



*AGREEMENT ON THE CONSERVATION OF
AFRICAN-EURASIAN MIGRATORY WATERBIRDS*

8th SESSION OF THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES
26–30 September 2022, Budapest, Hungary

“Strengthening Flyway Conservation in a Changing World”

**DRAFT REPORT OF THE 8th SESSION OF THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES (MOP8)
TO THE AFRICAN-EURASIAN MIGRATORY WATERBIRD AGREEMENT (AEWA),
26–30 SEPTEMBER 2022, BUDAPEST, HUNGARY**

**DRAFT REPORT OF WORKING GROUP 1
ON SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL MATTERS
27 & 28 SEPTEMBER 2022**

1. The Working Group met from 16:30 to 18:00 on 27 September and between 09:00 and 18:00 on 28 September. It was chaired by Hungary, represented by Mr Andras Schmidt, with Egypt serving as Vice-Chair, and was supported by Secretariat staff.

AEWA MOP8 DR.1 Procedure for Submission of Proposals for Amendments to the Agreement

2. The **Chair** opened the floor to general comments.
3. The **Czech Republic, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States**, made the following statement:

“The EU and its Member States welcome Draft Resolution 8.1 and recognise the positive impact the additional step and consultation of the Technical Committee can have on the quality of the amendment proposals submitted by Parties. It can furthermore ensure the proper implementation of the Agreement obligations that will arise for given species populations. The EU and its Member States support the adoption of Draft Resolution 8.1 with some amendments.”

4. The **Chair** opened the floor to proposed amendments to the DR.
5. Proposed amendments were tabled by the **Czech Republic, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States** – with a supporting intervention from **Germany** – and by **South Africa**.
6. The **Chair** requested the Secretariat to prepare a revised text of DR.1, incorporating the amendments tabled, for consideration and adoption by plenary.

AEWA MOP8 DR.2 Adoption of Amendments to the AEWA Annexes

7. The **Secretariat** provided an overview of proposals for amendments received.
8. The **Chair** opened the floor to general comments.
9. The **Czech Republic, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States**, supported DR.2 but requested clarification on the modalities of application of the data deficient category 3(f).

10. The **United Kingdom** was concerned by the significant threats posed by Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza (HPAI) to waterbirds and seabirds and its potential impact on the conservation status of affected populations. Noting the need for timely preparation of possible amendments to the AEWA Annexes, Parties should intensify monitoring of affected species and populations, and ensure that data was available for the population status assessment submitted for consideration at MOP9.

11. The **United Kingdom** proposed to add an asterisk to the 3(e) listing of the Icelandic breeding population of Greylag Goose.

12. The United Kingdom proposal was supported by the **Czech Republic, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States**, and **Iceland**.

13. **Wetlands International** acknowledged that there was an error in the new Table 1, concerning the North-west and Central Europe population of Red-breasted Merganser, which should be listed as category 2c in Column B.

14. The **Working Group** confirmed this correction.

15. The **Chair** requested the Secretariat to prepare a revised text of DR.2, incorporating the amendments tabled, for consideration and adoption by plenary.

AEWA MOP8 DR.3 – State of Implementation of AEWA and its Strategic Plan 2019-2027.
Documents for adoption: AEWA/MOP 8.14 *Draft format for national reports on the implementation of AEWA 2021-2024*; 8.16 *Draft format for the national reporting module on the implementation of the AEWA Plan of Action for Africa*.

16. The **Chair** opened the floor to general comments.

17. The **Czech Republic, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States**, expressed general support for DR.3 and strongly supported the recommendation to advance the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

18. The **Chair** opened the floor for specific comments on documents AEWA/MOP 8.14 and 8.16.

19. There being no requests from the floor, the **Chair** requested the Secretariat to forward both documents to plenary, without amendment.

20. The **Chair** opened the floor for specific proposed amendments to the DR itself.

21. Amendments related to capacity and resource mobilisation were tabled by the **Czech Republic, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States**, and **Egypt, speaking on behalf of the Africa Group**. Following bilateral discussions, mutually acceptable text was agreed and communicated to the Secretariat.

