

Minutes of the Second Meeting of AEWA Technical Committee

Station biologique de la Tour du Valat, Le Sambuc, France, 5-7 November 2001

Agenda Item 1: Opening

1. The Executive Secretary of AEWA, Bert Lenten, opened the Second Meeting of the Technical Committee (TC), welcoming delegates and observers. He thanked Christian Perennou of the Tour du Valat biological station (TdV) for the excellent excursion the previous day. Mr Lenten expressed his thanks for being able to hold the meeting there at such short notice. The Egyptian authorities had understood the change of plan following the events in USA on 11th September and it was hoped to hold another meeting in Zaranik, Egypt one day.

2. Mr Lenten introduced Jean-Paul Taris, Director General of TdV, who welcomed the members of the Committee and expressed the hope that the outcome of the meeting would also benefit the Station.

3. The Executive Secretary informed the meeting that the Chair, Mr Barry Taylor, was unable to attend and that Mr Dan Munteanu (Vice-Chair) would chair this meeting. Mr Munteanu welcomed participants and also thanked TdV. Apologies had been received from Mr Seyni Seydou (Western Africa), Mrs Janine van Vessem (Wetlands International), the Ramsar Bureau and the Secretariat of the Bern Convention, who were unable to attend.

4. He also welcomed the alternates for Southern Africa (Mr Yousoof Mungroo), Western Africa (Mr Momodou Lamin Kassama), Southwestern Asia (Mrs Elena Kreuzberg) and Wetlands International (Mr Ward Hagemeyer), and also the delegates from Tanzania (Mrs Miriam Zacharia and Mr Mzamilu Kaita), the Netherlands/Depositary (Mr Jan-Willem Sneep), UK (Mr David Stroud and Mr Robert Vagg), BirdLife International (Mr David Pritchard), UNEP/UNON (Mrs Jasmin Kanza of CMS), FACE (Mr Kai-Uwe Wollscheid), OMPO (Mr Olivier Guy-Noël) and UNEP/WCMC (Mr Christoph Zöckler).

Agenda Item 2: Welcoming addresses

5. Jan-Willem Sneep, representing the Depositary, welcomed and thanked the TdV representatives for their help. It was his opinion that whilst international conferences were necessary to achieve international agreement, the implementation of such agreements was even more important. The significant role of this meeting in advance of MOP2 in the coming year was to help Parties implement the AEWA agreement. He wished everyone a pleasant and successful meeting.

Agenda Item 2a: Introduction to activities of Tour du Valat

6. Dr Patrick Grillas, Scientific Director of TdV, gave a short introduction to the work of the Station. Its aim was the conservation and restoration of Mediterranean wetlands and its work programme included the training of wetland managers and the implementation of conservation research projects throughout the Mediterranean regions. The work plan for the next five years included projects on Mediterranean marshes, reed beds, agriculture and the environment, and Mediterranean lagoons. In addition, various long-term studies concerned with the ecology and conservation of single species - frequently birds - or groups of species were being conducted.

7. Dr Christophe Barbraud of TdV summarised the work on waterbirds - particularly flamingos, pelicans, various gulls and herons. Research concentrated on population ecology and the consequences of habitat management on vulnerable species. Studies covered the effects of human intervention related to reedbed management on breeding, and intrusion by flamingos in paddy fields. The results of this research were being transferred through publications, cooperation with local ornithological groups, and through a prototype online atlas of waterbirds - a project being carried out in collaboration with AEWA.

Agenda Item 3: Adoption of the Rules of Procedure

8. Bert Lenten presented proposed changes to the Rules of Procedure (Document AEWA/TC 2.2), based on a discussion that had taken place at the previous TC meeting. He explained that the provisions of Rule 4 of the current Rules of Procedure had been found not to be in line with Resolution 1.8, particularly regarding the question of alternate members. The amendments now being tabled were intended to eliminate this discrepancy. Problems had also been encountered with Rule 7, because some of the Committee members originally nominated had stepped down soon after MOP1, and there was no provision for filling these vacancies intersessionally.

9. Clarifying, Bert Lenten explained that only members, and in their absence their alternates, have voting rights; both members and alternates were appointed by the MOP. He thought it unlikely that the MOP would empower the TC to appoint intersessional replacements with full voting rights. Robert Vagg suggested that provision should be made for by-elections to replace resigned members for the remainder of the term.

10. Regarding the organisations listed in Rule 4, Ward Hagemeyer suggested that it might be preferable to leave the choice of delegate to the organisation, rather than obliging them to appoint a named Member.

11. Bert Lenten questioned whether the original intention, i.e. to have a small committee and avoid frequent changes of personnel, should be adhered to. The current Rules of Procedure stated that appointment was for a six-year period.

12. Mariano Gimenez-Dixon (IUCN) suggested slight modification to the proposed wording of Rule 7 to permit the TC to appoint a full replacement member, "in close cooperation with the region", between Sessions of the MOP. This replacement member should have full voting rights.

13. Charles Mlingwa, (Eastern Africa) and Valentin Serebryakov (Eastern Europe) were of the opinion that their countries had been elected to represent their regions, and that their countries should therefore appoint any replacements. Bert Lenten reminded both that the MOP had appointed a named person to represent each region, and that in the case of his or her absence this member should be replaced by the appointed alternate.

14. Consensus was finally reached on the proposal that the Secretariat draw up amended Rules of Procedure to allow the appointment, in consultation with the relevant region, of replacements with full voting rights, whose terms of office should run until the next MOP. This amended version should be put to the next session of the MOP for approval.

Agenda Item 4: Adoption of the agenda and work programme

15. At the request of Kai-Uwe Wollscheid, representing FACE, the provisional agenda (Document AEW/TC 2.3) was amended to switch Items 22 and 24. The agenda was then adopted as amended.

Agenda Item 5: Admission of Observers

16. Bert Lenten reported that representatives from BirdLife International, UNEP, WCMC, FACE and OMPO were present, and proposed their acceptance as observers. Charles Mlingwa seconded this proposal, which was adopted unanimously. In addition to the official observers, Dr Klaus Riede also attended the meeting as an expert to present the Global Register on Migratory Species (GROMS).

Agenda Item 6: Review of the Membership of Experts and Representatives of the Technical Committee

17. Introducing this Agenda item, the Executive Secretary explained that the TC was originally intended to have not more than 15 members. MOP1 had wisely decided to admit observers from Contracting Parties. Prior to this TC meeting, however, at least ten developing countries had asked to attend at the expense of the Secretariat. These requests had had to be refused because no provisions had been made to cover these costs. Mr Lenten reminded the TC that if it wished to open its meetings to a larger circle of participants this would mean considerable extra work for a small secretariat, and require more staff to make the arrangements. He felt that if observers from developing countries and economies in transition were to be admitted, the budget should make provision to cover this, or voluntary contributions should be sought. Additional funds should also be made available to contract additional staff to organise TC meetings.

18. Ward Hagemeyer asked if the fact that some countries wanted to send their own representative indicated that the system of regional representation was not working.

19. Herby Kalchreuter (CIC) stated that he had read the Executive Secretary's criticisms with interest, but that he preferred to stick to the current practice, perhaps inviting additional experts to deal with special subjects.

