



# Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals

*Secretariat provided by the United Nations Environment Programme*



## REPORT OF THE FOURTEENTH MEETING OF THE SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL OF THE CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF MIGRATORY SPECIES OF WILD ANIMALS

*Bonn, Germany, 14-17 March 2007*

### 1. Opening remarks

1. Prof. Colin Galbraith (Vice-Chairman) called the meeting to order at 09:10 of Thursday, 15 March 2007, and welcomed delegates to Bonn and to the 14<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Scientific Council, particularly mentioning the councillors from Yemen and Madagascar attending their first Scientific Council since their countries' accession. As Mr. John Mshelbwala (Chairman) had been unexpectedly delayed, Prof. Galbraith announced that he would deputise until such time as Mr. Mshelbwala could take over the chairmanship of the meeting.<sup>1</sup>

2. COP8 in Nairobi, 20-25 November 2005, had been a successful meeting and now nearly one and half years on, it was necessary to review progress and focus on the key issues identified at the COP as well as some new ones which had arisen since.

3. It was important for the Scientific Council to maintain its deserved reputation for scientific integrity, to address the issue of climate change and its effect on migratory species and to maximise the opportunities presented by greater political interest in CMS's core work. As a result of that greater interest the Scientific Council had to ensure the utmost accuracy of its work as its advice would come under greater scrutiny. Prof. Galbraith urged delegates to participate fully in the meeting.

4. Dr. Christiane Paulus (Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety, Germany) welcomed the delegates to Bonn on behalf of the Government of Germany. She hoped that delegates had enjoyed the excursion along the Rhine Valley the previous day. She pointed out that the meeting was taking place in the UN Campus in Bonn in the building which had once served as the office of the members of parliament and wished the delegates well with their full and interesting agenda.

5. Mr. Eric Blencowe (Chairman of the CMS Standing Committee) thanked the Secretariat and the German Government for organising the previous day's excursion and was looking forward to observing his first Scientific Council meeting as Chairman of the Standing Committee. He mentioned that he would be speaking at greater length later about the UK's initiative for an agreement on raptors and the related intergovernmental meeting scheduled for October 2007.

6. On behalf of CMS and UNEP, Mr. Robert Hepworth (CMS Secretariat, Executive Secretary) welcomed delegates to Bonn and to the excellent new facilities provided by the German Government. This was Mr. Hepworth's first inter-sessional meeting of the Scientific Council since becoming Executive Secretary. There was much progress to report since the successful COP in

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Mshelbwala joined the meeting and took the chair of it on the second day, Friday, 16 March 2007. The present report being organised thematically rather than chronologically, work started on the first day and continued in subsequent days appears to be moderated initially by Prof. Galbraith, and subsequently by Mr. Mshelbwala.

Nairobi which had provided a sound financial basis for the Convention. Further voluntary contributions, grants and support from private sector partners and the European Commission (in the Commission's case earmarked for Sahelo-Saharan Antelopes) amounted to an additional €4 million. Yemen had become the 100<sup>th</sup> party to the Convention in 2006. Membership had reached 102 with Honduras's accession and news had just reached the Secretariat that Costa Rica had completed its parliamentary procedure for accession. It was hoped that Costa Rica, with its outstanding record on biodiversity conservation, would become the 103<sup>rd</sup> party shortly.

7. The Convention was making solid progress, with agreements re-energised, concluded or being negotiated for turtles, Saiga Antelopes, Pacific Cetaceans and the Aquatic Warbler, whose wintering site in Africa had just been discovered. Other work including research into and conservation of mega-fauna in drylands in Africa and Asia, an action plan for the Mediterranean Monk Seal, the publication of two booklets on climate change and wildlife watching, and a workshop on Sahelo-Saharan Antelopes. CMS's success relied heavily on the scientific purity of its advice from the Scientific Council. This had to be maintained. The Scientific Council should of course take account of the broader picture but should focus on the core issues concerning migratory species and their needs.