22. **Mauritius** highlighted difficulties, due largely to technical capacity constraints, in submitting national reports to AEWA and other MEAs.

23. Noting that the AEWA Small Grants Fund (SGF) had remained dormant since 2015, **Tanzania** proposed an amendment to facilitate funding support through the SGF.

24. The **Secretariat** observed that implementation of the SGF was subject to capacity of the Secretariat, as well as availability of additional voluntary contributions replenishing the Fund.

25. Further amendments on other topics were tabled by the **Czech Republic, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States**, by **Uganda**, and by **Wetlands International** (seconded by the EU).

26. The **Chair** requested the Secretariat to prepare a revised text of DR.3, incorporating the agreed amendments, for consideration and adoption by plenary.

AEWA/MOP8 DR.4 – Adoption, Revision, Retirement, Extension and Implementation of International Species Action and Management Plans. Documents for adoption: AEWA/MOP 8.23 *Draft revised format and guidelines for AEWA International Single and Multi-Species Action Plans*; 8.24 *Draft format and guidelines for AEWA International Single and Multi-Species Management Plans*; 8.25 *Draft AEWA International Single Species Action Plan for the Conservation of the Common Eider*.

27. The **Chair** opened the floor for general comments.

28. **Finland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States**, stated:

“Species Action and Management Plans embody the quintessence of AEWA and the flyway approach, fostering coordinated conservation and management of prioritized populations across their range. We would like to thank the Technical Committee, Secretariat and wide range of experts that have been involved in producing the various documents we have before us today as well as the wider AEWA community involved in the implementation of these Plans throughout the flyway”.

29. The **Chair** opened the floor for specific comments on documents AEWA/MOP 8.23, 8.24 and 8.25.

30. **Finland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States** proposed amendments to documents AEWA/MOP 8.23 and 8.25, and noted in relation to 8.23 that the proposal to include favourable reference values as a mandatory part of all action plans was useful for measuring conservation action, but would be challenging to achieve within the first ten years of action plan implementation.

31. **Wetlands International** indicated that the CMS definition of favourable conservation status should be applied in the context of AEWA implementation, noting that this differed from the definition in the EU Habitats Directive and might affect the proposal tabled by the EU.

32. The **EU** confirmed that it would hold bilateral consultations with Wetlands International and communicate any agreed further amendment to the Secretariat.

33. The **Chair** requested the Secretariat to forward documents 8.23 and 8.25 to plenary for adoption, subject to inclusion of agreed amendments, whilst document 8.24 could be forwarded to plenary without amendment.

34. The **Chair** opened the floor to comments and proposed amendments to the text of DR4 itself.

35. **South Africa** proposed an amendment calling on the Range States of the Benguela Current Coastal Seabirds Multi-Species Action Plan to prioritise and allocate resources for the conservation of seabirds.

36. **Finland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States**, tabled proposed amendments that had been posted on the MOP8 website. These included the following statement:

“Regarding the Action Plan for the Lesser White-fronted Goose, the Technical Committee recommends in document AEWA/MOP 8.22 that it be extended for another three years to

allow for its revision and subsequent adoption at MOP9 (reflected in the current operative paragraph 11 of the Draft Resolution).

The EU and its Member States propose that the Action Plan instead be retired, as it is unlikely that an agreement amongst all Range States can be reached on the revision of the Plan.

Range States and other relevant actors should, however, still be encouraged to continue funding and implementing conservation efforts for this globally threatened species at flyway level, despite the absence of an AEWA International Action Plan and attached international conservation coordination mechanism. A conservation note developed by the Technical Committee during the next triennium could be useful for guiding and encouraging continued action within the Western Palearctic.

