

**Report of the 1st Meeting of the AEWA Standing Committee
Bonn, 24-25 November 2003**

Agenda item 1: Opening

1. Opening the meeting, Jochen Flasbarth, Head of Department, welcomed the participants on behalf of the German Federal Ministry for the Environment. Mr. Flasbarth stressed that his Ministry would continue to support AEWA in future and wished the conference good results. Referring to the outing to the Ahr Valley the guests had taken part in the day before, Mr. Flasbarth explained that this region was of considerable importance as a habitat of several bird species, including the Black Stork and the Kingfisher, and noted that the Ahr Mountains has been designated as Special Protected Area under the EU Bird Directive.
2. Mr. Flasbarth noted that Federal Environment Minister Jürgen Trittin had pledged one million euros of support for the GEF, but noted that while these funds were about to be approved, austerity measures were increasingly affecting the Ministry's budget. Along with the other CMS agreements, AEWA would also benefit from the planned UN Campus for which 65 million euros had been earmarked. Furthermore, he mentioned that the co-located CMS Agreements, including the AEWA Secretariat, were receiving administrative support from the CMS Agreements Unit. To strengthen this Unit, the Federal Government had decided to provide a Junior Professional Officer to this Unit.
3. Bert Lenten thanked the Ministry for its broad support for the AEWA and, having announced that he was chairing the meeting until the election of the Chair.

Agenda item 2: Welcome addresses

4. Mr. Lenten asked for welcome addresses.
5. Yousoof Mungroo, Chairman of the AEWA Technical Committee, referred to the event as yet another milestone in the short time AEWA had been in force, since it was the very first meeting of the Standing Committee, whose nominated members had been approved at the second session of the MOP in Bonn in September 2002. So far, four meetings of the AEWA Technical Committee had been held, the most recent one in Tashkent. Mr. Mungroo noted that most of the nominated members were present, demonstrating the level of commitment the Agreement enjoyed. The establishment of the Standing Committee would now permit the Technical Committee to dedicate itself primarily to scientific and technical issues. It had to be borne in mind, however, that technical, scientific and policy issues of the Agreement were very often interlinked.
6. Mr. Mungroo also expressed his thanks for the German Federal Government's support. He wished the meeting success.
7. In his welcome address, CMS Executive Secretary Arnulf Müller-Helmbrecht called it a historic moment that in a development, following exactly that of the Convention, AEWA has established a Standing Committee which now hold its first meeting. He praised the speedy and impressive development of membership and implementation of the Agreement. The CMS Scientific Council had proposed in its first meeting in 1985 an Agreement for the East

Atlantic Flyway. Birdlife International and Wetlands International played a key role in developing the Agreement, which entered into force in 1999, bringing all the stakeholders together. After its conclusion in 1979, CMS numbered 15 parties, and by the time Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht joined it 13 years later, it had 38 parties globally. AEWA, which he referred to as the flagship under CMS, already has 43 members eight years after its conclusion and four years after its entry into force. He was pleased to note progress being made, above all with regard to the GEF project, and he acknowledged the outstanding role Germany as the host of CMS and three Agreement secretariats which is providing much additional support and has topped that with the pledge of matching funds for the implementation of the GEF project.

8. John O'Sullivan, BirdLife International (BLI), noted that his organisation had been involved in the Agreement for a long time, having already contributed to its development at the Nairobi meeting in 1994 and, particularly, at the final negotiation meeting the following year. BLI had maintained its commitment because of its belief that the Agreement could make a real difference to the conservation of waterbirds over the vast areas it covers. Mr. O'Sullivan went on to note how important the birds the Agreement focuses on are to millions of people from the Arctic to the southern tip of Africa. Saving them required a great deal of work. With this in mind, BLI certainly welcomed the new Standing Committee.

9. Ward Hagemeyer, Wetlands International (WLI), welcomed the new members to AEWA. It had already been clear ahead of MOP2 that a Standing Committee was needed. Now was the time to step up efforts to implement international programmes, in particular GEF, which enjoyed the strong support of AEWA. Mr. Hagemeyer also thanked the Ministry for its financial contribution to the GEF. He stressed how important it was for WLI to work with AEWA, and expressed his hope that it would be able to support the Standing Committee as a member.

10. In his welcome address, Oscar J. Merne (Ireland), pointed out that his country's nature conservation authority, which he represented at the meeting, had always been an enthusiastic supporter of international conventions and meetings as a means of furthering the conservation of fauna, flora and ecosystems. The Irish authorities had recognised the value of AEWA to effective conservation of migratory waterbirds and their wetland habitats, and Ireland had been one of the first countries to sign the Agreement, which it ratified this autumn.

11. To advance the AEWA aims and objectives, Ireland was now completing the process of designating a comprehensive network of Special Protection Areas for migratory wetland birds under the European Bird Directive. Together with NGOs, the authorities had also established the Irish Wetland Bird Survey for monitoring the numbers and distribution of migratory waterbirds overwintering throughout Ireland. In October, the nature conservation authority had also participated in a workshop held in Northern Ireland launching the development of an international flyway action plan for the East Canadian High Arctic Light-bellied Brent goose.

12. Mr. Merne wished the Agreement even more success, and said that while he was retiring, he would still be representing his authority at international meetings.

13. Mr. Lenten stressed the need for a Standing Committee to separate policy from scientific/technical issues where necessary, while acknowledging that issues such as extending areas and raising the number of species clearly affected both the Standing and the Technical Committee. He added that he was looking forward to an interesting meeting.

Agenda item 3: Adoption of the Rules of Procedure

14. Mr. Lenten introduced the Rules of Procedure and asked for comments.

15. Gerhard Adams, Representative of Europe and Central Asia, referred to a number of items in the Standing Committee's Rules of Procedure that required clarifying:
 - Rule 14: he questioned if this was the right place to state how Parties should elect their representative and suggested to delete this Rule;
 - Rule 11: "no" or "not";
 - Rule 31: does the budget not require a higher quorum than a simply majority? (Suggestion: two thirds majority)
 - Rule 38: should this be stipulated in the Standing Committee's Rules of Procedure?
16. Mr. Hagemeyer pointed to further items possibly requiring clarification:
 - Rule 1: is a general description, but Rule 5 overlaps considerably with it, so is it necessary?
 - Rule 12: does it refer to two persons, or does it need rephrasing?
 - Rules 16/17: no clear reference to representatives of NGOs, so formally, he shouldn't be at the meeting!
 - "Meeting" is sometimes written in upper and sometimes in lower case.
 - No clear reporting relations between Technical Committee and Standing Committee.
17. Jan-Willem Sneep, Representative of the Depositary, pointed to the unfortunate formulation "meeting of the Meeting", and suggested "session of the Meeting" instead.
18. Andrew Williams (UK) noted an overlap between Rules 37 and 9.
19. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht stated that no general access was stipulated for CMS but that CMS would like to attend the Standing Committee regularly. The second point he made was that, although not having a specific rule for this in its rules of procedure, it was practice for the CMS Standing Committee to hold closed sessions when sensitive issues were concerned.
20. Mr. Merne suggested that Rule 15 be rephrased, referring to a "regional member eligible for re-appointment". And for Rule 29 he proposed a quorum of two thirds or five rather than four.
21. Dr. Mohamed Ibrahim, Representative of Middle East and Northern Africa, suggested that Rules 2, 9 and 37 could be collected in one item.
22. Mr. Lenten suggested deleting Rule 5.
23. Mr. Adams held that Rule 5 reiterated Item 1.e. of the Resolution and was therefore difficult to delete.
24. Mr. Sneep suggested that the last sentence of Rule 1 be deleted, to which the meeting agreed.
25. Mr. Lenten referred to an overlap of Rules 9 and 37, but not of 2 and 37. He proposed to merge Rule 9 and 37 and to keep Rule 2, which was approved by the meeting. Regarding the request of WLI to insert a rule after Rule 10, he asked whether more clarification was required with respect to how the Technical Committee relates to the Standing Committee.
26. Mr. Adams asked whether this made sense. The two resolutions adopted by MOP 2 respectively on the Technical Committee and the Standing Committee clarified each other's responsibility and questioned the need to add a rule on this.
27. Mr. Lenten said a link was provided in Rule 16, but questioned whether an additional reference was necessary.
28. Mr. Sneep argued that there was not need for a special rule. The meeting agreed.