20. Mariano Gimenez-Dixon reiterated that the TC was intended as a practical working group, and not an additional MOP. He endorsed the suggestion to admit additional experts, perhaps appointed by Parties, and having a small budget for this if possible. Mr Mungroo felt the present arrangement was adequate. Opening the meetings would be a considerable burden on the Secretariat, and would mean a loss of overview for all concerned.

21. Charles Mlingwa felt that ideally permitting additional participants was a good thing, but appreciated the problem for poorer countries that could not afford to send delegates. Other countries would be able to attend regularly, and might tend to dominate the proceedings. In view of this he felt it preferable to keep the TC as it now was, thereby making it more effective.

22. David Pritchard felt that the purpose of the TC should be to provide a good regional balance of technical advice. Ramsar, for example, had no provision for observers at such meetings. Parties should not feel that any country was being excluded, and other ways could be found to involve those countries particularly interested in the work of the Committee. The national focal points could be used to maintain a network, rather than funding being provided to attend meetings. It was important that the message be positive.

23. Bert Lenten endorsed this suggestion, and agreed to work on this proposal. It was important to improve communication (for example by posting the proceedings of meetings on the Internet etc.), to give a positive signal, and to involve more countries in the work of the Committee, which should not be perceived as meeting behind closed doors.

24. Summing up, the Executive Secretary concluded that there was a general wish to keep the TC small. The Rules of Procedure stated that all Parties were entitled to send observers. In this case only the UK and Tanzania had taken advantage of this opportunity. The question was whether this rule should remain unchanged, permitting the theoretical attendance of 35 Party representatives, plus nominated experts etc., or whether the Committee wished to make a proposal to the next MOP to change this Rule and not admit all countries.

25. Olivier Biber (North and Southwestern Europe) suggested recommending to the MOP that the TC should be restricted to experts and NGO experts, but the Rules of Procedure should include an article advising on how the regions should ensure the flow of information, for example, by distributing minutes of meetings to all Parties, who could communicate their comments and input to their regional TC representatives.

26. David Pritchard proposed drafting a new Resolution on the TC to be considered and hopefully adopted by MOP2. The meeting agreed that this should contain all the points discussed here.

Agenda Item 7: Adoption of the minutes of the first Meeting of the Technical Committee

27. The report on the TC meeting held from 23-24 October 2000 in Bonn, was presented for discussion and approval.

28. Valentin Serebryakov commented that the ranking in the List of Priorities was not technically correct. The Executive Secretary replied that he felt the list could not be changed at this stage; it had been very difficult to place the tasks in order of importance, and that the list was primarily intended as a guide for the Secretariat.

29. These comments having been noted, the Minutes of TC1 were adopted.

Agenda Item 8: Report by the Chairman

30. The Executive Secretary stated that Mr Barry Taylor had informed him that he had not prepared a report for the present meeting because there was little on which to report. He had mainly been involved in administrative and financial affairs.

Agenda Item 9: Report of the Depositary

31. On behalf of the Depositary, Jan-Willem Sneep stated that in the period 1999-2000 a number of countries had deposited their instruments of accession/ ratification. As a result the Contracting Parties now numbered a total of 32. The Chairman observed that this was proof that AEWA was growing and functioning.

32. Valentin Serebryakov reported that the Ukraine, as a signatory, had prepared the relevant documents for ratification and passed these to Parliament. He hoped Ukraine would soon be a full Party to the Agreement.

Agenda Item 10: Report by the Secretariat

33. The Executive Secretary read a prepared report to the Committee. Summing up, Mr Lenten emphasised that this report covered only the most important activities since the establishment of the Permanent Secretariat. Regarding the new location in the CMS Agreements Unit in Bonn, he missed the translation and document reproduction services the Dutch government had provided, which are not available at the UN premises. There were doubtless benefits such as the possibility of sharing staff with the other Agreements. But he had also encountered problems that were probably inevitable when finding one's way in a new environment, not least having to find new suppliers, printers, translators etc. All things considered, the work programme had probably been somewhat ambitious for the first year.

a). Report on financial and administrative matters

34. The Executive Secretary stated that he would report on this point later under Agenda Item 21.

b). Recruitment of the Assistant

35. The Executive Secretary reported that the original recruitment process had been started before the first Technical Committee meeting. Unfortunately, a procedural error had occurred and the process had had to be repeated, starting at the end of 2000. Mirna Maya had been the successful candidate and entered on duty on 9 July 2001.

c). Application for the recruitment of a Junior Professional Officer

36. The Agreement Secretariat had completed the necessary forms and received approval from UNEP. Currently the Secretariat was waiting for an offer from one of the Ministries of Development Cooperation to fund a JPO for a period of three to four years. The JPO's task would be to assist the Secretariat in developing information material.

d). Any other issues

37. Asked by Herby Kalchreuter about the Great Snipe International Action Plan, Bert Lenten replied that BirdLife International had been commissioned to draft this Plan in close collaboration with the experts on this species.

38. Robert Vagg enquired if the Executive Secretary considered that the problems experienced with the UNEP system had been mere teething troubles. Bert Lenten replied that he felt the transition would take approximately two years, after which the situation would return to normal.

39. The Agreement Secretariat had recently been informed that the UK was willing to support the AEWa project on invasive species. David Pritchard endorsed the cooperation with other Conventions, because similar activities were being undertaken or planned by these. Mr Lenten fully agreed and reported that he had already made contact with, for example, the Ramsar Bureau.

40. Jesper Madsen, (Expert on game management), asked how the TC could support the Secretariat in future regarding the quality of the projects undertaken. The TC had a responsibility for quality, but had little chance of evaluating what was being done. He would appreciate a discussion on how to improve the TC's input into the work of the Secretariat.

41. The Executive Secretary welcomed any suggestions in this direction but emphasised that the adoption of projects was the responsibility of the MOP. While a loss of momentum should be avoided, better communication about projects would be useful. Mr Madsen suggested the formation of an ad hoc working group to deal with this question during the meeting, and Ms Adams, Mr Biber, and Mr Stroud agreed to join him in this.

42. Closing the discussion on this agenda item the Chairman thanked Mr Lenten for his report.

Agenda Item 11: Report on activities of the working groups

a). Brent Goose Action Plan

43. Jesper Madsen reported that the Working Group had been established at the last TC meeting. At MOP1 the second draft of the Action Plan had been discussed, and a third draft had meanwhile been circulated. Pending formal adoption by the MOP2, the Plan could only be implemented on a voluntary basis. The Secretariat had written to the range states of this species and had received positive replies from many countries. On this basis it had been decided to begin implementation of the plan. A first one-day meeting, attended by all the key-countries, had been held in Denmark on 10th October 2001 and had been a very productive and instructive session.

44. The first point discussed had been the adoption of the Terms of Reference, which had been unanimously agreed upon. Copies of these were available from the Secretariat.

45. Further, it had been decided that BirdLife International should be a member of the Working Group. The activities planned for the coming year included the formal adoption of the Action Plan. It was hoped to complete this by early 2002. At the same time it was hoped to start compiling national action plans, on which it was intended to present a first report to the MOP in 2002. Another planned measure was an awareness campaign, with a poster in English and Russian.