We therefore propose to delete operative paragraph 11 and replace it with a new operative paragraph 7), as follows:

*Retires the International Single Species Action Plan for the Lesser White-fronted Goose (*Anser erythropus*) Western Palearctic population, but calls on all Range States, relevant governmental and non-governmental organisations including the European Commission to continue the implementation of urgent conservation action and provision of funds for this globally threatened species and requests the AEWA Technical Committee to produce a conservation guidance note for the Lesser White-fronted Goose during the next triennium.”*

37. Responding to the proposal tabled by the EU in relation to the ISSAP for Lesser White-fronted Goose, **Norway** made the following statement:

“Norway finds that it is very unfortunate that an ISSAP is retired due to different views on management between parties. We think this sends a very negative signal in a time where the environmental challenges are greater than ever before – and where the need for fruitful international collaboration on migrating species is more important than ever before.

We sincerely hope that the generally good cooperation along the flyway for the endangered Fennoscandian population will continue, in spite of the weaker commitment a guidance note will entail for the Parties.

Given the situation, we support the EU text proposal, which may help secure stronger commitments for the urgent conservation actions ahead.”

38. **Wetlands International** made the following statement in response to the statements of the EU and Norway concerning the ISSAP for Lesser White-fronted Goose:

“International species action plans are to facilitate that Range States and other stakeholders reach agreement on the best course of conservation action and coordinate their actions of the whole flyway. The AEWA/EU International Single Species Action Plan for the Lesser White-fronted Goose has been revolutionary in the history of AEWA because it was the first plan with an AEWA International Species Working Group bringing together governments and experts. It was the first and so far the only plan with a dedicated coordinator at the AEWA Secretariat. That capacity has proven to be crucial to elevate the species action planning work at AEWA to a completely new level. The existence of this action plan has not only put the Norwegian breeding population (which is about 2/3 of the EU population) of the Lesser White-fronted Goose on a recovery path, but it has also helped the 28,000 – 40,000 birds in the Western Main Population and served as an entry card of AEWA to countries like Turkey, Iraq, Iran, Azerbaijan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan and Russia, of which only one,

Uzbekistan, is a party to AEWA, whilst Turkmenistan will join as a result of the existence of the plan.

On the other hand, it is regrettable that European countries have failed to reach an agreement on how to deal with the birds breeding in Sweden, representing less than a third of the EU wintering population and less than 1% of all Lesser White-fronted Geese in the Agreement Area. Wetlands International is deeply disappointed that this failure has resulted in terminating a plan for all AEWA populations, in spite of the recommendation of the AEWA Technical Committee which is reflected in the original text. Wetlands International further fears that replacing an AEWA action plan with a far less prestigious conservation guidance instrument, without a coordination mechanism and capacity in the Western Main Population will result in a setback also in that population representing 97% of the birds in the Agreement Area. This is what is called *throwing out the baby with the bath water.*"

39. A proposed amendment to paragraph 17 was tabled by **South Africa**.

40. The **Ramsar Convention Secretariat** and **Wetlands International** supported retaining the original language for paragraph 19 of the DR, rather than the corresponding amendment included in the EU's proposals.

41. The **Secretariat** observed that the guidance referred to in paragraph 18 was developed in response to Strategic Plan Target 1.3, and suggested an alternative text to the one proposed by the EU in order to match the wording of the Strategic Plan. The **EU** supported this suggestion.

42. The **Chair** requested the Secretariat to prepare a revised text of DR.4, incorporating the agreed amendments, for consideration and adoption by plenary.

AEWA/MOP8 DR.5 – Further Development and Strengthening of Monitoring of Migratory Waterbirds. Documents for adoption: AEWA/MOP 8.27 *Draft monitoring priorities for waterbird species and populations of AEWA*; AEWA/MOP 8.28 *Draft waterbird monitoring synergies with other frameworks*.

43. The **Chair** opened the floor to general comments.

44. The **Netherlands, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States**, made the following statement:

"The EU and its Member States underline the importance of waterbird monitoring as an essential tool for the implementation of the agreement. Though progress is made in the number of populations whose status can be assessed based on monitoring, more support is needed to reach the target of two-thirds of the populations set by the AEWA Strategic Plan 2019–2027. The EU and its Member States highlight the interconnectedness between developing and strengthening waterbird monitoring in general and the development of monitoring under the AEWA Site-Network (AEWA/MOP8 DR.6), amongst others on the monitoring of pressures.