29. Mr. Lenten proposed to amend Rule 12 by deleting the word “and” in the second line after Representatives.
30. Mr. Mungroo proposed to use the following wording in Rule 12: “Representatives or his/her Alternate Representative”. In the last sentence, after his, “/her” should be inserted. The meeting agreed.
31. The meeting agreed to Mr. Adams’ proposal that “no” be changed to “not” in Rule 11.
32. Mr. Lenten suggested that Rule 14 be deleted since it referred to what the MOPs should do. This was approved.
33. The meeting approved inserting a reference to eligibility for re-election in Rule 15.
34. Mr. Adams suggested that discussing Rule 17 be postponed either to a later point during the meeting or to the next meeting. The meeting agreed.
35. Mr. Lenten suggested to regard all UNEP administered organisations as an extended part of the UNEP/ AEW A Secretariat, which would imply that these organisations are allowed to attend the meetings of the Standing Committee as observers. The meeting agreed.
36. Regarding Rule 29, the meeting approved that a quorum consist of at least four out of seven voting members of the Standing Committee. This should also apply to budget issues.
37. Regarding closed sessions, Mr. Adams remarked that the Standing Committee might also have issues to be discussed in the absence of observers. The meeting agreed to the option of closed sessions. Regarding Rule 38, Mr. Adams observed that the Standing Committee could not prescribe that other Agreement committees submit reports to it.
38. Mr. O’Sullivan suggested that if Rule 38 was deleted, other committees might not report at all. “Shall” should therefore be replaced with “may”. The meeting agreed.
39. Mr. Hagemeyer called for more clarity about how committees relate and report to each other.
40. Mr. O’Sullivan suggested that “and participants of the previous meeting” be inserted in Rule 32.
41. Mr. Merne objected that in the case of closed sessions, participants might not want to communicate records to others and suggested inserting “and those attending the Meeting”.
42. Mr. Lenten remarked that closed sessions did not have reports.
43. Mr. Merne said that provisions should be made for parts of meetings being closed.
44. Mr. Lenten said that this was not common practice. The meeting agreed.
45. Opening the Tuesday morning session of the meeting, Mr. Mdoe invited Mr. Adams to report on his findings regarding which international NGOs could be invited to participate in the meeting of the Standing Committee and how this should be addressed in the Rules of Procedures. He reported that he had very carefully studied Resolution 2.5 and Resolution 2.6 respectively in terms of Institutional arrangements regarding the Technical Committee and the Standing Committee. One of his findings was that the Meeting of the Party decided to have an Institutional arrangement regarding participation of NGOs at the TC meeting but abstained to establish similar arrangements for the meeting of the Standing Committee. Therefore he did

not see a possibility for the Standing Committee to lay down which international NGO could participate at the Standing Committee meetings by amending the Rules of Procedure. Neither was there any urgent need for this in his view because, as laid down in the Rules of Procedure, the Chairman is entitled to invite NGOs. Which NGO would be invited would also depend on the issues that would be discussed and the particular expertise on these. Furthermore he thought it would be wise for the number of NGOs invited not to be higher than the number of regional representatives of the Standing Committee. Finally he thought that there was no need to make any provision for attendance of CMS and other UNEP organisations. These could be seen as extended parts of the UNEP/ AEWA Secretariat.

Agenda item 4: Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

46. Mr. Lenten invited the members of the Standing Committee to propose candidates for being the Chair or Vice-Chair.

47. Referring to Tanzania's high level of involvement in the Arusha meeting of the Technical Committee, Mr. Adams suggested Charles Mdoe, Assistant Director Wildlife Division, Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, Tanzania and Representative for Eastern and Southern Africa as candidate for the chairperson.

48. This was seconded by Mr. Sneep and Dr. Ibrahim, and the meeting elected Mr. Mdoe.

49. Stressing the important role The Netherlands was playing in AEWA, Mr. Adams suggested Mr. Sneep as Vice-Chairman.

50. This was seconded by Mr. Mdoe and Mr. Sneep was elected by the meeting.

Agenda item 5: Adoption of Agenda and Work Schedule

51. Acting now as Chairman of the Standing Committee, Mr. Mdoe asked the meeting for the adoption of the agenda and the work programme.

52. Mr. Lenten proposed that Item 17 – Date and venue 3rd Meeting of the Parties – be discussed in a closed session after the meeting.

53. Mr. Hagemeyer asked whether there would be reporting from the closed session.

54. Mr. Lenten suggested that all the participants come together for a lunchtime announcement on the item after the closed session.

55. The meeting agreed with the proposed amendment and adopted the Agenda and Work Schedule.

Agenda item 6: Admission of Observers

56. Mr. Lenten informed the meeting that Ireland, South Africa (not present currently), the UK, BirdLife International, Wetlands International, UNEP/ Department of Environmental Conventions and UNEP/ CMS requested to participate in this meeting as Observers. The meeting agreed on the admission of these Observers.

57. Mr. Mdoe moved on to Item 7, the Report of the Standing Committee Members and Observers.

58. Mr. Hagemeyer asked if observers could also make statements.

59. Mr. Adams reported on behalf of the European region on developments regarding Waterbird Conservation. The EU Birds Directive had seen positive developments. The European Commission was reviewing conditions for the ratification of the AEWA. A Council Resolution was to be proposed in 2004 on the EU's status as a Party to the Agreement. The EU Candidate Countries were obliged to adopt the very stringent regulations of the EU Birds Directive – a circumstance Mr. Adams hoped would be particularly conducive to the preservation of waterbirds.

60. Last summer, a survey of the Special Protection Areas (SPAs) had been issued, and the results were published recently. From this overview, it became clear that e.g. Spain had made a huge step forward by designating 81 new SPAs. Also many other countries had made some progress in this respect.