46. Mr Madsen reported that a population model was seen as a prerequisite for the implementation of the Action Plan. Work on this model was already being undertaken under the Fifth EU Framework Programme Coastal Bird Diversity. Mr Madsen's institute, NERI, was in close contact with the project coordinator Professor John Coss-Custart, who would like AEWA to be represented on the user group. The population model would be quite advanced, and would require the input of a large amount of information. It was hoped to have a prototype model ready in 2003.

47. Bert Lenten pointed out that a difference should be made among the range states between the so-called key countries and the flyover countries. Only one of the key countries had formally responded, asking if the Brent Goose was a priority species for AEWA. The Working Group felt that work should continue, even though this was not the case.

48. Jesper Madsen replied that the already long history of the project, thanks to the initiative taken in the Netherlands, was one good reason for continuing with it. Secondly, it would be easy to put into practice. Another argument in its favour was the population decrease that was apparently being observed.

49. Jan-Willem Sneep (Netherlands) thanked the small committee for their work. He reminded the TC that it had not been possible to adopt the Action Plan at MOP1 because at that time the EU had not adopted it. He felt that the MOP2 would be the appropriate place.

50. Bert Lenten reported that a voluntary contribution from the Netherlands had been received and been used to support some delegates attending the meeting in Denmark. Part of this grant has been allocated to develop a poster on the species.

51. Mr Sneep added that of course the Netherlands willingly supported this Action Plan. They were looking forward to seeing results in the future, and believed it would be a model for other action plans.

The Development of a format for Species Action Plans

52. The Executive Secretary recalled that the previous meeting of the TC had decided to establish a working group for the development of a format for Species Action Plans. His preparatory work had included the analysis of existing Action Plans and preliminary discussion with BirdLife International. Much still to be done and he would report back to the working group soon.

53. David Pritchard added that the Blue Book format was used by both the EU and the Bern Convention. The group should also consider projects being funded by the UK, especially those concerning Africa. Currently a uniform format was being sought for eight species. He reminded the Committee that many such action plans existed worldwide, but not many of them were being implemented. It would be useful to consider why this was so.

54. The Executive Secretary confirmed that the question of implementation was also of concern to AEWAs. Indeed, one of the aims of the Brent Goose Action Plan had been to make the required action as concrete and tangible as possible. It was too early to evaluate the usefulness of this approach, but there was no doubt that a common methodology was required.

b). Species Action Plans in Africa

55. Bert Lenten reported that the previous TC had decided to establish a Working Group on this issue, to be chaired by Mr Taylor. Unfortunately Mr Taylor had not been able to take any action so far, and it was doubtful whether he would be able to do so in future.

Agenda Item 12: Report on the non-toxic shot workshop

56. Kai Uwe Wollscheid reported that a workshop had been held in Romania in October 2001. The aim had been to raise awareness of the non-toxic shot issue in central and eastern European countries, particularly among the candidates for accession to the EU. The number of participants (an official representative from each country and representatives from national hunters' organisations) had been lower than expected, which in his view demonstrated a low level of awareness of the problem.

57. The Romania workshop had been divided into a theoretical and a practical part. First, experts from Wetlands International had presented the report "Lead Poisoning in Waterbirds" and the experience at national level in the form of case studies demonstrating the process adopted in each country. They had considered the legal and other aspects, and had compared various types of shot. This had been followed by a practical demonstration on a clay pigeon shooting range, using shotguns provided by the industry using steel shot to demonstrate that there were very few differences. The main outcome had been agreement among the participants on recommendations such as the need to increase international cooperation with stakeholders, and the recognition that, although there is much information available, this is not widely disseminated. This was where AEWAs could help. There was also a need for case studies for individual countries to demonstrate

applicability, and help decide how awareness could be raised amongst various groups in those countries. This could take the form of guidelines based on experience already gained elsewhere, and information material for hunters etc. Education and training needed to be strengthened, and manufacturers should be encouraged to make the existing products more easily accessible.

a). Introduction on the Update Report 2000: Lead Poisoning in Waterbirds

58. Ward Hagemeyer gave a brief introduction to the subject, also referring to the report "Lead Poisoning in Waterbirds"; This International Update Report 2000 was the third report on the subject.

59. Jesper Madsen thanked Mr Hagemeyer for emphasising this problem, which was a serious one. He felt, however, that the human health aspects should also be stressed. In Greenland the human intake of lead, apparently through the consumption of seabirds, was found to be approaching critical levels. Mr Hagemeyer promised to follow up this suggestion and include this point on the list.

60. Herby Kalchreuter reminded the Committee of the recommendations made in Romania, and that another workshop in a different region would seem to be the best way to achieve these aims. Bert Lenten agreed that a similar workshop in southern Europe would be good idea. It was decided to establish an ad hoc working group under the chairmanship of Ward Hagemeyer to discuss during the meeting how to proceed, and develop guidance to be given to next MOP.

Agenda Item 13: Implementation of the International Implementation Priorities 2000-2004

61. Referring to Document 2.7, the Executive Secretary reported that many of these projects were already running, and that if the GEF project were approved in 2002 funds would be available to begin most of the remaining projects.

62. Olivier Biber thanked the Secretariat for the useful information contained in this document. He felt that it was indeed necessary to place the various projects in order of priority.

63. Reporting on the outlook for those projects not yet completely funded, the Executive Secretary thanked all the donor countries for their support and expressed the hope that their generosity would continue. The Secretariat lacked time and human resources to do much work on this, but discussions were currently being held with France, for example, regarding a financial contribution towards a conservation project for colonial waterbirds. He saw no serious problems with financing, but planned to contract someone to review this list and reassign the priorities, and to prepare the next list covering the period to 2007. The Executive Secretary reminded Committee members that international projects for inclusion on this new list could be submitted to the Secretariat at any time.

Agenda Item 14: Update on the GEF Flyway Project

64. The Wetlands International representative reported on progress on this project covering the entire AEWA area and all AEWA species. It was felt that the project would further many of AEWA's goals, so co-funding would be welcome and would indeed be essential if the full project, which could run for between five and seven years, were to be implemented.

65. Asked if a report was available, Mr Hagemeyer replied that many documents had been discussed, and a framework of the full brief was available, but that no summary had yet been produced. He agreed that a short paper should be prepared, which would be useful for mobilising resources. There was, however, a leaflet with background information on the GEF project in English, French and Arabic.

66. Klaus Riede suggested looking into the EU Life database, which might contain useful information regarding funding and asked how the project was linked to EU Natura 2000. Ward Hagemeyer replied that there was no formal link yet, but that it might be possible to sell it as underpinning for Emerald Network or Natura 2000 and perhaps secure some funding thus.

67. The Executive Secretary outlined the process by which the ten demonstration areas had been selected from the 26 originally proposed. He also pointed out that if a site received funding through this project this precluded further GEF funding. Considering the limited resources available for demonstration projects some countries had been advised to apply for a medium-sized GEF project rather than being added to the list of demonstration projects in the AEWA/ GEF project.

68. In reply to Mr Mungroo's query about a public awareness workshop in Africa, Mr Hagemeyer replied that outreach workshops had been held in the Middle East and Central Asia, where waterbird conservation was regarded as lagging behind other regions. No such workshops were planned for Africa because enough information was already available on the needs there.

