



Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS)

Secretariat provided by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

Report of the 26th meeting of the CMS Standing Committee

Bonn, 17-18 July 2003

Agenda Item 1: Opening Remarks

1. The Chair, Mr. Lee-Bapty (United Kingdom), opened the meeting. He thanked the German Government for having provided excellent facilities and interpretation services. He also thanked the Secretariat for having produced and provided the documentation for the meeting, and he thanked the participants for their presence.

2. Mr. Flasbarth (Director, Nature Conservation Department, Environment Ministry, representing the Host Government) welcomed the participants and expressed the pleasure of the German Ministry of Environment and the City of Bonn to regularly host the meetings of the Standing Committee. This was the first meeting since COP7 in September 2002. The 25th anniversary of the Bonn Convention in 2004 would be a good time to find new Parties to the Convention. He announced that the German Government will financially support a Junior Professional Officer in 2003-04 and that this person would provide financial and administrative support to the CMS Agreements Unit. Mr. Flasbarth also announced that the German Cabinet had decided to make available the former Parliament buildings in Bonn to the UN as a centre for all of its activities in Bonn.

3. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht (CMS Executive Secretary) welcomed the participants (list at Annex 1) and thanked the German Ministry of Environment for their commitment to regularly host the Standing Committee meetings, as was the case two years earlier, in providing the meeting venue, organization and hospitality as well as the interpretation. This was not all. In 2002 alone, they also welcomed the Seventh Meeting of the CMS Conference of the Parties and the Second Session of the AEWMA Meeting of Parties. Besides the present meeting, the German Government had also welcomed in Bad Godesberg the Tenth Meeting of the ASCOBANS Advisory Committee in 2003. The Executive Secretary hoped that CMS would celebrate the Convention's 25th Anniversary in Bonn in 2004, perhaps in connection with the next meeting of the Standing Committee. He drew attention to the provisional agenda of the meeting (CMS/StC26/1/Rev.1) and enumerated the issues raised in the provisional annotated agenda and meeting schedule (CMS/StC26/2).

Agenda Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda, Work Schedule and Rules of Procedure

4. Mr. Glowka (CMS Agreements Officer) introduced the revised document list (CMS/StC26/3/Rev.1). The revision included the new documents that had been circulated to the Standing Committee just prior to the meeting (CMS/StC26/5/Add.1 - Update on Headquarters Agreement; CMS/StC26/8/Add.3 - Argentina Contributions; CMS/StC26/12/Add.2 - GROMS; CMS/StC26/13/Add.1 - South Pacific Marine Mammal Conservation Workshop; CMS/StC26/Inf.7.4 - UNEP/UNON Information; and CMS/StC26/Inf.11 - Reservations since COP7). Under this agenda item were the revised agenda, the annotated agenda (CMS/StC26/2) and the rules of procedure (CMS/StC26/Inf.10).

5. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht noted that the rules of procedure, once adopted, were valid until revision was requested. No revision had been requested, thus the existing rules of procedure remained in force. There was no objection. The Executive Secretary proposed that some items would be best addressed in a closed session reserved for Contracting Parties participating in the meeting. Observers would be requested to leave the room. There was no objection to his proposal. Finally the Executive Secretary noted that the Secretariat would report on new developments under existing agenda items.
6. The Depository proposed moving its report from agenda item 11 to agenda item 4. It was so agreed.
7. Finally, the Chair requested that all interventions by participants should concern developments since COP7. They should not repeat the content of the documents.
8. The agenda and the meeting schedule were adopted as amended.

Agenda Item 3: Secretariat report on inter-sessional activities since COP7

9. The Secretariat's report, as was past practice, was embodied in the CMS Bulletin 17. As an update, Mr. Glowka announced that, subsequent to the issuance of the Bulletin, three new Parties joined the Convention: Syria, the Ivory Coast and Belarus. The last country joined only in September 2003.
10. Mr. Powell (Representative of Oceania) noted that on page 30 of Bulletin 17, a correction should be made concerning the South Pacific Marine Mammal Conservation Workshop to the effect that Australia and New Zealand were the only countries "with capitals in the South Pacific region".
11. Mr. Streit, EUROBATS Executive Secretary, announced that Belgium became a new member of his Agreement on 13 June 2002.

Agenda Item 4: Reports from Standing Committee members and Observers

12. Mr. Williams (Representative of Europe) reported on the membership of two CMS Agreements. The Aquatic Warbler MoU was concluded in Minsk in April 2003. The competent authorities from nine Range States had signed the MoU in Minsk. At the time of the Standing Committee Meeting ten of 15 Range States had signed the MoU in total. He also noted that Spain and the United Kingdom were close to ratifying the Albatross and Petrels Agreement. The European Great Bustard would be the subject of a meeting in Hungary at the beginning of October 2003. Thanks to a contribution (25,000 pounds) made by the UK to the IOSEA Secretariat through CMS, information materials, including a Web site, were being developed for Indian Ocean and South East Asian turtles as well as the MoU. A study of turtle habitats in Kenya was also being supported. Regarding research, a list was being established of international and regional organisations involved with by-catch. The AEW Technical Committee would be meeting in Scotland beginning of April 2004. The UK may issue a contract by year-end to pull together in a study the latest research on what effects climate change has had on migratory species. He noted that the UK and the Netherlands will host the Global Flyway Conference in Edinburgh from 3-8 April 2004, reviewing the last 40 years' progress on waterbird conservation and management. He concluded by announcing the next meeting of the CMS Scientific Council would be held in Scotland in 2004.

13. Dr. Domashlinets (Representative of Europe) announced Ukraine's signing of the Aquatic Warbler MoU. He also mentioned some of the outcomes of the Environment for Europe Ministerial Meeting in Kiev, namely a resolution on biodiversity including activities in the European ecological network, the official signing of the Carpathian Convention and the Black Sea ecological corridor project under GEF. He also reported that the Ukrainian Parliament adopted on 9 July 2003 a Law on Ukraine's accession to ACCOBAMS.

14. Mr. Ankouz (Standing Committee Vice Chairman; Representative of Africa) referring to his written report (CMS/StC26/Inf.7.3) announced that the Second Sahelo-Saharan Conference on Antelopes had been held in Agadir, Morocco, from 1-5 May 2003. Among other things participants reviewed progress since 1998, revised and updated the Djerba Action Plan for the 14 countries concerned and discussed possibilities for further implementation activities. He mentioned that institutionalised co-operation would be welcomed as well as supporting the projects in the region. In Guinea, information was being collected on marine turtles, as well as on cetacean species, for which financial help was required. In Senegal, there was ongoing research on birds and pooling of efforts on marine turtles.

15. Mr. Koyo (Representative of Africa) reported that national committees had been formed for Egypt, Kenya, Tanzania and South Africa to establish directives about the shooting of birds. Protection was needed from targeting migratory birds. The situation of bats was being examined in Tanzania, but there was little activity elsewhere in the sub-region. Regional collaboration was being organised under the umbrella of CMS for waterbirds through AEWA, Ramsar and regional economic coordination instruments such as the East African Community, ECOWAS, COMESA. Education and awareness were being emphasised. Other national and cross-border action plans were being undertaken for mountain gorillas, African elephants, zebras and marine mammals. Where problems were encountered, emergency or rapid response committees were being established.

16. Ms. Cespedes (Representative of the Americas and the Caribbean) described the efforts of Chile and Peru on Humboldt penguin and Marine turtle conservation since 2002 under two CMS sponsored projects. The Albatross and Petrels Agreements had been ratified by Ecuador. Uruguay had not ratified because of problems with unpaid contributions to United Nations organisations, but would nonetheless organise a conference on albatrosses and petrels. An informal technical meeting on marine species had been held in Argentina.

17. Mr. Prasad (Representative of Asia) explained that a legal protection programme in two sites for marine turtles, controlled by the Sri Lankan Government Department of Wildlife Conservation and by the private sector, had been set up. Also, a protected area for bird nesting sites had been established within the protected area under the Sri Lanka's flora and fauna protective ordinances. Some difficulties had been caused by drought.

18. Mr. Powell (Representative of Oceania) noted that Oceania's participation was well covered in the reports. He proposed to address the substance of agenda item 11 found in Documents CMS/StC26/13 and 13/Add.1 instead. A workshop had been held in Apia, Western Samoa, in March 2003. Eleven Range States participated. The recommendations were found in the documentation before the Standing Committee. Recommendations 3 and 4 called for CMS to participate in a further workshop in Apia by December 2003. This would bring together CMS Parties, non-Parties, stakeholders and the CMS Secretariat. The first workshop, mainly brought together technical and other experts; the second workshop should bring together a broader audience including decision makers. The CMS Secretariat's participation was essential. CMS, he noted, should become more involved with marine mammals in

this area. In terms of the meeting's cost CMS, he proposed, should cover one third of the costs, the rest being assumed by Australia and New Zealand.

19. The Chair reacted to this intervention with a procedural proposal that provisional conclusions would be made for each activity that carried financial implications. At the end of the meeting the financial questions would be reviewed and decisions would be taken. It was so agreed.

20. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht noted that CMS was regularly represented at the International Whaling Convention (IWC). He also noted that three global treaties: IWC, the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) and CMS all have mandates dealing with cetaceans. IWC had difficulty taking proactive conservation decisions because of the "three quarters rule". Australia and New Zealand supported a whale sanctuary in the South Pacific region. In the Berlin IWC meeting held in June 2003, the proposal failed for lack of a sufficient majority. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht said that the proposed workshop would be a good exercise not just for whales, but also for CMS since there was no membership from the South Pacific. He went on to say that CMS/StC26/13 indicated that up to US\$30,000 in extra-budgetary funds were available from carry-over balances for purposes of the workshop, but that an accurately costed concept would be needed from the organisers. Experience gained from the development, conclusion and implementation of ASCBANS and ACCOBAMS could help develop an Agreement to establish the sanctuary and rules in the South Pacific, an example which might lead to more Parties in the region joining the Convention.