## **2. Adoption of the Agenda**

8. Prof. Galbraith thanked the speakers for their welcome to the Council and for their introductory comments. He proceeded to set out the provisional schedule for the day's discussions and called upon Dr. Marco Barbieri (CMS Secretariat, Scientific and Technical Officer) to propose the adoption of the agenda.

9. Dr. Barbieri drew the attention of the meeting to documents CMS/ScC14/Doc.1 (Provisional Agenda) and CMS/ScC14/Doc.1.1 (Provisional Schedule). The Secretariat had no changes to propose to the Provisional Agenda as it appeared in CMS/ScC14/Doc.1. It had however received requests from members to allow for a few presentations and consideration of issues which did not fit conveniently into the already listed items: these included in particular the presentation of the final outputs of the conference "Waterbirds around the World"; the presentation of a Partnership for the East Asian – Australasian Flyway; the presentation of the "Sea Migrants Project"; the presentation of an initiative for the conservation of the Arabian leopard. Dr. Rainer Blanke (Councillor for Germany) requested that the results of a recent workshop organised by the Wetlands International Goose Specialist Group be presented to the plenary as well as to the Bird Taxonomic Group. It was agreed that these issues would be taken in the agenda under Agenda Item 11: Any Other Business. Dr. William Perrin (Appointed Councillor for Aquatic Mammals) asked to present a report on the outcomes of the IWC Scientific Committee. M. Dieudonné Ankara (Councillor for Republic of Congo) wanted to include in Agenda Item 8 a discussion on the impacts of diseases other than avian influenza, as viruses were spreading among populations of apes in Congo, Angola and Gabon. Prof. Galbraith thought that this was an important issue, and whilst the avian 'flu was a major concern to CMS, other diseases of wildlife were relevant also.

10. Mr. Mark Tasker (ACAP) asked that CMS/ScC14/Doc.15 on agenda item 9 (relations with other organisations) also be raised earlier in the schedule, as he would not be able to stay for the third day of the meeting. Dr. Barbieri indicated that the problem existed also for the representative of IUCN, he concurred therefore on the need to consider Agenda Item 9 earlier in the schedule.

11. Subject to the above the agenda and schedule were adopted as proposed. The Agenda is attached to this report as Annex 1.

12. In the course of the meeting, Taxonomic Working Groups, Regional Working Groups and Thematic Working Groups were convened, and reported to plenary at different times. Deliberations of the various working groups are reported and/or referenced under the relevant agenda items whenever possible. In the case of the Regional Working Groups, a summary of their deliberations is given at the end of the section concerning Agenda Item 8.

### **3. Resources and Working Practices of the Scientific Council**

13. The chair introduced this agenda item by noting that all organisations had room to improve their working methods, and so it was for the Scientific Council. He did not see major problems in the operations of the Council. However he felt that, while Council's meetings were normally productive, the Scientific Council's work between meetings could be sharpened. He then invited the Executive Secretary, Mr. Hepworth to introduce document CMS/ScC14/Doc.20.

14. Mr. Hepworth invited the views of the Scientific Council on its operation. The Secretariat was reviewing all the Convention's institutions and would report back to the Standing Committee. He did not think that there were any major problems in the operation of the Scientific Council but the Convention was the victim of its own success. Running the Scientific Council now that the Convention counted 102 Parties was becoming expensive, and there had not been enough money to be able to offer support to all eligible members to attend this meeting.

15. Mr. Hepworth suggested that the Scientific Council's operations could be streamlined. It was customary for the Scientific Council to meet immediately before the COP and once inter-sessionally. He proposed that the inter-sessional meeting should remain as it was and greater effort would be made to raise the money to ensure all could attend; that the inter-sessional meeting would set up working groups as necessary that could operate through correspondence, e-mail and teleconferencing to strengthen the Scientific Council's inter-sessional performance and productivity; and by way of innovation, that the pre-COP meeting should take the form of a committee of approximately 20 elected by the full Scientific Council meeting a few months before the COP. He advised against electing these representatives on a purely regional basis for fear of politicising the Scientific Council.

