



# Doc 17.1 Options for New Structure and Modus Operandi for the Scientific Council



CMS COP11

Regional Preparatory and Negotiations Workshop for Africa

Harare Zimbabwe

21–23 September 2014

# Mandate

Future Shape process Activity 7 (UNEP/CMS/Res.10.9) identifies the need to restructure the CMS Scientific Council in order to maximize its efficiency, expertise and suitability to the evolving needs of the Convention.

# Current Structure of the Scientific Council

- Any party can nominate qualified experts to the scientific council
  - Currently 98 experts
- Convention also allows for the COP to appoint experts known as “COP Appointed Councillors”
  - These cover specific taxonomical and geographic regions
  - Currently 9 experts

# Current Structure-Meetings

- No standing schedule, convened whenever deemed necessary by the secretariat
- Most often this is once intersessionally, and once before the COP meeting
- Recently the standing committee has decided to decouple the ScC meeting from the COP so it will meet 3-4 months prior (as in July 2014)

# Current Structure-Working Groups

- Most focus on taxonomic groups or important cross-cutting issues
- Some are mandated by resolutions such as:
  - Flyways (Resolution 9.2)
  - Minimizing poisoning to migratory birds (10.26)
  - Migratory Landbirds of the Africa Eurasian region (Resolution 10.27)
- Typically working groups meet during Council meetings

# Constraints of Current System

1. Very large membership of around 100 experts
2. Expensive meetings with high number of sponsored delegates
3. Uneven distribution of experts
4. No resources to generate intersessional work
5. Relatively low intersessional participation in working groups

# Challenges of Restructuring

The new structure should:

- Reduce costs
- Allow the council to better adapt to the evolving needs of the convention
- Ensure adequate distribution of scientific and policy expertise
- Ensure more intersessional activity
- Remain within the original bounds set forth by the Convention's text

# Scenario A

## *Scenario A*

### **Regional Representatives\*:**

- 3 Africa
- 3 Europe
- 2 South America
- 2 Asia
- 1 Oceania
- 0 North America

### **COP-Appointed Councillors: (taxa)**

- 1 Birds
- 1 Aquatic Mammals
- 1 Terrestrial Mammals
- 1 Fish
- 1 Reptiles
- 1 Invertebrates

### **COP-Appointed Councillors: (themes)**

- 1 Climate Change
- 1 Bycatch
- 1 Invasive Alien Species
- 1 Sustainable Use
- 1 Migration Ecology
- 1 Wildlife Disease

**Pool of party-appointed  
councillors**

Figure 4: Scenario A

\*elected by regional groups from the pool of party-appointed councillors



# Scenario B

## *Scenario B*



Figure 5: Scenario B

\*elected by regional groups from the pool of party-appointed councillors

# Scenario C

## *Scenario C*



Figure 6: Scenario C

# Considerations

- Composition of regional membership: representative vs. uniform
- Strength of regional representation (much higher in Scenario C)
- Coverage of species and cross-cutting themes
- Potentials for redundancy of expertise
- Relative weight given to COP appointed councillors

# Way forward

- Discussion and commentary from Scientific Council meeting
- Parties decide on the new structure at COP in November
- COP may choose to request the Standing Committee to nominate councillors on their behalf, regional groups to elect representatives
- COP may request for new Scientific Council to meet and establish a *modus operandi*