock-on benefits for other species and habitats arising out of actions centred on "flag-ship" species, the extent of such benefits was difficult to predict. Mr O'Sullivan (BirdLife International) considered that many existing action plans designed for implementation in Europe could easily be adapted to extend to Africa if necessary. Dr Serebryakov (Ukraine) thought that the Management Plan was a good model but warned against being too proscriptive, since each plan had to be suited to the circumstances of the species in question.

Mr Lenten stressed the importance of AEWAs members promoting the Plan among the Range States. He said that the Working Group should be as broadly based as possible and not exclusively made up of representatives of AEWAs Parties. Mr Lenten suggested that the Committee should appoint Jesper Madsen to the Working Group and that all Range States and participating organisations be invited to nominate members. Mr Lecocq suggested that John Haradine should represent FACE. Bart Ebbinge (Alterra, the Netherlands) was also suggested.

The resources available to the working group were uncertain. The development of the population model had yet to be costed, although there was already a possible source of finance. Mr Madsen explained that Bart Ebbinge's institute was already working on a small scale project, with a larger project within the framework of the EU's Fifth programme set for 2001-2004. Preliminary data would be available from the smaller project. Most of the funding had already been arranged through the European Union, but the work could be usefully complemented by an expert workshop.

A group to develop a model for AEWAs International Species Actions Plan by examine existing management plans made up of CIC, BLI and WI was established. Mr Danzo (Ghana) commented that the basic knowledge of migration routes was too low for African countries to develop such

management plans. African countries might benefit from a working group on the management plan process, which would provide pointers about how to conduct the necessary research and data gathering to feed into management plans. Mr Taylor agreed to chair the group provided that it could operate by e-mail correspondence and undertook to contact other African members of the TC. Mr Gimenez-Dixon confirmed that IUCN had often encountered the problem that there was little data available in Africa to help flesh out Action Plans. Mr Taylor recommended BirdLife International as a potentially useful partner in securing core data to identify those African species most in need of Action Plans. Mr O'Sullivan mentioned a large project which BLI was leading which was being submitted to the UK Government's Darwin Initiative within the next few days and referred to a forthcoming publication on Important Bird Areas in Africa. Unfortunately, little emphasis was placed on bird migration between different IBAs.

18. Review of Phasing Out Lead Shot in Wetlands

As reported under item 10, Mr Lecocq (FACE) felt that it was time to move away from the discussion on whether lead was causing a problem and to start taking positive action to promote non-toxic shot and address hunters' concerns about the cost and effectiveness of alternative ammunition. It was not desirable to wait until MOP2 to exchange views and learn from each other's experiences.

Mr Kalchreuter (CIC) reported that his organisation had held a symposium which had decided against a general move away from lead-shot, but acknowledged that lead-shot in wetlands was presenting problems on a different scale. He therefore suggested a joint workshop of FACE and CIC-Migratory Bird Commission on that matter.

The question was posed whether lead shot was a problem in Africa. The issue had recently been discussed in Egypt, because people were aware of the discussion in Europe. The hunting lobby had opposed any restrictions because of cost implications. Local manufacturers would need assistance in converting production from lead to other materials. Pollution arising from the use of lead shot was also not thought to be significant, or at least, it was relatively insignificant compared with other environmental pollutants. Most local hunters used snares or nets rather than shotguns.

Mr Taylor thought that the use of lead shot was probably higher in South Africa with a long hunting tradition than elsewhere in Africa. Mr Mlingwa (Tanzania) thought that most hunters using lead shot were probably foreign visitors. This caused the Committee some concern since they thought it regrettable that European hunters might be using lead shot in Africa when it was banned in their home countries. Mr Mokoko (Congo) reported on a problem his authorities had had with an ordnance factory, which was causing some pollution. There had been some conflict because the factory was a source of employment locally. Mr Mokoko did not believe that lead shot was widely used for hunting waterbirds, for which local people used snares and nets. Shotguns were more usually used in hunting larger game, like mammals.