61. The European Community has developed guidelines on hunting to clarify the interpretation of hunting law provisions. Terms such as the reproduction period and breeding grounds have been defined. This has been clarified for each Member State and each species, enabling straightforward arrangements on when hunting is prohibited. Candidate Countries had been asked to report on progress made in this respect.

62. The UK wished to extirminate the Ruddy Duck for the benefit of White-headed Duck. Another problem was arising with the cormorant. The cormorant was now increasingly in conflict with fisheries. A major project was surveying this problem at European level.

63. Mr. Merne reported that Ireland was developing an international flyway plan for the Light-bellied Brent Goose. Ireland already had 110 SPAs, and a further 60 were in the pipeline. The great majority of these SPAs would benefit wetland species. The Ruddy duck had been placed on the hunting list, although it only had a small population in Eire. It was more abundant in Northern Ireland. National phasing out of lead shot had not yet been addressed. In Ireland, all shot was imported.

64. Regarding the Continental Cormorant (*Phalacrocorax carbo sinensis*), this species was classified as threatened in 1979; now it was a pest. However, an Atlantic subspecies (*Phalacrocorax carbo carbo*) was not undergoing the same population explosion, so there was no need to cull or control it as a fishing pest.

65. Mr. Williams reported on practical conservation measures in the UK. A policy on translocation of species, which is relevant for the re-establishment mentioned in the AEWA Action Plan. On lead shot, legislation banning lead shot had introduced in Wales (2002). Legislation for Scotland was foreseen for 2004. An eradication programme for the Ruddy Duck was agreed in principle. Under research as mentioned at the CMS Standing Committee, the UK will contract out a literature review on the impact of climate change on migratory species. The UK will host the 5th Meeting of the AEWA Technical Committee, which will be organised back-to-back with the Global Flyway Conference. The preparations for this meeting are well advanced. Finally, Mr. Williams informed the meeting that the new UK focal point for AEWA will be Mrs. Hilary Neal, replacing Mr. Steve Lee Bapty.

66. Dr. Dan Munteanu, Representative of Europe and Central Asia reported on developments in Romania. He informed the meeting that hunting was temporarily forbidden in the Danube Delta, with the actual area covered by this measure even extending beyond the Delta, benefiting both breeding and migratory birds. Similar measures had been introduced for stretches of the Black Sea coastline. Another good development was that WWF had opened an office in Romania.

67. However, Dr. Munteanu also had some bad news. The Ministry of Water and Environment, which is responsible for nature conservation, had been merged with the

Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry. In the new “Super Ministry”, biodiversity was given a very low status.

68. The Ministry’s Department of the Environment received some support and started with identifying SPAs. Institutes throughout the country had been invited to establish a Nature 2000 network.

69. Mr. Hagemeyer informed the meeting on the work on the indicators for the 2010 target. This relates to discussions in the European Commission. In Europe the 2010 target is set as a regional target. Waterbirds have been identified as major biodiversity indicators to assess how well we are doing in halting the loss of biodiversity. In his view, AEWAs should also become more involved in this process.

70. Furthermore he reported on progress made regarding the International Waterbird Census. He informed the meeting that Wetlands International would like to step up the IWC by covering more countries. For this a project proposal will be submitted in due course to the AEWAs Secretariat.

71. Amongst others, e.g. ONCFS and AEWAs Secretariat, Wetlands International will also be involved in the meeting on Sustainable Hunting in western Africa next year. This initiative is in line with the Sustainable Hunting Initiative of the EU, and therefore he suggested that the AEWAs Secretariat should make contact with the EC to extend an invitation for this meeting and to request some support.

72. Robert Hepworth of UNEP congratulated Tanzania and The Netherlands on their being elected for the Chair and Vice-Chair.

73. Mr. Hepworth also passed on greetings from Klaus Töpfer, who generally congratulates AEWAs on progress made. He continued with reporting on the substantive support UNEP is giving to AEWAs, presenting a paper without going in detail but just highlighting three issues. The first issue was on harmonisation of reporting to Biodiversity-related Conventions. Unfortunately AEWAs had not taken part in this due to the fact that when the project started AEWAs had not entered into force. It is expected that in the first quarter of 2004 a set of guidelines will be ready on co-ordination of reporting to Biodiversity-related Conventions. The second point mentioned was that the UNEP World Monitoring Centre (Cambridge) continues to take close interest in AEWAs and has been involved in a number of projects. UNEP-WCMC was recently identified by the SBSTA meeting for a particular role in assisting CBD to monitor progress toward the biodiversity targets for 2010. The third issue dealt with the findings of the 3rd Global Environmental Outlook. Mr. Hepworth stressed that a synoptic report about the relationship of GEO3 to the Conventions would be published next year. Finally, he was pleased to note that the Agreement had taken advantages of being co-located with the CMS Secretariat. This was a practical example of synergy.

74. Mr. O’Sullivan said he was delighted to inform the meeting that BLI had recently opened an Africa Division office in Nairobi, where five permanent staff were now engaged in a programme having much in common with the work of the Agreement. The programme includes site and species planning and project work as well as awareness both among decision-makers and the general public. With other BLI Offices in Europe (based in Wageningen, The Netherlands) and in the Middle East (based in Amman, Jordan), BLI was now better placed than ever to assist with and contribute to the work of the Agreement.

75. BLI and AEWAs were continuing to work together on a number of issues. In particular, the Spanish Ornithological Society (SEO, the BLI Partner in Spain) was working with the Secretariat and others to produce an International Species Action Plan for the Northern bald ibis. The first meeting was planned for early 2004 in Madrid.

76. The June 2003 edition of BLI's popular magazine "World Birdwatch" carried an article on the Convention on Migratory Species and went into some detail on AEWA. Mr. O'Sullivan said he hoped this would help promote awareness of the Agreement.

Agenda item 12: Update on the development of the Communication Strategy for the Agreement

77. After the lunch break, the meeting focused on an update of the development of the Communication Strategy. Gwen van Boven presented the results of a Quick Scan for AEWA. The three main areas in the Quick Scan were: 1) Recruitment of new Parties and the procedures around accession; 2) Implementation of the Agreement and 3) communication. In total, 19 Range States responded and 11 interviews were conducted. The findings in general are as follows:

- AEWA is seen as tool for international co-operation.
- Electronic communication via Website/ Email is valued, although the quality of the Website could be improved.
- The chief concern is the visibility of the Agreement's benefits.
- There is a need for more guidance on accession to the Agreement.
- A number of suggestions were made to improve communication.

78. At the end of her presentation, Ms. van Boven informed the meeting that this quick scan had yielded valuable information. She invited the Standing Committee to provide her with comments. Based on the Quick Scan and comments received she would start to work on drafting the Communication Strategy. A working session to discuss the strategy and to elaborate an action plan is foreseen in the margins of the Global Flyway Conference next year.

79. Mr. Mungroo suggested that a deadline for comments on the Communication Strategy be set so that progress could be made.