69. Regarding the added value compared, for example, to the Ramsar network, Mr Hagemeyer explained that other "networks" had so far been no more than lists of individual sites. Identifying the functional link between sites was the obvious added value over existing networks.

70. Mr Hagemeyer stated that some countries had been disappointed not to have been given demonstration projects. It had been explained to them that only a limited proportion of the total funds would be allocated to these, whereas the bulk would be spent on training and communications strategies, from which all countries would benefit.

71. David Pritchard reminded the Committee that eleven of the projects already presented in the previous Agenda item were dependent on implementation of the GEF project.

72. Thanking Mr Hagemeyer, the Chairman said he looked forward to hearing good news about the progress of this project at the next meeting

Agenda Item 15: Review and approval of new projects for inclusion in the Register of International Projects

73. The Executive Secretary reminded the Committee that members had been asked to submit proposals for inclusion in this register with the intention of reviewing them during the current meeting, but he had received no new proposals since the last MOP. He felt that the TC should now discuss whether the original Register of International Projects should be updated, and whether it was considered useful.

74. Olivier Biber mentioned the satellite tracking of white storks, which although funded by private organisations was an international project and would qualify. Bert Lenten confirmed that this project would be included, but that he was dependent on Parties for information on new projects for inclusion in the list. This was intended as a rolling document, to be constantly updated.

75. David Stroud felt that the register was very useful, but that the timetable should be clearer. He also suggested that it should be published, for example in the AEWAs newsletter. Asked about the criteria for projects to be included in the register, Bert Lenten agreed to distribute these to Committee members soon.

Agenda Item 16: Guidelines for the acceptance of contributions in cash and contributions in kind

76. The Executive Secretary presented document 2.8, recalling that this topic had originally been raised at the Negotiation Meeting in The Hague in 1995. While appreciating that some countries would find this useful, the Secretariat feared this might lead to serious financial problems and was not in favour in principle. Possibly this option should be limited to developing countries or economies in transition. The minimum contribution to which this could apply should be 1,000 USD.

77. Resolution 1.6 asked the Secretariat, in close cooperation with the TC, to consider the possibility of payment in kind, the reason for the inclusion of this item on the Agenda. UNON should be informed of the outcome of the discussions, and might perhaps take a lead in forcing a decision on this issue. Jasmin Kanza stated that consultation with UNEP and UNON had revealed that so far there was no precedent for such a procedure. However, the Committee was free to make proposals and, if they were accepted, this would be a first case study.

78. Considering the procedure, David Pritchard doubted that a request, the decision to accept it and the payment itself could be made within the cycle of a single budget year. Bert Lenten agreed that this was a problem, but expected this kind of payment would remain the exception.

79. Robert Vagg asked if any Parties had asked to pay in kind instead of cash. The Executive Secretary replied that while existing Parties had not done so, some prospective Parties had clearly indicated that they were not permitted to make long-term financial commitments, and that this restriction prevented them joining AEWAs.

80. Olivier Biber felt that it would be easier to discuss a more concrete proposal such as a draft resolution. The Executive Secretary agreed to produce a more detailed outline as a basis for a draft resolution (including a definition of the exceptional circumstances required to qualify for payment in kind) and to present this to the Committee the following day.

Welcome address of the Executive Director of UNEP Dr. Klaus Töpfer

81. At the start of the second day of the meeting, Ms Kanza read a message received the previous day from the Executive Director of UNEP, Mr Klaus Töpfer (see Annex 2). This was followed by a discussion of two questions raised therein.

82. Regarding paragraph 14, the Executive Secretary welcomed this initiative, of which he had not been aware, and proposed contacting the information unit on conventions to ask what kind of information they required. There would be no problem establishing a link to the AEWAs website.

83. Clarifying, Mr Gimenez-Dixon stated that ECOLEX was an initiative of IUCN-ELC in Bonn to provide a source of information on international environmental legislation, treaties etc. Ms Adams said she felt such international information was already available elsewhere; more information on national legislation was required, as well as English translations of this.

84. David Pritchard agreed. AEWA should provide input to this database, but should also consider its own needs as an end user of the information it contained. He felt that mere access to agreement texts etc. was not sufficient. Information on case law in different languages, definitions of terms, precedents etc. would be more useful, as would GIS mapping of legally significant areas. It was, however, difficult to discuss this question at such an early stage. The Executive Secretary stated that he would be meeting the director of IUCN-ELC in Bonn in the coming week, and would request more information.

85. Ms Kanza then requested comments on the question of co-location of the Agreements in Bonn.

86. The Executive Secretary stated that AEWA had been the first of the Agreements to co-locate, and that it had not surprisingly taken some time to become familiar with the new procedures. Co-location had some benefits, for example in this case the "loan" of the ASCOBANS assistant as report writer for the current meeting. Synergies could also be expected during periods of temporary high workload. On the other hand expectations had perhaps been too high. It was not easy to "borrow" CMS staff. The Agreements had no excess capacity, and it was not fair to use CMS staff as stopgaps, except on a very temporary basis. However, enhanced contact with the other Agreements had proved useful. The Agreements had similar problems, so the improved flow of information and advice was beneficial. It was also easier to harmonise and synchronise activities, for example shared representation of the Agreements and CMS at international meetings.

87. Another question put forward by UNEP/UNON concerned the scope for including AEWA in future pilot projects to harmonise reporting. The general consensus was that it was important to harmonize the reporting system for biodiversity-related conventions in order to reduce the workload of the policy officers involved.

88. Asked who was involved in the process of harmonization of the reporting system, Mr Christoph Zöckler named CBD, Ramsar and CMS. The first draft was available on the WCMC website.

89. Returning to the question of governance and administration, Bert Lenten reported that this was sometimes difficult. According to Resolution 1.1, AEWA is governed by the MOP, but since co-location the role and responsibility of CMS regarding AEWA had not always been clear. Administration had become more difficult since integration, and initially many mistakes had been caused by unfamiliarity with the UNEP rules. This situation was now gradually improving.

90. David Pritchard suggested that while the TC was the only intersessional body under the Agreement, the Committee was perhaps not the right decision-making body for budget and administration issues. There was no governance instrument for such issues, and their inclusion on a technical agenda might in future prove to be a problem. Agreeing, the Executive Secretary suggested the need for a separate governance panel, following an appropriate amendment of the rules. He felt that the Technical Committee should decide whether a form of Standing Committee was required.

91. Mr. Vagg reminded the meeting that the CMS Standing Committee had been established by a resolution of the Conference of Parties, whereas the AEWA TC was established in the convention text.

92. Mr Biber agreed that there might be a need for a Standing Committee in the future, but reminded the Committee that such a decision could only be taken by the MOP. The Executive Secretary believed that a Standing Committee could allow all parties to send observers, and could deal with governance questions such as those raised the previous day. This would allow the TC to concentrate on scientific questions.

93. Referring to the text of the Agreement, Mr Gimenez-Dixon felt that the TC should not be assuming the tasks of a Standing Committee, and should not, for example, be dealing with budget questions, which needed a different kind of expertise.