21. The Chair agreed that the substance of the Australian proposal was in line with the views of COP. The Standing Committee could enable the will of COP to be done. Mr. Ankouz recalled the need to find funding to be able to accept the proposal, however, in principle, he supported the initiative. The representative from the UK also supported the proposal and reported that it had been lobbied by Parties not present.

22. Mr. Adams (German CMS Focal Point) agreed that the proposal was important and reflected the views of COP7. He agreed with the Secretariat that the Bonn Convention could attract new members.

23. Ms. Céspedes supported the proposal, but wondered about the financial implications. The Chair replied that they would be covered. The Standing Committee agreed to support the proposal in principle, leaving the financial question to the end of the meeting.

24. Mr. Bulir (Representative of the Depository) announced that Syria (82nd Party), Ivory Coast (83rd Party) and Belarus (84th Party) had joined the Convention. Bolivia, Denmark and Norway had lodged reservations. The German Foreign Office was contacting other countries about acceding to the Convention.

25. He further reported that Germany was a Party to four regional Agreements and a Signatory to two Memoranda of Understanding. Within ASCOBANS Germany was working to improve the conservation status of small cetacean species in the North and Baltic Seas (Jastarnia Plan), by examining submarine sonar signal disturbances and undertaking research projects on small cetaceans' avoidance of fishing nets.

26. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht asked for assistance in and advice from the Standing Committee on recruiting new Parties to the Convention in the regions, thus strengthening the role of CMS. Standing Committee members have the responsibility to specifically report on membership developments with regard to CMS and the Agreements negotiated under its auspices. He made a proposal for a study as to how the Standing Committee's role in encouraging CMS membership could be strengthened. The

Chair agreed that it was part of the role of the Standing Committee, but it was decided to postpone the treatment of the issue until the next Standing Committee.

27. Mr. Rotich (Representative of UNEP), referring to his prepared report (CMS/StC26/Inf.7.4) stated that the Executive Director was interested in providing more support to CMS. UNEP had to work more with CMS in the future, especially in with regard to building stronger ties to regional offices. UNEP had agreed to providing financial assistance to the recently completed CMS Sahelo-Saharan Antelopes Meeting and in the publication of a CMS report on small cetaceans.

28. The Chair acknowledged the support CMS had received from UNEP and added that he looked forward to future extended collaboration with UNEP, especially in administrative, financial and project matters.

29. Mr. O'Sullivan (Representative of BirdLife International), referring to his written report, pointed out that document CMS/StC26/Inf.7.1 had reported on developments since COP7. The illustrated article mentioned in the report on CMS had now been published. A future study was being planned on Asian birds and bird habitat conservation, and what governments can do to cooperate. It refers to recommendations regarding CMS, including supporting the listing of additional bird species and joining CMS as a Party.

30. Dr. Boere (Representative of Wetlands International) announced that the first technical meeting between WI, CMS and AEWA under the new Joint Work Programme had resulted in the development of a series of project proposals. A workshop would be organised, with the close co-operation of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, in Chile in October 2003 on flyways at the Seventh Neotropical Ornithological Congress. It was hoped that the meeting would be the occasion to promote CMS as an instrument for flyways in Latin America. Wetlands International had re-started its programme on waterbird harvesting. Wetlands International had also developed draft terms of reference for a new fresh water fish specialist group. The Global Flyways Conference was scheduled for 3-8 April 2004 in Edinburgh. A new WI office in Washington had been opened to promote flyway co-operation and had terms of reference to promote CMS. Wetlands International had just recruited as database officer a former CMS intern. This recruitment was expected to facilitate synergies with respect to data management, in particular linkages between WI databases and GROMS.

Agenda Item 5: Institutional Matters

Item 5.1: Headquarters Agreement and Secretariat international juridical personality

31. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht introduced document CMS/StC26/5 (Headquarters Agreement and Secretariat International Juridical Personality). He added that an update was provided in CMS/StC26/5/Add.1 which transmitted a letter from the German Minister for the Environment to CMS and UNEP, acting on behalf of the United Nations Organisation, in which supplemental information is provided on the status of the German Government's ratification process. The same document provided a note verbale from the Office of the UNEP Executive Director to CMS and Germany notifying them that UNEP had ratified the Agreement. CMS COP7 had earlier endorsed the Agreement. He noted that because it was an international agreement the Headquarters Agreement could be registered in the United Nations Treaty Series and that UNEP will be invited to initiate registration once the Agreement had entered into force.

32. Mr. Adams (German CMS Focal Point) said that the German Government was enthusiastic about its signing of the Agreement in 2002. The Agreement would provide the Secretariat with significant rights within Germany and his country would ratify the Agreement as soon as possible. The Agreement had been adopted by the upper house of the German Parliament. The lower house was presently considering it. It was hoped that the Agreement would enter into force in late 2003 or by early 2004.

Item 5.2: CMS 25th Anniversary and Communications Concept

33. Mr. Glowka introduced two documents. CMS/StC26/6 (CMS 25th Anniversary) proposed a concept for CMS's upcoming 25th Anniversary in 2004. CMS/StC26/6/Add.1 (CMS Communications Concept) proposed a comprehensive communications concept, strategy and programme. Work on the 25th Anniversary was initiated first, when it was realised that, because it was at heart a communications event, to be most effective, the 25th Anniversary would need to be nested within a broader communications concept as a sub-component of the concept's implementation programme. Both the 25th Anniversary concept and the broader communications concept, would increase CMS' global visibility. He noted that both concepts could be funded from existing and extra-budgetary sources. He invited Ms. Pauls (Associate Information Officer) to provide a presentation on the communications concept.

34. Ms. Pauls recalled that the 25th Anniversary was a unique opportunity to take stock of CMS achievements and look to the future to introduce new communication tools and core materials, including a basic restructuring of the CMS Web site. The communication concept was a comprehensive approach to develop targeted material and was a foundation for future communications-related activities. It includes a situation analysis, an action-oriented strategy in the short and medium-term and a concrete work programme for 12 months, mainly covering the update of existing tools. Medium term (5 years) aims of the strategy comprised setting of standards for harmonised communication tools; involving Parties, Agreements and NGOs; and co-operating with other Conventions and private corporations. In the long run, the concept should help with the recruitment of new Parties and improve the Convention's implementation.

35. The Chair invited the Standing Committee to consider and endorse the communications concept and the 25th Anniversary proposal. He asked the Secretariat about the financial implications of the proposals. Ms. Pauls noted that one third of the funding would come from unspent money in the Secretariat's existing information and capacity unit (US\$64,173) with the remaining two-thirds coming from Trust Fund reserves. Fundraising, including from private sources, would decrease Trust Fund participation.

36. Mr. Adams emphasised that it was important for CMS to produce comprehensive information materials. He said that the communications concept should try to raise the awareness of different stakeholders and the public. CMS benefits should be highlighted. Some existing brochures needed to be updated, but he questioned whether this required as comprehensive an approach as a communications concept. Parties and non-Parties should be the key stakeholder target groups. Raising NGO awareness in those countries was also important. The general public was less important as a target group, as it did not support CMS *per se*.

37. Mr. Koyo supported the proposal as important and pertinent for global convention communication. CMS progress and achievements should be emphasised. Non-Parties and new members should be shown what they could realise from the Convention. There was a need for a special "target package" for countries that are not yet Parties. In Africa, he said, there was a lack of information about CMS and its impact. It was critical to make this information available.

38. Dr. Domashlinets believed that there was a need for specific examples of CMS activities and their economic benefits. He suggested that there should be an international day of migratory species in connection with the 25th Anniversary.

39. Mr. Powell associated himself with the German remarks. He questioned whether this was the appropriate time to be considering a communications concept, given the obvious financial considerations. Most of the funds focus on the 25th Anniversary anyhow. The communications concept could wait and should be considered by COP8.

40. Ms. Céspedes found the communications concept too ambitious for financial reasons, as some countries, in particular Latin America, had difficulty paying assessed contributions. There was a need to focus work, emphasise closer co-operation and demonstrate how to fulfil Convention obligations.

41. Mr. Williams suggested focusing on the 25th Anniversary, the communications concept being a larger issue that should be studied by COP8.

42. Professor Galbraith (Scientific Council Chair) found the presentation and the ideas to be excellent. He indicated that the CMS materials must carefully consider the target audience. He also emphasised that the materials ultimately produced should not neglect the animals themselves.

43. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht noted that the key element in gaining more personnel support from UNEP was how much money the Secretariat actually spent. This provided the basis for UNEP to return the 13 % overhead costs, in things such as increased personnel capacity. At the same time COP7 sent the message that the CMS Secretariat was not busy enough spending money. He said that he foresaw the 25th Anniversary as an important vehicle to update CMS's information materials and raise the profile of CMS worldwide. He said as well that the Secretariat is increasingly invited to contribute to major events around the world, and has been invited to participate in activities in Oceania, Latin America and the Caribbean and Asia, organising training courses for stakeholders. The Secretariat is constantly restricted in its ability to participate in these events when it does not have the proper materials to contribute, including training materials.

44. The communications concept was to produce the materials used in such training: core materials, special materials, training materials for promoting CMS' work. He asked the Standing Committee to please tell the Secretariat what it wanted. He suggested creating a working group at this meeting to create a usable proposal.

45. The Chair suggested that an alternative would be to ask the Secretariat to redraft the proposals, with the main focus on the 25th Anniversary. The Chair stated that the alternative to the working group would be to submit it to the next COP.