16. Dr. Pierre Devillers (Councillor for the EC) had read the Secretariat's paper with interest and agreed that it was important to consider the costs of the Convention's institutions but he felt that the proposal would significantly change the nature of the Scientific Council. The Scientific Council should evolve and needed to improve, but it essentially worked well, and one reason for its success was that the Scientific Councillors tended to stay on for at least part of the COP and were able to explain in person the rationale for the advice given to the Parties. He therefore opposed moving the pre-COP meeting to two months before the COP and opposed reducing this meeting to a large committee, as then only councillors from developed countries would be likely to attend the COP in person. This proposal would place too much burden on the Secretariat to convey scientific views to the Parties and the advice would be impersonal and bureaucratic. In conclusion, he said that the Secretariat should increase the pressure on Parties to find the money to fund the Scientific Council properly, that financial savings that were fundamentally detrimental to the character of the Scientific Council were too high a price to pay, but if one of the Scientific Council's meetings had to be downgraded, then the inter-sessional one should become the committee, not the pre-COP meeting.

17. Mr. David Morgan (CITES) said that his organisation had been through a similar process. CITES ran three committees, which were run back-to-back to save on costs. These committees were relatively small and were made up of regional representatives, and it had not been CITES'

experience that this had led to politicisation. The committees did not meet immediately prior to the COP and this did reduce the direct scientific input into the Conference, placing a greater burden on the Secretariat to produce digestible documentation in good time for the Conferences. Mr. Morgan concluded by saying that CITES had produced a comparative paper on MEAs' scientific bodies and would be happy to let the CMS Secretariat have a copy.

18. Mr. Preben Clausen (Councillor for Denmark) said that the financial issue had also been raised on the AEW Technical Committee, but in the case of CMS, a larger organisation with a wider remit, there were other considerations apart from regional representation. Any CMS Committee would also need to have different taxonomic expertise represented if it had to work efficiently.

19. The chair agreed that the committee would need a multidimensional approach, which in part would be addressed by the presence of the COP Appointed Councillors.

20. Mr. David Stroud (Ramsar Convention on Wetlands) said that the Ramsar Convention too had been reviewing the working of its Scientific and Technical Review Panel. Key points were: ensuring timely input of advice to the COP; developing a rolling programme of working groups and strategic planning and improving communication between working group members by using the opportunities of web-based fora. Prof. Galbraith thought web-based communication was a good idea, even if it was not yet universally accessible.

21. Mr. Hepworth elaborated other elements of the paper, which included a greater emphasis on working in smaller, *ad hoc* groups and drew participants' attention to the draft questionnaire to identify potential working group members and establish the optimal frequency and composition of Scientific Council working groups. In summarising, the chair reminded councillors that a number of models had been presented and some complex issues needed to be addressed.

22. Dr. Olivier Biber (Councillor for Switzerland) agreed with Dr. Devillers that it was vital for the Scientific Council to hold a full meeting immediately before the COP, and that if a committee were to replace the Scientific Council in part, the inter-sessional meeting should be the one to be discontinued. He also suggested that a brief meeting of the Scientific Council should be held immediately after the Conference to set up the working groups with the fresh impetus of the COP. Dr. Barbieri however pointed out that many councillors did not stay for the entirety of the COP, especially sponsored delegates who could only be supported by the Secretariat for the duration of the Scientific Council.

23. Prof. Wim Wolff (Councillor for the Netherlands) had mixed feelings. He agreed with Dr. Biber and Dr. Devillers but thought the use of more working groups was a good idea, as it would help cut the duration of meetings.

24. Ms. Maria Cristina Morales Palarea (Councillor for Paraguay) stressed the importance of the pre-COP meeting of the Scientific Council. Councillors had had the opportunity to brief the focal points and in the case of COP8, great progress had been made in preparing the ground for an MoU, removing the need for a separate meeting and therefore saving money.