94. The Executive Secretary argued that adhering strictly to the Agreement text would cause problems. The budget had to be discussed in advance of the MOP. In order to avoid clashes it was essential for the Secretariat to obtain feedback on financial and administrative issues before their presentation to the MOP for the final decision.

95. It was agreed that an ad hoc working group made up of Ms Adams, Mr Mlingwa, Mr Mungroo and Mr Biber, should look more closely at this question and report back to the Committee.

Agenda Item 17: Establishment of a small conservation grants fund

96. Presenting his report, the Executive Secretary stated that so far not much progress had been made. In recent months he had been in contact with the fundraising officer of the Ramsar Bureau. The problem was how such a fund could be maintained without causing a lot of additional work for the Secretariat.

97. David Pritchard told the Committee that the Ramsar Small Grants Fund had been set up in the 1990s, and much of the debate since had concerned the administrative burden. Even more serious, however, was the funding problem and the accompanying frustration for staff. It was a political decision that the Fund be maintained centrally by the Ramsar Convention Secretariat, and a similar decision might be appropriate for an AEWA fund. Mr Lenten agreed, but felt more time was needed to look into details and consult further with Ramsar before establishing such a fund.

98. Elena Kreuzberg (Southwestern Asia) felt this would be an important tool to encourage small countries to become Parties to AEWA. Ramsar's Small Grants Fund enables them to obtain knowledge on an international level, and this would be a very important aspect for AEWA too.

99. Mr Mungroo reminded the Committee that such a fund would require additional Secretariat staff.

100. Concluding, the Executive Secretary agreed that the fund would be a useful promotional tool for the Agreement and that it should be established, but that the consequences should be considered. He would visit Ramsar soon to discuss details, and would present a proposal to the next TC meeting.

Agenda Item 18: Amendments to the Action Plan

101. The Executive Secretary reported that he had so far received no proposals for amendments, and was still working on some of the items discussed at the last meeting, with work on some of the species contracted out to Wetlands International. Parties should feel free to contact the Secretariat with suggested amendments before the next MOP. It was likely that in March 2002 Wetlands International would be contracted to maintain this rolling document. Ward Hagemeyer reported that work currently being done on a conservation status update would be finished in the first half of 2002. Work on the Action Plan would follow.

102. Herby Kalchreuter enquired about the position of the Jack Snipe; Wetlands International had been commissioned to collect more data on the conservation of this species. Bert Lenten replied that the 2000 TC meeting had considered amendments to the Action Plan on several species and that these would be included in the list as and when Wetlands International made an appropriate recommendation.

Report on study on Jack Snipe in France

103. Mr Olivier Guy-Noël (OMPO) informed the meeting about the two studies conducted in France to increase knowledge on the species. The first study dealt with morphological and age analysis based on tail feathers. A new method had been developed that ensured 90 % certainty. A total of 3,262 birds had been examined in ten years. The study, which was very near to completion, showed that in France there exist an average of three juveniles to one adult bird. If this age ratio were to drop this would be danger signal. The second study, completed in 2000, was on samples from French hunters. Archives had provided some data from as far back as 1980. As a result the previous minimum estimate should be increased tenfold, whereas the maximum figure was, as previously thought, between 1 million and 1,250,000 birds. The classification and status of the Jack Snipe in the AEWa agreement should therefore be changed.

104. In reply to Mr Kalchreuter's question, Mr Olivier stated that the population was stable, whereas the number of hunters had decreased by 10 % over the last ten years. It was generally felt that this study provided useful additional information on this species.

105. Mr Lenten asked if there was now enough information about the Jack Snipe to prepare a proposal as requested by Resolution 1.9. In reply, Mr Kalchreuter reported that back data collection had been completed, but that ringing recovery data was needed before proceeding. He assured the Committee that most of the information would be available before MOP2, where some advice would be given.

Agenda Item 19: Review of the Conservation Guidelines.

106. The Executive Secretary apologised for the fact that that the 200-page document sent to members by e-mail prior to the meeting had been faulty, and would have to be sent again. Mr Hagemeyer again asked for comments to be sent directly to the Secretariat before 1st December. These would be incorporated into the final version of the Conservation Guidelines, which would be produced in book form.

Agenda Item 20: Developments on the Global Register of Migratory Species (GROMS)

107. Klaus Riede (Museum Koenig) gave a detailed presentation of the GROMS project. Opening the ensuing discussion, David Pritchard asked how Mr Riede had determined the needs of potential end users and assessed the demand.

108. Replying, Mr Riede said that he had presented the project to CMS at an early stage. The scientific steering committee had met twice and was due to meet again in January 2002. This included CMS and various German organisations, and would hopefully in future have an international membership. He was currently concentrating on the very basic information he felt should be included, and was awaiting response to the first edition.

109. In reply to the Chairman's question about the national contributors, Mr Riede replied that at the outset he had contacted numerous institutions, many of which had supplied data that had now been included. He said that so far there had been no real cooperation with BirdLife International. Ward Hagemeyer promised him the use, among other data, of the European Bird Breeding Atlas, which was compatible with GIS maps.

110. Christoph Zöckler (WCMC) stated that his organisation already had more than 20 years' experience in the management of species data. He saw GROMS as a valuable contribution, but also perceived considerable duplication. He felt a way should be sought to link the various sources and thus avoid duplication. He believed there was now a need for much clarification as to how future cooperation could be ensured, and that this was too large a task for one person. He would prefer a more harmonised approach in the future.

111. Mr Riede listed other similar projects, and also felt it was time to link these activities. The original GROMS project had been subject to constraints imposed by the funder; these required the results to be published on a CD-ROM, thus limiting the amount of data that could be collated. When new funding was available, the terms of reference could be changed.

112. Jesper Madsen, enquired about the future and whether GROMS would still be state of the art in five years' time. Klaus Riede explained that consideration was now being given to the recent proposition that CMS should take over the running of the project, in cooperation with the University of Bonn and WCMC, and to the question as to how it was to be financed.

113. Bert Lenten, referring to Document 2.13, recalled that the German government had already invested DM 1 million in the development of GROMS, but that the project was unlikely to be finalised by 2002, making more investment necessary for its development and of course for its later maintenance. CMS was now seeking co-funding, and had contacted AEWA informally to enquire about this possibility. Mr Lenten hoped for guidance from the TC on this fundamental question: whether the AEWA Secretariat should step into what might be regarded as a never-ending project and become involved in data base management. This guidance was all the more necessary because so far no exact price had been named. He understood that the Executive Secretary of CMS was awaiting a reply, as Germany would definitely be handing the project over to CMS at the end of 2002.

114. Mr Gimenez-Dixon said that, as he understood it, WCMC was to become the information hub for UNEP (and therefore CMS), and he believed this would be the best arrangement. He felt it would be cheaper for AEWA to pay for the services of WCMC than to create its own data management structure.

115. Olivier Biber also felt that database management was not a task for conventions or agreements, especially not as WCMC existed to deal with this. He felt that the work that had been done on GROMS should flow into that system. Other organisations, including IUCN, had been handling data for decades and had large networks of researchers. The conventions and agreements were invited to make use of these.

116. Jesper Madsen felt it was difficult to negotiate on a project without an overall strategy. Red List information was not sufficient, information on population level was also required. Ward Hagemeyer also thought it more important for AEWA to support a database on population and distribution, rather than putting this information into a larger database such as GROMS.