80. Ms. van Boven requested that comments be made immediately.

81. Mr. Merne agreed. He also noted that access to websites was not always available. Neither were websites always managed properly. So any website arrangement should entail a long-term commitment to maintain the system.

82. Mr. O'Sullivan remarked that time had to be found to identify things having the biggest effect but requiring the smallest effort. Existing parties ought to be encouraged to spread the word.

83. Mr. Hagemeyer said he missed the implementation among the objectives of the Secretariat.

84. Mr. Lenten noted that AEWA was still in the phase of building up a network. In this respect, the main priority for the moment is the recruitment of Parties. Of course some implementation is also taking place currently. The second priority is promoting the flyway approach. Mr. Lenten expects that these priorities will change after MOP3 and much more emphasis will be put on implementation from 2005 on.

85. Ms. van Boven said that the idea of the Quick Scan was to show whether views were actually the same.

86. Mr. Hagemeyer questioned the representativeness of the survey. What about the parties that had shown little response? Interviews had only been conducted with people who already believe in the Agreement. What about the non-contracting countries?

87. Ms. van Boven said that she had tried to contact these countries but had received no positive answers.

88. Mr. Lenten referred to the proposed working session during the Global Flyway Conference and suggested that at least one Standing Committee member should participate. On his request Mr. Sneeep volunteered to participate in the working session on behalf of the Standing Committee.

89. Mr. Merne warned of a proliferation of events around the Edinburgh Conference and asked whether somebody could produce a timetable of events.

90. Mr. Lenten said that he would contact WLI on organising a meeting of two hours.

91. Commenting on the Communication Strategy, Mr. Sneeep stressed the importance of sufficient input in getting Range States to become Parties. In his view, the Depositary has some guidelines, which could be used by countries that want to join the Agreement. Perhaps these guidelines could be made more attractive. In his second remark he pointed out that information should not be confused with communication, and websites should be seen merely as tools to provide information.

92. Mr. Lenten said that while there were models for accession to the Agreement, no guidelines existed. Recently he discovered that ASCOBANS has such guidelines. Time had to be found to develop similar guidelines for AEWa.

93. Mr. Hepworth recommended further consultation with the UNEP division devoted to communication and information.

94. Before the Chairman closed this agenda item, Mr. Lenten pointed out that the UK had provided funds for the first phase of the Communication Strategy for which he was very grateful.

Agenda item 8: Report of the Standing Committee, Observers and the Depositary

95. The meeting then focused on the Report of the Depositary. On behalf of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Dr. Sneeep gave the latest information on accession of Range States to the Agreement. At the second session of the MOP (Bonn, 25-27 September 2002), 33 Parties were welcomed to AEWa. Since MOP2, the following 10 new Parties could now be welcomed: Israel, Lebanon, Equatorial Guinea, Ukraine, Hungary, Syria, Ireland, Slovenia, Luxembourg and France. The Agreement is to enter into force for Luxembourg and France on the 1 December 2003. So 43 countries were now party to AEWa, 28 from Eurasia and 15 from Africa. The Depositary congratulated the AEWa Secretariat on the successful progress of the AEWa. Furthermore, Mr. Sneeep informed the meeting that Belgium, the European Community and Morocco had signed the Agreement but had not ratified it yet. 78. Mr. Lenten added that Uzbekistan had also agreed to join AEWa, while Libya, Morocco and Belgium were making progress towards ratifying. Iceland was also hoping to join. AEWa was reckoning with a further ten new parties in future.

96. BLI noted that Africa was poorly represented in the list.

97. Mr. Lenten agreed that not much progress had been made in Africa. It was important to go there and explain to the ministries and other institutions what AEWA's objectives are, preferably accompanied by a local person.

98. Mr. Adams stressed the need to disseminate news about the GEF project and specific conservation projects, and also to demonstrate the advantages of AEWA to interested countries.

99. Mr. Lenten reiterated the goal of reaching African countries.

100. Mr. Merne said that the European Union was set to ratify. Already, 25 European states, including most of the EU Member States, had signed and ratified the Agreement, and were putting pressure on the others to do so.

101. Austria and Italy had already started the process, while activities were underway in the Baltic States. Mr. Lenten informed the meeting that in particular, OMPO had taken up the role of ambassador for AEWA for this region.

102. Mr. Mdoe said that efforts should be kept up and called developments encouraging.

Agenda item 9: Report of the Technical Committee

103. Mr. Mungroo presented the Report of the Technical Committee. The 4th Technical Committee Meeting was held in Tashkent, Uzbekistan, on 12 and 13 May 2003. During that meeting, a new modus operandi was introduced. Some of the agenda items were discussed in small working groups, and the chairs of the working groups reported the outcome of the discussions in their respective groups to the plenary. Their new style was highly appreciated by the members of the Technical Committee. Also for the first time, the Technical Committee focused mainly on technical and scientific issues.

104. Mr. Mungroo mentioned the implementation of the International Implementation Priorities (IIP) 2003 – 2007. The Technical Committee recommended that:

- the list of IIP 2003 – 2007 be reviewed regularly;
- a working group on assessing the top priorities among the list of IIP 2003 – 2004 projects and on the development of criteria for future IIP projects be established.

105. The 5th Technical Committee meeting would be held from 30 March – 2 April in North Berwick, Scotland, back to back with the Waterbirds Around the World Conference. Preparation was well underway.

106. On behalf of the Secretariat, Mr. Mungroo thanked the Government of Uzbekistan for having so efficiently hosted the 4th Meeting and the UK Government for hosting the 5th Meeting.

107. With reference to the draft minutes of TC4 meeting, Mr. Sneep noted that the Global Flyway Conference 2004 was being hosted by the UK and The Netherlands and not by Wetlands International.

108. Mr. Lenten promised to amend these minutes accordingly.

Agenda item 10: Report of the Secretariat

109. Mr. Mdoe then moved on to the Report of the Secretariat, an updated version of which was delivered by Mr. Lenten.

110. Mr. Lenten pointed out the new premises for the Agreement Secretariat that would become available in the framework of the new UN Campus. He stressed that the development of the UN campus is time-consuming for all Secretariats. Fortunately, the ASCOBANS Secretariat volunteered to take part in some meetings on behalf of CMS, EUROBATS and AEWA.

111. The Agreement's Unit had proved beneficial and was making good progress. UNON has meanwhile recognised that a medium-size organisation such as CMS with its co-located Agreements needs at least 5 five members in the Agreement's Unit to enable the latter to provide the necessary services to CMS and the Agreements. The process had started to recruit some of these new Staff members.

112. Considerable effort was being made to finalise MOP2. Although Proceedings and a special Newsletter were being published, the Secretariat was still working on publishing e.g. an AEWA Action Plan, International Implementation Priorities, etc.

113. The meeting was informed about the Sustainable Hunting Workshop, which takes place in Senegal in 2004 and will be organised by ONCFS under the umbrella of AEWA. As mentioned earlier that Wetland International is also involved in this project.

114. Ideas were being developed to get the Russian Federation, representing some of the most important countries for migratory birds, on board.