46. Ms. Pauls observed that the communication concept had no special focus on recruiting new members. It was a question of how CMS presented itself first and foremost. Potential members were at other conferences, and could be approached by presenting well-designed materials, perhaps in the context of side events done in the margins of, for example, CITES and CBD.

47. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht recalled that meetings or events could be held in the margins of IUCN, CITES and CBD, informally, but this was difficult to accomplish because there was always competition from better-financed organisations who offer hospitality. The papers before the Standing Committee were the result of several months' work. He reiterated that the working group approach was preferable.

48. It was agreed that Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean, Germany, Oceania and the Secretariat would make up the working group. It would report back to the Standing Committee. Germany was asked to chair the working group.

49. Germany, as chair of the Working Group, reported the Working Group's conclusions. The communications concept was so important that it should be discussed at the next COP. It was decided unanimously that the Standing Committee was not the right body to take such a decision. The 25th Anniversary should be celebrated adequately and Parties should be invited to plan events to produce a global effect. The Secretariat should be free to issue documents and to organise events to promote the Convention. The benefits of CMS for migratory species and the benefits that CMS membership brings in comparison to other conventions should be emphasised. Parties and key partner organisations should be invited to support 25th Anniversary events financially or in-kind.

50. Concerning 22 May 2004, International Biodiversity Day, the Standing Committee decided to contact the CBD with the request to designate migratory species as the theme to draw attention to migratory species as an important global component of biodiversity, and to CMS's 25th Anniversary as well.

51. The Chair welcomed the transmittal of the communications concept to the next COP. He briefly summarised the Working Group's conclusions: efforts should be concentrated on the 25th Anniversary; the Secretariat should have financial flexibility to promote the Convention and its successes; Parties and related organizations should do their utmost to promote CMS as indicated above.

52. Mr. Adams said documents should focus on benefits of participating in CMS.

53. Mr. Koyo warned that such materials should not be too general. The Secretariat and the regions should collaborate on this. Mr. Ankouz stressed the need to emphasise that CMS is an important, effective instrument. The CBD must be convinced of CMS' importance, as CMS is an operative instrument that serves to support the CBD's implementation. The Chair announced that the course of action as explained by Germany and as summarised by him had been adopted. The financial implications of the decision would be considered later in the meeting.

Item 5.3: Co-operation with Other Bodies and Processes

54. Mr. Glowka introduced document CMS/StC26/7 (Cooperation with Other Bodies and Processes). He noted that this document was an adaptation of information presented in the Secretariat's report on the Strategic Plan (CMS/StC26/9). He explained that COP7 had approved a post for a new Inter-Agency Liaison Officer. Recruitment would begin at the end of 2003. Entry on duty was foreseen for 2004.

55. Professor Galbraith noted that there was growing need to develop a scientific dialogue between the biodiversity-related conventions. Scientific liaison between the Secretariat, CBD, Ramsar and others, as such, was not yet established. He suggested that the issue should probably be addressed by the next Scientific Council meeting and the COP. He wondered whether perhaps UNEP might have a key role in facilitating this. Mr Rottich took note. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht said such was in place for the bigger comprehensive conventions.

56. The Executive Secretary also noted that the CMS Secretariat had been approached to co-fund an IWC meeting on whales and environmental degradation planned for Spring 2004 at the University of

Siena. He requested the Standing Committee to give its favourable opinion on the availability of extra-budgetary funds from the CMS Trust Fund.

57. Mr. O’Sullivan recalled that the NGOs mentioned in the document were committed to working with the Convention. An increased commitment should be sustained with something more concrete and formal before the next COP.

58. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht expressed his appreciation for the support of BirdLife International and that of other NGOs. He highlighted that the relationship with Wetlands International was advancing with the Joint Work Programme and that he foresaw the need to concretise the NGO support in the development and implementation of CMS Agreements. He noted that one area the Secretariat was exploring was “outsourcing” day-to-day secretariat work and other functions under MoU to, for example, Birdlife (bustards and aquatic warblers), Wetlands International and other well-established organisations based on the successful model developed for the Siberian Crane MoU with the International Crane Foundation. He informed the Committee that he was preparing the conclusion of an MoC with BLI, following the example of the Ramsar Bureau, and to conclude under this umbrella Letters of Agreement for BLI’s secretariat work to implement selected CMS MoU. The Chair noted that slow staff recruitment or replacement argued for outsourcing some functions.

59. The Chair summed up that it was agreed that financial support for the 2004 cetaceans and environment meeting in Italy would be contingent on the availability of unspent funds. It was further agreed that the Standing Committee endorsed action taken by the Secretariat regarding collaboration with other organisations.

Agenda Item 6: Review of current status of contributions to the CMS Trust Fund, CMS budget and resources

Open session

Income and expenditure report (2001-2002)

60. The Administrative/Fund Management Officer, Ms. Kanza, explained that mandatory current contributions stood at 95.04% at the end of May 2003. Some Parties were still paying previous arrears. After payment, there was a time lag (via New York, Nairobi and Bonn) before these could be shown as paid. Expenditures as of May were 78.19%. Earmarked contributions changed from time to time, based on the UN scale. Voluntary member and non-member contributions for specific activities were often used for travel costs for members who might not come otherwise. In reply to questions concerning broad use of the expenditure item to include Agreements, and content of the largest item (UNON services), it was agreed that the Standing Committee was to obtain answers to those questions. In reply to a question from the representative for Africa, Ms. Kanza noted that the largest item was for COP7, which had more participants than COP6. The Chair asked why the expenditure was charged to the Secretariat, rather than part to the Agreements.

Carry-over balance

61. These were funds actually available in the CMS bank account. The document explained the process, which was extensively debated in COP7. US\$700,000 is presently available for investment and activities.

Impact of the Euro

62. Several conventions have asked the United Nations to examine the Euro impact. It was relevant for members to know how things stood; details were summarised in the document so that Parties could take decisions and communicate them to the Secretariat. The Euro could go up or down. The Parties could shift from the US dollar, but the result might be worse.

63. Mr. Streit recalled that since the present budget was agreed, the dollar had lost more than 25%, resulting in much less funds for the programme. New budget proposals have been increased and may lead to budgeting in Euros in 2004.

Income and expenditure (2003)

64. The income should be taken up in the closed session. It was agreed to note it.

Extra-budgetary resources

65. Mr. Adams requested information about Table 2(a), column c, in document CMS/StC26/8/Add.2, in which it was indicated that the Standing Committee Chair had approved allocations of US\$200,000. He asked whether there was a common understanding on how financial decisions were taken between meetings of the Conference of the Parties. It was the Standing Committee which should have been taking these decisions, as the Chair had no rights or authority to make them. His decision was between April and the present. Why was the Standing Committee not consulted? Ms. Kanza had provided much information, but some explanations were missing, specifications lacked. What projects and sources of funds were involved in the budget, the Trust Fund?

66. The Chair recalled that the COP decisions did not cover everything the Secretariat was required to do. The Antelope meeting in North Africa could not wait. All of these items were urgent. Funding was available from carryover balances from the previous period.

67. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht confirmed the Chair's report. Estimates had been given to the COP with UNON support so that others would be able to plan. Wetlands International had requested a binding commitment for the Flyway conference in Edinburgh; the Parties could have been asked, but there would have been no result in time. Rule 13 gave the Chair the possibility to take urgent decisions; confirmation by the Standing Committee was required. GROMS, the Antelope, Great Bustard and South Pacific meetings were looked after in time, with refunding foreseen later.

68. Mr. Adams disagreed with the interpretation of the Rules of Procedure. US\$200,000 was a large sum, despite urgency, and should have been taken up at the next COP. There was a need for a clear decision on defining responsibilities of the Chair in those cases where a decision was urgent and could not wait.

69. The Chair, on behalf of the Standing Committee, asked the Secretariat to prepare draft rules to be considered at the next Standing Committee to be submitted to the COP in 2005. Future chairs should have clearly delineated authority. An explanation of the urgency would have been desirable, but the Secretariat had only limited time to prepare this meeting. The items in Table 2 (a) should be treated for decision by the Standing Committee as those in Table 2 (b). The IUCN item should be reviewed.

70. Mr. Powell appreciated the difficult situation of the Secretariat and the Chair between COPs and favoured new directions. In order for him and his government to better understand the documents, he asked which of the urgent decisions were priorities and what were the criteria for priorities.

71. The Chair replied that justification was given, but not priority, as money was available in carry-over balances. The degree of urgency varied; the Antelope meeting was very urgent. Did the Oceania representative want detailed information?

72. Mr. Powell thought it helpful to have a description of each of the items. The marine mammal meeting was documented and should have been in Table 2 (b). A general priority list should be established and requests so classified. At the request of the Chair, Mr. Powell presented, "Draft proposed criteria for assessing extra-budgetary decisions between COPs" (not in a particular order):

- the activity leads to a conservation gain;
- a range of activities that focus on a range of species (marine & terrestrial);
- prioritizing activities that cross regions rather than focus on a particular region;
- priority given to species listed for concerted action (Appendix I) and for cooperative actions (Appendix II);
- supporting activities in regions that encourage increased participation in CMS by states from the region to be supported.

73. Mr. Koyo stated that activities included in or deriving from a work plan as set up by the COP should be subject to financial allocations in this context. The Secretariat and Chair could have the authority to handle work plan activities flexibly.

74. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht recalled that the work plan derived from several decisions of the COPs. All this together produced an overview to take initiatives, often only depending on and reacting to outside elements. Flexible activity was the dynamic of the Convention. The authority to act was available, otherwise the Secretariat would find itself making a more bureaucratic implementation of Parties' requests.