117. Christoph Zöckler suggested that a more concrete strategy for GROMS should be formulated before the next MOP, indicating the expected benefits both for AEWA and for other conventions and agreements, and also the cost of the various options. Population estimate data was of primary importance; as Wetlands International had the mandate to gather this they should continue to do so.

118. The Executive Secretary repeated his question as to whether AEWA should step into a never-ending project. While Ward Hagemeyer saw no problem, as there was no need to make an unlimited commitment, Jesper Madsen considered that, with the current staff status, the work would have to be contracted out.

119. Mariano Gimenez-Dixon agreed that this might be a never-ending commitment. The Secretariat should ensure that its data needs were met, from whatever source, and he thought GROMS would be better managed by WCMC, allowing AEWA to access and input information.

120. Summing up, the Executive Secretary suggested the establishment of an intersessional working group with data holders and others to investigate the added value for AEWA of GROMS compared to existing databases, and also the cost involved in terms of money and effort. This group, which would be made up of representatives from Wetlands International, WCMC and BirdLife International, would report back to the next TC with guidance.

Report of the Working Group on Contribution in Kind

121. Bert Lenten presented the findings of the working group on contribution in kind, which specified the criteria to be met before such a contribution would be accepted.

122. Referring to criterion No. 1, Charles Mlingwa said that for most, if not all, developing countries the cost of a contribution in kind (e.g. paying the salaries for personnel working in Bonn, hosting meetings or supplying equipment) would far exceed the small monetary payment due, and would therefore not be the chosen option. The Executive Secretary pointed out that the ruling would apply to countries contributing more than 1,000 USD per annum, and suggested that work for the Secretariat could even be done in the contributing country.

123. Olivier Biber enquired who would be responsible for ensuring the fair conversion of the amounts into services. Ms Kanza replied that the Secretariat would do this initially in close cooperation with UNON.

124. Mr Mungroo feared contribution in kind might lead to a lack of liquidity. The Executive Secretary thought this unlikely because very few countries would fulfill all the required criteria. The door would be opened to countries eager to join AEWA but lacking the means to pay the contribution.

125. Mr Mokoko (Central Africa) thought it very unlikely that any government finance department would admit to being unable to pay.

126. Mr Lenten asked the members of the TC if they agreed to his proposal. Mr Biber declared that he was not in favour as no case had so far occurred. In general the meeting agreed to the proposal because MOP1 had requested the advice of the Committee in Resolution 1.6.

Report of Working Group on Project Evaluation and Review

127. The group's findings were presented by Mr Madsen. He expressed the hope that the suggested procedure would make the process more transparent and assist the Secretariat. He felt that this forum should become more interactive, both at its meetings and between sessions. The aim was to increase the involvement of TC members in supervision and analysis of projects.

128. Mr Gimenez-Dixon commented that the proposals looked too good and wondered about the amount of time required for serious monitoring and follow-up. Mr Madsen agreed that time and resources would be constraints, but thought the Committee members should become more active, in line with Article 7 of the Agreement.

129. David Pritchard was very much in favour of the proposals. The Executive Secretary also welcomed this initiative but considered that not all the projects on the list would require evaluation by the TC. He suggested that the question as to whether evaluation was necessary, and who should be responsible, should be decided when the list was updated.

130. Ward Hagemeyer observed that this again demonstrated the need for a Standing Committee. Quality control should be one of the first priorities of the TC, but would threaten other work such as the budget. Mr Biber agreed that the burden on the TC should be considered. It was their task to follow up the current projects, and perhaps in future the number of projects to be evaluated could be reduced. The TC should itself judge whether it had the capacity to fulfill the demands, and tell the MOP if this were not so. In that case more money would have to be made available to finance work outside, or parts of the work would have to be delegated to individual Parties or TC members.

131. David Pritchard considered that in future the TC might need to define its own work programme in order not to lose sight of its objectives. Bert Lenten was in favour of the proposals, but felt that the Committee needed to consider carefully whether it could manage this additional task without its other work suffering.

132. Mr Biber suggested that when, prior to the next MOP, Parties were asked to submit suggested revisions to the priority list, the Party accepting the priority should be asked to nominate a controller. In this connection the Executive Secretary asked the Working Group to review the list of priorities currently being implemented and suggest controllers for each.

133. On behalf of the Working Group, Jasper Madsen agreed to consider how many projects were involved, and to name a possible controller for each. In a second phase, the further procedure should be established in cooperation with the Secretariat.

Agenda Item 21: Adoption of the draft proposal regarding Budget 2003-2005

134. In the light of the earlier discussion about governance and administration issues, the Executive Secretary asked the Committee if it felt qualified to deal with the next Agenda item. Mr Gimenez-Dixon felt this was not a matter for the TC and the Committee then voted on whether to proceed or refer this item to another committee yet to be established. The majority was in favour of proceeding with the Agenda as adopted.

135. Opening the item and referring to Document 2.10, the Executive Secretary reminded the committee that the budget is a tricky issue at every MOP or COP of any convention. Although the explanatory notes clearly indicate how the figures were arrived at, Mr Lenten wanted to voice some of his concerns in particular regarding human resources. However he was obliged to inform the TC that the proposed budget was dependent on the recruitment of a number of new Parties. If this did not occur before MOP2 the current proposal would have to be reconsidered. Although the number of Parties had doubled since 1999, the main impact of any increase was felt by the major contributors to the budget, e.g. Germany, UK, etc. Finally he also informed the TC that this budget proposal had been sent to UNON for comments, and that some had meanwhile been received.

136. The TC agreed that the job description of the Executive Secretary should be brought into line with Resolution 1.1, and that UNON should be asked to re-classify the job description before MOP2.

137. The need for additional staff was discussed at length. In general the TC understood that there was a need for more staff to fulfill all the obligations given by the MOP to the Secretariat. It was clear that the workload of the Secretariat had increased enormously due to the growing number of Parties and its activities. Only Mr Sneep doubted if an additional technical officer for the Secretariat was needed. In his view the Secretariat should clearly justify this based on the role/tasks of the Executive Secretary, the Assistant/Secretary and the Administrative and Fund Officer. Regarding the latter he asked to receive the job description. He doubted if the MOP would approve the recruitment of additional staff.

138. Increasing the number of staff would have a financial impact on the total budget. Mr Lenten explained that for this reason he had applied for a JPO to support the AEWAs Secretariat and the other Agreements Secretariats in developing information material. He also stated that as well as the increase in costs for salaries, additional staff would also have some impact on other budget lines, for example travel costs, purchase of equipment, etc.

139. Mr Olivier expressed his amazement that this Committee, consisting of top-level biologists and scientists, was discussing the financial matters of the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat. In his view the TC was not qualified to do this. Mr Lenten reiterated that as long as there was no Standing Committee the TC was obliged to deal with financial matters.

140. Mr Hagemeyer stated that the budget line 1200 was proof that AEWAs was active. As an example he mentioned a survey that was to be conducted in Iran, financed by AEWAs, as a result of which Iran was now considering joining the Agreement. He suggested creating a special budget line for voluntary support of surveys and that this budget line should be increased. Mr Lenten replied that this budget line was available for national surveys, and that the total amount had been increased by 10,000 USD compared to the previous budget.