115. On information exchange, Mr. Lenten reported on the development of a DVD about AEWA. The latter will also be used for the GEF project. Furthermore he informed the meeting on the development of a new exhibition and on the coming issue of the regular Newsletter.

116. Co-operation with other organisations was being extended. A Joint Work Programme between CMS/ AEWA was concluded with Wetlands International, while another one with the Ramsar would be concluded in due course. Also work has been done on development of a Joint Work Programme with the UNCCD Secretariat. Currently, the Secretariat is considering drafting a MOU with OMPO.

117. Dr. Ibrahim stressed that there was a need disseminate information on the lead shot issue to Africa.

118. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht reiterated that he congratulated the Agreement on the tremendous progress made. However, as already indicated in his welcome address, he pointed out that he had not been given the opportunity to consult with the AEWA Secretariat on the Secretariat's Report.

119. Regarding the paragraph on 'Future Premises for the Agreement Secretariat (page 1)' he clarified that Bonn has interests of its own to establish a UN City.

120. The second point he raised dealt with the paragraph on the 'Agreements Unit'. In his view, the Agreements Secretariat has quoted only a part of Resolution 1.1. namely paragraph 3: "*Staff members of the Agreements Unit will function independently and will report to their respective Agreements*". He pointed out that if the Executive Secretary of AEWA had quoted paragraph 2 of the same Resolution, which reads as follows: "*The Executive Secretaries to the Agreements will report to the Executive Secretary of CMS for internal administrative matters and communication with UNEP. They will report to the Parties as well as to the competent bodies of the Agreements on their work programme. The competent*

bodies of the Agreements shall contribute to the annual performance appraisal of an Agreement's Executive Secretary." then the whole paragraph written in the Secretariats report could probably be left out. Everything that has been reported in this paragraph of the report would fall under paragraph 2 of Resolution 1.1. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht stressed that he could respond to some of the issue mentioned in this particular paragraph but refrained from doing this because he thought that this was of no importance for the Standing Committee.

121. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht then went on to the paragraph on 'Financial and administrative Matters'. He deplored that the information provided in the written report was partly incomplete, and outdated. He informed the meeting that he had made many efforts to increase the capacity of the Admin Unit. He also noted that he had requested UNEP to clarify in a binding manner the institutional relationship between UNEP, UNON, CMS, Admin Unit and co-located Agreement Secretariats. No response had been received so far. He was pleased to inform the meeting that UNON has recognised that a medium-size organisation such as CMS with the co-located Agreements would need 5 Staff members for the Admin Unit to service all Secretariats. The costs of these Staff members will be borne by the 13 % overhead charges (PSC) taken by UNEP subject to the regular availability of the funds from PSC. He noted also that to the satisfaction of all UNEP-administered secretariats the UNEP Executive Director has approved the additional posts for the Admin Unit; it should however be noted by the Committee that the recruitment will take some time.

122. Mr. Hepworth expressed regret on behalf of UNEP HQ that a paper had been circulated to the Committee, which contained text showing unresolved differences of opinion between UNEP officers. He hoped this would not recur. He added that it was vital to respect not only the independent functions of the AEWA Secretariat, but also the overall responsibility of the Executive Secretary of CMS for administrative matters concerning all the co-located agreements, which had been agreed by Parties."

123. Good progress was made on the Joint Work Programme with the Ramsar Convention. A signing ceremony was foreseen to take place during the CBD COP next year. As Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht heard, Mr. Lenten would probably not attend the CBD meeting. He discussed this with the Secretariat of the Ramsar Convention and it was decided to proceed.

124. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht commented that AEWA does not seem to feel very committed to the implementation of the Joint Work Programme that has been concluded between CBD and CMS.

125. As a response to the comments from Egypt, Mr. Lenten responded that information materials on the lead shot issue are available in English and French. He hoped that all information materials including the DVD could also be made available in Russian and Arabic. However, this was a matter of funding.

126. Regarding the comments from the Executive Secretary of CMS, Mr. Lenten agreed with Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht that many of the problems are linked to the institutional relationship between CMS and the Agreements, which is still unclear.

127. Mr. Lenten pointed out that it was very hard for a small Secretariat like his to follow up all activities that were initiated by CMS, such as the Joint Work Programme with CBD. However, it turned out that when the activities of the Joint Work Programme were reviewed by CMS, AEWA had probably been the most active Secretariat regarding implementation of this Joint Work Programme.

128. Mr. Hagemeijer acknowledged that the AEWA Secretariat can't do everything taking into account the limited staff available. He recommended making use of members involved in the subsidiary bodies to represent the Agreement in important meetings.

129. Dr. Ibrahim asked whether any activities were underway regarding invasive species.

130. Mr. Lenten informed the meeting that the Technical Committee was currently discussing Guidelines on avoidance of introduction of invasive alien species.

**Agenda item 11: Implementation of the International Implementation
Priorities 2003-2007**

131. Mr. Lenten introduced document StC 1.7 on the implementation of the International Implementation Priorities.

132. In accordance with Recommendation 2.1, the Standing Committee was mandated by the MOP2 to adopt the Dark-bellied Brent Goose Action Plan. Mr. Lenten reported on progress made so far and requested if the formal adoption should wait till next Standing Committee meeting of could be done by Email.

133. The Meeting agreed to do the adoption by Email.

134. Mr. Lenten explained that AEWA has contracted out work on drafting a Single Species Action Plan for the Bald Ibis. He stressed that matching funds are needed for organising a workshop in Spain early in 2004.

135. In relation to some of the project listed in doc. StC1.7, Mr. Hagemeyer wanted to clarify that Wetlands International is working on it. Wetland International has received a small grant from JNCC (UK) to work on progress report on banning lead shot. The funds available are very small and therefore only limited time could be dedicated to this. Furthermore Wetlands International is involved in the workshop on this issue, which will take place in Senegal as mentioned earlier. Last year, Wetlands International received a small grant from AEWA to do some surveys of poorly known areas. Regarding the Wader Atlas, it is planned to distribute a consultation draft before the Global Flyway Conference for formal consultation based on this the final version is published later that year. Furthermore, Wetlands International was working on a proposal on how more targeted the report on status and trend of populations could be produced for the next MOP. This report will probably only focus on changes. This might be the most effective way of reporting.

136. Mr. Ibrahim inquired what the field guide for Central Asia and adjacent countries would be used for and whether this material could be extended by to African countries. Thereafter he offered that regional training programmes in Africa for implementation of the Agreement could make use of facilities in Sharm-el-Sheik.

137. Mr. Lenten explained that MOP2 decided that the development of a field guide for Central Asian and adjacent countries is a priority. The development of this guide is part of the GEF project and was also identified during the regional workshop, which took place in Uzbekistan as a priority. In a similar workshop held in Bahrain such a need for Arabic-speaking countries did not come up.

138. Mr. Hagemeyer added that the Steering Committee of the African Waterbird Census proposed to develop a similar guide for migratory waterbirds for Africa last year. WLI was looking for funding for this project.