75. The Chair had been seized with a request from Oceania for a budget line explanation of Tables 2 (a) and 2 (b). Professor Galbraith noted that much of the discussion related to work of the Scientific Council. Mr. Adams referred to COP discussions on the information management plan. Table 2 (b) should take account of that.

76. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht noted that work on an information management plan was a long-term activity. The Secretariat was waiting for an information officer who would take that responsibility.

77. Replying to a request of clarification from Professor Galbraith, Dr. Marco Barbieri, CMS Scientific and Technical Officer, explained that in the case of the elaboration of the Strategy of the Scientific Council the Standing Committee was not requested to grant additional funding, but authorization to use the already allocated funds earlier than expected in the COP-approved budget, as most amounts were needed earlier than foreseen.

78. The Chair requested details on Tables 2 (a) and 2 (b) from the Secretariat.

Temporary assistance

79. Ms. Kanza recalled that none was provided by COP. US\$7,000 was insufficient; replacement of a staff member cost US\$12,000.

Staff overtime

80. There was no budget line, but there was a need to meet costs.

Hospitality

81. US\$500 was insufficient, even for the Standing Committee.

Wind Turbine Study

82. Dr. Barbieri noted that COP7's Resolution 7.5 instructed the Scientific Council to assess existing and potential threats from offshore wind turbines in relation to migratory mammals and birds, and to develop specific guidelines for the establishment of such plants. The requested resources were meant to subcontract the preparation of a background paper to be submitted to the 12th Meeting of the Council.

Cetaceans Legal Study

83. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht recalled that the need for the legal study derived in part from the Conference of the Parties listing additional cetacean species at its Seventh Meeting. It was apparent that these and other listings on the CMS Appendices created increasing potential for overlap between CMS, IWC and CITES. He suggested that a study should be commissioned on legal competence (among other things).

Global Register of Migratory Species (GROMS)

84. Mr Müller-Helmbrecht explained that the Host Government had handed GROMS over to the CMS Secretariat in September 2002, following the end of their project which supported GROMS' research and development. The funding requested would make it possible to continue with the mandate given by the Conference of the Parties as attempts had failed to get the funding required from other sources.

CBD/CMS Joint Work Programme Revision

85. Mr. Glowka recalled that the recently endorsed CBD/CMS Joint Work Programme applied to the years 2002-2005. Early in 2003 the CMS Secretariat had seen the need to secure a consultant to begin revising the joint work programme in anticipation of the CBD COP's meeting in February 2004. Subsequent to the Chair's approval of the allocation, the CBD Secretariat confirmed that it would prefer to begin work on the revision after its COP. Notwithstanding this, Mr Glowka recommended that an allocation was still required to ensure that the work could go ahead in 2004 before the next CMS Standing Committee meeting.

Impact Assessment

86. Mr Glowka explained that that the Conference of the Parties at its Seventh Meeting had adopted Resolution 7.2. This resolution *inter alia* requested the Scientific Council to review existing

international guidance, identify gaps and if necessary develop further guidance. The extra-budgetary money requested would be used to hire a consultant to make an input in the next.

IUCN World Congress

87. Mr Glowka explained that this item concerned the representation of migratory species themes during and before the IUCN World Congress. It was raised when the Secretariat's conceptualisation of the 25th Anniversary needs was still in its very early stages. The funds were foreseen for indicative activities such as side events at the Congress or co-operation with the IUCN communications department in the run-up to the Congress. The item was considered as a component of the planned 25th Anniversary activities.

Website

88. Mr Glowka pointed out that before the Secretariat developed its conceptualisation of the 25th Anniversary activities it had already foreseen some necessary basic restructuring and updating of the CMS website, too. In the course of developing the 25th Anniversary activities, website issues were then incorporated.

Great Bustard Range State Meeting

89. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht noted that at its Seventh Meeting the CMS COP had allocated for 2004, under budget line 3309, US\$30,000 for a Great Bustard Range State meeting. The Secretariat had requested, and the Standing Committee Chair had approved, reallocating the money to 2003 in anticipation of the meeting taking place in Hungary in 2003, one year earlier.

Marine Turtles

90. Dr. Barbieri explained that this item concerned support for the Second Mediterranean Conference on Marine Turtles. The first conference in Rome (2001) had been jointly organized by CMS and the Secretariats of the Bern and Barcelona Conventions. It had been very successful. Similar collaborative arrangements were being developed by the three conventions for organizing the second event, scheduled in late 2004. The amount requested was expected to cover basic travel costs of sponsored participants and the publication of the conference proceedings.

91. The Chair asked if there were any further questions on Table 2 (a). Mr. Ankouz noted that the CMS Secretariat had given the Standing Committee sufficient information. He stated that the Standing Committee needed to provide more flexibility and discretion to support the Secretariat and the Chair. It was decided to approve the items in Table 2 (a). The Chair asked the Standing Committee if they required explanations for Table 2 (b). He invited the Secretariat to provide the explanations.

Official Missions, Supplies, Post and Courier, Miscellaneous and Bank Charges

92. Ms. Kanza explained, with regard to staff travel, air travel costs had increased; additional travel costs were covered by the UK and Germany. The regional office in Bangkok required more official travel under the former Deputy Executive Secretary. Also supplies, post and courier, miscellaneous and bank charges could not be covered without extra funds.

93. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht noted that it might be necessary to request more travel funds for the second half of the year.

Database on CMS projects

94. Dr. Barbieri observed that the Secretariat had to manage in parallel a relatively high number of conservation projects, at different stages of development. Project management implied different actions from different offices in the Secretariat. The Secretariat had also to compile information on projects for different occasions and contexts particularly to fulfil reporting requirements of the COP, Standing Committee and the Scientific Council. The proposed database was aimed at assisting the Secretariat in the day-to-day management of projects, as well as in the storage of documents and basic information on projects.

UNCCD/CMS MoU/Joint Work Programme

95. Mr. Glowka explained that a large number of CMS Appendix I and II species were found in dry and sub-humid areas subject to desertification and drought and that the CMS Secretariat was interested in entering into a memorandum of cooperation with the UNCCD Secretariat. A consultant had been found at the end of 2002 to research the complementarities between CMS and UNCCD, provide a possible draft joint work programme between the fora and propose some joint activities. There was a need to better integrate migratory species considerations into the national desertification planning processes and that the money requested would support a pilot study in a country at the community level.

Electrocution Study

96. Dr. Barbieri referred to the COP Resolution 7.4 on Electrocution of Migratory Birds, which requested the Secretariat to collect more information with respect to collisions and electrocutions on electricity transmission lines of railway infrastructure and other relevant issues. A consultant or subcontract was needed to compile information in a report, to be submitted to the Scientific Council for technical review and eventually disseminated to the Parties.

GROMS

97. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht referred to the need for an additional US\$50,000 in 2004 to continue with the operationalisation and implementation of GROMS.

Agreement development and servicing

98. Mr. Glowka referred to budget line 3210 and COP Resolution 7.11. He explained that the Secretariat was faced with ever-increasing requests to develop and then service CMS Agreements. The money requested would provide money to inter alia initiate and adopt various MoU, to provide seed money for projects under their respective action plans and to outsource selected coordination-related activities to other organisations.

CMS Strategic Plan Meeting

99. Mr Glowka explained that a process was underway to revise the CMS Strategic Plan. Switzerland was chairing a working group. A first draft had been produced and would be the subject of discussion by the Steering Committee later in the meeting. The COP did not provide funding for any activities related to the Strategic Plan. While this item had yet to be discussed, the Secretariat wanted at minimum to provide the Standing Committee with the basis to fund a facilitated working group meeting to support the work on the Strategic Plan if it was found to be desirable to have such a meeting later on.

100. The Chairman invited questions and comments on the Secretariat's presentation.

101. Regarding the communications concept and the 25th Anniversary, Mr Adams noted the working group came to the conclusion that the Secretariat should concentrate on the 25th Anniversary instead of implementing the entire concept. The US\$79,100 budgeted for 25th Anniversary activities as one component of the communications concept should be increased to roughly US\$100,000 to cover also travel costs and overheads. The US\$57,875 and US\$6,298 already available for 2003 and 2004 from COP7 approved budget shown in table 2 (b) should therefore be supplemented by US\$36,000 additional extra-budgetary funds. Consequently, US\$18,000 additional extra-budgetary funds should be allotted for 2003 and US\$18,000 for 2004.

102. Mr Adams further explained that the working group came to the conclusion that the Secretariat should be given the freedom to use this money as they deem fit for this celebration, including development of information material.

103. Mr Müller-Helmbrecht said the communications concept could be gutted if financed at the level that Mr Adams had proposed. Mr Adams said that there seemed to be a misunderstanding. The working group considered the communications concept as very important and that it should be presented to the next COP for consideration.

104. The Chair recalled that the Committee agreed already earlier that the question of the communications strategy itself should be referred to the COP and that the short-term efforts for the celebration of the 25th Anniversary should be the subject of new figures to be inserted into table 2(b).

105. Mr Müller-Helmbrecht noted that the communications concept included a short-term strategy and programme. The short-term measures were meant to be in place for the 25th Anniversary, not anticipating the COP long-term strategy to be prepared by the new Information Officer. The 25th Anniversary was considered a vehicle for introducing new information material. The money proposed by Germany was insufficient to prepare 25th Anniversary activities.

106. As to the proposal concerning the Information Management Plan suggested by Mr Adams, Mr Müller-Helmbrecht said that in annex I to resolution 7.11 of the last COP it was noted "projects to be financed by voluntary contributions and/or trust fund surplus". The new Information Officer, once recruited, would have to see what needs to be done in order to implement the Information Management Plan and would have to go and seek voluntary contributions first.