25. In summarising, the chair set out four possible options: first, the status quo which to function properly needed better funding; second, a full meeting inter-sessionally and a committee before the COP; thirdly, an inter-sessional committee with more working groups, and a full Scientific Council immediately before the COP and perhaps a brief planning session after; and finally, a full Scientific Council pre-COP and a Committee post-COP. The chair proposed the

establishment of a working group to further discuss options for strengthening the modus operandi, the working group should report to the plenary on its recommendations.

26. Councillors volunteering to serve on the Working Group were: Baker, Biber, Clausen, Kralj, Keita, Lamptey, Morales and Palarea.

27. Mr. Lamptey reported on the Modus Operandi Working Group in the morning session of 17 March. The Group had discussed the four models and permutations of them, and presented two options. The first, which was their recommendation, was for the *status quo* to be maintained, with possible savings from the greater use of inter-sessional working groups to carry the work forward. The second option was for a full meeting to take place immediately before the COP and for a committee to meet immediately afterwards and intersessionally, again with more work devolved to inter-sessional working groups.

28. Constraints operating were that the text of the Convention provided for a Scientific Council to which all Parties were entitled to send a representative and the requirement arising from the COP to find ways of cutting costs.

29. Mr. Hepworth said that the first option would only provide savings if the duration of the meetings could be reduced from 3 to 2 days with more of the onus being placed on the working groups. The second option seemed to address the need for streamlining more radically. A further consideration was the timing of the inter-sessional meeting which could be moved forward to ensure it benefited from the impetus achieved at COP.

30. For the Standing Committee, Mr. Blencowe reported that the Committee had requested the Scientific Council to look at ways to reduce the costs of its operation, preferring the Scientific Council to decide itself how to review its working practices. There was a risk however that if Scientific Council's proposals did not achieve the required savings, the COP might impose a more unpalatable solution.

31. Dr. Biber asked how much the Scientific Council was being asked to save and what the travel and daily subsistence costs for supported delegates were. Travel costs would not be reduced by holding a two-day rather than a three-day meeting.

32. Mr. Hepworth said that the Secretariat would have to examine costs in greater detail. A two-day rather than a three-day meeting would clearly cost less in DSA. Dr. Barbieri added that travel costs was a variable costs, savings could be made by booking in advance and often it was cheaper if the journeys spanned a weekend.

33. Mr. Blencowe said that no fixed amount of savings had been identified in advance, but he thought it important for the Scientific Council to give the right signal, provided by shortening the inter-sessional meeting and doing more in working groups.

34. Prof. Alfred Oteng Yeboah (Appointed Councillor for African Fauna) voiced concern that with one COP every three years there was a danger of the Convention losing momentum and he thought consideration should be given to more frequent meetings of the Scientific Council. Other options should be considered, and other aims beyond saving money should be set, such as more efficient working methods.

35. Dr. Devillers said that the Scientific Council should keep options open but note the initial advice of the Working Group that two options be considered with the indication that the first option

was the Working Group's preference. He repeated his view that it was vital to keep a full Scientific Council meeting immediately before the COP.

36. The chair noted Dr. Devillers' view and the two options of the Working Group and asked the Secretariat to examine the cost implications of both. With a view to the 15<sup>th</sup> Meeting, it was noted the preference of the Scientific Council to hold it back-to-back with the COP, and that there was scope to reduce its duration to two days.

#### **4. Review of the Strategy Implementation Plan of the Scientific Council 2006-2011**

37. The chair introduced this item by referring to document CMS/ScC14/Doc.21 and described the implementation plan as a major advance for the Scientific Council and as an important tool in coordinating the Convention's work. It served to show the full extent of the Scientific Council's tasks and helped set priorities.

38. Dr. Barbieri said that this meeting was the Scientific Council's first opportunity to review progress since COP8 and as the Scientific Council's plan mirrored that of the Convention, it helped to structure the Scientific Council's input into the overall strategy. The plan contained practical objectives and activities designed to be measurable, and helped identify where additional expertise was needed, as the Scientific Council's own resources were finite. Some activities had progressed well, notably where funding had been found. Other areas had been deferred. More detailed examination of individual items would be better left to the dedicated Working Group, but nonetheless Dr. Barbieri gave a short overview of some of the key elements.