141. Mr Pritchard felt that the title of budget line 3304 was ambiguous and asked if it was only for meetings or also for support of the Action Plan. Mr Lenten explained that the amount allocated here was just matching funds for meetings. Support for implementation of the Action Plan etc. came entirely from voluntary contributions.

142. Regarding the Executive Secretary, the TC considered that this was a reasonable budget proposal. Mr Mungroo stated that in his view this was reasonable although he fully appreciated that an increase of 58 % would be difficult to justify. Mr Lenten agreed, but was of the opinion that when establishing a new organisation such increases due to the recruitment of new staff were unavoidable. As soon as the organisation stabilised, budget increases would be only required to compensate for inflation.

143. There was general agreement that this draft budget proposal could be accepted by the TC and should be proposed to MOP2. Furthermore there was general approval to set the minimum contribution at 100 USD. Only Mr Kassama (Western Africa) opposed this proposal.

Agenda Item 22: Development of an Action Plan for the Central Asian-Indian Flyway

144. Ward Hagemeyer gave a presentation on the workshop that had been held in Tashkent in August 2001. He reported that for the first time there had been a large participation from the region, that a draft action plan was being produced and that CMS - together with Wetlands International - would soon present details of how this action plan should be implemented. This further work was part of the project being funded by the Netherlands government and was currently being dealt with by Wetlands International. The action plan would be adopted at a further workshop to be held in the region.

145. Elena Kreuzberg enquired about the role being played by the region, and about capacity building. Mr Hagemeyer replied that the region was involved firstly through participation in the workshop, secondly by submitting their comments on the further development of the action plan, and finally by participation in the follow-up meeting when the plan would be adopted. The countries involved were making the suggestions, and capacity building was one of the recommendations of the action plan.

146. The Executive Secretary commented that there was considerable overlap between the AEW region and the Central Asian-Indian flyway (CAIF), and that it was not good to ask countries to join both agreements. Instead, the AEW area could be extended to cover this, and CMS had asked the Secretariat to make a note describing the three options. These options are inserting CAIF in the Asian Pacific Waterbird Conservation Strategy, development of a new CMS Agreement or inclusion in AEW. The Secretariat would be sending this proposal to the countries involved, thus continuing the discussion.

147. Ms Kreuzberg asked how many countries would be involved in the proposed extension of the agreement area. The Executive Secretary replied that about 15 additional countries were concerned. One argument against a new agreement for the region was that this would include only developing countries. An extension of the AEW area, on the other hand, would include industrialised countries and thus ensure sound funding.

148. Mr Charles Mlingwa spoke in support of the proposed extension of the Agreement area, which he felt would be a positive step and would bring tangible results.

149. Valentin Serebryakov voiced concern about the definition of the range of the CAIF. There was known to be migration in this part of the former Soviet Union, which was a very vast territory, but there was very little knowledge about this. Bert Lenten replied that the experts involved in CAIF were working hard to collate the information available, and all this would be included in the Action Plan. The idea was to use the same format for the CAIF Action Plan as for AEWa. If, in the long term, the CAIF were included in AEWa the two Action Plans could be merged into one.

150. Mr Lenten requested the advice of the TC regarding extension of the Agreement Area to include CAIF. Mr Valentin Serebryakov felt that if there were no technical difficulties in broadening the area this should be proposed to MOP2 for adoption.

151. Summing up the discussion, the Executive Secretary concluded that the TC agreed that AEWa should remain involved in the development of CAIF, that MOP should be informed and that, if applicable and depending on outcome of the discussion in the region, a proposal should be tabled to extend the AEWa region.

Working group on priority implementation and the role of the Technical Committee

152. Reporting on behalf of this group, the Executive Secretary stated that Jesper Madsen left the meeting that morning, leaving a note that he had been unable to convene the group but promising to communicate with its members soon and submit a proposal for the Secretariat to distribute to the Committee members for their comments. This would consist of a list of implementation priorities, with a named member of the Technical Committee as the suggested focal point.

Working Group on non-toxic shot

153. Ward Hagemeyer reported on this working group, in which Mr Biber, Mr Wollscheid and himself had discussed the lead shot issue and how to take it forward.

154. The Executive Secretary reported that the presentation in Rumania by Martin Tulp, an expert on steel shot, had been excellent. It was planned to use the remaining funds to produce a small awareness-raising publication. The text had already been published in the Dutch national hunting newsletter, and it only required translation into local languages.

155. Referring to the proposal to hold a further workshop in southern Europe, Herby Kalchreuter reported that, according to the OMPO representative, French hunters were keen to participate, contrary to expectations. He felt that if the French took part, OMPO might make a financial contribution to such a workshop.

156. David Stroud asked how mortality levels due to lead could be assessed. He suggested that guidelines for future research on this issue would be useful, and asked if technical assistance would be necessary. The Executive Secretary replied that no further research was needed. It was well known that every wetland is contaminated by lead pellets, it was only local people who were not aware of this. In the rest of Europe this information was available, but in Ukraine, for example, the most important element was awareness-raising. David Pritchard felt that any resolution should encourage Parties to take responsibility by establishing their own time scale for the phasing out of lead shot, and setting their own deadlines.

157. Outlining the possible next steps, Mr Lenten suggested trying to organise a workshop for southern Europe, possibly in Italy, in early 2002. He hoped to obtain funding for this, perhaps from OMPO. A recommendation could be ready by the next TC meeting in May 2002, and this could be tabled at the MOP in Bonn that same year. There may also be money left over from the Swiss government, which could be used to produce leaflets before the TC meeting.

158. The body of the work could be carried out by a special working group (of which Herby Kalchreuter should be a member) under the TC, which should seek better contact with FACE etc. Later this small working group should be supervised by the TC. The Working Group was requested to produce an elaborated list of recommendations for the next TC.

Agenda Item 23: Excursion

159. The excursion was unfortunately cancelled.

Agenda Item 24: Development of the Agreement's Website

160. Christoph Zöckler gave a detailed presentation of the AEWA website, work on which was still in progress. He emphasised that suggestions and recommendations were welcome.

Report of the Working Group on Governance

161. Ms Kanza, reporting on the ad hoc working group on governance, stated that the group had met briefly, but had felt there was no need for such a decision yet. The relevant rule states that the TC should deal with "any other business". It was felt that the TC, which was originally intended to deal with scientific issues, should itself decide which of these other decisions it considered beyond its mandate.

162. Mr Gimenez-Dixon felt the MOP should decide if the TC should make decisions on other matters. The Committee agreed that the Executive Secretary should prepare an appropriate proposal for discussion at the next TC meeting and for final decision at the next MOP.

Agenda Item 25: Arrangements for the Second Session of the Meeting of the Parties

163. The Executive Secretary reported that the next Meeting of Parties to AEWA would be held from 26-28 September 2002 in Bonn. At MOP1 the German government had invited AEWA to hold the meeting back to back with the CMS Conference of Parties in Bonn, and this offer had been accepted. Preparations had now begun. The venue was the Bundeshaus, the former parliament building, which was very spacious and had excellent facilities. The host government agreement was currently being finalised. Tentative plans to hold a scientific symposium between the two meetings were currently being discussed with the German government.

