



# Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals

*Secretariat provided by the United Nations Environment Programme*



## Report of the 41<sup>st</sup> Meeting of the CMS Standing Committee

*Bonn (Germany), 27-28 November 2013*

### Opening Remarks and Organizational matters

#### 1. Opening Remarks and Introduction

1. The Chair, Alfred Oteng-Yeboah (Ghana) opened the meeting by welcoming Committee members and observers and thanking the Government of Germany for its continued support of the Convention. He stressed the importance of the conservation of migratory species, which was being recognized by IPBES, a fact that presented great opportunities for the Convention to increase its profile and to raise awareness of migratory species.

2. Mr Chambers, speaking at his first Standing Committee since his appointment, identified the Convention's main tasks as the preparation of the forthcoming Conference of the Parties, implementing the Future Shape Resolution, improving accountability to Parties, delivering better conservation policies and finding synergies within the CMS Family and the broader community of Multilateral Environment Agreements (MEAs).

3. The Chair then introduced Bakary Kante (UNEP) who conveyed the good wishes of UNEP Executive Director, Achim Steiner, who wished to reaffirm his support of the CMS Family as important players among the MEAs dealing with sustainability. Mr Kante congratulated Mr Chambers on his appointment as Executive Secretary and commended him for his work on international environmental governance. UNEP had emerged from the Rio+20 process with an enhanced budget, extended mandate and an additional 80 posts.

#### 2. Adoption of the Agenda and Schedule

4. The Chair called upon the Secretariat to introduce the provisional agenda (UNEP/CMS/StC41/2.1.Rev.1) and the annotated agenda and schedule (UNEP/CMS/StC41/2.2.Rev 1).

##### 2.1 Provisional Agenda

5. As there were no requests from the floor to amend the Provisional Agenda, it was adopted as presented.

##### 2.2 Annotated Agenda and Schedule

6. The Chair said that postponing Agenda Item 12, the hosting of the COP, would be necessary as the representatives of the countries making bids would not be arriving until the second day. The discussion of the two bids would be held in closed session after the presentations and the result would be announced immediately afterwards. There were no other proposals to change the schedule, which was adopted as amended.

#### 3. Adoption of the Rules of Procedure

7. Bert Lenten (Deputy Executive Secretary) explained that the Rules of Procedure remained in force until such time as the Committee decided to revise them. The Rules of Procedure operating at the previous meeting would therefore be used. The findings of the Working Group on Rules of Procedure for the Conference of the Parties and Standing Committee and Retirement of Resolutions and Recommendations established at the previous meeting of the Standing Committee would be discussed under Agenda Item 14.

## **4. Adoption of the Draft Report**

### **4.1. 40<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Standing Committee**

8. Mr Lenten (Deputy Executive Secretary) introduced the draft report of the 40<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Standing Committee. This had been circulated to members and the comments received accommodated as appropriate. The draft report as presented was adopted.

## **5. Depositary**

9. Gerhard Adams (Germany) referred the Meeting to Document UNEP/CMS/StC41/5. Since the last meeting of the Standing Committee, membership of the Convention had risen to 119 with the accession of Swaziland and Fiji. Most of the Convention's efforts relating to recruitment were undertaken by the Secretariat and the German Government. The Meeting noted the Depositary's report.

## **6. Standing Committee**

### **6.1. Standing Committee Members**

10. No regional member of the Standing Committee sought the floor to add to the written reports. These (Documents UNEP/CMS/StC41/6.1a to f) were noted.

### **6.2. Observers**

11. Andre Tenorio Mourao (Brazil) expressed his appreciation for the invitation to the meeting representing a non-Party in the final stages of accession to the Convention. Brazil was already a Party to ACAP and was a signatory to the Grassland Birds MOU and should be a Party to the parent Convention by the time of the next COP.

12. Margi Prideaux (Wild Migration) speaking via a Skype connection from Australia drew attention to "A Natural Affiliation", a review of the developing role of NGOs in the CMS Family (UNEP/CMS/StC41/6.2.a). It outlined the fact that there was scope for NGOs to increase their support for implementing the CMS Family and included suggestions on how this might be achieved. The Committee indicated its consent for Wild Migration to continue discussions through the Scientific Council and COP11.

## **7. Scientific Council**

13. Fernando Spina (Chair, CMS Scientific Council) supplemented his report (Document UNEP/CMS/StC41/7) with a presentation in which he outlined some of the highlights of a busy year.

14. The CMS Scientific Council's online workspace based on the one pioneered by AEWA now had 200 people registered and efforts were being made to encourage greater usage. The Secretariat had been requested to contact Parties to stress the importance of the Council and to ensure that people nominated to serve on it were allowed to devote sufficient time to fulfill their responsibilities as members. Nancy Céspedes (Chile) requested that National Focal Points be informed of any difficulties in communicating with nationally appointed Councillors.

15. Consideration was being given to reforming the Council to increase its efficiency. More work would be undertaken through Working Groups dealing with subjects such as connectivity, demography, marking and tracking, and economic value. One output could be best practice guidance which would contribute to raising the profile of the Convention.

16. In October 2013 a suite of meetings had taken place in Formia, Italy. First had been the regular meeting of the Chairs of the Scientific and Advisory Bodies (CSAB) of the biodiversity MEAs, followed by the ad hoc Working Group on avian taxonomy, the Strategic and Planning meeting and finally a workshop on the economic value of migratory species, the first of its kind in Italy.

17. Mr Spina had attended the First Meeting of Signatories of the Raptors MOU in Abu Dhabi in December 2012 where he had promoted collaboration with EURING; the Saker Falcon Task Force, where he led one of the break-out groups; and Working Groups on African-Eurasian Migratory Landbirds and Bird Poisoning. He had helped select the consultants developing the project on the effects of renewable energy installation on migratory species being conducted by CMS, AEW, BirdLife International and IRENA.

18. For World Migratory Bird Day, Mr Spina had brought the Bologna Operatic Choir to Bonn to sing a selection of songs by Verdi at a benefit concert, the proceeds from which were donated to a project in Africa concerning Grey Crowned Cranes. A similar event would be organized in 2014 in conjunction with the choir of Deutsche Welle, the German international radio station.

19. Mr Oteng-Yeboah and Mr Spina had attended the first plenary session of IPBES in Bonn where the Work Plan had been developed. Both had also attended the IPBES Bureau in Bergen, Norway, in June.

20. The Chair of Council's report was noted.

## **8. UNEP**

21. Mamadou Kane (UNEP) referring to Document UNEP/CMS/StC41/8 gave an overview of the main support given by UNEP to the Convention since the last COP. All MEAs were benefitting from focal points working in the Regional Offices, work on InforMEA was continuing, the CMS Small Grants Programme had been funded and support given to the Dugong MOU in completing its application for GEF funding. UNEP had managed the recruitment of the new Executive Secretary and delegations of authority had been negotiated with all the Executive Secretaries of Bonn-based instruments. Seven posts within the CMS Family including five in the Administration and Fund Management Unit were funded through the Programme Support Costs.

22. At the 40<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Standing Committee, UNEP had highlighted the need to establish an MOU with the Standing Committee of CMS along with other UNEP-administered Conventions, because of the adoption of new international auditing standards that would be operative on 1 January 2014. The MOUs were intended to make the division of responsibility clear, to fill an administrative vacuum and to help avoid situations where COP Resolutions were not consistent with UN rules.

23. Mr Chambers apologized for the late distribution of the draft which he explained should have been published as an in-session document. The intention had been to launch the discussion and for approval to be obtained through a postal procedure rather than at the meeting.

24. With respect to document production, Andrew Bignell (New Zealand) asked that his appreciation be put on the record of the fact that the Secretariat had posted the meeting papers in good time.

### **Action Point**

Members of the Standing Committee to circulate the draft MOU to elicit comments from Parties and comments to be sent to the Secretariat by the end of February 2014

## **9. Financial and Human Resources**

### **9.1. Report on the Implementation of the CMS Budget during the Triennium 2012/14**

25. Bruce Noronha (Secretariat) introduced Document UNEP/CMS/StC41/9.1 showing the status of the CMS Trust Fund at the end of December 2012. While there was a seemingly healthy balance, a number of commitments would reduce this and unpaid contributions for the year amounted to €245,000. Some Parties had arrears dating over many years, while it might be expected that some of the shorter-term arrears would be paid late. In all there were contributions of €778,000 outstanding from 55 Parties, the majority of which was attributable to ten of them. Thirty-nine Parties had long-term arrears totalling €210,000 (90 per cent attributable to ten Parties); this compared with €160,000

last year. Unpaid contributions for 2013 currently stood at €568,000 (compared with €390,000 in 2012) with ten Parties accounting for €520,000.

26. Staffing budget lines were projected to be underspent by €230,000 and these savings were used to extend the appointments of two junior professionals. As one staff member had already served four years as a JPO, a new temporary post to manage the development of the new website had had to be created. Another temporary post had also been created to assist the Agreements Unit and COP11 preparations. The JPO working on African issues had left the Secretariat to take up a position in Nairobi. The Secretariat had benefitted from the JPO scheme but these appointments together with an Associate Programme Officer post funded by Germany dealing with sharks and gorillas were all coming to an end. The Secretariat faced the prospect of losing several posts.

27. Because of the over-spend on IT and communication, the Secretariat was looking to reduce costs by using alternatives to UNV for archiving data; these alternatives might however be less secure. Contracts with mobile phone providers had been revised to reduce the cost of roaming. Teleconference facilities would be used to reduce travel and e-communication would reduce the need for conventional post and courier services.

28. On two procedural matters, Mr Noronha said that expenditure on some budget lines was very uneven across the triennium and he would try to present information as factually as possible. He also suggested that the frequency of the financial reports be reduced from quarterly to biannually, given the amount of staff time required to compile them.

29. Projects in the pipeline for the coming months included the launch of the new website and the e-community. The allocation set aside for the Strategic Plan had been fully expended on hiring the consultant, but further refinement of the draft would have to be carried out. Mr Kante (UNEP) announced that UNEP would make a contribution of US\$20,000 to allow the work to continue; the meeting expressed its gratitude.

30. Ms Céspedes (Chile) the Chair of the Finance and Budget Sub-Committee gave a report of the Sub-Committee's meeting held on 27 November. It had been attended by representatives from Chile, the Islamic Republic of Iran and Tunisia and observers from Norway and Germany. The Sub-Committee had endorsed the use of savings to extend the two professional level posts and to reduce frequency of the Secretariat's financial reports to half-yearly from quarterly. The model of the costed programme of work based on that used by CITES was recommended for adoption by CMS. The Sub-Committee would support the Secretariat in the preparation of the 2015-2017 draft budget and would continue to make the budget process as transparent as possible. Every effort should be made to reduce the level of arrears. The future role and composition of the Sub-Committee had also been discussed and some changes would be proposed for inclusion in the budget resolution.

31. Mr Bignell (New Zealand) said that communication between the Secretariat and the Sub-Committee had been good, but confusion over the timing of the meeting had led to New Zealand being unable to attend. He welcomed Mr Noronha's report and agreed with the proposed reallocation of resources on the understanding that extra staff should focus on preparations for the COP and that the temporary new posts and extensions of existing ones should not entail longer-term commitments.

32. Oliver Biber (Switzerland) asked what action was being taken to collect the arrears. He said that it was the policy of the Swiss Government to favour countries that paid their contributions to MEAs in the allocation of financial support.

33. Malta Qwathekana (South Africa) said that ministers were often unaware that their countries were behind with payments and suggested that they be directly contacted through diplomatic channels. As a National Focal Point, she felt personally responsible for ensuring that her country's contributions were paid. Countries could also pay for several years making payments worthwhile, and withdrawing the right of having travel and accommodation provided should act as an incentive to clear arrears.