39. **Activity 1.1.1** (*Undertake summary scientific reviews of the main taxonomic groups of migratory species, to identify outstanding candidate species for listing on Appendix I*). The Secretariat had commissioned a report on cartilaginous fish and a presentation would be made by Dr. Sarah Fowler of the IUCN-SSC Shark Specialist Group. The Scientific Council needed to identify other groups for further reviews in the near future. Dr. Barbieri had already consulted those Councillors who coordinated the taxonomic working groups. Further consideration was requested by the taxonomic working groups which were expected to meet later in the meeting schedule. Recommendations on possible further reviews are included in the reports of the taxonomic working groups, appended to this report (Annexes 2-6).

40. **Activity 1.1.5** (*Prepare new Action Plans (prioritised according to threat status), according to the CMS format, for the protection and recovery of all Appendix I species that do not yet have one*). A grant had been received from the Italian Government to cover the development of new action plans, preferably for species also covered by AEW. Guidance was required from the taxonomic groups, especially the avian group, as to which species should be targeted. Relevant deliberations are included in the report of the working group on birds (Annex 4)

41. **Activity 1.1.7** (*Through the CMS-Information Management System, the Scientific Council will report to each meeting of the COP on the population status (size and range) of all Appendix I species and level of protection in each range state, using the most up to date information available. This will be achieved by means of a standardised report*). Preliminary discussions had been held with the coordinators of the taxonomic working groups and the Vice-Chairman of the Scientific Council, Dr. Devillers. Coordinators of taxonomic working groups stood ready to coordinate the compilation of the report for the species belonging to their group. The format of the report had to be determined, its definition was the best way for this meeting of the Scientific Council to make its contribution. A draft format had been prepared by the Secretariat following the meeting with the working group coordinators; it was submitted to the working groups for consideration.

Recommendations of the working groups were reported to the plenary in the morning session of 17 March 2007. They are included in the reports of the groups, appended to this report (Annexes 2-6). The Secretariat was tasked to finalize the format in the light of comments received.

42. **Activity 1.3** (*Ensure that the best information is available to identify and assess the major threats to migratory species*). A number of reviews were to be undertaken over the triennium requiring considerable fund-raising effort. The Scientific Council would be asked for its input on the appropriate scope for these studies. The foreseen Working Group dealing with sustainable use could also address the terms of reference of a review of the impact of hunting on migratory species (objective 1.3.2). Mr. Baker would lead on a review of by-catch (Objective 1.3.3), the issue was to be dealt under Agenda item 5.3d. Former Council Chairman, Prof. Wolff had been approached to lead the drafting of specifications regarding a review of barriers to migration (Objective 1.3.5). Draft Terms of Reference for the review prepared by Prof. Wolff were circulated later as document CMS/ScC14/CRP.3, and was endorsed by the Scientific Council without modification (Annex 7).

43. Funding from the Italian Government had enabled a review of the impact of Invasive Alien Species on Migratory Species to be brought forward from the next triennium. Possible input from the Scientific Council was expected to be discussed under Agenda item 8.5. Other major recognised threats such as climate change and by-catch were going to be covered under specific Agenda items.

44. **Activity 2.3.4** (*Review the existing international guidance on environmental impact assessment, identify gaps in relation to migratory species interests and if necessary develop further guidance relating to migratory species issues*). A volunteer was sought to act as focal point for this activity.

45. **Activity 4.1.1** (*Maintain close cooperation with scientific focal points and committees of daughter Agreements, regional initiatives (particularly in the marine environment), and the Scientific bodies of UNEP and other conventions (particularly with regard to synergistic actions and cross cutting issues (Research, monitoring, capacity building, addressing threats, recovery actions for Appendix I species etc.)). This will be achieved through cross-representation on appropriate bodies, periodic meeting of Chairs, cross-reporting and joint activities*). There were examples of members of Scientific Council who acted as liaison points with other organisations (e.g., Dr. Perrin with the IWC). It would help the Scientific Council if other contact points could be identified with other bodies especially for those with which CMS did not have formalised links.