The EU and its Member States welcome the "*Report on the Development of Waterbird Monitoring along the African-Eurasian Flyways*" (AEWA/MOP 8.26) and value the presented overview of achievements and challenges in the field of waterbird monitoring. We underline the importance of implementing and strengthening national monitoring schemes throughout the Agreement Area, and of the potential value of increased contributions to the Waterbird Fund, as a tool for achieving AEWA monitoring targets.

The EU and its Member States adopt the priorities and recommendations outlined in document AEWA/MOP 8.27 to guide the further development and strengthening of the monitoring of AEWA waterbird populations and drivers of their trends. In this context, we propose to highlight the importance of working towards demographic monitoring and the monitoring of drivers to analyze the possible causes of these trends.

The EU and its Member States endorse the possible synergies of waterbird monitoring with other frameworks and processes as outlined in document AEWA/MOP 8.28, and adopt the recommendations for strengthening those synergies.”

45. The **Chair** opened the floor to comments on documents AEWA/MOP 8.27 and 8.28. There were no further requests to speak; both documents were therefore forwarded to plenary for adoption, without amendment.

46. The **Chair** opened the floor to comments and proposed amendments to the text of DR.5 itself.

47. Proposed amendments were tabled by **The Netherlands on behalf of the EU and its Member States**, and **South Africa**. There were no objections to these proposals.

48. Additional minor amendments were tabled by the **Ramsar Convention Secretariat** and **OMPO**. There were no objections from Parties to the inclusion of these amendments.

49. The **Chair** requested the Secretariat to prepare a revised text of DR.5, incorporating the amendments tabled, for consideration and adoption by plenary.

50. Subsequently, the **Working Group** reviewed DR.5 Rev.1, as prepared by the Secretariat.

51. **The Netherlands, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States**, tabled a further minor amendment that had been agreed with South Africa. There were no objections to this additional amendment.

52. The **Chair** requested the Secretariat to prepare a further revision of DR.5, incorporating agreed amendments, to be forwarded to plenary for adoption

AEWA/MOP8 DR.6 – Inventory and Monitoring of the AEWA Flyway Site Network Document for adoption AEWA/MOP 8.29 *Draft monitoring framework for the AEWA flyway site network*.

53. The **Chair** opened the floor to general comments.

54. The **European Commission, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States**, made the following statement:

“The EU and its Member States support the development of an effectively managed and monitored site network under the Agreement, which is a prerequisite for ensuring a coherent flyway level protection for all migratory species’ populations. We welcome the fact that the EU Natura 2000 Network Standard Data Format (SDF) is identified as the international framework that provides all the necessary information for an assessment of the indicators for state, pressure and response of the AEWA Flyway Network sites.

The EU and its Member States stress that for some EU countries, delivering on the monitoring obligations will require investments in both human and financial resources. However, the AEWA Flyway Site Network will only work properly if the required data is gathered throughout the Agreement area. Therefore, the EU and its Member States call for matching efforts in this area both in EU countries and Contracting Parties elsewhere in the Agreement

area. If and where necessary, support by the AEWA bodies (Secretariat and Technical Committee), in particular to African countries, should be ensured. This might have consequences in terms of action prioritization and budget and should be taken into account in the relevant discussions on DR.8.

The EU and its Member States consider that the existing Special Protection Areas (SPAs) classified pursuant to Art. 4 of the Birds Directive are sufficient to guarantee the protection of all birds falling under AEWA Annex III & Table 1 in these areas. The requirements under the EU legislation are that all species referred to in Article 4 of the Birds Directive that are present on a site need to be listed in the site's SDF and no conservation objectives and measures are to be established for non-significant occurrences on a given site.

The EU and its Member States consider that it is important to ensure the process and tools which will be used for the data submission are as integrated as possible with other existing frameworks. This will avoid any unnecessary additional burden on Parties for example with manual data entry of parts of information from the relevant SDF fields.”

55. The **Secretariat and Wetlands International** responded to the requests for technical clarifications requested by the **European Commission on behalf of the EU and its Member States**.

56. The **Chair** opened the floor to further comments on document AEWA/MOP 8.29. There were no requests to speak and the document was therefore forwarded to plenary, without amendment.