34. Mr Chambers (Executive Secretary) welcomed the suggestions on how to deal with Parties in arrears. He stressed that the original invoices were sent to Ministries of Foreign Affairs by UNEP through diplomatic channels and that reminders were sent if necessary. The Secretariat also sent copies to Focal Points. It was suggested that members of the Standing Committee approach the Parties in their regions with arrears.

#### **Action Points**

It was agreed that the Secretariat's report to the Finance and Budget Sub-Committee could be sent to the Standing Committee and the frequency be reduced from four times to twice a year.

The proposed extensions of contracts and temporary posts were agreed on the understanding that there was no longer-term commitment and that the main focus of the officers' work should be preparing for the COP.

### **9.2. Costed Programme of Work 2013-14**

35. Mr Lenten (Deputy Executive Secretary) said that document UNEP/CMS/StC41/9.2 had been produced in response to a request made at COP10. The format was an adaptation of the model used by CITES and a draft had been presented to and approved by the 40<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Standing Committee.

36. The Programme of Work was based on the old Secretariat structure and covered all the former Units with the exception of the Administration and Fund Management Unit, which was entirely financed by UNEP. The Agreements Unit had been responsible for the Central Asian Flyway, the Argali Sheep initiative and the Snow Leopard, for which there was no core funding but costs were almost entirely covered by voluntary contributions. Activities were grouped by category with their estimated cost together with core budget allocations and required additional funding from voluntary contributions. The Inter-Agency Liaison Unit's budget was largely allocated to staff costs.

37. In the table, activities that were not being carried out through lack of resources were annotated accordingly, facilitating the process of identifying priorities and reallocating resources. The draft format for the Costed Programme of Work was approved.

### **9.3. 2013 Report on CMS activities in North America**

38. Monika Thiele (Secretariat) attending the Standing Committee for the first time explained her role in Washington D.C. where she divided her time between CMS and the UNEP Regional Office for North America (RONA). Her principal duties for CMS were to raise the profile of CMS, in North America, build political support for Convention activities, and to foster contacts with key organizations and partners based in Washington. These include government agencies (e.g. U.S. State Department, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration), international organizations (e.g. World Bank, IUCN, GEF) and NGOs (e.g. Pew Environment Fund, WWF, AWF, Audubon, etc.). She also tried to mobilize resources to support CMS activities globally and is well placed engage representatives of the private sector, government and various multinational institutions. By maintaining regular contact with these organizations, CMS presence increased and more opportunities for engaging with policy shaping activities emerged; for example, identifying opportunities such as inputs to the Global Ocean Commission's strategic plan for activities in the High Seas. As Ms. Thiele's presence in Washington became better known, CMS would receive more opportunities to attend key policy setting meetings, roundtables and seminars on topics related to biodiversity or wildlife conservation generally. At these meetings she would be able to network with key stakeholders from the US Government and NGO community which would help to raise the awareness of CMS, thanks to useful factsheets and information products.

39. Working for both CMS and UNEP had the added benefit of facilitating natural synergies between CMS and UNEP's Programme of Work. Often this enabled cost-sharing benefits when travel costs were split between the two organizations for the same meeting (e.g. Nairobi Mission, or IWC

Technical Meeting on Marine Debris and Entanglement, or CBD/SBSTTA 16). Ms. Thiele also provided significant programmatic support to the CMS marine-related activities, including topics such as marine debris, marine mammals, sharks, ocean noise and topics related to wildlife crime, ecological networks and climate change.

40. Although accession to the Convention was not imminent, the USA had demonstrated its support for migratory species conservation through continued voluntary support to the IOSEA Marine Turtle MOU (US\$130,500) and the Shark MOU (US\$75,000). The USA also had signed the Pacific Islands Cetacean MOU recently (November 2012). There were even signs that the U.S. might join ACAP Treaty, an effort which Ms Thiele had been helping to champion in the last two years. She worked closely with the Executive Secretary of ACAP, Mr. Warren Papworth, who was preparing for a mission to Washington at end of February 2014. Another initiative with which CMS was engaged was WHMSI — the Western Hemisphere Migratory Species Initiative. In January 2013, CMS helped to facilitate the determinations of grant awards by WHMSI. US\$75,000 out of the total available funds (US\$100,000) had been allocated to projects supporting CMS-listed species. Last, news had just arrived that the International Crane Foundation had received a grant of US\$24,000 from the USFWS Critically Endangered Animal Fund.

41. The Committee welcomed the opportunity to meet Ms Thiele in person and to find out at first-hand what she was doing on behalf of CMS. Asked whether the USA was likely to engage in the West African Marine Turtle MOU to the same extent that it had for IOSEA, Ms Thiele said that there was interest from the USA but she doubted that there would be any resources allocated until one of the Range State signatories signalled its commitment to take the lead. Abdul Munaf Qaimkhani (Pakistan) said that his country had received grants from the USFWS “Wildlife without Borders” programme for marine turtles. He asked whether contacts had also been developed with Canada. Ms Thiele confirmed that she could engage more with Canada but that her assignment for the first two years had been to focus on the USA. However, through UNEP RONA and through her work on WHMSI and flyways, Ms. Thiele had engaged with some key members from the Canadian government as well.

42. Mr Bignell (New Zealand) said that recruiting the USA to CMS might prove difficult and noted that there were other regions (Africa for example) where CMS needed to increase its profile. Marianne Courouble (France) reiterated the point that despite original requests, a report had not been submitted in 2012 to Standing Committee covering the Washington Officer’s accomplishments; it had only been issued later. Then she asked whether the staff member in Washington would be able to raise the funds necessary to support the cost of the post. She asked what the cost-benefit of the post was for CMS and requested that an analysis be made to ascertain what the resources raised were against the cost of the post. Ms. Thiele referred to the slides in her presentation regarding resources from the USA for Sharks, Sea Turtles, and Cranes, and reiterated that funds raised were a result of a collective effort (including Laura Cerasi) and that she alone could not take credit for the funds. Further, she noted that some support was also in-kind and not easily quantifiable. The support given to IOSEA, for example, was due to long standing relationship between IOSEA Secretariat and the USA. Wendy Jackson (New Zealand) commented that CMS should be careful about putting resources into a region that was not Party to CMS. Ms. Thiele clarified that CMS was rather leveraging resources from the region, to support CMS portfolio globally. Ms Qwathekana (South Africa) responded positively noting a desire to similarly access benefits from the Washington Officer to assist with finding more support from the US Government for implementation of West Africa agreements.

43. Mr Chambers apologized for the fact that the report requested at COP10 had not been presented to the Standing Committee in 2012. He hoped that now that Parties had received the 2013 reports and heard in person from the Officer, that they could now see the direct benefits of the post for themselves. Mr. Chambers also noted that the UNEP Executive Director recognized the investment value of this post for UNEP, and noted that there was consideration of converting this post into an MEA Focal Point Post, to join the rest of the network of UNEP/MEA Focal points.

<b>Action Points</b>
----------------------

The Secretariat to provide a cost-benefit analysis of the Washington D.C. post for COP11.
---

## **10. Resource Mobilization**

44. Laura Cerasi (Secretariat) introduced Document UNEP/CMS/StC41.10 which described the Secretariat's past and present activities and future plans to mobilize resources. The aim was to increase the amount raised in contributions not earmarked for specific ends and to encourage longer-term funding. Grants would be sought from more sources and the base of donors would be broadened.

45. The Secretariat had prioritized its fund-raising effort and Parties had received the list of key activities. Donors had been approached through general appeals and tailored contacts. The Secretariat had been successful in its application for funds from the European Commission and continued to work closely with numerous partners, supporting their applications for grants whenever possible. CMS would receive a new contribution from the Commission (Africa-Caribbean-Pacific capacity building phase II project). Funding for conservation actions was being facilitated through notifications of grant opportunities e.g. with foundations and letters of support by the Secretariat; Ms Thiele in Washington was actively supporting that effort.

46. The Secretariat had promoted resource mobilization through events and outreach activities. Breaking new ground, CMS had for the first time in 2013 organized a benefit concert to mark World Migratory Bird Day and the bicentenary of Verdi. (See agenda item 7 above)

47. There were a few activities with budget lines and allocations in the core budget for which additional resources would be required. These included the implementation of MOUs, the organization of the COP, the project on renewable energy and work related to the Scientific Council and its forthcoming meeting.

48. Finally, the Secretariat wanted to launch the "Migratory Species Champion Programme" for the CMS Family. The Programme had already been approved by the AEWA Standing Committee and ASCOBANS Advisory Committee. The concept note for the scheme had been circulated some months before and its main aim was to address the lack of a solid funding stream by broadening the base of donors and to provide greater visibility for CMS and its activities. Potential "Champions" would be asked to make a three-year commitment of an amount above a predetermined minimum and rather than sponsoring a specific activity they would be agreeing to support a wider portfolio. In return for their support, Champions would be officially recognized by CMS. Side events would be organized at the COP and similar events to promote the scheme and Ambassadors asked to help recruit "Champions". CMS was liaising closely with BirdLife International which operated a similar scheme; this would mean CMS could learn lessons from BLI's experience and the two organizations could work together rather than compete. The Committee endorsed the "Migratory Species Champion Programme".

49. Lyle Glowka (CMS Abu Dhabi) gave an update on the dugong and sea grass project that was being prepared for GEF. The draft project had cleared the UNEP review and could now be submitted to GEF. It had received a project preparation grant of US\$170,000 and approximately US\$6 million in pledges from the GEF-5 STAR allocations of the partner countries and pledges of support and in-kind contributions now amounted to US\$99 million. If approved, the project would start in 2014 and would be the third CMS project to benefit from GEF funding (the other two being the Central Asian Siberian Crane Wetlands project and "Wings over Wetlands").

## **11. Working Group on Rules of Procedure of the Conference of the Parties and Standing Committee and Retirement of Resolutions and Recommendations**

50. Mr Bignell (New Zealand), the Chair of the Working Group explained that it had been set up at the previous meeting of the Standing Committee to deal with four issues: organization of the COP; the rules of procedure of the COP; the rules of procedure of the Standing Committee; and the retirement of resolutions and recommendations. The four issues were dealt with separately in the four annexes to the main Document. Mr Bignell expressed his thanks to the other members of the Working Group and to the Secretariat for their assistance.

51. One additional change that the Working Group wished to propose was for the membership of the Finance and Budget Sub-Committee to be rationalized in future so as to be a subset of the Standing Committee. Currently, the representative of Oceania on the Sub-Committee was the Philippines, which was not a member of the Standing Committee, and was unlikely to send a representative to Bonn for a half-day meeting.

#### COP Organization

52. There were concerns that the proposals to extend the Bureau to include the members of the Standing Committee would be a burden for some delegations, especially those attending regional coordination and Parties with only one COP representative. It was pointed out that attendance at the Bureau would not be compulsory and that apologies would be accepted, but such a system operated successfully at other forums.

53. The proposal to curtail the opening ceremonies was accepted after clarification of the definition of “main authorities”, which was intended to mean the Chair of the Standing Committee, a senior representative of the Host Government, the local mayor and some other strategic contributors. The intention was to restrict the opening ceremony to a maximum of two hours, to allow more time for the substantive agenda.

54. Clarification of the requirements relating to Credentials was necessary following the experience of COP10, when sponsored delegates had come without proper documentation. It was pointed out that any voting of consequence took place at the end of the COP, allowing delegates time to ensure that original Credentials could be sent from capitals during the meeting if necessary. Delegates seeking sponsorship should provide a copy of their Credentials, before the Secretariat issued tickets.