139. Responding to the second point mentioned by the representative of Egypt, Mr. Lenten said that it would be taken into account as soon as the GEF project starts.

140. Mr. Hagemeyer commented on Mr. Lenten's remarks by explaining that in the previous GEF project proposal, a large component had been included regarding training. Due to the fact that the funder that had been identified for this had redrawn his commitment, the whole project has to be revised, leading to the implementation of the training strategy being taken out. Instead of that part of the proposal, a transferable training module is being developed.

141. Referring to the co-ordination of waterbird ringing schemes, Mr. Merne noted that the DG Environment of the European Union might be interested in the scheme, particularly in relation to huntable migratory birds. The main interest of the EU is probably to establish the flyways of these birds and to establish the period migration before the breeding season. Here it would make sense to get in touch with the respective EU authorities to identify common areas of activity.

142. Mr. Hagemeyer said that WLI together with EURING has submitted a proposal to the EU to including ringing recoveries into the Wader Flyway Atlas, but so far the EU has not shown any interest.

143. Mr. Merne remarked that the EU was currently limited to a quite large extent to its LIFE fund; probably other priorities are set. However, the situation might change after the EU has ratified the AEWA.

Agenda item 13: Update on the African-Eurasian Flyways GEF project.

144. Mr. Hagemeyer gave an update of the African-Eurasian Flyways GEF project. He reiterated that he was very pleased that the GEF council had approved this project the previous week. He explained that the overall outcome would be the enhanced conservation of migratory waterbirds and their critical sites in the African/Eurasian flyways. Activities would be strategic and catalytic, addressing the flyway-scale causes of site degradation and related species decline. The network of sites of critical importance to migratory waterbirds would be identified and existing data/information resources improved and linked to create a tool for flyway planning and management. Sub-regional Training and Awareness Raising Programmes would be developed in four sub-regions to provide the basis for individual and institutional capacity development. Best practice management would be catalysed through a number of demonstration projects showcasing approaches and techniques of how to implement an array of wetland management activities in different environmental and social contexts. Communications would be improved to enhance co-ordination and co-operation in the flyways between and within governments and NGOs.

145. Mr. Hagemeyer stressed the significance of the scheme's dual approach of establishing a scientific base and integrating information while at the same time offering training to enhance data quality. GROMS had been added to the database. Developing a training module was important, since it could provide a powerful tool to convince people of the flyway philosophy. Mr. Hagemeyer maintained that the role of the Standing Committee in the project required clarification.

146. Mr. Merne raised the issue of co-funding and asked whether it was possible to drop parts of the programme if funding was not sufficient or if it was an all-or-nothing concept.

147. Mr. Hagemeyer said that that hurdle had already been taken.

148. Mr. O'Sullivan remarked that his organisation was committed to the project but stressed that WLI was shouldering most of the work and congratulated it on this.

149. Taking up the issue of credit, Mr. Hagemeyer pointed out that Chris Baker had done the main work.

150. The meeting agreed with Mr. Adams' view and decided not to amend the Rules of Procedure.

Agenda item 14a: Future development of the Agreement

151. Mr. Hagemeyer informed the meeting about the Central Asian Flyway (CAF) project, stressing that it addressed very specific problems of conservation, most of which were water-related. With financial support of The Netherlands WLI started to define an Action Plan for the conservation of Migratory Waterbirds in that region in 2000. In 2001 a workshop was organised with representatives of governments and experts of the Range States to discuss the draft Action Plan prepared by WLI. Based on the outcome of this discussion, a second draft will be compiled. The reason to discuss CAF here is because CAF needs not only an Action Plan but also a framework for it to be implemented. Regarding the latter three alternatives could be considered:

- a stand-alone Agreement under CMS
- extension of the AEWA region by inclusion of the CAF
- an Asia-Pacific Migratory Waterbird Conservation Strategy with a non-binding, bilateral character.

152. A meeting would probably be held in India in 2004 to get endorsement for the Action Plan and to reach agreement on under which framework the implementation of the Action Plan will take place.

153. The current project funded by The Netherlands will end in April 2004. WLI is working on a new project proposal to be submitted to Ministry of Development Cooperation of The Netherlands that will run for another three years and preferably works on a larger region covering the area between Northern Russia and the Indian Subcontinent.

154. Mr. Lenten said that the issue was being debated among CMS and AEWA, and that their common position was to extend the AEWA Agreement area by inclusion of CAF. This option avoids starting from scratch. However, as long as the CAF has not been included into the AEWA region, no funds will be available for activities regarding CAF.

155. Mr. Hagemeyer said that in case the region would have a preference for a legally binding instrument, WLI would prefer to extend the AEWA Agreement area instead of developing a new CMS Agreement. One of the cons of a stand-alone Agreement would be that the CAF region only encompasses countries with a weak economy. So it would be very difficult to accrue funds for activities.

156. Mr. Lenten explained that CAF involved a total of 22 countries nine of which are located in the AEWA area. It would be very difficult to convince these countries to join two Agreements both of which deal with Migratory Waterbirds and to also pay both agreements their dues. He stressed that it was up to the region to decide which option they preferred.

157. Mr. Hagemeyer stated that WLI is in favour of developing legal agreements. However, it is not always feasible to establish this kind of agreement in a short time frame. For the CAF region WLI is in favour of a legal agreement but leaves it to the countries to decide on this. Mr. Merne noted when drafting AEWA we have been rather conservative regarding the eastern boundary. New information on the flyways of certain species shows that birds from much further east are migrating to the AEWA area. This was clearly an argument in favour of extending the Agreement, which could however only proceed in full agreement with the Range States.

158. Mr. Adams said that clarity had to be reached on whether there was any desire to extend AEWA. The opinion of the Range States was crucial, and a thorough analysis was required. He questioned if, at an early stage of the implementation of AEWA, it would be wise to extend the Agreement area to the east. He would appreciate the Secretariat keeping the Standing Committee posted on developments regarding CAF.

159. Mr. Lenten remarked that this issue had already been discussed at the Technical Committee meeting in Tashkent and at MOP2, the upshot having been that it was very difficult to say “no” since there was no scientific reason not to extend AEWA, especially given the complexity of the flyways involved. The next step in the matter would be the CMS/WLI workshop in India. Mr. Lenten stressed the language problem: a flyway officer speaking Russian was required.

160. Mr. Hagemeyer explained that the name of the new flyway had caused some confusion. In the past the name Central Asian Indian Flyway was used. However, at COP7 this name was rejected by the Range States, and since then the name Central Asian Flyway had been used.

161. Mr. Sneep underlined the importance of developing this flyway and actively supporting corresponding efforts.

162. Mr. Lenten stressed that close contacts did exist with the region and that it was important for the process to continue, but that the Range States had to decide on which framework they wanted to use to implement the Action Plan..

Agenda item 14 b: Additional species to be included

163. Regarding the issue of additional species, Mr. Lenten reported that WLI had drawn up a list of passerines, birds of prey and some sea birds species, which was being forwarded to MOP2. The latter requested the TC to review this list. Unfortunately, there had been no time to discuss this issue at the last TC meeting. It had been decided to establish an intersessional working group to prepare a proposal to be discussed at the next TC in 2004. The TC will report back on this issue at the next Standing Committee meeting..