Mr Lecocq (FACE) remarked that several countries in eastern and central Europe and throughout Africa promoted hunting as a tourist attraction. He also agreed that converting production from lead, where droplets of molten lead were simply dropped from a height to form spheres, to other materials for which the process was more complicated, would be a problem.

19. Arrangements for the Second Session of the Meeting of the Parties

Mr Schmitz (Germany) explained briefly the arrangements so far agreed for MOP2. The Meeting would take place in the Hotel *Maritim*, at the beginning of September 2002, again in conjunction with the COP of the parent Convention. Two large plenary halls, smaller meeting rooms and offices would be available.

20. Date and Venue of the Next Meeting of the Technical Committee

Mr El-Din (Egypt) provisionally offered that his country would host the next meeting of the TC. It was agreed that the meeting should take place in October 2001.

21. Any Other Business

Promotion of the Agreement

Mr Lenten explained that a number of promotional materials had been prepared, including posters, post cards and leaflets in English, French, Russian and Arabic. He urged Committee members to promote the Agreement in other fora. Some delegates asked whether material was available which could form the basis of a press release. Mr Lecocq (FACE) recalling that IUCN had issued the Red Data Book in CD-Rom format asked whether the Secretariat had considered wider use of this medium. There were advantages relating to reduced postage costs, but good quality photographs were often bound up with copy-right difficulties. It was agreed that the Secretariat should consider combining forces with other organisations to gain access to good quality material.

GEF Flyway Project

Dr Chris Baker (Wetland International) gave a presentation on the “Enhancing Conservation of the Critical Network of Wetlands Required by Migratory waterbirds on the African-Eurasian Flyways” GEF project. The total value of the preliminary PDF-B project was US\$ 627,000 of which US\$ 350,000 would come from GEF, the maximum allowed for this level of project.

Partners in the project were UNEP-GEF, UNEP-CMS, AEWAs, Wetlands International, Ramsar Convention, other co-financiers and beneficiaries. Its main purpose was to develop a strategy to conserve the critical wetlands upon which the birds depend in the AEWAs range by identifying key gaps in knowledge and reviewing best practice. The project would also promote capacity building, exchange of know-how and knowledge, communications and research. There were also twelve site-based pilot projects dealing with management issues such as eco-tourism and habitat restoration. Wetlands International’s Dakar office had considerable experience of out-reach work and would help develop training aspects of the project.

The AEWAs TC needed to be represented on the Steering Committee, which would meet on 16 November. The representative ideally would come from Africa or SW Asia, speak good English and come from a country not benefiting from major project funding. The Committee accepted a proposal from Mr Lenten that Saulet Sakenov should be asked to attend.

Wader Study Group

Dr Stroud had contacted the Secretariat to seek support for the Wader Study Group. Given the relevance of the work of this group to the aims of the Agreement, Mr Lenten thought the Committee should consider the request. Mr Delany explained that lots of data still had to be analysed, some census work was still being carried out and that the coverage of the work concentrated mainly on the temperate zones. It was decided that Mr Lenten would make contact again with Dr Stroud to obtain more details and to discuss with relevant organisations at a later stage how to tackle this problem.

Sharing Website Information

Mr Zöckler agreed to convene the group dealing with exchanging website information soon.

Communication among Committee Members

Regional representatives were urged to communicate with the other Parties from their region, especially before TC meetings. E-mail lists would be established to ensure that members could communicate with each other. Mr Lenten suggested setting up a brief set of biographies with photographs of the Committee members. The Secretariat asked for feedback from the Committee members on the handling of the first meeting, and it was agreed that a heavy agenda had been dealt with effectively.

22. Closure

The meeting was brought to a close with a round of thanks to all who had contributed to the preparation and execution of the meeting.