107. Regarding the 25th Anniversary, the Chair recalled that the Committee accepted the recommendation of the working group that using the 25th Anniversary as a lever for updating the full range of information material was not appropriate because it involved expenditure on the updating of material that should be subject of decision from a COP. However, an appropriate figure for the recognition of the 25th Anniversary not tied to the updating of the full range of CMS material would be needed. Germany proposed an additional US\$18,000 for 2003 and US\$18,000 for 2004, added to the funds available from the approved budget, as well as to the US\$6,000 for the IUCN World Conservation Congress and the US\$6,000 for the website in table 2(a).

108. Mr Powell said the summary of the Chair was quite accurate. He said he hoped the Secretariat would make the marking of the 25th Anniversary a success that encourages non-Parties to join and focuses on benefits for species and Parties. He said increasing the US\$79,100 originally budgeted for 25th Anniversary activities as component of the communications concept up to roughly US\$112,000,

including the items from table 2 (a), would allow some flexibility. Therefore he endorsed Germany's proposal.

109. Ms Céspedes confirmed this and supported Germany and Oceania.

110. The Chair asked the Secretariat to reflect and come back with a new proposal for a different sum for 25th Anniversary activities for the final discussion on financial consequences of the decisions from this meeting. Mr Powell agreed.

111. The Chair pronounced the figures of tables 2 (a) and 2 (b) provisionally adopted pending the consultation of Mr. Powell with his capital in Australia and with the proviso that the proposed figures for the 25th Anniversary could be subject to any reconsiderations the Secretariat may ask for at the final decision on financial matters. He also proposed a summary of lessons learned from the session notably: (1) the Standing Committee needs explanations from the Secretariat as to why additional financial resources are requested; (2) criteria and/or rules are needed to guide how the Chair should address extra-budgetary requests from the Secretariat between Standing Committee meetings, keeping in mind the need to build in adequate flexibility to appropriately react to requests that are proposed; and (3) the Secretariat's explanations of the projects and initiatives behind the extra-budgetary requests made indicate that the Secretariat knows what it is doing.

(Argentina contributions, arrears of contributions, sponsorship and personnel were discussed in closed session. The report is found in Annex 1 and is subject to restricted distribution to Standing Committee members)

Administrative arrangements

112. Document 8/Add.1 showed developments since COP7, an information document including the approved budget, contributions, expenditures, and contributions at 31 May 2003. Document 8/Add.2 showed extra-budgetary resources, especially new activities since COP7. Document 8/Add.3 was considered in the closed session. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht called for terms of reference to show how the Convention was functioning, its relationship to UNEP and UNON and was to see the UNEP Executive Director for that purpose before holding discussions with the Convention and Agreements. A proactive decision was needed for a 5-person common services unit. The Chair made it clear that the Standing Committee should be informed on the UNEP-UNON relationship as it affected the Convention. This will be the subject of an external study.

Agenda Item 7: Implementation of the CMS Strategic Plan (2000-2005)

113. Mr. Glowka introduced the Secretariat's report on the implementation of the CMS Strategic Plan (CMS/StC26/9). He noted that documents CMS/StC26/9/Add.1 (Report of the Open-ended Strategic Plan Working Group) and CMS/StC26/9/Add.2 (2010 – The Global Biodiversity Challenge: A Possible CMS Contribution to Defining the Target and Measuring the Achievement) were also before the Standing Committee. He suggested that the Standing Committee first address implementation of the current strategic plan, then the development of revised strategic plan, and finally, the 2010 target which was one issue that the new strategic plan will need to address.

Implementation of the Current Strategic Plan

114. With regard to the implementation of the existing strategic plan, Mr. Glowka noted that there had been some developments since the Secretariat had finalised and submitted its report to the Standing Committee that he would like to report on. The Andean flamingo project had been launched. The Letter of Agreement for a project on the Lesser White-fronted goose had yet to be finalised. At its recent General Assembly the International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC) adopted a resolution which emphasised the need for coordinated conservation action and public education and awareness measures for the Lesser White-fronted goose. The resolution also urged international bodies to advise on priority conservation measures. The Siberian Crane MoU Range State meeting had been postponed until 3-4 October in Moscow.

115. The 2nd International Congress on Chelonian Conservation, where CMS was represented by Jacques Fretey, adopted two relevant resolutions. European countries were invited to sign the African Atlantic Coast Marine Turtles MoU and FAO was invited to collaborate in MoU implementation through the Sustainable Fisheries and Livelihoods Programme.

116. Regarding the Houbara bustard, the CMS Secretariat was still in contact with the lead country over the finalisation of the Agreement, which had been a state of development for almost 10 years.

117. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht recalled that the Houbara Bustard Agreement was first proposed by the lead country in December 1998. He noted that finalisation of the Agreement depended on the lead country, as the Secretariat did not have the capacity to undertake the work involved. The process to develop the Agreement has taken a long time and the Secretariat has sent numerous reminders to the lead country. He suggested that perhaps a new staff member could be seconded to do the work. He also asked the Standing Committee for advice as to whether the Secretariat should approach the lead country again, or whether an intermediary, such as the CIC President, should be approached to intervene. The Chair asked if something like this could be contracted to, for example, BirdLife International. The Executive Secretary asked if carry-over funds could be used for this.

118. Professor Galbraith foresaw the need to clarify the lead country's intentions first before making a joint approach by CMS and CIC. Only thereafter should the use of carry-over funds be considered.

119. Mr. Adams acknowledged that the Houbara bustard was a top CMS priority, however, he was astonished by what was being discussed. He noted that the Secretariat had earlier in the meeting claimed that it had no capacity to spend money fast enough on projects, yet here it was requesting authority from the Standing Committee to use unspent balances on yet another project. This was another example that the Secretariat should better prepare for future Standing Committee meetings and compile a list of what it wants to spend on projects.

120. Mr. Powell supported Germany's comments. He suggested that the lead country should be approached first to determine the way forward before the Standing Committee approves an uncosted figure.

121. The Chair noted that the absence of a written justification for a proposal from the Secretariat should not be a reason not to consider the proposal, especially if this is simply a matter of re-directing unspent funds to more productive uses. He said that if there were no further comments his interpretation of what was just said was that the Standing Committee recommended that the Secretariat work with the CIC to design an approach to the lead country if funds were available, to hire staff; failing that, to use the funds for temporary staff doing the same work.

122. Continuing with the Secretariat's update of its report on the implementation of the Strategic Plan, Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht noted that the Sahelo-Saharan Antelope Range State meeting was described in CMS Bulletin 17 (CMS/StC26/4). The meeting was successful. Follow-up work will be done by the Range States, the Secretariat and by other organisations. A summary report of the meeting was being drafted.

123. Mr. Glowka pointed out that the Secretariat's report on the implementation of the strategic plan was essentially an internal Secretariat report. He said that to be truly representative the review report and subsequent reports should reflect the activities of Parties and other actors. The final report sent to COP8 should cover the field broadly.

124. The Chair suggested that if a full report is needed, perhaps the national reports could be mined for information and that this could then be related to the strategic plan's implementation.

125. Mr. Biber, speaking as chair of the Strategic Plan Working Group, explained that he was worried about the slow progress in implementing the 2000-2005 plan. He believed that out of 102 action points only 19 cases showed real outcomes. He noted that most "outcomes" listed are really only "outputs". Other priority projects should be advanced so that the Convention would be in a better position to launch the 2006-2011 plan.

126. The Chair asked if it was a lack of outcomes or simply a lack of reporting to the Secretariat. It was clear that the Secretariat's report was not a comprehensive assessment of the plan. Fuller reporting was needed other than through the next set of national reports. The issue was how to obtain fuller information?

127. Mr. O'Sullivan believed that the document presented by the Secretariat is too pessimistic. There is a lot going on particularly in the regions. The Standing Committee must have a greater role in reporting on regional activities. The Chair replied that the Strategic Plan's implementation was a duty for all actors. He did not believe that that the Standing Committee could greatly affect this.

128. Mr. Biber recalled that progress on the Strategic Plan's implementation was the primary measure of the Convention's impact and success. This information would be particularly useful for the 25th Anniversary and before the next COP. This would also be how potential Parties would be able to measure the value of joining the Convention.

129. Mr. O'Sullivan asked how much the Standing Committee wanted to be informed about what the Convention is trying to do. If additional information was needed there could be pre-consultation with all the interests concerned, or the Standing Committee could rely on a report from the Scientific Council.

130. The Chair invited all Parties, observers and the Secretariat to report to the Standing Committee on their activities and the activities of others. He noted however that the United Kingdom had asked European Parties to report to his country or to the Ukraine on implementation of the Convention and no replies were received. The alternative was to send a note around to all the Parties on a regular basis.

131. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht recalled that in 1994 the concept of full reporting had already been considered by COP when it discussed using the strategic plan approach. At the end of each planning period, a report would be made. Regular information from the Parties to the Standing Committee could be linked to the strategic plan implementation report. The task of collecting information on and synthesising activities contributing to the strategic plan's implementation and then reporting on them

could be contracted to WCMC, since it already had experience compiling the synthesis the national reports for COP7. He emphasised that the undertaking would need to go beyond national reports to include NGO, UNEP and other organisations' activities.

132. Professor Galbraith pointed out that it was necessary for the Standing Committee to have three categories of information: (1) information on successes; (2) information on things that are not working; and (3) information on key issues impacting on the Convention. A synthesis of reporting from Parties under these headings would be helpful. The Scientific Council could look at underlying scientific issues.

133. The Chair observed that the Standing Committee did not want to go through each strategic plan item. The Scientific Council, for example, was well qualified to look at scientific issues. The Standing Committee could guide the Secretariat on how to deploy its resources for proper reporting. He suggested that if there were no further comments that the Standing Committee should take note of the discussion and proposals advanced. It should request the Secretariat to discuss the issue various issues with WCMC on how to more fully report to the Conference of Parties. The Secretariat should bring proposals to the next Standing Committee meeting.