55. The proposals regarding COP organization were accepted.

#### COP Rules of Procedure

56. Oliver Schall (Germany) again raised the issue of overburdening Standing Committee members with participation in the Bureau and stressed that attendance should not be obligatory. This caveat was accepted.

57. Akankwasah Barirega (Uganda) proposed that Rule 14 (2) be amended so that in the event of a tie, any decision should be considered rejected. This was agreed.

58. The draft of the COP Rules of Procedure as amended was accepted.

#### Standing Committee Rules of Procedure

59. The proposals contained in document 11 Annex III regarding the Rules of Procedure of the Standing Committee were accepted subject to minor amendments to the wording concerning consultation in Rule 3 (3), the size limit to documents in Rule 3 (6) and procedures in the event of a tied vote Rule 3 (16).

#### Retirement of Resolutions

60. The proposals contained in document 11 Annex IV regarding the Retirement of Resolutions and Recommendations were accepted.

#### **Action Points**

The Secretariat to redraft the terms of reference to be adopted at COP11 for the Finance and Budget Sub-Committee to ensure that its membership is a sub-set of the membership of the Standing Committee.



## **12. Organization of COP11**

61. The Chair invited first His Excellency Jorge Enrique Jurado Mosquera, the Ambassador of Ecuador to Germany and then Carolina Constantino, Political Attaché at the Embassy in Berlin to make their presentations on hosting the COP.

62. Before describing the biodiversity and geography of Ecuador, the importance the country attached to the Convention and the facilities and resources that would be made available in Guayaquil, Mr Jurado expressed his sympathies to the people of the Philippines following the typhoon.

63. Ms Constantino explained that she was deputizing for the National Focal Point who was unable to travel as a result of the aftermath of the typhoon and acknowledged the solidarity shown by the world community to her country. She emphasized that the Philippines was one of the most biologically diverse countries, particularly with regard to marine species, and was part of the Coral Triangle.

64. Mr Bignell (New Zealand) sought assurances from both prospective host countries that the issuance of visas would not be a problem given the global nature of the Convention. Neither country required visas for short-term visitors. Both countries' presentations emphasized their experience in hosting international meetings and as CMS had never held a COP in Asia or Latin America, whichever venue was chosen would present opportunities for the Convention to reach out to non-Parties in regions where recruiting new members was a priority.

65. After the Committee met *in camera* to discuss the bids and make its choice, the Chair announced the outcome of the deliberations. The decision of the Standing Committee was to accept the offers of both Ecuador and the Philippines to host sessions of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention. Ecuador would host COP11 in November 2014 and the Philippines would host COP12 in 2017.

## **13. CMS Strategic Plan Working Group**

66. Ms Jackson (New Zealand), Vice-Chair of the Working Group presented Document UNEP/CMS/StC41/13 explaining the activities undertaken by the Working Group over the past year and adding a summary of the main outcomes its meeting of 25-26 November. A draft Strategic Plan had been elaborated and circulated, and comments taken on board, resulting in a robust document. The Working Group had gone through the latest draft, and the chapters and outline chapters had been further refined. It was still possible to make comments until 15 December 2013 and work on crystallizing the next draft would start in the New Year. Input from the Standing Committee and Scientific Council and the other agreements within the CMS Family would be particularly welcome. The allocation in the core budget and the voluntary contributions from Germany and South Africa had been almost fully expended and further funds were needed.

67. A new draft Plan would be sent in mid-January to the Working Group for wider consultation in February. The greater the number of inputs and the broader the "buy-in", the better the Plan would be. The daughter agreements had also been fully involved in the process, reinforcing the intention that the Plan should be a Strategic Plan for migratory species rather than just for CMS as an institution. It was intended that the Strategic Plan be a concise document targeted at high-level decision makers and that it would be complemented by a "companion volume" setting out the detail.

68. Ms Céspedes (Chile) expressed her thanks to the Working Group's Chair, Ines Verleye and the rest of the team for their efforts, especially for communicating with other Parties regarding the progress being made. Ms Qwathakana (South Africa) was concerned that so central an activity as the strategic plan might not be able to progress for want of sufficient funding. Mr Biber (Switzerland) asked what would happen if the funds were not found before the COP. Monika Lesz (Poland) felt that

the targets were ambitious and wanted to see more concrete proposals for achieving them in the companion volume.

69. Ms Jackson said that she and the Working Group Chair could continue refining the Strategic Plan itself. Where she foresaw difficulties was in the drafting of the companion volume and devising the indicators, although much of the preparatory work had been done by the consultant, Dave Pritchard. Mr Pritchard had been asked to give an estimate of how much more time would be required to complete the drafts.

70. Mr Kante (UNEP) undertook to provide a further US\$20,000 to enable the Working Group to continue the elaboration of the Plan (see Agenda Item 9 above). Members of the Committee were invited to consider making voluntary contributions.

#### **14. Future Structure and Strategies of CMS: Update on Implementation of Priority Activities**

71. Presenting Document UNEP/CMS/StC41/14, Mr Chambers (Executive Secretary) updated the Committee on progress made in implementing Resolution 10.9 on Future Structure and Strategies of the CMS and CMS Family. CMS was involved in the discussions on international environmental governance and the Rio+20 process, where high level endorsement had been given to ensuring greater synergies among MEAs.

72. UNEP Regional Offices were engaged in capacity building and increasing the involvement of NGOs. All of the regional offices had an officer in place with the exception of Latin America where an appointment would be made soon. A number of regional meetings had been organized to assist countries with the revision of their NBSAPs, presenting an opportunity to promote the CMS guidelines on the inclusion of migratory species. In addition, a global workshop on NBSAPs had taken place in Nairobi.

73. Efforts were being made to increase involvement with IPBES and data hubs. CMS was well placed to interact with IPBES as the Chair of the Standing Committee was a member of the IPBES Bureau. Four proposals had been made for the IPBES work programme with a fifth for a rapid assessment of migratory species submitted later. The second meeting of the IPBES Plenary in Antalya, Turkey would decide on priorities; of the main candidates, pollination and economic value were of greatest relevance to CMS.

74. The website was being thoroughly revised (see Agenda Item 16.1) and the expected launch would take place in the first quarter of 2014. One area where improvements would be seen would be the coverage in French and Spanish. The project had been a joint effort between CMS and various daughter agreements and support had been received through contributions from the CMS Trust Fund as well as from daughter agreements and a voluntary contribution from Finland.

75. A number of gap analyses were foreseen in the Resolution – including on the viability of MOUs and species coverage on the CMS Appendices – but no allocation had been made in the core budget. Accordingly, first drafts would be prepared by the Secretariat and circulated for comment.

76. The *modus operandi* and role of the Scientific Council were under review with the aim of increasing the support it gave the Convention and improving its efficiency. A meeting of the officers of the Council, the chairs of the working groups and the COP-appointed councillors had taken place in October in Formia, Italy, which considered the results of an initial assessment which included the survey of expertise of scientific councillors and a comparison of the structure and *modus operandi* of the scientific bodies of MEAs and CMS Family instruments. The Secretariat would draft an options paper on the future structure of the Council for consultation with the Parties.

77. The Convention's presence in different regions of the world was being enhanced through partnerships, for example the German development organization GIZ in Central Asia and the International Crane Foundation across the range of the Siberian Crane.

78. Owing to the pioneering efforts of AEWA, the CMS online reporting system was now operating, representing a considerable advance in the Convention's data collection capability.

79. Additional staff members had been deployed to the MOU Coordination Unit, but complementing posts funded from the core budget with JPOs and a P2 funded by Germany. These posts were however of limited duration with no guarantee of the incumbents being replaced after 2014.

80. While some training sessions had been specifically organized, opportunities were being taken to use events run by partners and to host joint events to share costs. The meeting of the Chairs of the Scientific and Advisory Bodies had taken place in Formia immediately before the Scientific Council.

81. Cooperation between programmes on the basis of thematic, taxonomic or geographic overlaps was being explored in many instances such as the case of the Central Asian Flyway. The meeting of Range States held in Abu Dhabi in December 2012 expressed a preference for managing the Action Plan through AEWA. This had been conveyed to the AEWA Standing Committee and a decision would be taken at the next AEWA MOP. There was scope for increasing synergies through closer integration of the CMS and AEWA Secretariats with the recruitment of a new Executive Officer of AEWA, as explained in Document UNEP/CMS/StC41/14.1 (see below)

82. The project being undertaken in partnership with AEWA (on behalf of the Family), BirdLife International and IRENA on the effects of renewable energy installations on migratory species had started and results should be available at the COP.

83. Ms Courouble (France) said that France had seen the Future Shape process as a priority and had accordingly funded it and participated in the Working Group. She welcomed the Executive Secretary's report and its emphasis on increasing efficiency. She suggested that the Secretariat continue to make regular calls for financial support and report progress.

84. Ms Jackson (New Zealand) said that she too had invested considerable time in the Future Shape process and was pleased to see that it was bearing fruit. Greater efficiency could be achieved in reporting processes and she would share her ideas with other Parties in due course. She noted that all documents included reference to the relevant part of the Future Shape strategy but also felt that it was useful to have a consolidated summary of the progress being achieved.

85. Mr Qaimkhani (Pakistan) pointed out that CBD Parties were in the process of revising their NBSAPs, some with the support of GEF funding. As all CMS Parties were also party to CBD, CMS National Focal Points should liaise with their CBD counterparts to ensure migratory species concerns were addressed.

86. Ms Qwathekana (South Africa) said that Future Shape had identified the need in some regions for support from the Convention, either in the form of staff on the ground (such as the AEWA Coordinator for Africa based in Cameroon) or officers with regional responsibilities based in Bonn. With regard to the Strategic Plan, it would be important to obtain solid baselines data so that progress could be properly assessed.

87. Mr Kane (UNEP) addressed the issue of the common use of an online reporting system by biodiversity-related MEAs. In February 2013 the BLG had seen a demonstration of the online reporting system pioneered by AEWA and endorsed the system. UNEP had now found funding to progress the project and had made initial contact with UNEP-WCMC.

88. Ms Céspedes (Chile) agreed with France that implementation of Future Shape should be the main priority and therefore welcomed the prominence it was receiving. Reform of the Scientific Council was a delicate issue and the problems of communication being experienced by the Chair were worrying.

89. Ms Courouble (France) recalled that the option of establishing a CMS presence in regional offices had been considered by the Future Shape Working Group. This would improve effectiveness on the ground, raise the Convention's profile and assist with local fund-raising. The CMS Project Office in Abu Dhabi dealing with the Raptors and Dugong MOUs might be a model for the CMS instruments in Africa. The proposal for CMS to merge services within the Family was consistent with the Future Shape recommendations and would lead to savings and the better use of resources.

90. Mr Adams (Germany) recognized the potential value of regional presence supported by governments or NGOs. With regard to the future relationship between CMS and AEWA and the proposal that CMS assume responsibility for strategic concerns allowing AEWA to concentrate more on implementation, he understood the reluctance of some to rush into decisions with far-reaching consequences. He felt that the time leading up to the COP should be used to examine how this could be effected practically and see what worked well. The Secretariat could come to COP with more specific proposals based on experience.

91. Ms Lesz (Poland) said that she had received a specific request from other European countries that Parties be kept informed of developments regarding the relationship between CMS and AEWA.

92. Volodymyr Domashlinets (Ukraine) welcomed the progress being made with implementing Future Shape and especially the synergies being sought to increase efficiency. He agreed with previous speakers who had expressed the need for a cautious approach to far-reaching decisions regarding the future relationship between CMS and AEWA and urged that whatever path was followed be consistent with AEWA Resolutions, pointing out that AEWA Resolution 1.1 referred to AEWA having an Executive Secretary not an Executive Officer. With regard to recruitment, Mr Domashlinets reported that the Russian Federation was expressing interest in signing some MOUs.