57. The **Chair** opened the floor to specific proposals for amendment of the DR itself.

58. Proposed amendments were tabled by the **European Commission, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States**. There were no objections from Parties to these proposals.

59. **Wetlands International** suggested adjustments to some of the text tabled by the European Commission.

60. Following consultations, the **European Commission, on behalf of the EU and its Member States**, tabled modified language to take account of the suggestions of Wetlands International.

61. The **Chair** requested the Secretariat to prepare a revised version of DR.6, incorporating the agreed amendments, to be forwarded for consideration by plenary.

AEWA/MOP8 DR.15 – International Synergies in Addressing Causes of Waterbird Mortality.
Document that DR wording was based on AEWA/MOP 8.40. *Opportunities for addressing causes of waterbird mortality.*

62. The **Chair** opened the floor for general comments.

63. **Finland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States**, made the following statement:

“There is a clear need for increased synergies both within the biodiversity and environment cluster as well as for better collaboration with other relevant sectors to address human-induced causes of waterbird mortality. Such synergies are vital to the efforts of implementing the AEWA Strategic Plan and will also serve as AEWA’s contribution to the mainstreaming of biodiversity across sectors. The seeking of synergies on national, regional and flyway level is particularly pertinent in light of the challenges of influencing cross-sectoral policies but also considering the limited resources available. Collaboration should also be sought across taxonomic groups (for example ASCOBANS), where relevant, to facilitate implementation at national level avoiding parallel processes.”

64. **Finland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States**, welcomed document AEWA/MOP 8.40.

65. The **Secretariat** proposed to delete the text in square brackets in the title of document so that the title now read ‘Addressing causes of waterbird mortality’.

66. The **Chair** opened the floor to proposed amendments to the text of DR.15 itself.

67. Proposed amendments, as posted on the MOP8 website, were tabled by **Finland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States**.

68. Further proposals, some of these suggesting adjustment to elements of the EU’s amendments, were tabled by **Egypt, Ethiopia, South Africa, United Kingdom, Zimbabwe and OMPO**. Where applicable, delegations were requested to resolve differences through informal consultations and to communicate agreed text to the Secretariat.

69. The **Working Group** subsequently considered DR.15 Rev.1, reflecting amendments that had been sent to the Secretariat.

70. Further interventions were made by **Egypt, Finland on behalf of the EU and its Member States, the United Kingdom, and OMPO**.

71. Agreed amendments were incorporated by the Secretariat into DR.15 Rev.2.

72. Following further discussion, the **Chair** requested the Secretariat to prepare DR.15 Rev.3 for plenary consideration, including the final amendments tabled by **Egypt** (in consultation with the EU), and **South Africa**.

AEWA/MOP8 DR.16 – Ecotourism and Waterbird Conservation

73. Noting that this DR did not involve the adoption of any additional document, the **Chair** opened the floor to general comments on DR.16. There were no requests to speak.

74. The **Chair** opened the floor to specific proposals for amendment of the text of the DR.

75. The **Czech Republic, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States**, supported adoption of DR.16, subject to inclusion of an amendment in the preamble. There was no objection to this proposal.

76. The **Chair** requested the Secretariat to prepare a revised text of DR.16, incorporating the EU amendment, to be forwarded for consideration by plenary.

AEWA/MOP8 DR.7 – Improving the Base Knowledge for Effective Waterbird Conservation and Management. Document for adoption AEWA/MOP 8.30 *Draft overview of knowledge gaps and needs relevant for AEWA implementation: priority needs in 2021*.

77. The **Chair** opened the floor to general comments.

78. **Finland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States**, made the following statement:

“The EU and its Member States welcome the Draft Overview of Knowledge Gaps and Needs Relevant for the Implementation of AEWA: Priority Needs in 2021 prepared by the Technical

Committee and can support the adoption of document AEWA/MOP 8.30 as an assessment of priority needs for information to underpin the implementation of the Agreement.