Draft Strategic Plan (2006-2011) and the 2010 Target

134. Mr. Biber explained that the draft 2006-2011 Strategic Plan was prepared by the Working Group via email on the basis of the current plan. If accepted by the Standing Committee, it could be submitted to COP8. The strategic plan should lead to a shorter-term work plan with concrete targets. He explained that in his view the Secretariat proposal for a facilitated workshop on the strategic plan was not necessary as the process of developing the revision by correspondence was adequate. Comments were being received from the Working Group members. Switzerland and some working group members were prepared to invest more time on this rather than having a workshop.

135. The Chair recommended continuing developing the strategic plan by e-mail rather than holding a workshop.

136. Having the floor, the Chair briefly introduced document CMS/StC26/9/Add.2 (The 2010 Target – Global Biodiversity Challenge). The 2010 target should be seen as an opportunity for CMS to demonstrate its contributions to biodiversity conservation to the leaders of the world's governments. He said that a maximum of 10 indicators were needed to represent the state of biodiversity loss globally. The issue was how should CMS implement and/or deliver on the target in the context of migratory species?

137. He proposed that the CMS should refer one or two indicators to the CBD. WCMC could be commissioned to conceptually develop these. He noted that it was important that CMS inform the CBD on the importance of migratory species in relation to biodiversity and offer to supply an indicator.

138. Professor Galbraith felt it was an opportunity for the Convention to contribute to the CBD process, clarifying the target and identifying the pressures on migratory species. He suggested that Appendix I species could be used.

139. Mr. Fragoso (World Conservation Monitoring Centre) said that CMS was well placed and could lead, for example, by developing an index related to migratory species. A lot of information is available. Appendix I or concerted action species were a good choice. WCMC would be happy to provide assistance.

140. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht noted that if the Convention wanted a co-ordinated approach with other stakeholders, 2010 was an ambitious goal and not far away, it should be incorporated into the 2006-2011 Strategic Plan. CMS needed to inform all interested Parties. Perhaps a network of research and monitoring centres of migratory species would be of interest. He asked how CMS' role in CBD could be strengthened. Mr. Biber agreed that the 2010 target should be incorporated into the Strategic Plan.

141. The Chair recalled that the CBD Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) would begin work on the 2010 target at its next meeting in November 2003 as an input into the next CBD COP meeting in February 2004. CMS should announce that it is undertaking the necessary work to contribute to the CBD process, hopefully before February. He asked if the Secretariat, WCMC, the Scientific Council and the Swiss observer could prepare a document for the CBD COP, with Standing Committee approval, via e-mail.

142. Dr. Boere (Observer from Wetlands International) noted that European species indicators already existed. Mr. Fragoso agreed. Dr Boere said that Wetlands International would contribute whatever information it had on waterbirds.

143. The Chair asked Mr. Biber to continue with the revision of the Strategic Plan. He noted that the role of the Standing Committee was to monitor and arrange the revision process, but not to contribute content per se.

144. Mr. Biber welcomed comments, especially from the regions. Latin-America and the Caribbean, as well as Asia, were not represented in the working group. He invited those regions to join the working group. He recommended the following procedure:

- Revision of the document and dispatch to working group members;
- Request for feedback and revision accordingly by 15 October 2003;
- Document sent to Secretariat by the end of November;
- Secretariat sends draft to Parties; comments by the end of February 2004;
- Secretariat forwards comments to working group chair by 25 March 2004;
- Scientific Council to examine Strategic Plan;
- No need for translation;
- Scientific Council comments included in next revision;
- Re-circulation to working group by the end of April 2004;
- Comments from the working group up to June 2004;
- Transmission to Secretariat by mid-July 2004;
- Transmission to the Standing Committee in autumn 2004.

145. The Chair emphasised that the more comments on the strategic plan the better and suggested that the working group be expanded to include international non-governmental organisations. The working group should sort out conflicting comments.

146. The Standing Committee agreed with the working group chairman's proposal and that of the Chair.

Agenda Item 8: Implementation and Development of Agreements

147. Mr Glowka introduced the agenda item. He explained that the background documentation for the agenda item was CMS/StC26/10 (Implementation of Existing Agreements and Development of Future

Agreements), CMS/StC26/Inf.8.1-6 (Reports from Existing Agreement Secretariats) and CMS Bulletin 17. He proposed that the Standing Committee consider the reports from existing Agreements first.

148. Mr. Lenten, AEWAs Executive Secretary, announced that France, Libya and Slovenia had joined AEWAs. The fourth meeting of the AEWAs Technical Committee was held in Tashkent in May 2003. The AEWAs Standing Committee would meet in Bonn later in 2003. Referring to his written report Mr. Stempel, ASCOBANS Executive Secretary, remarked that it showed how busy the ASCOBANS Secretariat had been especially with regard to the by-catch issue. Mr. Streit observed that EUROBATS had a successful and large work programme. He invited Switzerland to accede to the Agreement and attend the COP. Mr. Powell, reporting on behalf of the ACAP Interim Secretariat, recalled that Australia would continue to provide the ACAP interim secretariat until the permanent seat was established. Ecuador had ratified ACAP; others (e.g., United Kingdom) were in the pipeline.

149. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht pointed out that CMS/StC26/10 was an introduction to the core priorities for Agreements and MoUs. The Secretariat had been slowed down by the lack of staff and the need for completing increasingly specialized tasks. The Agreements Officer, for example, has been redeployed to address a number of substantive issues that normally would have been addressed by other staff members had a full staffing complement been available. The recruitment process was underway for a qualified Deputy Executive Secretary for CMS. Central Asia was on hold. The Secretariat wanted to hire an English/Russian specialist to handle substantive issues and correspondence with Russian-speaking countries. The Secretariat was considering taking on other short-term specialists. He indicated that the short-term assistance be funded from the unspent salaries associated with the funded but vacant posts in the Secretariat.

150. Mr. Adams understood that there were serious staff problems and workload within the Secretariat. He reflected upon his earlier comments in the meeting that the Secretariat was making more and more proposals for funding and questioned whether there really were funds for all these things. He agreed that funds would be better invested in the recruitment system.

151. The Chair said that he shared Germany's concerns with the way the Secretariat had presented its proposals. He pointed out however that he had similar staffing problems in the United Kingdom and that similar temporary solutions were being used. He considered these to be disruptive, but appropriate.

152. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht recalled that the present capacity problem in the secretariat was the result of a structural recruitment bottleneck caused *inter alia* by the new staffing system of the UN. He noted that according to the opinion of the Nairobi headquarters the UNEP Executive Director has the authority to hire short-term staff to get essential tasks done, namely when the recruitment of regular staff is delayed. Therefore he did not need the Standing Committee's specific additional authorisation. He was particularly concerned about the bureaucracy should the Standing Committee wish to be also involved in the processes of consulting about appointment of short-term staff. If this would happen the Secretariat's ability to accomplish its work would be even more seriously hampered.

153. Mr Ankouz emphasised that the Standing Committee needed to ensure that the urgent work of the Secretariat continued. He believed that limited contracts would help to achieve this. He therefore supported the idea of using unspent funds from vacant posts to hire short-term assistance.

154. After a lengthy and controversial discussion the Standing Committee acknowledged that the Secretariat did not need to request additional funds, but informally requested the Standing Committee's prior approval to recruit temporary staff to fill the gap of lacking regular staff. The Standing Committee agreed to the Secretariat's proposal.

Agenda Item 9: Status of On-going Projects

155. Dr. Barbieri briefly introduced CMS/StC/11 (Overview of the Status of Small-scale Projects Financed by the CMS Trust Fund). He explained that the document covered Scientific Council-approved projects started after COP7, or which were ongoing at the time of COP7, as well as projects in the phase of elaboration. He pointed out a few updates with respect to the information contained in the document, notably the start of a project on Andean flamingos. The Executive Secretary acknowledged the remarkable work made by Dr. Barbieri in the management of projects, and expressed his special thanks to him. The meeting took note of the report.

Agenda Item 10: Implementation of the CMS Information Management Plan

156. Introducing the agenda item, Mr. Glowka explained that it was composed of three sub-items concerning (1) the information management plan, (2) the adoption of the new national report format and (3) GROMS. Three documents were before the Standing Committee: CMS/StC26/12 (Implementation of the CMS Information Management Plan); CMS/StC26/12/Add.1 + two attachments (Proposed Revised Format for National Reports); and CMS/StC26/12/Add.2 (Global Register of Migratory Species).

Implementation of the CMS Information Management Plan

157. Mr. Glowka noted that CMS/StC26/12 provided an update on the activities completed to date under the Information Management Plan (IMP). He said that the IMP's further implementation and development would depend upon the entry on duty of the yet to be recruited CMS Information Officer as the Secretary presently did not have sufficient capacity to devote. Notwithstanding this the Secretariat sought Standing Committee guidance on the implications of the approved budget on the processing and synthesising of Party reports for COP8.

158. Finally he reminded the Standing Committee that the approved budget indicated that projects related to the Information Management Plan were to be financed by voluntary contributions and/or Trust Fund surplus. Without the funds, a contract could not be made with WCMC to synthesise and process the national reports. In response the Chair suggested that the issue could be taken up by the Standing Committee at its next meeting if necessary.

National Report Format

159. Mr. Fragoso reminded the Standing Committee that it had agreed a new national report format at its 23rd Meeting. The Seventh Meeting of the Conference of Parties adopted Resolution 7.8 whereby it was recommended that after some fine-tuning based on lessons learned from the voluntary use of the format a final version should be presented to the 26th Meeting of the Standing Committee. He noted that a few changes had been introduced and he described where these were. The Standing Committee was asked to endorse this as the final format.