93. Ms Céspedes (Chile) and Ms Jackson (New Zealand) both representing countries outside the AEWA Agreement area asked what the consequences of the Convention assuming a greater representative role for AEWA would be for the wider CMS Family. Both support greater synergies in principle but wanted to see the detail of the proposal. It was not clear what the "common areas" were that were referred to in the AEWA Standing Committee decision.

94. Ms Qwathekana (South Africa) said that Activity 12 of Future Shape dealt with the viability of MOUs and gave an indication that the emphasis should be on reviewing existing instruments rather than setting up new ones. It would be advisable to know what worked well and what did not work before new instruments were negotiated. From all accounts, AEWA seemed to operate effectively, so she asked what the rationale for changing it was, what weaknesses were being addressed and what benefits the proposed changes would bring.

95. In response, Mr Chambers said that the Secretariat had tried to ensure that all documents and activities were related to the mandates from key Resolutions adopted at COP10 as well as providing a composite summary of all progress on implementing Future Shape. The Secretariat was aware of the importance of incorporating migratory species in NBSAPs and was trying to ensure that the opportunity of doing so presented by the review process was exploited to the full; to this end, the Secretariat had been in contact with the UNEP MEA focal points in the regions, and had attended the NBSAPs Global Forum in Nairobi and side events at other forums. The Executive Secretary of CBD had written to his national focal points stressing the importance of other MEAs in achieving the Aichi Targets. Regarding increasing the Convention's presence in the regions, the Secretariat was looking to enter partnerships with appropriate organizations and a member of staff was attending an IUCN meeting in Dakar for this very purpose. It was expected that the online reporting system would be

aligned with the Strategic Plan and UNEP's support for African Caribbean and Pacific countries and their data hubs was welcome. A consultant had been engaged to analyze the implications for AEWA of subsuming the Central Asian Flyway and the results would be presented to the AEWA MOP in 2015.

#### CMS/AEWA

96. Øystein Størkersen (Vice-Chair) speaking in his capacity as Chair of AEWA Standing Committee explained that the vacancy for the post of AEWA Executive Officer had been published, interviews held and a favoured candidate identified. UNEP was expected to issue the formal offer shortly and it was expected that the new incumbent would enter on duty in the New Year. Bearing in mind the outcomes of the Future Shape process, it had been decided to use the opportunity presented by the appointment of a new head of the AEWA Secretariat to re-examine the relationship between the parent Convention and the Agreement.

97. In September 2013 the AEWA Standing Committee had discussed the issue at length and had found an acceptable compromise on the way forward to maximize collaboration. The Committee's decision was reproduced in Document UNEP/CMS/StC41/14a and it invited a response from the CMS Standing Committee. Mr Størkersen said that it was impossible to foresee all possible consequences or provide definitive answers to the many questions that were raised, so no hasty or irrevocable decisions had been or would be made. A proposal would be prepared for submission to AEWA MOP6 which might include the idea of the Executive Secretary of CMS assuming the main representative role within AEWA. The period between the appointment of the new Executive Officer and the MOP could be used as a trial period with pilot schemes testing how closer cooperation between the two Secretariats over "common services" worked.

98. Mr Chambers apologized for the late publication of Document UNEP/CM/StC41/14a; this had been unavoidable given that it was written in response to the decision of the AEWA Standing Committee that had only taken place in September. He cited AEWA Resolution 5.17 which mandated the Agreement Secretariat to participate in the Future Shape process and in the broader MEA context, the Rio + 20 summit had taken forward thinking on synergies. With regard to CMS and AEWA, there were two issues. First, at present both had an Executive Secretary exercising similar functions to a great extent. There was a case for reducing the duplication by assigning the strategic role to the Executive Secretary of CMS allowing the head of AEWA to concentrate on the implementation of conservation policies. Ideas on how best to proceed with this option would be developed in the run-up to the next AEWA MOP. Secondly, most of the species listed under AEWA were also listed under CMS and the conservation issues dealt with by AEWA were also of concern to CMS. There was therefore ample scope for close cooperation in terms of day-to-day work concerning fundraising, outreach, partnerships, info management and capacity building. The period leading to the next AEWA MOP could be used for pilot projects.

99. Mr Chambers said that the proposed closer cooperation did not amount to merger of the Secretariats and the autonomy of the Agreement as an independent international treaty would be respected. CMS and AEWA would collaborate playing to their respective strengths, and savings achieved could be redirected into providing Parties better services and implementation. The model to follow was the chemicals cluster of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions. The arrangements with ASCOBANS of having the CMS Executive Secretary fulfill this function for the Agreement also worked to the satisfaction of Parties. All the Bonn-based secretariats were served by the common AFMU and acceptable cost-sharing arrangements had been devised.

100. Ms Jackson (New Zealand) welcomed the links to the Future Shape process, the attempts to increase synergy and references to the Chemicals cluster of Treaties which had just held its super-COP and might prove to be an apt model to follow. The document had been received late and this had meant that there had been insufficient time to consult other Parties.

101. Mr Biber (Switzerland) welcomed the further explanations. He was in favour of improving efficiency and greater synergies, and saw no reason to rule out full merger, but said that Parties needed

to be aware of the advantages and disadvantages, so cautioned against a rushed decision. The Future Shape process had pointed to greater cooperation between the members of the CMS Family but he had envisaged a more systematic approach based on an independent analysis of where synergies could be achieved. He had contacted the regional representative of Europe on the AEWA Standing Committee asking in vain that any decision be deferred. The decision of the AEWA Standing Committee had therefore not been reached through consensus. He also foresaw difficulties arising from the different geographical coverage of CMS, AEWA and other instruments. A step-by-step approach should be adopted, allowing Parties to assess the success of pilot schemes.

102. Mr Barirega (Uganda) shared concerns expressed by others over process but wanted the advantages of closer collaboration to be extended to other instruments such as the Gorilla Agreement. The growth of the CMS Family had been one of the main reasons for undertaking reforms under the Future Shape process.

103. Elsa Nickel (Germany) supported the idea of having a single Executive Secretary for CMS and AEWA as this would reduce duplication of effort. An AEWA Executive Officer concentrating on implementation would also mean more resources being targeted at conservation. The merged arrangements with ASCOBANS worked well and the same concerns had been voiced at the outset. Parties should aim for a win-win situation whereby CMS gained authority as it led the whole family while the instruments benefitted from being part of a greater whole. She did however suggest a cautious step-by-step approach allowing arrangements to be reversed if necessary, but felt that opportunities should be taken to increase cooperation whenever they arose rather than waiting for a grand scheme to be elaborated.

104. Ms Courouble (France) said that the number of MOUs in the CMS Family had grown without a corresponding increase in resources. Parties were facing financial constraints and NFPs had to justify the support given to MEAs. At AEWA it was noted that some parts of the programme were not being implemented, so the proposed efficiencies from having a single Executive Secretary were welcome. She suggested that a start be made on implementing some of the practical steps identified in the Future Shape process.

105. Mr Bignell (New Zealand) warned that even small-scale pilot projects might not be without difficulties and asked by what criteria the success of any experimental changes would be judged. Pilot schemes implied some form of review process, with adaptive management to alter course as required. A series of actions should be set in train leading to a discussion and decision at COP11 on how (or whether) to proceed.

106. Mr Qaimkhani (Pakistan) said that the approach being advocated seemed to strike the correct balance of seeking synergies and achieving efficiencies, while leaving options open.

107. The Chair summarized the discussion so far by saying that no Party had spoken in outright opposition. Those expressing cautious support wanted a step-by-step approach allowing results to be evaluated against predetermined criteria before any irrevocable decisions were made.

108. Nicola Crockford (BirdLife International) said that her organization took a keen interest in this issue on the grounds that both CMS and AEWA were key instruments in international efforts to conserve birds. She agreed that synergies should be sought and that pilot projects would be valuable in setting the future course. She pointed out that a consultant had been engaged to identify the correct way ahead for the Central Asian Flyway, so it would be logical and consistent to do the same for AEWA. She asked whether there were other members of the CMS Family that needed help more than AEWA; AEWA seemed to function well.

109. The Chair presented a draft Standing Committee decision and invited comments.

110. Ms Qwathekana (South Africa) reiterated her concerns that an analysis by UNEP would be useful together with a clear "road map" and that the approach should reflect the concerns of those urging caution. While synergies were desirable there seemed a risk that the process might impede

AEWA, which was already working reasonably well. Parties and staff should be fully consulted throughout.

111. Mr Biber (Switzerland) welcomed the new draft but asked that it be revised as it created the false impression that the Secretariats were not contributing anything towards implementation. In parallel to the pilot phase, an independent analysis should be undertaken to identify where synergies could be found.

112. Ms Céspedes (Chile) wanted to know what the wider benefits for the whole CMS Family would be, given that many Parties were not Range States of AEWa. Parties would require all the relevant information two months before the COP.

113. The Chair called for a drafting group to be formed to revise the draft decision. The members of this “Friends of the Chair” group were: New Zealand, South Africa, Switzerland, Chile, Ukraine and Germany with Norway as convener.

114. Mr Størkersen (Norway) reported back to the Committee highlighting the main changes made to the draft which were intended to address the concerns expressed by Parties. There was reference to the Executive Secretary seeking support from UNEP to undertake the analysis.

115. Mr Kane (UNEP) having consulted colleagues in Nairobi confirmed that UNEP was willing to fund the study into the parallels with the Chemicals Cluster and asked that the wording of the Decision make clear what action the Standing Committee was requesting. The Chair welcomed this offer.

116. Mr Barirega (Uganda) asked that it be specified who should approve the documents referred to in the third paragraph and through what procedure. The Chair said that he would give final approval after proper consultation with the Committee.

117. Mr Bignell (New Zealand) was of the opinion that the Standing Committee should in the first instance address its requests to the Executive Secretary and leave it to him to decide how to fulfill the Parties’ wishes. The Executive Secretary could engage a consultant or accept assistance from UNEP as he saw fit. However, Mr Barirega said that there were precedents for the Standing Committee to make requests of UNEP and proposed appropriate revised wording. Mr Størkersen explained that the text had been drafted before the offer from UNEP had been made and without it being known whether funds would be available for the study.

118. In response to concerns raised about how impartial UNEP’s assessment of the Chemicals Cluster merger would be, Mr Bignell said that some conflicts of interest were inevitable but it could be left to the good judgment of the Parties to assess whether the UNEP report was impartial.

#### **Decision of the Standing Committee on Synergies within the Wider CMS Family**

Referring to CMS Resolution 10.9 on the Future Structure and Strategies of the CMS and CMS Family (November 2011) and the decision adopted by the 9<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the AEWa Standing Committee (September 2013) on future collaboration with the CMS Family;

Recognizing the legal autonomy and independence of the Convention and the Agreement, in order to promote efficiency and effectiveness of both instruments and cognizant of meaningful engagements with the Secretariat;

The Standing Committee:

1. Supports the decision of the AEWa Standing Committee and instructs the CMS Executive Secretary to work closely with the AEWa Executive Officer to explore shared services in an effort to improve the conditions for the Secretariats toward strengthening implementation support. To this end, the Standing Committee requests the CMS Executive Secretary and the AEWa Executive Officer to identify current shared services and opportunities where services maybe further shared. The analysis could include elements such as: representation in international fora and other relevant activities and events; coordination of outreach efforts; fund raising and administration;

conference services; and development of implementation tools. The analysis and draft proposal are subject to approval by the Chairs of the CMS and AEWA Standing Committees before starting the pilot phase.

