

**8<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE**  
03 - 05 March 2008, Bonn, Germany

---

**PROPOSAL FOR AMENDMENT OF PARAGRAPH 7.5 OF THE AEWA ACTION PLAN REGARDING THE FREQUENCY OF UPDATE OF INTERNATIONAL REVIEWS REQUIRED UNDER PARAGRAPH 7.4**

*(Drafted by the Secretariat)*

**BACKGROUND**

Paragraph 7.4 of the AEWA Action Plan requires the Secretariat to prepare a set of seven international reviews in cooperation with the Technical Committee and the Contracting Parties, necessary for the implementation of the Action Plan, covering a broad array of conservation aspects:

- a) reports on the status and trends of populations;
- b) gaps in information from surveys;
- c) the networks of sites used by each population, including reviews of the protection status of each site as well as of the management measures taken in each case;
- d) pertinent hunting and trade legislation in each country relating to the species listed in Annex 2 of the Agreement;
- e) the stage of preparation and implementation of single species action plans;
- f) re-establishment projects; and
- g) the status of introduced non-native waterbird species and hybrids thereof.

In paragraph 7.5 it is pointed out that the Secretariat shall endeavour to ensure the update of all these reviews at intervals of not more than three years, i.e. for presentation to each ordinary session of the Meeting of the Parties (MOP).

Since the entry into force of the Agreement one of the international reviews (*A. Reports on the Status and Trends of Populations, also known as Conservation Status Review - CSR*) was produced and submitted to each MOP. Another review (*G. The Status of Introduced Non-native Waterbird Species and Hybrids thereof*) was produced once only and submitted to MOP2 in 2002. None of the remaining five international reviews had been produced by then.

To bridge this gap in the implementation of the Action Plan, at MOP3 in 2005 the Parties stressed the importance of these documents to inform on conservation action planning and urged the Secretariat to give priority to the production of international reviews and deliver as many of them as possible to the next session of the MOP.

In the triennium 2006-2008 the Secretariat strictly followed this instruction by MOP3. Funds were secured for five of the seven mandatory reviews, as well as for a few more reviews requested in MOP resolutions, which were commissioned to external experts on the basis of terms of reference endorsed by the Technical Committee. The only two mandatory reviews described in paragraph 7.4 for which the Secretariat did not undertake drafting in this triennium are B (*gaps in information from surveys*) and C (*the networks of sites used by each population, including reviews of the protection status of each site as well as of the*

*management measures taken in each case*). These two reviews will result from the work of the Wings Over Wetlands Project, but not before MOP5.

While obtaining information for these papers from the Contracting Parties, the Secretariat often received complaints concerning the increased work load of national focal points – for each review (apart from CSR) they received extensive questionnaires to fill in. Besides being a highly time-consuming undertaking, the production of all reviews simultaneously also has major financial implications. After carefully examining the draft versions of the international reviews, the Secretariat concluded that a triennial update is probably not necessary for some of the reviews. This time span is too short for any significant changes in the situation with regard to some of the aspects analysed by reviews.

### ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION BY THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

For these three reasons, in order to adjust the frequency of updating the international reviews to a more adequate and cost-efficient level, the Secretariat would like to propose a revision of the intervals of update. Below is an overview of the proposed intervals for each review accompanied by a short justification.