160. Mr. Powell felt that national reports would be improved thanks to the new format. He proposed that an option to submit a short 2-page summary should be available for those who could not fill out the whole format.

161. Mr. Adams was happy that some Parties had used the format successfully. As national reports become more detailed, the more difficult they were to fill out. A summary format would be useful and he supported the proposal of Mr. Powell.

162. Ms. Céspedes said the format was clear and useful for her country's information, but she also supported the summary form. The Chair pointed out that the availability of the summary option would cause most countries to opt for the short form. Mr Powell replied that if half of the Parties submitted no report, all would be useless. Each country should submit the short, and some the long, format.

163. Mr. Fragoso, while acknowledging that half of the Parties had not responded to the request for national reports, said that the response rate was actually an improvement for CMS over past return rates. He concluded that the new report format had actually encouraged compliance. While the blank report looked formidable, most Parties would find that one third of the questions did not apply to them. He noted that too the report format had also been sent to the Parties pre-filled out and Parties had been asked to correct and complete the rest of the format. Mr. Biber noted that the response rate was variable depending on the convention concerned.

164. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht recalled that, previously, reports were not harmonised and evaluation was extremely difficult. With the new format CMS will be better able to monitor and evaluate implementation. In addition, the new format would contribute to harmonise reporting requirements for the biodiversity-related conventions.

165. The Chair proposed that the Standing Committee adopt the national report format, drawing attention to Parties to the possibility to provide short summaries.

166. Mr. Glowka expressed his concern with the proposal regarding the short summaries. He noted that the Conference of Parties had stated that only fine-tuning was necessary. Adding the summary option was not, in his opinion, "fine-tuning". Furthermore, providing the short summary option just as the new report format was being introduced would undercut the report format's use before any experience and practice were established. He suggested that CMS use the new format first and gain some experience with it, determining in the process how receptive Parties were to the new format. At minimum, the summary option should not be provided until after COP8.

167. Ms. Céspedes agreed with Mr Glowka. She warned that providing the summary option might result in only that being returned. Mr. Fragoso noted that ninety percent of those answering chose to use the new format. Mr. Powell suggested using the format, with the summary in reserve. Mr. Adams agreed.

168. In summary the Chair proposed that the Standing Committee adopt the new report format. The Standing Committee could revisit issue of a summary in the future if it turned out the response rate for the next COP was low. It was so agreed.

Global Registry of Migratory Species (GROMS)

169. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht explained that the Standing Committee was asked to take note of document CMS/StC26/12/Add.2 which provided an update on the Secretariat and other activities related to GROMS. In order to further update and assist the development of the database, a contract for GROMS had been signed with the Museum Alexander Koenig, affiliated with the University of Bonn. The cost would be taken from the Trust Fund. Further decisions (and funding) would come from

COP8, in addition to the regular German voluntary funds contributed to the Secretariat; these will be used for personnel, operational costs and travel. The Chair asked for the reaction of COP7.

170. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht recalled that GROMS was included as part of the Parties' deliberation on the Information Management Plan. Primary emphasis was given to funding the IMP and GROMS on a voluntary basis. Carry-over funds were given second priority. Up to the present, GROMS has been supported with voluntary funds, and only a small percentage from carry over.

171. Mr. Williams, recalling Resolution 7.8, said that a consultation process was envisioned by the COP on GROMS before any decisions were taken in this regard.

172. Mr. Adams explained that GROMS was conceptualised to be used within the Information Management Plan presented in Resolution 6.5. At present GROMS had not been clearly integrated into the IMP and Germany would work towards this.

173. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht recalled that the final report of the project by the German authorities was currently under preparation. In addition, as soon as Secretariat had the capacity, it would take action to initiate next steps as requested by the COP in Resolution 7.8. He foresaw that the work will be organised for 2004 jointly with other organisations.

174. The Chair emphasised that the Standing Committee's report should clearly reflect that staff shortages were inhibiting the follow-up work on GROMS and other aspects of Resolution 7.8 including the solicitation of funds from perspective partner organisations. He said that projects such as GROMS appear to be at risk of either being allowed to die or would need to continue at a cost to Convention.

175. Mr. Powell reminded the Standing Committee that the COP decided the relative priority of GROMS vis à vis other Convention work and how funds should be allocated. He also said that US\$15,000 of extra-budgetary resources had already been agreed in principle by the Standing Committee during the discussion on agenda item 6. This satisfied the intention of the Conference of the Parties. This was reflected in table 2(a) found in document CMS/StC26/8/Add.3. He was reluctant to agree an additional allocation from the Trust Fund especially since this would be a disincentive for voluntary contributions and anticipate a worst case scenario which is not a good way to plan. In summary, he indicated that the Standing Committee had covered the deficit indicated by the Secretariat through the allocation of US\$15,000 under Table 2(a) and that it was his proposal that no additional funds be allocated at this time.

176. The Chair commented that US\$50,000 had been proposed for 2004, the year of the next Standing Committee meeting and the last few months of 2003 could accommodate a procedure to consult the Standing Committee if there has been a failure to solicit the needed funds. He noted that Germany promised to have some further ideas on GROMS.

177. Mr. Adams said that he had additional ideas on the facilities that GROMS can provide for the further development of the CMS Information Management Plan. In some of the action points the issue of GROMS had not been fully treated by the Secretariat in the implementation of Resolution 6.5. The German Government would provide to the Secretariat in writing suggestions on the importance of GROMS in the implementation of Resolution 6.5 so that it can take them into consideration. GROMS was initiated at the request of CMS with the understanding that when it was ready CMS would take it over. Work was started in 1996-97 and the original budget of DM 250,000 to DM 500,000 was then increased to DM 1,000,000. The project was presented to the Standing Committee, the COP and the Scientific Council a number of times. GROMS is very important and useful. The development of

GROMS is at a point that the German Government would very much like CMS to take it over and take all possibilities to use it for the good of the Convention. Germany has been providing additional money beyond its normal contribution. He would like the Secretariat to use this money to maintain GROMS.

178. The Chair proposed that the Secretariat should receive the written suggestions of Germany and add them to its own ideas on how to seek funds from other organisations. The Standing Committee members should familiarise themselves with the benefits of GROMS. If by the end of October 2003 the Secretariat is not successful in soliciting funding for GROMS, it should ask the Standing Committee Chair to start a written procedure for consultation with the Standing Committee about the need to secure the necessary funds.

179. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht supported the German intervention. He explained that GROMS was innovative when it was created. It remained innovative today. GROMS was modest, unlike other organisations' databases, and if it is not possible to fund GROMS from any sources this would leave CMS with a bad image. Another appeal should be made to the Agreements, Parties and organisations to fund and otherwise support GROMS for example by linking it to other databases.

180. The Chair summarised. He noted that there was little new information about the merits of the system and that the COP did not accept on-going responsibility to maintain the database. The Standing Committee can consider an emerging plan later on in the future but it cannot adopt GROMS per se. The Secretariat's appeal should be made and the Chair should be approached by the end of October. A decision should be made on what should be put to the Standing Committee if need be. In the mean time the Standing Committee members should familiarise themselves with the benefits of GROMS.

Agenda Item 11: Matters arising from CMS COP7 not addressed by other items

(this item was examined under agenda item 4)

Agenda Item 12: Scientific Council matters as they relate to the work of the Standing Committee

181. Professor Galbraith reported that the last meeting of the Scientific Council was demanding but fruitful. He thanked the Scientific Council members for their hard work. The next meeting would be held in Glasgow, 31 March – 2 April 2004, funded by the UK with full interpretation. A field trip would take place after the meeting, followed by the Global Flyway Conference in Edinburgh. A strategic plan was being developed for the Scientific Council. Among other things it would address modus operandi, research and relations with other organisations. A small meeting to further develop the strategy would be held at the end of the year. The Standing Committee took note of Professor Galbraith's report.

Agenda Item 13: Date and venue of the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties

182. In the interests of time, the Chair introduced the agenda item, stating that he had hoped that everyone had read the document. He proposed that the Standing Committee instruct the Secretariat to continue its consultations and provide additional information to countries that have requested it. The Standing Committee should express its interest to find a venue outside Europe and Africa for the meeting. When a strong candidate has been found the Secretariat should initiate a dialogue with AEWA

to determine whether the COP and AEWA MOP should be combined. Developed country Parties should consider the possibility of entering into partnership with developing country Parties who may be otherwise reluctant to host a COP. Mr. Lenten said that AEWA will hold its COP after the next Ramsar COP and therefore will probably have its MOP in early 2006.

Agenda Item 14: Date and venue of the next meeting of the Standing Committee

183. In his introduction to this agenda item, Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht indicated that it was difficult to plan the next meeting of the Standing Committee when the date of the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties in 2005 was unknown. Once the date of the next COP was determined we should count back and determine whether there should be one or two meetings of the Standing Committee. He described some of the factors that needed to be considered. If the COP takes place in March 2005 then early spring 2004 might be appropriate for the Standing Committee meeting so preparations for the COP could be completed 6 months before. If the COP is in September 2005 then the meeting could take place around the 24th of June. (the 25th Anniversary of the Convention). He also said that the dates would need to be consulted with the German host government.

184. The Chair summarised that it was too early to determine when the next Standing Committee should take place. The Chair questioned whether two days would be sufficient considering the time constraints that the Standing Committee was under for the present meeting.

Agenda Item 15: Any other business

Excessive Hunting

185. The Chair introduced the agenda item by inviting Standing Committee members to raise any other matters of business. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht noted that hunting problems remained with animals such as antelopes and Houbara bustards, especially in North Africa. He stated that the Convention needs to recognise that Appendix I species are being hunted in Contracting Parties in contravention of their CMS obligations. He reminded the Standing Committee that pursuant to Article III (6) the COP may make recommendations to Parties that are Ranges States of Appendix I species that they take further measures considered appropriate to benefit the species.