2. Building on the work already completed through the Future Shape process, also requests the Executive Director of UNEP to support and fund the CMS Executive Secretary to undertake additional analysis and thorough assessment of all CMS instruments regarding the benefits and disadvantages of shared services, including:
  - a. Costs and savings (human and financial resourcing) under relevant Costed Programmes of Work, where available;
  - b. Impacts on Parties and Signatories; and
  - c. Impacts on implementation support
3. Also requests the Executive Secretary to assess the pilot phase described in paragraph 1 and - together with the analysis described in paragraph 2 – submit draft documents to the Chair of the CMS Standing Committee by 1 June 2014, for circulation to the Committee. Once approved by the Committee, these documents shall be transmitted to CMS COP11 and to AEWA MOP6 for consideration.

## 15. Other International Policy Matters

119. Johannes Stahl (Secretariat) presented Document UNEP/CMS/StC41/15.1 outlining CMS activities relating to IPBES since the last CMS COP and the first session of the IPBES Plenary in Bonn.

120. IPBES had sought themes to be included in its programme of work and CMS and its daughter Agreements had made six submissions through the Chair of the Standing Committee who also was Vice-Chair of the IPBES Bureau. The six themes proposed were: the function of migratory species in ecosystems; the economics of ecosystem services provided by migratory species; protected area systems and the needs of migratory species, in particular connectivity; marine migratory species in areas beyond national jurisdiction; migratory species and climate change; and traditional knowledge and migratory birds. These submissions and those from other MEAs, Governments and NGOs were available online on the IPBES website.

121. The Multi-disciplinary Expert Panel (MEP) had met and a draft Programme of Work had been published. Two of the six priorities action areas were particularly relevant to CMS: the methodological fast-track assessment on values of biodiversity and ecosystem services and the assessment on pollination and its impact on food security. Since publication of the Standing Committee documentation, a scoping document had been submitted to IPBES for a potential migratory species assessment and it was possible that the second plenary session of IPBES in December 2013 would accept this additional activity. Capacity building was another area to be given priority attention. The Secretariat would seek support from UNEP and the IPBES Secretariat to fund the participation of the Chair of the Scientific Council and a member of staff, as it was understood that CITES received such assistance.

122. Mr Bignell (New Zealand) said that he had been closely involved in the development of IPBES and commended it for the transparent way it was conducting its business. It would be highly desirable to have migratory species assigned higher priority within IPBES and he supported the general approach of the Convention towards engaging in the new process.

123. Ms Crockford (BirdLife International) mentioned a submission in response to the greatest threat of bird extinction after albatrosses. Waterbird numbers around the Yellow Sea were declining because of the loss of their habitats. A consortium of 20 organizations including BLI, UNEP Grid-Arendal, WWF, WCS, ICF and the IUCN was proposing an assessment of the value of the ecosystem, which would provide a regional focus for a global issue. Ms Crockford sought advice on how this proposal should be progressed.



124. Mr Chambers said that consideration of which rapid assessments to undertake was well advanced but thought that this particular example might be a useful case study. After global assessments were made, regional ones would follow. CMS might propose the Yellow Sea as a regional example.

125. Mr Bignell (New Zealand) agreed that the Yellow Sea was an important staging post for migratory species, recognized by the IUCN and the EAAFP. Range States were being urged to improve their coastal management policies as bird populations were declining.

#### **Action Points**

The Secretariat would seek support from UNEP to fund CMS participation in future IPBES meetings

The Secretariat is to recommend capacity-building activities to IPBES

The Secretariat on behalf of the Standing Committee is to invite IPBES to report to COP 11 on its activities related to migratory species

## **16. Information, Outreach and Capacity Building**

### **16.1. Information Management, Communication and Outreach**

126. Veronika Lenarz (Secretariat) said that the Convention's main tools were its website, the bulletin and more recently social media (Facebook and Twitter). The "Press Room" on the website contained interviews, "Media Watch" provided links to newspaper articles of interest to CMS, and videos were available on YouTube.

127. With the help of UNEP's regional networks, the Secretariat had also placed a series of "opposite the editorial" (op-ed) articles in newspapers across the world on a variety of issues and the German economics magazine "*Wirtschaftswoche Green*" had offered to publish a regular column from the Executive Secretary.

128. An electronic publication had been produced following the Year of the Bat campaign, further volumes were added to the "Technical Series" and additional information displays were being added to the Convention's portable roll-up banners.

129. The four CMS Ambassadors promoted the Convention at appropriate events and took part in the Convention's campaigns. Of the Convention's campaigns, World Migratory Bird Day was now a regular fixture in the UN calendar and in 2013 statements of support had been received from the UN Secretary-General, the UNEP Executive Director and the German Minister of the Environment. A concert organized through CMS Scientific Council Chair, Fernando Spina, was held in Bonn (see also Agenda Items 7 and 10)

130. Natalie Epler (Secretariat) described development concerning the creation of a website for the CMS Family which was being conducted in conjunction with AEWA, ASCOBANS and EUROBATS.

131. The Online Reporting System had been launched in October and log-in credentials had been sent to all National Focal Points. Ms Epler gave a short demonstration and explained that a user guide had been posted on the CMS web page. Secretariat staff had received training from UNEP-WCMC.

132. The CMS Family database project would result in better information management and would underpin data used on the website. Direct feeding of information from the CMS Family into InforMEA would be facilitated. Ms Epler demonstrated the system showing examples of species information (publications and listings) and countries (meetings hosted, national reports, contact details and instruments signed). WCMC and CITES had launched *Species +* which had subsumed previous data systems; web feeds of CMS data would be implemented early in 2014.

133. Regarding the website, the four independent URLs would be maintained but there would be a common portal. It was expected that the new site would be launched in the first quarter of 2014. The update had been funded by the core budget of CMS, the Bonn-based Agreements and a voluntary contribution from Finland. Ms Epler gave a preview of the design of some of the pages and described the new features, which included greater use of maps and graphics, pull-down menus and easier navigation. The new site would have more material in French and Spanish.

134. Several members of the Committee expressed their approval of the new website design. With regard to Ambassadors, it was suggested that CMS seek a candidate from East Asia. Ms Lenarz said that the Secretariat was in touch with UNEP to ascertain whether CMS could use the parent organization's ambassadors, including the Chinese actor Li Bingbing. The Secretariat would have to present a draft programme. Given the difficulties of electronic communication in some places, Ms Courouble (France) asked whether an offline version of the reporting form would be available. The offline version was not yet available. Similar questions had arisen when AEWA piloted the online reporting system and would be addressed when resources were found. The European Commission and UNEP had supported the project but more funds were needed.

## **16.2. Implementation of the Capacity Building Work Plan for 2012-14**

135. Francisco Rilla (Secretariat) said that the Work Plan was based on the mandate contained in the Resolution passed at COP10 modifying the strategy adopted at COP9. One task had been to identify the principal needs of the national focal points of CMS and their equivalents under the CMS instruments.

136. Funding from the ENRTP Strategic Cooperation Agreement (SCA) between the European Commission - DG Environment and UNEP had allowed the Secretariat to develop a National Focal Point Manual for CMS and its Instruments, which was available in English, French and Spanish, and to organize a complementary training workshop in Africa in conjunction with AEWA. An interactive e-community was being established and the project was an example of how well the CMS Family collaborated. Mr Rilla gave an overview of how the Manual had come about and summarized the main features and the different chapters. A series of pre-COP workshops were foreseen for 2014.

137. Mr Rilla had participated in two workshops organized in the context of the revision of NBSAPs under CBD. These workshops had been held in Harare, Zimbabwe and Nairobi, Kenya and the importance of NBSAPs as instruments for implementing CMS and the relevance of the Aichi Targets were stressed.

### E-Community

138. Ms Epler (Secretariat) reminded the meeting that the prototype e-community which was part of the website project had been demonstrated the previous year. Considerable progress had been made and the current version was undergoing tests and minor final modifications. Ms Epler gave another demonstration showing the online version of the Manual.

139. Ms Céspedes (Chile) welcomed the good progress being made. She had participated in the initial workshop on the Manual and found the final product to be very informative and was sure that it would prove to be an invaluable training tool.

140. Florian Keil (AEWA) thanked the CMS Secretariat for having taken the lead on a number of issues of value to the wide CMS Family and for the recognition of the input from AEWA and other Agreements. There were many collaborative efforts, such as World Migratory Bird Day, in connection with which Mr Keil showed a video of the event held in Kenya.

## **17. Synergies and Partnerships**

141. Ms Cerasi (Secretariat) gave a brief presentation saying that many issues related to synergies and partnerships had been addressed under other agenda items. CMS continued its close cooperation with daughter agreements. CMS was part of the Biodiversity Liaison Group of MEAs, and active in the Environmental Management Group of UNEP and in IPBES. Existing agreements and arrangements with other organizations were being reviewed and updated, with more concrete areas of collaboration being identified while new strategic ones had been developed.

142. The Secretariat along with AEWA and BirdLife International was working on a project with IRENA, the international renewable energy agency, on the conflicts between the deployment of renewable energy technologies and migratory species. With AEWA, CMS was working with the Conservation of Arctic Fauna and Flora (CAFF) on an update of the Arctic Species Trend Index, with the United Nations World Tourism Organization on “Destination Flyways” project (see also Agenda Item 18).

143. The Secretariat also took part in a number of committees and initiatives initiated by other organizations such as the Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management, which had been set up at CITES COP16 in March 2013.

144. Mr Adams (Germany) welcomed the report and added that Germany had a particular interest in renewable energy and the more general topic of energy and would work on a draft Resolution for COP11. Germany would also seek to secure some funding for follow-up actions; other Parties interested in contributing were welcome to do so.

## **18. CMS instruments: Progress report on activities**

145. Melanie Virtue (Secretariat) presented the document which reported on work related to CMS instruments mandated under Resolutions 10.9 and 10.16. No new MOUs had been negotiated, so there were still 19 in existence, three managed by outposted offices.

### Sharks MOU

146. The Secretariat had been occupied carrying out the tasks assigned to it by the First Meeting of the Signatories including setting up the Advisory Committee. Contact was being maintained with CITES and appropriate RFMOs and current projects included a series of capacity building workshops in the Middle East organized by IFAW; the first had been held in Yemen and two more were scheduled for Egypt and the United Arab Emirates in 2014. The latest countries to join the MOU were Vanuatu and Colombia.

### Dugong MOU

147. The team in Abu Dhabi had been joined by Jillian Grayson who was attending the Standing Committee. The 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of Signatories had taken place in Manila in February 2013 and the main focus of work was preparing an application for a GEF project. Five new signatories had joined the MOU.

### Pacific Island Cetaceans MOU

148. Management plans were being developed for dolphin conservation in the Solomon Islands and for the whale sanctuary in Fiji. The University of Hawaii and the NOAA had facilitated training on strandings in Tonga and Vanuatu. The USA had signed the MOU and the Technical Advisory Group had been expanded with two American experts joining. The MOU had been cited as an example of an effective conservation instrument by both the IWC and CBD.

### Atlantic Turtles MOU

149. Following the conclusion of the arrangement with URTOMA new partners were being sought in the region to help administer this MOU. This MOU and the one dealing with West African Aquatic Mammals were prime candidates for finding synergies.

### IOSEA Marine Turtles MOU

150. This MOU was being administered through the CMS Project Office in Bangkok led by Douglas Hykle. A site network was being developed and Mr Hykle was engaging the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission on the question of bycatch.

151. A number of different instruments were concerned with similar issues: bycatch, underwater noise and marine debris and accordingly they were coordinating their efforts.