As outlined in both the background document and Draft Resolution 8.7, the EU and its Member States highlight the need for synergies and close collaboration with other relevant international organisations and processes when striving to bridge knowledge gaps. This is of particular relevance in relation to seabirds as well as the proposed establishment of strategic guidance related to the potential for wetland restoration, which should be developed in close collaboration with other ongoing work including under Ramsar and UNEP.

In this context, it is important to highlight not only the role of the global biodiversity conventions, but also relevant regional environmental treaties and processes such as Bern, HELCOM, OSPAR, the Barcelona Convention, the Nairobi Convention and the Arctic Council Biodiversity Working Group CAFF. There are many other examples within the AEWA region.”

79. The **Chair** opened the floor to specific comments relating to document AEWA/MOP 8.30. There were no requests for the floor and the document was therefore forwarded to plenary, without amendment.

80. The **Chair** opened the floor to proposed amendments to the DR itself.

81. Proposed amendments were tabled by **Finland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, South Africa, and United Kingdom**, as well as by **BirdLife International, OMPO and Wetlands International**.

82. The **Chair** recalled that proposals from observers had to be seconded by at least one Party. He asked interested Parties to consult with each other and with observer delegations and to send the wording of agreed amendments to the Secretariat so that a revised version of the DR could be produced.

83. Subsequently, the **Working Group** reviewed DR.7 Rev.1 as prepared by the Secretariat.

84. The **Czech Republic, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States** pointed out a minor typographical error, which the Secretariat undertook to correct.

85. There being no further requests for the floor, the **Chair** requested the Secretariat to forward DR.7 Rev.1 (including correction of the typographical error) to plenary for its consideration and adoption.

AEWA/MOP8 DR.8 – Revision and Adoption of Conservation Guidance. Documents for adoption: AEWA/MOP 8.31 *Draft revised AEWA Conservation Guidelines no. 1: guidelines on the preparation of national Species Action Plans for migratory waterbirds*; AEWA/MOP 8.32 *Managing waterbird disturbance: a short guide for wetland managers [draft]*; AEWA/MOP 8.33 *Draft initial guidance on ecosystem services in relation to migratory waterbirds*; AEWA/MOP 8.34 *Draft Guidance on addressing the risk of accidental shooting of look-alike species of waterbirds in the Agreement Area*; AEWA/MOP 8.42 *Complementary guidelines on climate change adaptation measures for waterbirds*.

86. The **Chair** opened the floor to general comments, followed by comments on the documents tabled for adoption through this DR.

87. There were no requests for the floor in relation to documents AEWA/MOP 8.31, 8.33 or 8.42.

88. **Finland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States**, tabled minor amendments to documents AEWA/MOP 8.32 and 8.34.

89. The **Chair** requested the Secretariat to incorporate the amendments tabled for documents AEWA/MOP 8.32 and 8.34 and to present revised versions to plenary for consideration and adoption. Documents AEWA/MOP 8.32, 8.33 and 8.42 could be forwarded to plenary without amendment.

90. The **Chair** opened the floor to proposed amendments to DR.8 itself.

91. The **United Kingdom** tabled an amendment on adaptive harvest management guidance. This proposal was supported by **Finland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States**.

92. The **Working Group** subsequently reviewed DR.8 Rev.1, prepared by the Secretariat to reflect the amendments tabled. There being no further interventions, the **Chair** requested the Secretariat to forward DR.8 Rev.1 to plenary for consideration and adoption.

AEWA/MOP8 DR.9 – AEWA’s Past Contribution to Delivering the Aichi 2020 Biodiversity Targets and its Future Relevance to the Post-2020 Process. Documents for adoption: AEWA/MOP 8.35 *AEWA’s contribution to the Aichi Targets 2011-2020*; [8.36 *Opportunities for AEWA to support the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework*]; 8.37 *The relevance of AEWA to delivery of the Sustainable Development Goals*.

93. The **Secretariat** noted that document 8.36 appeared in square brackets as the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework had not yet been adopted, and proposed that the current draft document be adopted on an interim basis and forwarded to the StC for finalisation, once the new framework had been adopted by the CBD.