Annex 1: List of Participants

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE REGIONS

NORTH AND SOUTH WESTERN EUROPE

Mr Olivier Biber (provisional member)

**Chef questions internationales nature et
paysage**

**Office fédéral de l' environnement, des forêts,
et du paysage**

Division principale Protection de la nature et du paysage

CH-3003 Berne

SWITZERLAND

Tel: (+41 31) 3230663

Fax: (+41 31) 3247579

E-mail: Olivier.biber@buwal.admin.ch

CENTRAL EUROPE

Prof. Dr. Dan Munteanu

President

Society for the Study and Protection of Birds and the
Environment

Str. Republicii 48

3400 Cluj

ROMANIA

Tel: (+40) 64 438086

Fax: (+40) 64 438086

E-mail: sorcj@codec.ro

EASTERN EUROPE

Dr. Valentin V. Serebryakov

Ornithological Society of Ukraine

Biology Department

National Shevchenko University

Volodimirska St. 64

Kiev 01033

UKRAINE

Tel: (+38 044) 2520120/ 2669239 (office)

Fax: (+38 044) 2520120

E-mail:

NORTH AFRICA

Mr. Sherif Baha El-Din

Advisor

Egyptian Environment Affairs Agency

Nature Conservation Sector

14 Shagaret El Dur

Zamalek

Cairo

EGYPT

Tel: (+202) 360 8160

Fax: (+202) 360 8160

E-mail: baha@internetegypt.com

CENTRAL AFRICA

Mr. Ikonga Jérôme Mokoko

Directeur Adjoint Project Parc Nationale Nouabale-Ndoki

WCS Congo

B.P. 14537

Brazzaville

CONGO

Tel: (+242) 811921/ 813888

Fax: (+242) 811921/ 813393

E-mail: oci@congonet.cg

EASTERN AFRICA

Dr. Charles Mlingwa

Director General

Tanzania Wildlife Research Institute

P.O. Box 661

Arusha

TANZANIA

Tel: (+255) 27 7677

Fax: (+255) 27 2548240

E-mail: tawiri@africaonline.co.tz

SOUTHERN AFRICA

Dr. Barry Taylor (Chair)
School of Botany and Zoology
University of Natal
Private Box X01
Scottsville 3209
SOUTH AFRICA
Tel: (+27) 33 2605116/ 2605104
Fax: (+27) 33 2605105
E-mail: TaylorB@nu.ac.za

REPRESENTATIVES OF ORGANIZATIONS

IUCN

Dr. Mariano Gimenez-Dixon
Programme Officer - Species
The World Conservation Union
28, rue Mauverney
1196 Gland
SWITZERLAND
Tel: (+41) 22 9990155
Fax: (+41) 22999015
E-mail: mgd@hq.iucn.org

WETLANDS INTERNATIONAL

Mr. Simon Delany
Wetlands International - Africa, Europe, Middle
East
Postbus 7002
6700 CA Wageningen
NETHERLANDS
Tel: (+31)317 478863
Fax: (+31) 317 478885
E-mail: delany@wetlands.agro.nl

CIC

Prof. Dr. Herby Kalchreuter
CIC - Migratory Bird Commission
c/o European Wildlife Research Institute (EWI)
79848 Bonndorf-Glashütte
GERMANY
Tel: (+49) 7653 1891
Fax: (+49) 7653 9269
E-mail: wildlife.ewi@t-online.de

EXPERTS

RURAL ECONOMICS

Mr Elijah Yaw Danso
Forest Sector Development Project
P. O. Box 1457
Kumasi
GHANA
Tel: (+233) 51 22376/7 mobile phone (0)27 53476176/7
Fax: (+233)51 22687
E-mail: elijah@forestry-ksi.org
eliyawdanso@yahoo.com;

ENVIRONMENTAL LAW

Mrs. Rachel Adams
Ministry of the Environment
P.O. Box 5
95464 Jerusalem
ISRAEL
Tel: (+972) 2 6553735
Fax: (+972) 2 6553744
E-mail: RachelA@environment.gov.il