### Birds of Prey MOU

152. The first Meeting of the Signatories of this MOU had taken place in Abu Dhabi in December 2012 and the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) had been established. Five further countries had signed the MOU. The Saker Falcon Task Force had met and was cooperating closely with CITES. A new issue of concern was the extent of bird netting along the Mediterranean coast of North Africa, mainly Egypt. Although the nets targeted quails, raptors were also being caught.

153. There was good news to report on the Amur Falcon. The 40<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Standing Committee had seen evidence of the unsustainably high level of harvesting using nets in Nagaland, India. The Secretariat had written to the Indian Government which responded by seizing nets and releasing captured birds. The Nagaland Forest Department deployed two staff members assisted by NGOs and no harvesting had taken place this year. Nick Williams of the Abu Dhabi Office had been invited by the Indian Government to lead a joint technical mission accompanied by two Hungarian ornithologists, to see what was happening and to fit satellite transmitters to three Amur Falcons, with help of NGOs and to engage villagers.

### Great Bustard MOU

154. This MOU was also managed by the Signatories, with Austria, Germany and Hungary taking the lead. The 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of Signatories had been held in April 2013 in Hungary where a new Action Plan had been developed alongside a new medium-term work programme. The Meeting also agreed to extend the area covered by the MOU to include Italy, Montenegro, Serbia and the European part of the Russian Federation. The Russian Federation might sign soon.

### High Andean Flamingos MOU

155. The CMS Secretariat attended the workshop organized by the Chilean Nature Agency and Foreign Ministry had taken place in August 2013 in Antofagasta, Chile with a focus on developing an Action Plan and with representatives of Chile, Peru and Argentina.

### Siberian Crane MOU

156. The MOU benefitted from the active participation of the International Crane Foundation. The support of hunters across the species' range was being sought and the participation of President Putin in the "Flight of Hope" where Siberian Cranes were taught migration routes by following a micro-light aircraft attracted the attention of world media.

### Saiga Antelope MOU

157. The MOU was being coordinated through two NGOs on the ground in the Range States. A study on fence design had been presented at a workshop in Astana in mid-2013 to minimize the impact of the Kazakhstan-Uzbekistan border fence between on migration routes and a side event had been

organized at the CITES COP16 with the participation of representatives from China and the Chinese Traditional Medicine Association. The Saiga Resource Centre, a web-based information portal, had been launched.

#### West African Elephant MOU

158. Cooperation with CITES through the MIKE (Monitoring the Illegal Killing of Elephants) scheme had been put on hold as the funding had stopped. A new stream of finance from the EC had been secured for a wider scheme, Minimizing the Illegal Killing of Endangered Species (MIKES), dealing with not just elephants but also great apes and rhinos, so developments could be expected shortly.

#### New Initiatives

159. Ms Virtue described activities covering a number of species, habitats and threats in Central Asia and the Secretariat's cooperation with the German development agency GIZ and the Swiss Government. In collaboration with the German and Mongolian Governments a workshop on the effects of infrastructure had been held.

160. A meeting of the Central Asian Flyways Range States had been held immediately after the First Meeting of Signatories to the Raptors MOU in Abu Dhabi. The meeting's preference was for the Action Plan to be integrated into AEWA.

161. The Argali sheep (*Ovis ammon*) had been listed on Appendix II at COP10 and a gap analysis had been carried out to ascertain the best way to proceed, with a stand-alone Action Plan rather than an MOU being the option chosen for the time being. The Action Plan was currently being finalized. The Secretariat was working with CITES and TRAFFIC on policies that could allow the species to be managed through sustainable hunting. The Argali was also an important prey species of the Snow leopard.

162. Kyrgyzstan had organized a summit with all 12 Range States present along with numerous NGOs, CITES, CMS, Interpol and the World Bank. The summit had adopted a declaration and CMS had offered to assist in transboundary aspects of conservation.

163. Mr Williams (CMS Abu Dhabi) noted that recent reviews of taxonomy were likely to promote the Asian sub-species of the Houbara bustard to a species in its own right. He indicated the Abu Dhabi office was aiming to conduct a desk study of populations, population sizes and trends, threats, existing activities and a review of potential options for enhanced international cooperation for conservation and sustainable use, including the CMS draft Agreement on the Asian Houbara bustard.

164. Ms Courouble (France) said that the negotiation of new MOUs was a subject covered during the Future Shape process and it had been agreed to put the development of new instruments on ice pending the results of a study on the effectiveness of existing ones. Existing resources were insufficient to allow the current instruments to be administered properly, yet there still seemed to be plans to cover more species.

165. Mr Bignell (New Zealand) noted that it was planned to develop an Action Plan for the Argali sheep without an MOU and he suggested that this might be a faster and less resource-intensive way forward. He requested that the Secretariat table a paper at the COP on conclusions drawn from the ongoing assessment of MOUs and their viability. Some hard choices might mean that some cherished instruments might be abandoned.

#### **Action Point**

The Secretariat to table a paper at the COP on conclusions drawn from the study of MOUs and their viability

## Agreements

### Wadden Sea Seals

166. Sascha Klöpffer (Common Wadden Sea Secretariat) explained that the Agreement had been signed in 1991 by Denmark, Germany and the Netherlands in response to the 1988 epidemic which together with the outbreak in 2002 had halved the area's Harbour seal population, which had now recovered to 40,000. There were also 4,000 Grey seals. The German and Dutch sectors of the Wadden Sea had been included on the UNESCO World Heritage List and the Danish sector would be added.

### ASCOBANS

167. Mr Heredia (Secretariat) said that the ASCOBANS Advisory Committee had met in Warsaw in September, where the Action Plans for the three sub-regions were discussed and where it was agreed to extend the ASCOBANS/ACCOBAMS Joint Working Group on underwater noise to include CMS as well. A workshop on underwater noise would be organized to take place during the European Cetacean Society's Annual Conference in 2014. The Agreement would also participate in the 2014 "WhaleFest" in Brighton, UK.

### Gorilla Agreement

168. Andrea Pauly (Secretariat) reported that six of the ten Range States were Parties to the Agreement but both Angola and Uganda were in the process of acceding. In accordance with the Agreement's Resolution 2.4, the Interim Secretariat was overseeing the development of the Action Plans. An IUCN Action Plan for the Cross River Gorilla (*Gorilla gorilla diehli*) had been elaborated at a meeting in Cameroon in February 2012 attended and partly funded by CMS.

169. The Agreement did not have its own Trust Fund and since it had entered into force only a third of the contributions from Parties had been received. Only part of the budget adopted could be met by Party contributions, the remainder of the funding needing to come from donors' voluntary contributions.

170. Mr Barirega (Uganda) welcomed the positive news regarding accessions and asked whether the Secretariat could become involved in the trilateral arrangements between Uganda, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Rwanda.

### AEWA

171. Mr Lenten, the Acting Executive Secretary of AEWA, reported that Gabon, Morocco, Swaziland, Côte d'Ivoire and Burkina Faso had become Parties. The Agreement had engaged a consultant based in Cameroon who was coordinating activities in Africa. She had recently visited Botswana and run a workshop in Cape Town, South Africa for focal points from southern and eastern Africa. Another workshop would be held in 2014 in Dakar, Senegal. France had provided a voluntary contribution to support implementation of the Plan of Action for Africa, and Swaziland and Uganda had been identified as sub-regional lead countries for southern and eastern Africa respectively.

172. The annual World Migratory Bird Day campaign continued to grow with a record number of registered events in 2013. The theme for 2014 would be tourism linking to the "Destination Flyways" project being run by the UN World Tourism Organization.

173. A number of International Single Species Action Plans had been developed; a meeting had recently taken place in Finland to draft one for the Taiga Bean-goose (*Anser fabalis*). Excessive bird netting in North Africa was to be the subject of a meeting with representatives from Egypt and Libya immediately after the Standing Committee.

## EUROBATS

174. Andreas Streit (Executive Secretary, EUROBATS) reported that Cyprus and Switzerland had joined the Agreement and Israel might do so soon and would then become the first Party from the extended Agreement Area. EUROBATS was working with the rest of the CMS Family on the new website. The Agreement's project funding scheme had proved to be successful, and voluntary contributions had enabled projects to be supported. A joint species Action Plan was being developed with the European Commission which would benefit non-EU Parties too.

### **19. Conservation Issues**

175. Mr Heredia (Secretariat) opened his presentation by describing the CMS Small Grants Programme, which had been funded over the triennium by UNEP. US\$200,000 had been allocated in the first tranche to 12 projects (one concerning Humpback whales had been cancelled due to security concerns in Mozambique) and a further US\$100,000 was about to be awarded. Species covered by the successful projects included several species of bird, Saiga antelopes, Snow leopards, whales and sturgeons.

176. With funding from the European Commission and the French *Fonds français pour l'environnement mondial* for Sahelo-Saharan antelopes, Niger has declared a protected area in the area of Termit tin Toumma, for which a Management Plan was being drawn up. The CMS Secretariat and the IUCN Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation were developing a regional strategy for Cuvier's gazelle in Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia.

177. Regarding ecological networks and Resolution 10.3 a project was being undertaken on migration in the corridor between Ethiopia and South Sudan with the financial support of Norway. In April 2013 a number White-eared kobs and elephants had been fitted satellite transmitters.

178. Connectivity was high on the agenda at the meeting of the Chairs of the Scientific and Advisory Bodies (CSAB) held in Italy in October. The CSAB had been followed by a one-day meeting on avian taxonomy, the Scientific Council strategy and planning meeting and the first ever workshop held in Italy on the economic value on migratory species. These meetings had been facilitated by Fernando Spina with the support of the Riviera d'Ulisse Natural Park and the regional authority of Lazio.

179. Membership of the Flyways Working Group established by Resolution 10.10 had been reviewed and the terms of reference renewed. It was envisaged to hold a workshop in Jamaica to develop an Action Plan for the Americas in conjunction with WHMSI.

180. On climate change and Resolution 10.19 the Secretariat was working with the COP-appointed Councillor, Colin Galbraith. A dedicated group of interns was being recruited and a workshop was being planned to take place in Costa Rica in April 2014 with the financial support of Germany and Monaco.

181. Resolution 10.27 on African-Eurasian Migratory Landbirds was being implemented through a Working Group chaired by Olivier Biber and a coordinator based in Accra funded by BirdLife International. See also Agenda Item 19.1 for a full report on activities.

182. A workshop on bird poisoning had been held in Tunis in conjunction with the Bern Convention. This was part of the implementation of Resolution 10.26 and considered guidelines on insecticides, lead, poisoned bait, rodenticides and veterinary drugs.

183. A study had been commissioned on invasive alien species and the draft review was now available on the Scientific Council workspace. There were plans for a draft resolution to be tabled at the COP.

184. A review was being undertaken of marine debris, the subject of Resolution 10.4 with funding from Australia. New codes of conduct would have to be devised.

185. On underwater noise (Resolution 10.24) CMS was now the third co-convenor of the joint working group with ASCOBANS and ACCOBAMS. Voluntary guidelines were being developed.

186. Some species were being considered for addition to the CMS Appendices and the proposals were circulating in the appropriate taxonomic and regional working groups of the Scientific Council. There were suggestions that the Polar bear (*Ursus maritimus*) should be included because of the threat posed by climate change to the Arctic sea-ice. The parties to the Agreement on the Conservation of the Polar Bear would be meeting in Moscow in December and CMS would attend. Other proposals concerned Cuvier's beaked whale (*Ziphius cavirostris*) which was being discussed by ACCOBAMS and the Tibetan antelope (*Pantholops hodgsonii*), which migrated between India and China.

### **19.1 Draft Action Plan for African Eurasian Migratory Landbirds.**

187. Mr Biber (Switzerland) reported on the progress achieved by the Working Group on African Eurasian Migratory Landbirds established by Resolution 10.27 which had been charged with drafting an Action Plan and of which he was the chair.