164. Mr. Hagemeyer said that not only should the species be discussed, but also whether the character of the Agreement and Action Plan implied that it was logical and appropriate to include them. Strategies might also be required that were not included in the Action Plan.

Agenda item 15: Institutional matters.

165. Mr. Adams said that just before the COP7 to CMS and the MOP2 to AEWA the Headquarters Agreement had been signed by UNEP, CMS and the German Government. Now that the MOP has endorsed this Headquarters Agreement, in accordance with Resolution 2.11, it is now also applicable for the UNEP/ AEWA Secretariat. As promised by Minister Trittin, the ratification process in Germany has started as soon as possible. Mr. Adams reported that it is expected that the ‘Bundesrat’ will ratify this Agreement in December 2003. The final procedure could be probably finalised in February/ March 2004.

166. Mr. Lenten expressed his sincere gratitude to the German Government regarding efforts made to finalise the Headquarters Agreement. In his view the Agreement extremely important for the proper functioning of the Agreement Secretariat.

Agenda item 15 b: Co-operation with other bodies and processes.

167. Mr. Lenten said that the Secretariat is involved in a number of JWPs. One with RAMSAR/ CMS and the AEWA Secretariat will be signed early in 2004. The JWP with WLI/ CMS and AEWA was signed in the course of 2003. Another one with UNCCD/ CMS and AEWA is under preparation. These JWPs are extremely important to avoid duplication of efforts. The Agreements Secretariat is considering drafting a JWP with OMPO.

168. Mr. Hagemeyer stressed that OMPO was not a hunting organisation. It did have ties with hunters but conducted no hunting research, concentrating instead on other areas. OMPO had a well-developed network and was co-operating intensively with WLI.

169. Dr. Ibrahim asked if AEWA could extend its co-operation to the MAP programme under the umbrella of UNESCO.

170. Mr. Lenten responded that he had visited the RAC/ SPA meeting for the first time this year because they are also dealing with Bird Action Plans. Furthermore, the Agreement Secretariat is trying to establish better contact with other regional Conventions/Agreements and initiatives. However, he pointed out that it is virtually unfeasible for a small Secretariat like that of the Agreement to follow what is happening in the Agreement area.

171. The meeting agreed that the Secretariat start the process to draft a JWP with OMPO.

Agenda item 15 c: Co-operation with CMS and its Agreements

172. Mr. Lenten said that co-operation with CMS was good in general, but that there were some minor problems. The institutional relationship between CMS and the AEWA Secretariat was not clear. Linked to that, responsibilities had to be clarified. Good working relations also existed with the other Agreements, notably ASCOBANS.

173. Ms. Kanza said that UNEP had commissioned an in-depth study of all conventions and their interrelations. The study was almost complete and would be distributed. It ought to give a clear picture of the status quo.

174. Mr. Lenten stressed that it is not clear that if CMS is committing itself to certain MOUs how far this is also applicable for AEWA. A good example is the MOU signed with UNCCD, which foresees a number of activities. This MOU could have an impact on AEWA in case it is expected that we implement some of the activities. This could lead to an additional workload for the Secretariat. Not in all cases is or has the Agreement Secretariat been directly involved in drafting the MOU. Although many issues are of interest for AEWA, more staff would be required for the Agreement Secretariat to do the work. The Agreement Secretariat is reluctant to step into too many processes.

175. Mr. Hagemeyer said that the Technical Committee could be involved in certain MoUs on wetland species e.g. the Aquatic Warbler/ Slender-billed Curlew. The question was how to interrelate with CMS regarding the MOU on Aquatic Warbler/ Slender-billed Curlew.

176. Mr. Lenten said that the Aquatic Warbler is not included in AEWA and that therefore, his involvement was restricted to participating in the meeting where the MOU on Aquatic Warbler was concluded. The Slender-billed Curlew is one of the AEWA species. The MOU for this species was concluded before AEWA entered into force. Under AEWA, the Secretariat allocated a limited amount of funds to do some surveys of wintering areas in e.g. northern Africa. The time spent on the Slender-billed Curlew is limited. Mr. Lenten again stressed the need to be wary of jumping into too many processes because this also means delivering results.

177. Mr. Hagemeijer said that while the Aquatic warbler was not covered by AEWA, it would make sense to explore the issue given the existing CMS-AEWA relations. WLI was already active in this area in any case.

178. Mr. Lenten said that this issue was not high on the list and that there was no need for AEWA to become involved.

179. Mr. Merne said that the possibility of agreements with major international hunting organisations had not been mentioned regarding the area of sustainable hunting. There were two organisations, CIC and FACE, which were in favour of sustainability and wetland conservation. He suggested adopting a waiting list process for future co-operation with organisations.

180. Mr. Lenten agreed that CIC and FACE are playing an important role. This year he participated in the General Assembly of CIC and made an opening statement stressing the important role CIC is/could be playing in the conservation of Migratory Species. During this meeting he worked closely with CIC to draft three Resolutions on the following issues: the Lesser White-fronted Goose, phasing out lead shot for hunting in Wetlands and the Houbara Bustard. All three were adopted. CIC is a permanent member of the TC. Also, there is regular contact with FACE.

Agenda item 18: Developments regarding the new UN campus in Bonn

181. Hans Mager, Head of Division Internal Administration, Federal Ministry for the Environment, gave a presentation on the new UN Campus in Bonn. All the members of the Technical Committee were provided with a brochure containing the details of his presentation.

Agenda item 16: Administrative and financial matters.

182. Addressing administrative and financial matters, Mr. Lenten noted that not much contribution was outstanding and not many countries were in arrears with their payments. Then he continued to introduce Annex 1 showing the income and expenditures over the period 2000-2002. The total excess of income over expenditures for 2000-2002 is US \$ 568,206. Fifty percent of this is caused by the savings that occurred in 2000 due to the fact that the Agreement Secretariat was actually established on the 17th July instead of the 1st January. The Government of The Netherlands covered the expenses made in the period between these two dates. Mr. Lenten reiterated that UNEP has a general rule that each Secretariat should keep an amount equal to 50 % of the annual Budget in the Trust Fund to cover the costs of e.g. salaries in case countries don't pay their dues directly. The current leftover is more than is really required for this purpose. So there is space for additional activities. With the approval of the Chair of the TC, who was also responsible for administrative and financial matters for the period 2000-2002, the Secretariat re-allocated some of the leftover of the first triennium for projects in 2003. Mr. Lenten then moved on to Annex 3 'Overview of expenditures for 2003'. The table prepared by the Secretariat shows a sound financial situation. He expected that by the end of this year the leftover would be limited. He explained that according to the UN rules the Executive Secretary is allowed to make changes in the budget categories. This means that e.g. in the category 10 Personnel Component leftovers in budget line English Translators might be used to cover shortages in budget line French Translators.