186. Mr. Ankouz asked that funds and awareness be raised so that Parties can better fulfil their responsibilities toward the antelope. A mandate should be given to the Secretariat to raise awareness for concerted action in the range states.

187. The Chair observed that an approach to the lead country for the Houbara bustard in conjunction with CIC should be first priority. With regard to the excessive hunting of antelope, he suggested that the Secretariat consult with the new Standing Committee Chairman.

188. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht confirmed that the Secretariat will make contact with CIC regarding the Houbara bustard and that action should be sought by the lead country in the Asian region between now and the next meeting of the Standing Committee. He said that the Secretariat will also make contact with the North African countries to get evidence of the excessive hunting problem regarding Antelope. A report would be made to the next Standing Committee meeting.

189. The Chair recalled that the Standing Committee needed to adopt a revised version of table 2(b) from document CMS/StC26/8/Add.2. The table represented the schedule of additional extra-budgetary funding that was requested from the Secretariat, a revised version of which was being circulated to the Standing Committee members.

190. He clarified that the amount for GROMS of US\$50,000 should be deleted while leaving the line item with a footnote to the effect that any requirement for extra funding in 2004 would be subject of a written consultation among the Standing Committee. With regard to the line on Houbara support, he pointed out that the footnote – additional expenditure if and when required and if availability through non-payment of salaries is authorised – was in keeping with the conclusions reached in the earlier discussions. With regard to the cetaceans and the environment line item the third new footnote – support authorised if savings are available from elsewhere – adequately reflected the conclusions of the discussion. Finally, he noted that the line for the strategic planning meeting had been deleted and another line for the 2010 Target work for US\$10,000 had been added by the Secretariat.

191. The Chair invited reactions from the Standing Committee members. Furthermore he noted that the Secretariat may wish to clarify whether the level of spending overall is something which could be funded and whether the Secretariat had a counter proposal on the amount of funding for the 25th Anniversary.

192. Mr. Adams asked whether it had been agreed to add US\$35,000 (or 30,000 as indicated in the BL 2273 for 2004) in the year 2004 for the Information Management Plan. He was of the opinion, which he felt reflected the opinion of the COP, that the necessary amount as indicated in Resolution 7.11 should be used. He recounted that the Committee had earlier heard from the Secretariat that it would not be possible in 2003 to use the money because an Information Officer had yet to be recruited.

193. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht was invited by the Chair to comment. He reiterated what he had earlier stated. The Secretariat was well aware of the need to continue work on the Information Management Plan as soon as possible and, to give WCMC an incentive to undertake additional work, not to interrupt work for too long. He recalled that he had earlier said that it was early enough to submit an additional request on this to the next Standing Committee meeting especially in light of the recruitment of the Information Officer. However, certainly the Standing Committee was sovereign enough to decide otherwise.

194. Mr. Powell agreed that the Executive Secretary's recounting had accorded with his own recollection of the previous discussion noting that the discussion was inconclusive because of the Executive Secretary's proposal. He favoured adopting the revised table, striking the amount allocated for GROMS while maintaining the proposed footnote, and arriving at a total of US\$219,000. This was still a very large amount and demonstrated the flexibility of the Standing Committee to accommodate the needs of the Secretariat. The Chair asked whether this was acceptable to Germany and the Secretariat.

195. Mr. Adams replied that his proposal was made because the budget provided for it and a surplus existed. He naturally wanted to put into action what the COP had provided. He had doubts on deciding next year because if there were problems spending the money this year it would also be problematic next year. However, if the Standing Committee wanted to accept a delay, then he would go along with it. He also proposed to leave the amount allocated for GROMS but add the footnote.

196. The Chair, recalling his understanding of the earlier decision on both GROMS and the Information Management Plan, asked if Germany could go along with those decisions. Germany

agreed. The Chair then noted that, as the sum of money proposed for activities related to Table 2(b) was now less than that originally proposed, it was his conclusion that the Secretariat was content that there was enough money to cover the activities.

197. He invited the Secretariat to propose a counter sum to the overall ceiling proposed for the 25th Anniversary. Mr Glowka responded that the Secretariat needed approximately US\$32,000 more than what had been proposed. This money would be used for a ceremonial act, whether alone or in combination with International Biodiversity Day, as well as important media work.

198. Mr. Powell stated that he thought the matter had been closed considering that the working group recommendations had been adopted by the Standing Committee and a figure of an extra US\$36,000 had been an agreed ceiling with which the Secretariat was to work within.

199. The Chair recalled that he had given the Secretariat an opportunity for a counter proposal, but not a commitment as to what the reaction of the Committee would be and he took Australia's reaction to the Secretariat's proposal as opposed. Mr. Glowka recalled his understanding of the Agreement. The Chair clarified that the working group did not come back with a recommended amount. Instead the ceiling had been proposed by Germany in the Committee itself.

200. Mr. Mueller-Helmbrecht simply recommended that the debate be suspended and that the US\$18,000 per year for 2003 and 2004 be kept as the figure. A footnote should be added with a strong appeal to the Parties from the Standing Committee for sponsorship to provide additional funds. He finished by saying that the Secretariat would not go for it because he knew how time consuming and frustrating fundraising was when no one responds to one's fundraising letters.

201. Ms Cespedes reminded the Chairman that the US\$18,000 figure was mentioned in the working group and no one had opposed it.

202. The Chair thanked Ms Cespedes but noted that the issue was now one of substance not procedure. He noted that the Standing Committee was supporting Australia, the only dissenting view to the Secretariat's proposal. He proposed that the footnote be added and then closed the agenda item. He also proposed a summary of lessons learned from the session notably: (1) the Standing Committee needs explanations from the Secretariat as to why additional financial resources are requested; (2) criteria and/or rules are needed to guide how the Chair should address extra-budgetary requests from the Secretariat between Standing Committee meetings, keeping in mind the need to build in adequate flexibility to appropriately react to requests that are proposed; and (3) the Secretariat's explanations of the projects and initiatives behind the extra-budgetary requests made indicate that the Secretariat knows what it is doing.

Agenda Item 16: Closure of the Meeting

203. After expressing thanks to the Government of Germany for the excellent facilities provided for the meeting of the Standing Committee, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 4.00 p.m. on Friday, 20 July 2003. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht thanked the Chair for his excellent work.

26th meeting of the CMS Standing Committee
Bonn, 17-18 July 2003
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Chair:	United Kingdom (Europe)	Mr. Steve Lee-Bapty
Vice-Chair:	Morocco (Africa)	Mr. Mohamed Ankouz
Members:	Germany (Depositary)	Mr. Jochen Flasbarth Mr. Harald Ganns Mr. Gerhard Adams Mr. Joachim Schmitz Mr. Bernd Bulir
	Kenya (Africa)	Mr. Andersen Koyo
	Chile (Americas)	Ms. Nancy Céspedes
	Sri Lanka (Asia)	Mr. Gajadeera A.T. Prasad
	Ukraine (Europe)	Mr. Volodymyr Domashlinets
	Australia (Oceania)	Mr. Stephen Powell
Observers:	Argentina	Mr. Gustavo Bouquet
	Switzerland	Mr. Olivier Biber
	CMS Scientific Council, Chair	Dr. Colin Galbraith
	UNEP/UNON - Nairobi	Mr. Nehemiah Rotich
	UNEP-WCMC	Mr. Gerardo Fragoso
	Wetlands International	Dr. Gerard Boere
	BirdLife International	Mr. E.J.M. Hagemeyer Mr. John O'Sullivan
Secretariats of CMS Agreements:	AEWA	Mr. Bert Lenten
	ASCOBANS	Mr. Rüdiger Stempel
	EUROBATS	Mr. Andreas Streit
UNEP/CMS Secretariat:	Executive Secretary	Mr. Arnulf Müller-Helmbrecht
	Agreements Officer	Mr. Lyle Glowka
	Scientific and Technical Support Officer	Dr. Marco Barbieri
	Administrative/Fund Management Officer	Ms. Jasmin Kanza
Report Writer:		Mr. Edgar Johnson
Meeting Secretariat:		Mr. Liam Addis Ms. Linette Eitz-Lamare Ms. Catherine Lehmann Ms. Patricia Nolan-Moss Ms. Anja Pauls Ms. Enkhtuya Sereenen Ms. Dunia Sforzin
Interpreters:		Demircan, Hatice Föhr, Mechthilde Irsfeld, Simone Lorenz, Gabriele Riecken, Ines Völker, Edith

26th meeting of the CMS Standing Committee
Bonn, 17-18 July 2003

PROVISIONAL AGENDA

1. Opening remarks
2. Adoption of the agenda, work schedule and rules of procedure
3. Secretariat report on inter-sessional activities since COP7
4. Reports from Standing Committee members and observers
5. Institutional matters
 - 5.1 Headquarters Agreement and Secretariat international juridical personality
 - 5.2 CMS 25th Anniversary and CMS Communications Concept
 - 5.3 Collaboration with other bodies and processes
 - 5.4 Any other institutional matters
6. Administrative and financial matters
7. Implementation of the Strategic Plan (2000-2005)
8. Implementation of existing Agreements and development of future Agreements
9. Status of on-going projects
10. Implementation of the CMS Information Management Plan
11. Matters arising from CMS COP7 not addressed by other agenda items
12. Scientific Council matters as they relate to the work of the Standing Committee
13. Date and venue of the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties
14. Date and venue of the next meeting of the Standing Committee
15. Any other business
16. Closure of the meeting