94. The **Chair** opened the floor to general comments and interventions on the documents to be adopted through this DR.

95. The **Czech Republic, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States**, supported documents AEWA/MOP 8.35 and 8.37 but considered that the current version of document 8.36 did not seem to take account of recent developments during 2022.

96. **South Africa** raised concerns about the nature and extent of ‘AEWA guidance’ referred to in document AEWA/MOP 8.36 and the proposed alternative text.

97. The **Czech Republic, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States**, and supported by the **United Kingdom**, suggested adjustments to the wording tabled by South Africa. These adjustments were acceptable to **South Africa**.

98. There being no interventions relating to documents AEWA/MOP 8.35 or 8.37 the **Working Group** forwarded both documents to plenary, without amendment.

99. The **Chair** requested the Secretariat to incorporate the agreed amendments to Document AEWA/MOP 8.36 prior to forwarding for plenary consideration.

100. The **Chair** opened the floor to proposed amendments to the DR itself.

101. The **Czech Republic on behalf of the EU and its Member States**, tabled proposed amendments and one factual correction to DR.9, as posted on the MOP8 website.

102. **BirdLife International** proposed an addition to the reference list in DR.9.

103. The **Chair** requested the Secretariat to prepare a revised text of DR.9 to reflect the agreed amendments.

104. The **Working Group** subsequently reviewed DR.9 Rev.1.

105. Further minor amendments were tabled by the **Czech Republic on behalf of the EU and its Member States**, supported by **South Africa**.

106. The **Chair** requested the Secretariat to incorporate these further amendments and to forward the text to plenary for consideration and adoption.

AEWA/MOP8 DR.11 – Institutional Arrangements: Technical Committee

107. The **Chair** noted that there was no separate document to be adopted under this DR. He requested the **Secretariat** to introduce the DR.

108. The **Secretariat** noted that DR.11 concerned both the work plan and composition of the TC during the forthcoming intersessional period. Prior to consideration during the concluding plenary session on 30 September, the work plan would be updated by the Secretariat to reflect all modifications arising from other DRs submitted to plenary for adoption.

109. With regard to composition of the TC, the **Secretariat** noted that DR.11 showed vacancies to be filled for the coming triennium. Two calls for nominations had been launched by the Secretariat and a small advisory group (composed of the Chairs and Vice-Chairs of StC and TC, together with two senior members of the Secretariat) had reviewed all of the nominations received.

110. The **Secretariat** read out the names and a brief biography for each of the nominees being recommended by the advisory group to fill the sub-regional vacancies in Africa and Europe, as well as the two vacancies for electable thematic experts, as follows:

Africa

Northern Africa: Hichem Azafzaf (Tunisia) as TC member, with Mohamed Ibraheem Habib (Egypt) as alternate.

Southern Africa: Melissa Lewis (South Africa) as TC member, with Douglas Harebottle (South Africa) as alternate.

Central Africa: Yves Davy Omon Souangbi (Central African Republic) as TC member. There was no recommended alternate, as no further nominations had been received for the sub-region.

Europe

Eastern Europe: Zurab Javakhishvili (Georgia) as TC member, with Vasyliy Kostiushyn (Ukraine) as alternate.

North & Southwestern Europe: Maria Dias (Portugal) as TC member, with Matthew Parsons (United Kingdom) as alternate.

Southwestern Asia: No nominations had been received. The position remained vacant, but according to the *modus operandi* of the TC, the Chair of TC could identify and appoint a member, on an interim basis, until the next MOP.

Electable Thematic Experts

Game management: Jesper Madsen (Denmark)

Rural economics: Nils Bunnefeld (German national, based in United Kingdom)

111. The **Chair** opened the floor to comments on the DR and on the nominations recommended by the advisory group, as read out by the Secretariat.

112. There being no requests for the floor, the **Chair** requested the Secretariat to prepare a revised version of DR11, populating the table of vacancies in the composition of the TC with the nominations recommended by the advisory group and updating the TC work plan as previously explained by the Secretariat.

Concluding remarks

113. The **Chair** congratulated the Working Group for completing its agenda on time and thanked delegates for their constructive participation. He also thanked the Secretariat and interpretation team for their effective support.