183. Mr. Williams asked if the US \$ 90, 431 allocated to project is part of the leftover from last year and the Chair of the TC approved re-allocation of funds to these projects.

184. Mr. Lenten confirmed that this was the case.

185. Mr. Lenten reiterated that the normal procedure is that Executive Secretary is allowed to shift money from one budget line to another one in the same Budget category. It is the responsibility of the Standing Committee to decide on re-allocation of leftovers at the end of the year. He proposed to mandate the Chair of the Standing Committee to agree and to sign off a proposal for the allocation of these leftovers.

186. Mr. Adams remarked that clarity had to be reached on who should decide how leftovers be allocated. It had to be settled what was up to the Chairman to decide and whether the Standing Committee as a whole. He could imagine that in exceptional cases where immediate action is requested the Chair could decide on allocating up to an amount of US \$ 5,000. .

187. Mr. Lenten referred to the discussion in CMS which was different in the sense that there, a discussion took place on deducting money from the Trust Fund not approved by COP. This money is a leftover of the approved Budget. He agreed with Mr. Adams that in the case of deducting money from the Trust Fund this would require approval from the whole Standing Committee.

188. Mr. Adams asked if the Secretariat could inform the meeting what had been mentioned in the terms of reference regarding the issue of leftovers. 164. Mr. Lenten responded by saying that as far as he knew nothing had been mentioned on this issue in the terms of reference. If no action is taking the leftovers will flow back to the Trust Fund and this fund will grow. In his view the question is if the Standing Committee wants this, because the money was meant for some activities that were delayed or did not take place for whatever reason. The Secretariat would like to spend all the money that has been approved by MOP2 in the next years.

189. Mr. Sneep said the Standing Committee should decide on leftovers.

190. Mr. Lenten agreed with the remark made by Mr. Sneep but pointed out that if to wait till the next Standing Committee would mean that the money could only be spent one year later. He was looking for a more flexible approach e.g. by Email, which would avoid unnecessary delays.

191. Ms. Kanza said that according to Annex III, paragraph 17, to Resolution 2.7 the Executive Director of UNEP may on request of the Secretariat and approved by the Standing Committee transfer uncommitted balance to the second or third calendar year. So in her view it should be decided what the Standing Committee is: is it the Chair or the Committee as a whole?

192. Mr. Lenten said that it was best to communicate the allocation proposals to all Standing Committee members by email, applying a two-week deadline. For the next Standing Committee he will evaluate this process and report back.

193. The meeting agreed with Mr. Lenten's proposal to communicate the allocation proposal by Email and to report back on this at the next Standing Committee meeting..

Agenda item 16 b: Allocation of funds accrued from new Parties

194. Mr. Lenten said that he was reckoning with a substantial income from the new parties. All in all, the total in 2004 would be US \$118,650. Mr. Lenten proposed to use the money according to Table 3 of the Annex, but pointed out that this table did not include the GEF project. He expected that the implementation of the GEF project would start somewhere

towards end of next year and therefore suggested postponing allocation of funds to this project to the next Standing Committee meeting.

195. Mr. Schmitz said that Germany supported the proposal of the Secretariat but cautioned that no plans should be made before funds incoming for 2003/2004 had arrived.

196. Mr. Lenten said that earmarking funds in advance was common practice within the UN organisations because money pledged meant a real commitment.

197. The meeting approved the proposal of the Secretariat to allocate US \$ 118,650 as laid down in document AEWA/ StC 1.10 to the projects mentioned there.

Agenda item 16 c/ d: Recruitment of new Staff/ of Staff for post being upgraded

198. Regarding staffing, Mr. Lenten said that a new Technical Officer would hopefully be recruited as of 1 July 2004. The post of Assistant to the Executive Secretary would probably remain vacant for another six months. The upgrading of this post has taken place but the vacancy announcement is still pending translation of the job description. The last 'vacancy' is the one of Executive Secretary. This post has also been upgraded to P4 level and, according to the new UN rules, has to be re-advertised again. The vacancy announcement stays online till 23rd December 2003. Mr. Lenten informed the meeting that he had re-applied for this post.

199. Mr. Hagemeyer noted that an Associate Technical Officer cannot represent and questioned the level of the position.

200. Mr. Lenten explained that a P3 position would be much more expensive.

201. Ms. Kanza noted that the post could be upgraded to P3 at the next MOP.

Agenda item 16 e: Request for Junior Professional Officer for information management

202. Mr. Lenten explained that for the second time, the AEWA Secretariat had applied for a Junior Professional Officer (JPO). In 2002 UNEP did not grant priority to this request and therefore this post was not communicated to the Donor countries that might be interested in supporting AEWA. Taking into account the foreseeable activities of the GEF project the Agreement Secretariat would like to disseminate information on this. The JPO will work 50% of his time for the GEF project and the remaining time for the AEWA and the co-located CMS Agreements. As a follow-up on the communication strategy there is a need to have such an Officer. Hopefully the 2003 application will be successful. However, more than 40 applications are received annually by the Deputy Executive Director, who sets the priorities among them. Last year, a CMS request was listed as a priority, and the Government of Germany decided to provide the JPO to CMS.

203. Mr. Adams stressed that the JPO was provided to CMS but should be used for the Admin Unit. This means that all Agreements co-located with CMS would benefit.

Agenda item 19: Global Flyway Conference.

204. Mr. Hagemeyer informed the meeting about the Global Flyway Conference in Edinburgh in April 2004, stressing that it was being hosted by The Netherlands and the UK. Representatives were coming from all over the world. Details could be found on the Wetlands International Website. Registering could also be done online. Mr. Hagemeyer noted that the organisers were still seeking financial support.

205. Mr. Lenten said that AEWA would be running a small symposium on sustainable development during the meeting.

Agenda item 20: Date and venue of the next meeting of the Standing Committee

206. Mr. Lenten informed the meeting that the German Government had kindly offered to host the next meeting of the Standing Committee, which was possibly taking place towards the end of 2004, in Bonn.

207. The meeting agreed to accept this invitation.

Agenda item 21: Any other business

208. Dr. Ibrahim suggested that the 24 November be declared the Day of AEWA in analogy to the Day of Wetlands.

209. Mr. Lenten commented that it was a good idea to have an AEWA day/ Migratory Bird day. He is willing to discuss this with BLI and come back to report back to the Standing Committee meeting in 2004..

Agenda item 17: Date and venue 3rd Meeting of the Parties

210. The meeting was then interrupted for a brief closed session of the Parties.

211. On resumption of the meeting, Mr. Lenten explained that the members of the Standing Committee had discussed the venue for MOP3, provisionally settling for Senegal and Mali as candidates. A problem had arisen regarding the date, since the mandate for the budget ended in 2005. The Standing Committee urged the Secretariat to find a suitable time slot somewhere towards the end of 2005.

Agenda item 22: Closure of the meeting

212. Mr. Mdoe thanked everybody present for attending and noted that attendance had been excellent, with 95 percent of the members present.

213. Mr. Lenten thanked the Chairman and thanked the Standing Committee for its excellent input. Thanks also went to WLI for their work done on the GEF project.