164. In reply to a question from David Pritchard regarding monitoring of implementation, the Executive Secretary stated that he would try to produce a synthesis of national reports before the MOP.

Agenda Item 26: Proposal regarding MOP3

165. The Executive Secretary reminded Committee members that a proposal should be forthcoming by the next TC meeting, to allow a resolution to be prepared for MOP2

Agenda Item 27: Date and venue of the next meeting of the Technical Committee

166. The Executive Secretary reported that he had received an offer the previous day from the government of Tanzania, through Mr Mlingwa, to hold the next meeting in Arusha in early May 2002. The dates for the meeting would be decided soon. The Technical Committee accepted this offer unanimously.

167. On behalf of the Committee, Mr Lenten thanked the Tanzanian government for their generous offer. He hoped to have a two-day meeting and a one-day excursion. Although it was felt that the current meeting could have been completed in two days, the length, as always, depended on the agenda.

Agenda Item 28: Any other business

168. The Executive Secretary reported that during the meeting many delegates had asked for their travel and hotel arrangements made for them in advance - and which they had themselves approved - to be changed. He asked members to bear in mind that this had caused considerable extra work for the Secretariat.

Agenda Item 29: Closure of meeting

169. In his closing remarks, the Chairman thanked the participants for the pleasant and calm atmosphere that had prevailed during the meeting. He felt that the Sunday excursion had given the participants an opportunity to get to know each other and find common ground. He also expressed thanks to those who had submitted documents, and otherwise contributed to the preparation of the meeting. The capacity of the Secretariat being small, this input had been essential.

Annex 1: List of Participants

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE REGIONS

NORTH AND SOUTH WESTERN EUROPE

Mr Olivier Biber (provisional member)
Chef questions internationaux 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
Commission for the Protection of Nature
Monuments
Str. Gh. Dima 49/2
3400 Cluj-Napoca
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) 2669238 (office)
Fax: (+38 044) 2520120
E-mail:

WESTERN AFRICA

Mr. Momodou Lamin Kassama
Coordinator Protected Areas System
Department of Parks & Wildlife Management
Box 1882, Banjul
THE GAMBIA
Tel: (+220) 375888/392174
Fax: (+220) 392179
E-mail: wildlife@gamtel.gm

CENTRAL AFRICA

Mr. Ikonga Jérôme Mokoko
Directeur Adjoint Project Parc Nationale Nouabale-Ndoki
WCS Congo
B.P. 14537
Brazzaville
CONGO
Tel: (+242) 511785
Fax:
E-mail: wcscongo@yahoo.fr

EASTERN AFRICA

Dr. Charles Mlingwa
Director General
Tanzania Wildlife Research Institute
P.O. Box 661
Arusha
TANZANIA
Tel: (+255) 27 2548240/ 2509871
Fax: (+255) 27 2548240
E-mail: tawiri@africaonline.co.tz

SOUTHERN AFRICA

Mr. Yousoof Mungroo
Director
National Parks and Conservation Service
Ministry of Agriculture F.T.N.R.
Reduit, Mauritius
Tel: (+230) 4642993
Fax: (+230) 4651184
E-mail: npcsagr@intnet.mu

SOUTHWESTERN ASIA

Ms. Elena Kreuzberg-Mukhina
Senior Researcher, Nature Conservation
Institute of Zoology, Uzbek A.S.
Nyazov street 1
700095, Tashkent
UZBEKISTAN
Tel: (+998 71) 2 241312
Fax: (+998 71) 1442603/1206791
E-mail: kreuz@uzsci.net

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) 229990015
E-mail: mgd@hq.iucn.org

WETLANDS INTERNATIONAL

Mr. Ward Hagemeier
Wetlands International - Africa, Europe, Middle
East
Postbus 7002
6700 CA Wageningen
NETHERLANDS
Tel: (+31)317 478867
Fax: (+31) 317 478885
E-mail: hagemeijer@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

UNEP/CMS

Ms. Jasmin Kanza
Administration and Fund Management Officer
UNEP/CMS
Martin Luther King Str. 8
53175 Bonn
GERMANY
Tel: (+49) 228 815 2404
Fax: (+49) 228 815 24
E-mail:

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

OBSERVERS FROM CONTRACTING PARTIES

UNITED KINGDOM

Mr. David Stroud
Senior Ornithologist
Joint Nature Conservation Committee
Monkstone House
City Road, Peterborough
UNITED KINGDOM
Tel: (+44) 1733 866810
Fax: (+44) 1733 555948
E-mail: david.stroud@jncc.gov.uk

UNITED KINGDOM

Mr. Robert Vagg
International Conservation Policy Adviser
Department for Environment,
Food & Rural Affairs (DEFRA)
GWD4, Temple Quay House (1/14)
Bristol BS1 6 EB
UNITED KINGDOM
Tel: (+44) 117 372 8110
Fax: (+44) 117 372 8317
E-mail: robert.vagg@defra.gsi.gov.uk

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

TANZANIA

Ms. Miriam Zacharia
Mr. Mzamilu Kaita
Wildlife Division
P.O. Box 1994 Dar Es Salaam
TANZANIA
Tel: (+255) 7442261501 (mobile)
(+255) 22 2866375
Fax: (+255) 22 2863496
E-mail: wildlife-division@twiga.com

OBSERVERS FROM INTERNATIONAL NGO'S

BIRDLIFE INTERNATIONAL

Mr. David Pritchard
International Treaties Adviser
BirdLife International
c/o RSPB The Lodge
Sandy, Bedfordshire SG19 2DL
UNITED KINGDOM
Tel: (+44) 1767 680551
Fax: (+44) 1767 683211
E-mail: dave.pritchard@rspb.org.uk

UNEP/WCMC

Mr. Christoph Zöckler
UNEP/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

Mr. Kai-Uwe Wollscheid
Conservation Officer
Fédération des Associations des Chasseurs de l'Union
Européenne (F.A.C.E.)
82, rue F. Pelletier
1030 Brussels
BELGIUM
Tel: (+32) 27326900
Fax: (+32) 2 7327072
E-mail: conservation@face-europe.org

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

O.M.P.O.

Mr. Olivier Guy-Nöel
Secrétaire General
5 Avenue des Chasseurs
75017 Paris
FRANCE
Tel: (+33) 01 44010510
Fax: (+33) 01 44010511
E-mail:

GUESTS

Mr. Klaus Riede

Klaus Riede
ZEFb (Zentrum für Entwicklungsforschung)
Walter-Flex-Str. 3
D-53113 Bonn GERMANY
Tel: +49 228 731872/9122234
Fax: +49 228/731869
E-mail: k.riede.zfmk@uni-bonn.de

SECRETARIAT

UNEP/ AEWAS SECRETARIAT

Mr. Bert Lenten
Executive Secretary
Ms. Mirna Maya, Assistant
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: aewa@unep.de

UNEP/ ASCOBANS SECRETARIAT

Ms. Patricia Stadié (Report Writer)
Martin Luther King Str. 8
53175 Bonn
GERMANY
Tel: (+49) 228 815 2415
Fax: (+49) 228 815 2440
E-mail: pstadie@ascobans.org