188. The Working Group had met in Accra in September 2012 and following this meeting the draft Action Plan had been revised and recirculated for comment. Drafts of the Plan and the accompanying annexes were available in English and French and the Standing Committee was urged to encourage all stakeholders to provide feedback; Arabic and Russian translations would be highly desirable if resources allowed. Mr Biber said that some work could proceed while the draft was being finalized and consideration was being given to how the plan would be implemented, with the options being a stand-alone arrangement, a modular approach, an MOU or linkage to an existing instrument such as AEW. The Landbirds Action Plan complemented AEW and the Raptor MOU which covered approximately the same geographic area but different bird families. A scientific meeting was foreseen for 2014 and an offer had been received by one of the Working Group members, Franz Bairlein of the Institute of Avian Research to host it in Wilhelmshaven. Mr Biber concluded his remarks by thanking the other members of the Working Group for their support, the Coordinator Samuel Temidayo Osinubi, the Ghanaian Government for hosting the meeting and donors, including the Swiss Government.

189. Ms Crockford (BirdLife International) raised the case of the Yellow-breasted Bunting (*Emberiza aureola*), which, following an 80 per cent decline, had been re-categorized by the IUCN from Vulnerable to Endangered. She drew parallels with the situation highlighted at the previous meeting of the Standing Committee regarding Amur Falcons in Nagaland. The birds were being hunted in China for food and to be stuffed and used as mascots. Ms Crockford suggested that the species be considered for a single species action plan under the African-Eurasian Landbird initiative and as a vehicle to establish bilateral and multilateral contacts in East Asia. She asked the Standing Committee to issue a statement and set in train appropriate actions.

### **20. Date and Venue of the 42<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the Standing Committee**

190. Mr Lenten (Deputy Executive Secretary) said that there were neither plans nor resources to hold another inter-sessional meeting of the Committee. The 42<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the Committee would therefore take place immediately before COP11 in Ecuador.



## **21. Any Other Business**

191. Ms Qwathekana (South Africa) suggested that to help with fund-raising the Secretariat should produce a two-page summary of all the projects for which voluntary contributions were being sought. This overview would complement targeted requests for funds.

## **22. Concluding remarks**

192. The Chair expressed his thanks to his Vice-Chair, the Secretariat, to the German Government for the evening reception and for having provided interpretation for the meeting, to the interpreters who had agreed to work longer than originally intended, and to all participants for their constructive engagement. The meeting was declared closed at 19:38.

## 41<sup>st</sup> Meeting of the Standing Committee

*Bonn, 27-28 November 2013*

UNEP/CMS/StC41/2.1/Rev.1

### PROVISIONAL AGENDA AND DOCUMENTS

<b>Opening Remarks and Organizational matters</b>			
1.	Opening Remarks and Introductions		No document
2.	Adoption of Agenda and Schedule		
	2.1	Provisional Agenda and Documents	StC41/2.1/Rev.1
	2.2	Annotated Agenda and Schedule	StC41/2.2
3.	Adoption of the Rules of Procedure		StC41/3
4.	Adoption of Draft Report of CMS Standing Committee Meeting		
	4.1	40 <sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Standing Committee	StC41/4.1
<b>Reports</b>			
5.	Depositary		StC41/5
6.	Standing Committee		
	6.1	Standing Committee members	StC41/6.1.a to 6.1.z
	6.2	Observers	StC41/6.2.a to 6.2.z
7.	Chairman of the Scientific Council		StC41/7
8.	UNEP		StC41/8
<b>Administrative and Budgetary Matters</b>			
9.	Financial and Human Resources		
	9.1	Report on the Implementation of the CMS Budget during the Triennium 2012 – 2014	StC41/9.1/Rev.1
	9.2	Costed programme of work for 2012-2014	StC41/9.2/Rev.1
	9.3	2013 Report on CMS Activities in North America	StC41/9.3/Rev.1
<b>Strategic and Institutional Matters</b>			
10.	Resource Mobilization		StC41/10
11.	Working Group on COP and StC RoP and Res/Rec retirement		StC41/11
12.	Organization of COP11		
	12.1	COP11 Provisional agenda	StC41/12.1

	12.2	COP11 Hosting	No document
13.		CMS Strategic Plan Working Group	StC41/13
14.		Future Structure and Strategies of CMS and CMS Family	StC41/14
15.		Other Strategic Matters	
	15.1	IPBES	StC41/15.1
<b>Implementation of the Convention</b>			
16.		Information, Outreach and Capacity Building	
	16.1	Information and Outreach	StC41/16.1
	16.2	Capacity Building	StC41/16.2
17.		Synergies and Partnerships	StC41/17
18.		CMS Instruments	StC41/18
19.		Conservation Issues	StC41/19/Rev.1
	19.1	Landbirds Action Plan	StC41/19.1
<b>Concluding items</b>			
20.		Date and Venue of the 42 <sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the Standing Committee	No document
21.		Any Other Business	No document
22.		Concluding Remarks	No document

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS/LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS/LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES  
CMS 41<sup>ST</sup> STANDING COMMITTEE**

---

**Ghana**

(Chairman/Président/Presidente)

Mr. Alfred Oteng-Yeboah  
National Biodiversity Committee Chair  
Council for Scientific and Industrial  
Research  
Ghana Forestry Commission  
P.O. Box M32  
Accra  
Ghana  
Tel: (+233) 244 77 2256  
Fax: (+233) 21777 655  
Email: alfred.otengyeboah@gmail.com

**Norway/Norvege/Noruega**(Vice-Chairman/Vice-président/Vice-  
Presidente)

Mr. Øystein Størkersen  
Principal Advisor  
Norwegian Environment Agency  
P.O. Box 5672 Sluppen  
N-7485 Trondheim  
Norway  
Tel: (+47 735) 80500  
Fax: (+47 735) 80501  
Email: oystein.storkersen@miljodir.no

**MEMBERS/MEMBRES/MIEMBROS****AFRICA/AFRIQUE/ÁFRICA****Ghana**

Mr. Nana Kofi Adu-Nsiah  
Executive Director  
Wildlife Division  
Ghana Forestry Commission  
P.O. Box MB 239  
Near Gimpa Achimota  
Accra  
Ghana  
Tel: (+233) 244 107 143  
Email: adunsiah@yahoo.com

**Tunisia/Tunisie/Túnez**

M. Khaled Zahzah  
Sous Directeur de la chasse et des Parcs  
Nationaux  
Direction Générale des Forêts  
30, rue Alain Savary  
1002 Tunis  
Tunisie  
Tel: (+216 71) 786833  
Fax: (+216 71) 794107  
Email: khaledzahzah2000@yahoo.fr;  
[khaledzahzah@yahoo.fr](mailto:khaledzahzah@yahoo.fr)

**Uganda/Ouganda**

Mr. James Lutalo  
Commissioner Wildlife Conservation  
Ministry of Tourism, Wildlife and Heritage  
Plot 6/8 Parliamentary Avenue  
P.O. Box 7103  
Kampala  
Uganda  
Tel: (+256) 77587807  
Fax: (+256) 414341247  
Email: jlutalo@mtti.go.ug;  
lutaloj@yahoo.com

Mr. Akankwasah Barirega  
CMS Scientific Counselor for Uganda  
Ministry of Tourism, Wildlife and Antiquities  
Plot 6/8 Parliamentary Avenue  
Kampala  
Uganda  
Tel: (+256) 414 31242  
Email: abarirega@tourism.go.ug  
cc: akankwasah@gmail.com

## **ASIA/ASIE/ASIA**

### **Pakistan/Pakistán**

Mr. Abdul Munaf Qaimkhani  
Deputy Inspector General (Forests) /  
Conservator Wildlife  
Planning Commission, Planning and  
Development Division, Government of  
Pakistan, Islamabad  
Enercon Building, G-5/2  
44000 Islamabad  
Pakistan  
Tel: (+92 51) 9245585  
Fax: (+92 51) 9245598  
Email: amqaimkhani@yahoo.com

## **SOUTH & CENTRAL AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN/AMERIQUE DU SUD ET CENTRALE ET CARAÏBES/ AMÉRICA DEL SUR Y CENTRAL Y EL CARIBE**

### **Chile/Chili**

Sra. Nancy Céspedes  
Jefa Departamento Recursos Naturales  
Dirección de Medio Ambiente  
Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores  
Teatinos N° 180  
Santiago  
Chile  
Tel: (+56 2) 827 4718  
Fax: (+56 2) 380 1759  
Email: ncespedes@minrel.gov.cl

### **Cuba**

Sra. Lourdes Coya de la Fuente  
Especialista  
Dirección de Medio Ambiente, Ministerio  
de Ciencia, Tecnología y Medio Ambiente  
Ministerio de Ciencia, Tecnología y Medio  
Ambiente  
Habana  
Cuba  
Tel: (+537) 2049460  
Fax: (+537) 8668054  
Email: lourdes@citma.cu

## **EUROPE/EUROPE/EUROPA**

### **Poland/Pologne/Polonia**

Ms. Monika Lesz  
Counsellor to the Minister  
Ministry of Environment  
Wawelska 52/54 Stv  
00-922 Warszawa  
Poland  
Tel: (+48 22) 5792667  
Fax: (+48 22) 5792730  
Email: [monika.lesz@mos.pov.pl](mailto:monika.lesz@mos.pov.pl)

Mr. Grzegorz Rąkowski  
Assistant Professor  
Institute of Environmental Protection  
Krucza 5/11  
+48 22 833-42-41 ext. 40  
Email: groza1@ios.edu.pl

### **Ukraine/Ucraina**

Mr. Volodymyr Domashlinets  
Head of Fauna Protection Division  
Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources  
of Ukraine  
Urytskogo str., 35  
3035 Kiev  
Ukraine  
Tel: (+380 44) 206 31 27  
Fax: (+380 44) 206 31 27  
Email: domashlinets@menr.gov.ua,  
vdomashlinets@yahoo.com

## **OCEANIA/OCEANIE**

### **New Zealand/Nouvelle-Zélande/Nueva Zelandia**

Mr. Andrew Bignell  
Strategic Partnerships Manager  
Department of Conservation  
18-22 Manners Street  
P.O. Box 10420  
6173 Wellington  
New Zealand  
Tel: (+64) 4713191  
Email : abignell@doc.govt.nz

Ms. Wendy Jackson  
Senior International Partner Liaison  
Department of Conservation  
Manners Street  
P.O. Box 10420  
6143 Wellington  
New Zealand  
Tel: (+64) 44713106  
Fax: (+64) 43813057  
Email: Wendy.Jackson@mfat.govt.nz

## **DEPOSITARY/DÉPOSITAIRE/DEPOSITARIO**

### **Germany/Allemagne/Alemania**

Ms. Elsa Nickel  
Deputy Director General, Directorate  
Nature Conservation  
Federal Ministry of Environment, Nature  
Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU)  
Robert-Schumann-Platz 3  
53175 Bonn  
Tel: (+49 228) 3052605  
Fax: (+49 228) 3052684  
Email: elsa.nickel@bmu.bund.de

Mr. Edward Ragusch  
Desk Officer  
Federal Ministry for the Environment,  
Nature  
Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU)  
Robert-Schuman-Platz 3  
53175 Bonn  
Tel: (+49 228) 99 3052663  
Fax: (+49 228) 99 3052684  
Email: edward.ragusch@bmu.bund.de

Mr. Gerhard Adams  
Head of Division  
Federal Ministry for the Environment,  
Nature  
Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU)  
Robert-Schuman-Platz 3  
53175 Bonn  
Tel: (+49 228) 99 3052631  
Fax: (+49 228) 99 3052684  
Email: gerhard.adams@bmu.bund.de