GAME MANAGEMENT

Dr. Jesper Madsen
Senior Research Biologist
Coastal Zone Ecology
National Environmental Research Institute
Grenåvej 12, Kalø
8410 Rønne
DENMARK
Tel: (+45) 89201700
Fax: (+45) 89201514
E-mail: jm@dmu.dk

OBSERVER FROM CONTRACTING PARTIES

GERMANY

Mr. Gerhard Adams
Mr Joachim Schmitz
Mrs. Catherine Gay (interpreter)
Mr. Vincent Buch (interpreter)
Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and
Nuclear Safety
Division N I 3
P.O. Box 12 06 29
53048 Bonn
GERMANY
Tel: (+49) 228 305 2634
Fax: (+49) 228 305 2684
E-mail: Adams.Gerhard@bmu.de
E-mail: Schmitz.Joachim@bmu.de

NETHERLANDS (Depositary)

Mr. Jan-Willem Sneep
Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and
Fisheries
Directorate for Nature Management
Division of Policy Instruments
P.O. Box 20401
2500 EK Den Haag
NETHERLANDS
Tel: (+31) 70 378 5255
Fax: (+31) 70 378 6146
E-mail: j.w.sneep@n.agro.nl

OBSERVER OF INTERNATIONAL NGO'S

BIRDLIFE INTERNATIONAL

Mr. John O'Sullivan
International Treaties Advisers
BirdLife International
c/o RSPB The Lodge
Sandy, Bedfordshire SG19 2DL
UNITED KINGDOM
Tel: (+44) 1767 680551
Fax: (+44) 1767 683211
E-mail: john.Sullivan@rspb.org.uk

UNEP/WCMC

Mr. Christoph Zöckler
World Conservation Monitoring Centre
219 Huntingdon Road
Cambridge CB3 0DL
UNITED KINGDOM
Tel: (+44 1223) 277314
Fax: (+44 1223) 277136
E-mail: chrisz@unep-wcmc.org

FACE

Dr. Yves Lecocq
Secrétaire Général
Fédération des Associations des Chasseurs de l'Union
Européenne (F.A.C.E.)
82, rue F. Pelletier
1030 Bruxelles
BELGIUM
Tel: (+32) 27326700
Fax: (+32) 2 7327072
E-mail: face.europe@euronet.be

TOUR-du-VALAT

Dr Christian Perennou
Le Sambuc
13200 Arles
FRANCE
Tel: (+33) 4 90 972013
Fax: (+33) 4 90972019
E-mail: perennou@tour-du-valat.com

GUESTS

Dr Chris Baker
Project Coordinator GEF-AEWA Flyways project
Wetlands International - Africa, Europe, Middle East
Postbus 7002
6700 CA Wageningen
NETHERLANDS
Tel: (+31) 317 478886
Fax: (+31) 317 478885
E-mail: baker@wetlands.agro.nl

SECRETARIAT

UNEP/ AEWA SECRETARIAT

Mr. Bert Lenten
Executive Secretary
Secretariat for the Agreement on the Conservation of
African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds
Martin-Luther-King-Str. 8
53175 Bonn
GERMANY
Tel: (+49) 228 815 2414
Fax: (+49) 228 815 2450
E-mail: awea@unep.de

UNEP/ CMS SECRETARIAT

Mr Douglas Hykle
Mr. Robert Vagg (Report Writer)
Mr. Thilo Schliebener
Mrs. Linette Eitz-Lamare
Martin Luther King Str. 8
53175 Bonn
GERMANY
Tel: (+49) 228 815 2401/2
Fax: (+49) 228 815 2449
E-mail: cms@unep.de

Annex 2:

No.	Title	Funded		Estimated Costs (US \$)	Priority
		Fully	Partly		
1	Guidelines on National legislation for Migratory Waterbird Conservation			25,000	8
2	Implementing existing international single species action plans			50,000 min/species/year	
3	Develop new International Species action Plans			40,000 <i>per species for action plan reparation</i>	
4	Guidelines on Avoidance of Introduction of Non-native Migratory Waterbird Spec.			25,000	
5	Identify all sites of international importance for AEWA species		X(GEF)1		
6	Identify priority areas for further survey		X(GEF)		
7	Identify priority areas for better protection		X(GEF)		
8	Habitat priorities for Waterbirds, particularly in Africa and SW Asia			200,000	5
9	Restoration/ rehabilitation techniques for waterbird habitats, particularly in Africa			60,000 <i>per manual</i> 80,000 <i>Minimum for each demonstration project</i>	5
10	Evaluation of waterbird harvests in the Agreement Area			200,000 (<i>can be split into 4-5 subprojects</i>)	16
11	Review of use of non-toxic shot for waterbird hunting		X2	50,000 (<i>workshop</i>); 30,000 <i>for each review report</i>	
12	Evaluation of socio-economic impacts of waterbird hunting			150,000	7
13	Evaluation of waterbirds as agricultural pests in Africa			100,000	9
14	Review of the use of agrochemicals in Africa, and their impact on migratory waterbirds		X	60,000	8
15	Guideline on minimizing/ mitigating the impacts of infrastructural			25,000	10

1 all except of atlas priorities

2 Publication partly funded

No.	Title	Funded		Estimated Costs (US \$)	Priority
		Fully	Partly		
	(and disturbance related) developments affecting waterbirds				
16	Survey work in poorly known areas			15,000 <i>per survey (average)</i>	3
17	International Waterbird Census-special gap-filling survey		X3	560,000	
18	Publication of an Atlas of Wader populations	X4			
19	Pilot study/ review of potential from waterbird ringing recovery analyses for the Agreement Area			50,000	15
20	Coordination of waterbird ringing schemes, particularly in Africa			50,000 <i>per annum</i>	11
21	Guideline on the use of satellite tracking for migratory waterbirds			25,000	17
22	Report on the Status and Trends of Populations for MOP2		X5		
23	Actions for conservation of colonial waterbirds			25,000 (<i>Guideline</i>), 15,000 (<i>monitoring study</i>)	9
24	Study of the potential impacts of marine fisheries on migratory waterbirds			40,000	2
25	Rehabilitation of important sites for migratory waterbirds, which have been degraded by invasive aquatic species		X6	60,000	
26	Analysis of training needs for migratory waterbird conservation	X(GEF)			
27	Regional training programmes in Africa for implementation of the Agreement			150,000 <i>per year, per regional programme</i>	1
28	Exchange of know-how on traditional approaches to wetland and waterbird management in Africa			60,000	4
29	Publication of Waterbird Monitoring Manuals			40,000 <i>per manual in one language</i> 20,000 <i>for translation/ printing/ mailing other languages</i>	
30	Establish a Clearing House for training materials for the Agreement			30,000 <i>to establish clearing house</i> 10,000 <i>per annum for maintenance</i>	9

3 Very limited funding of LNV available

4 Full funding available from: LNV, EC, Flemish Ministry, Alterra and Wetlands International

5 Partly funded by LNV and JNCC

6 Could be partly funded by the voluntary contribution of France

No.	Title	Funded		Estimated Costs (US \$)	Priority
		Fully	Partly		
31	Develop and implement a Communication Strategy for the Agreement			10,000 <i>to prepare communication strategy</i> 75,000 <i>to implement first tranche of actions</i>	11
32	Development of the Agreement Website		X7		
33	Regional Workshops for the promotion of the Agreement		X(GEF)8		

7 Partly funded by the voluntary contribution of Germany

8 Two workshops will take place next year; one in the Middle East and one in Central Asia. Both workshops will be organized back to back with other meetings in these regions.