| <i>Paragraph</i> | <i>Title</i>  | <i>Interval</i>                         | <i>Justification</i>   |
|------------------|---|---|--|
| 7.4a             | Reports on the status and trends of populations (aka CSR)   | <b>3 years</b><br>(for each MOP)        | Essential document, which assesses the conservation status of the AEWAs populations and informs amendments to Annex 3 and other decisions  |
| 7.4b             | Gaps in information from surveys  | <b>6 years</b><br>(for each second MOP) | Filling gaps in information from surveys is often a long process and usually takes years. It would however benefit from a more frequent review and six years is considered an optimal interval.  |
| 7.4c             | The networks of sites used by each population, including reviews of the protection status of each site as well as of the management measures taken in each case | <b>6 years</b><br>(for each second MOP) | The establishment of network of sites to be covered by protection status and managed in accordance with management plans is also a lengthy process and requires years. It would however benefit from a more frequent review and six years is considered an optimal interval. |
| 7.4d             | Pertinent hunting and trade legislation in each country relating to the species listed in Annex 2 of the Agreement  | <b>9 years</b><br>(for each third MOP)  | Legislation creation / amendment is usually a less dynamic process and a nine-year interval is considered appropriate for analysing this type of matter.   |
| 7.4e             | The stage of preparation and implementation of single species action plans  | <b>6 years</b><br>(for each second MOP) | SSAPs are usually implemented over a period of 10 years before being revised. It is however recommended to continue reviewing progress in their implementation at shorter intervals in order to allow for adjustments, as necessary.   |

|      |   |   |  |
|------|---|---|--|
| 7.4f | Re-establishment projects   | <b>9 years</b><br>(for each third MOP)  | Successful re-establishment of a waterbird population would usually take a good number of years. The number of such projects within the Agreement area is also limited. Therefore, nine years is considered an optimal interval for reviewing re-establishments.   |
| 7.4g | The status of introduced non-native waterbird species and hybrids thereof | <b>6 years</b><br>(for each second MOP) | Non-native species of waterbirds could become established and invasive within relatively short periods of time. Their status should be closely monitored and subsequent policies should be established by the Agreement's bodies and implemented by the Contracting Parties and other relevant stakeholders. |

Following this proposal for revised intervals of update, the following chart shows the reviews to be presented to each MOP in the next 15 triennial cycles.

|       | 7.4a<br>CSR | 7.4b<br>Gaps in<br>information | 7.4c<br>Network<br>of sites | 7.4d<br>Hunting &<br>trade<br>legislation | 7.4e<br>SSAPs | 7.4f<br>Re-<br>establishments | 7.4g<br>Non-<br>native<br>species |
|-------|-------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|---------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| MOP4  | X           |                                |                             | X   | X             | X                             | X                                 |
| MOP5  | X           | X                              | X                           |   |               |                               |                                   |
| MOP6  | X           |                                |                             |   | X             |                               | X                                 |
| MOP7  | X           | X                              | X                           | X   |               | X                             |                                   |
| MOP8  | X           |                                |                             |   | X             |                               | X                                 |
| MOP9  | X           | X                              | X                           |   |               |                               |                                   |
| MOP10 | X           |                                |                             | X   | X             | X                             | X                                 |
| MOP11 | X           | X                              | X                           |   |               |                               |                                   |
| MOP12 | X           |                                |                             |   | X             |                               | X                                 |
| MOP13 | X           | X                              | X                           | X   |               | X                             |                                   |
| MOP14 | X           |                                |                             |   | X             |                               | X                                 |
| MOP15 | X           | X                              | X                           |   |               |                               |                                   |
| MOP16 | X           |                                |                             | X   | X             | X                             | X                                 |
| MOP17 | X           | X                              | X                           |   |               |                               |                                   |
| MOP18 | X           |                                |                             |   | X             |                               | X                                 |
| MOP19 | X           | X                              | X                           | X   |               | X                             |                                   |

The modified text of AP paragraph 7.5 should therefore read as follows:

*“The Agreement Secretariat shall endeavour to ensure that the reviews mentioned in paragraph 7.4 are updated at the following intervals:*

- (a) – three years;
- (b) – six years;

- (c) – six years;*
- (d) – nine years;*
- (e) – six years;*
- (f) – nine years;*
- (g) – six years.”*

#### **ACTIONS REQUESTED FROM THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE**

The Technical Committee is invited to review this proposal, make amendments as appropriate, and approve it for follow up procedure in accordance with Article X of the AEWA for amendments to the Agreement.