Mr. Sönke Hansen  
Trainee  
Federal Ministry of Environment, Nature  
Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU)  
Intern  
Robert-Schumann-Platz 3  
53175 Bonn

Mr. Oliver Schall  
Deputy Head of Division  
Federal Ministry for the Environment,  
Nature  
Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU)  
Robert-Schuman-Platz 3  
53175 Bonn  
Tel: (+49 228) 99 3052632  
Fax: (+49 228) 99 3052684  
Email: oliver.schall@bmu.bund.de

Mr. Hans-Christian Stotzem  
Trainee  
Federal Ministry of Environment, Nature  
Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU)  
Intern  
Robert-Schumann-Platz 3  
53175 Bonn

## OBSERVERS

### Party Observer

#### **Ecuador/Équateur**

HE Jorge Enrique Jurado Mosquera  
Ambassador  
Embassy of Ecuador in Germany  
Joachimstaler Str. 12  
10719 Berlin  
Germany  
Tel: +49 (0)30 8009695  
Email: eecualemania@mrrree.gob.ec

Mr. Fernando Bucheli  
Minister of the Embassy  
Embassy of Ecuador in Germany  
Joachimstaler Str. 12  
10719 Berlin  
Germany  
Tel: +49 (0)30 8009695  
Email: eecualemania@mrrree.gob.ec  
[fbucheli@hotmail.com](mailto:fbucheli@hotmail.com)

Mr. Christian Sevilla  
Chief Conservation and Restoration of  
Insular Ecosystems  
Galapagos National Park Directorate  
Av. Charles Darwin S/N,  
ec200350  
Puerto Ayora, Santa Cruz  
Ecuador  
Tel: (+593) 05 2526189  
Fax: (+593) 05 2526190  
Email: csevilla@galapagos.gob.ec

#### **France**

Mme Marianne Courouble  
Chargée de mission "Affaires  
internationales"  
DGALN/DEB/SDPEM,  
Ministère de l'Ecologie, du Développement  
Durable  
Arche sud  
92055 La Défense cedex  
Tel: (+33 1) 40813190  
Fax: (+33 1) 40817471  
Email:  
[marianne.courouble@developpement-durable.gouv.fr](mailto:marianne.courouble@developpement-durable.gouv.fr)

#### **Philippines/Filipinas**

Ms. Carolina A. Constantino  
Political Attaché  
Embassy of Philippines in Germany  
Uhlandstrasse 97  
10715 Berlin  
Tel: +49 (0)30 864950-28  
Fax: +49 (0)30 8732551  
Email: caroldfa08@gmail.com

#### **South Africa/Afrique de Sud/Sudáfrica**

Ms. Nopasika Malta Qwathekana  
Senior Policy Advisor, International  
Biodiversity and Heritage  
Department of Environmental Affairs  
Private Box X447  
0001 Pretoria  
Tel: (+27 12) 3103067  
Fax: (+27 12) 3201714  
Email: mqwathekana@environment.gov.za

Ms. Humbulani Mafumo  
Deputy Director Conservation  
Management  
National Department of Environmental  
Affairs  
Private Bag X447  
0001 Pretoria  
Tel: (+27 1) 2 310 3712  
Fax: (+27 8) 6 541 1102  
E-mail: hmafumo@environment.gov.za

#### **Non-Party Observer**

#### **Brazil/Brésil/Brasil**

Mr. Andre Tenorio Mourao  
First Secretary  
Ministry of External Relations  
Embassy of Brazil in Berlin  
Esplanada dos Ministérios - Bloco H  
70.170-900  
Brasilia – DF  
Tel: +493072628241  
Fax: +493072628320  
Email: andre.mourao@itamaraty.gov.br

## **Chairs**

### **Scientific Council**

Mr. Fernando Spina  
Senior Scientist  
ISPRA - Istituto Superiore per la Protezione  
e la Ricerca Ambientale  
Via Cà Fornacetta, 9  
40064 Ozzano Emilia (BO), Italy  
Tel: (+39 051) 65 12 214; (+39 347) 35 07  
032  
Fax: (+39 051) 79 66 28  
Email: fernando.spina@isprambiente.it

### **Landbird Working Group (AEMLWG)**

Dr. Olivier Biber  
Chair of the African-Eurasian Migratory  
Landbird Working Group (AEMLWG)  
International Biodiversity Policy Advisor  
Gruner AG  
Sägerstrasse 73  
3098 Köniz,  
Switzerland  
Tel: (+41 31) 917 2009  
Fax: (+41 31) 917 2021  
Email: olivier.biber@gruner.ch

## **IGO**

### **CITES**

Mr. David Morgan  
Scientific Services Team  
CITES Secretariat  
Maison Internationale de l'environnement  
Chemin des Anémones, 11-13  
1219 Châtelaine-Genève,  
Switzerland  
Tel: +41 22 917 8123  
Fax: +41 22 7973417  
Email: david.morgan@cites.org

### **UNEP/PNUE/PNUMA**

Mr. Mamadou Kane  
Programme Officer/MEAs Liaison  
United Nations Environment Programme  
United Nations Avenue, Gigiri  
P.O. Box 30552  
100 Nairobi  
Kenya  
Tel: (+254 20) 762 5046  
Email: mamadou.kane@unep.org

Mr. Bakary Kante  
Director  
Division of Environmental Law and  
Conventions (DELIC)  
United Nations Environment Programme  
(UNEP)  
United Nations Avenue, Gigiri  
P.O. Box 30552  
100 Nairobi  
Kenya  
Tel: (+254 20) 7624011  
Fax: (+245 20) 7623927  
Email: bakary.kante@unep.org

## **NGO**

### **Bird Life**

Ms. Nicola J. Crockford  
International Species Policy Officer  
RSPB - BirdLife International  
Wellbrook Court, Girton Rd  
CB3 0NA Cambridge  
United Kingdom  
Tel: (+44 1 767) 693072  
Fax: (+44 1 767) 68 3211  
Email: Nicola.crockford@rspb.org.uk

### **IFAW**

Mr. Peter Püschel  
Director  
International Environmental Agreements  
International Fund for Animal Welfare  
Geranienweg 8  
35396 Giessen  
Germany  
Tel: +49 641 25011 586  
Fax: +49 641 25011 587  
Email: ppueschel@ifaw.org

### **WAZA**

Mr. Gerald Dick  
Executive Director  
WAZA (World Association of Zoos and  
Aquariums)  
IUCN Conservation Centre  
Mauverney 28  
Gland  
Switzerland  
Tel: (+41 22) 9990792  
Fax: (+41 22) 9990791  
Email: gerald.dick@waza.org



### **Whale and Dolphin Conservation**

Ms Astrid Fuchs  
Campaigns and Projects Manager  
WDC - Whale and Dolphin Conservation  
Implerstrasse 55  
81371 München  
Mob: +49 (0)176 99244144  
Email: astrid.fuchs@whales.org

### **Migratory Wildlife Network (connected by Telephone)**

Dr. Margi Prideaux  
Policy and Negotiations Director  
Migratory Wildlife Network  
Berrymans Road (RSD 426 Newlands  
Service)  
5223 Gosse  
Australia  
Tel: (+61 8) 8121 5841  
Fax: (+61 8) 8125 5857  
Email: margi@wildmigration.org

### **CMS Agreements and MOUs/Accords et Mémorandum d'Entente de la CMS/ CMS Acuerdos y Memorandos de Entendimiento**

#### **AEWA**

UNEP/AEWA Secretariat  
Platz der Vereinten Nationen 1  
53113 Bonn, Germany  
Tel: (+49 228) 815 2455  
Fax: (+49 228) 815 2450  
Email: aewa@unep.org

Mr. Bert Lenten  
Officer in Charge  
Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2407  
Email: blenten@cms.int

Mr. Sergey Dereliev  
Technical Officer  
Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2415  
Email: sdereliev@unep.de

Mr. Florian Keil  
Information Officer  
Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2451  
Email: fkeil@unep.de

#### **Common Wadden Sea**

Mr. Sascha Klöpffer  
Deputy Executive Secretary  
Common Wadden Sea Secretariat  
Virchowstrasse 1  
26382 Wilhelmshaven  
Germany  
Tel: +49 4421 910814  
Fax: +49 4421 910830  
Email: kloepfer@waddensea-secretariat.org

#### **EUROBATS**

UNEP/EUROBATS  
Platz der Vereinten Nationen 1  
53113 Bonn, Germany  
Fax: (+49 228) 815 2445  
Email: eurobats@eurobats.org

Mr. Andreas Streit  
Executive Secretary  
Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2420  
Email: [astreit@eurobats.org](mailto:astreit@eurobats.org)

## UNEP/CMS Secretariat / Secretariat PNUE/CMS / Secretaría PNUMA/CMS

UNEP/CMS Secretariat  
Platz der Vereinten Nationen 1  
53113 Bonn, Germany  
Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2401  
Fax: (+49 228) 815 2449  
Email: secretariat@cms.int

Mr. Bradnee Chambers  
Executive Secretary  
Tel: (+49 228) 815 2410  
Email: bchambers@cms.int

Mr. Bert Lenten  
Deputy Executive Secretary  
Acting Head of Terrestrial Species team  
Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2407  
Email: blenten@cms.int

Mr. Marco Barbieri  
Scientific Adviser  
Tel: Tel.: (+49 228) 815-2498  
Email: mbarbieri@cms.int

Ms. Laura Cerasi  
Associate Programme Officer  
Fundraising and Partnerships  
Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2483  
Email: lcerasi@cms.int

Ms. Natalie Epler  
Associate Information Officer  
Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2428  
Email: nepler@cms.int

Mr. Borja Heredia  
Head of Avian Species team  
Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2422  
Email: bheredia@cms.int

Ms Aline Kühl-Stenzel  
Associate Programme Officer  
Terrestrial Species  
Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2419  
Email: Akuehl-stenzel@cms.int

Ms. Veronika Lenarz  
Senior Public Information Assistant  
Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2409  
Email: vlenarz@cms.int

Mr. Bruce Noronha  
Administration and Fund Management Officer  
Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2496  
Email: bnoronha@cms.int

Ms. Andrea Pauly  
Associate Programme Officer, Sharks  
Tel: (+49 228) 815-2477  
Email: apauly@cms.int

Mr. Francisco Rilla  
Coordinator Capacity Building  
Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2460  
Email: frilla@cms.int

Mr. Johannes Stahl  
Associate Technical Officer  
Implementation Support  
Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2436  
Email: apauly@cms.int

Ms. Monika Thiele  
Associate Programme Officer  
Tel: (+1 202) 9741309  
Email: monika.thiele@unep.org

Mr. Robert Vagg  
Report Writer  
Tel: (+49 228) 815 2476  
Email: rvagg@cms.int

Ms. Melanie Virtue  
Head of Aquatic Species team  
Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2462  
Email: mvirtue@cms.int

**CMS Abu Dhabi Office**  
c/o Environment Agency  
Al Mamoura, PO Box 45553  
45553 Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates  
Fax: +971 2 4997252

Mr. Lyle Glowka  
Executive Coordinator  
Tel: +971 6934 472  
Email: lglowka@cms.int

Mr. Nick Williams  
Programme Officer - Birds of Prey (Raptors)  
Tel: +971 6934 624  
Email: nwilliams@cms.int

Ms. Jillian Grayson  
Associate Programme Officer  
Tel: +971 6934 312  
Email: jgrayson@cms.int

## **INTERPRETERS/INTERPRÈTES/INTÉRPRETES**

Ms. Caroline Bechthold

Ms. Angelika Haarkamp

Ms. Nina Uhrig-Hammerstein

Ms. Beatrice Mandeau

Ms. Vivian Puhlman

Ms. Katharina Suntrup