46. In summary, the chair said that it was clear that the Secretariat had been working hard and it was heartening to hear that money had been found to progress several projects. It was important for CMS to foster links with other organisations to ensure that it could influence policy developments in other fora. He added that he thought that while Scientific Council meetings had been very constructive, follow-up work between sessions could have been more rigorously pursued. He then called for the establishment of a working group to review further the implementation of the Strategy Implementation Plan. The following participants offered to join the working group: councillors Bagine, Biber, Custodio, Galbraith, Micevski and O'Sullivan and observer Herrenshmidt.

47. The Working Group met twice during the meeting. Mr. Carlo Custodio (Councillor for the Philippines) reported on the discussions of the group during the morning session of 17 March. The Group had reviewed the programme of implementation as proposed in document CMS/ScC14/Doc.21. Time constraints had made it impossible to review every detail of the plan. It was noted that some items were progressing well, while others had not progressed at all. Some of the triennium targets were behind schedule but there was time for ground to be made up. The Group thought it advisable for an estimate of the cost of implementing work should be included and

that CMS/ScC14/Doc.21 should be updated and made available online. A written report produced by the group is appended to this report as Annex 8.

**5. Scientific Council tasks arising *inter alia* from resolutions, recommendations and other decisions of the Conference of the Parties**

**5.1 *Concerted actions for selected Appendix I species/groups (Res. 3.2, 4.2, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1 and 8.29 refer)***

48. Reporting on progress in the implementation of Concerted Actions, recommendations of the Council for ongoing Concerted Actions and possible identification of other candidate species to be the subject of Concerted Actions were discussed within the taxonomic working groups. The reports of the taxonomic working groups are reproduced as Annexes 2-6 to this report.

**5.2 *Cooperative actions for Appendix II species (Recommendations 5.2, 6.2, 7.1 and 8.28 refer)***

49. Reporting on progress in the implementation of Cooperative Actions, recommendations of the Council for ongoing Cooperative Actions and possible identification of other candidate species to be the subject of Cooperative Actions were discussed within the taxonomic working groups. The reports of the taxonomic working groups are reproduced as Annexes 2-6 to this report.

**5.3 *Other resolutions and recommendations (not already covered under previous agenda items)***

**a) *Resolution 8.1: Sustainable Use***

50. Ms. Paola Deda (CMS Secretariat, Inter-Agency Liaison Officer) introduced document CMS/ScC14/Doc.10. She noted that COP8 had passed Resolution 8.1 seeking the Scientific Council's views on the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines and their applicability to CMS and migratory species.

51. In relation to sustainable use, since COP8 the Secretariat had worked on a study of wildlife watching and ecotourism with support from the travel firm, TUI. It showed some of the pros and cons of wildlife watching through case studies. There were no general guidelines on managing wildlife watching, nor had there been a global overview, although guidelines existed for particular species and sites. Issues, which tended to recur, were: disturbance, habitat damage, visitor management and human impacts. The establishment of a working group was foreseen to address these issues.

52. Dr. Thomas Althaus (WAZA) spoke of experience from the CITES Animals Committee which had already examined the applicability of the Addis Ababa Principles.

53. Dr. Marie-Christine Grillo-Van Klaveren (ACCOBAMS) congratulated the CMS Secretariat on the brochure on wildlife watching. Whale watching was a subject in which ACCOBAMS had an interest and had developed guidelines on this activity. The Agreement was also working on a "quality label" concept which should be ready for presentation at the forthcoming ACCOBAMS MOP in October.



54. Dr. Colin Limpus (Appointed Councillor for Marine Turtles) was anxious to ensure that the emphasis in ecotourism was placed on the conservation and sustainability of the species and it should be left to other agencies (e.g., UNDP) to defend the interests of the growing industries.

55. The chair agreed with this sentiment and thought that the ACCOBAMS quality label would contribute to ensuring that the interests of the animals were addressed. He then sought guidance from the Secretariat on what outcomes were expected from the proposed working group and comments from the floor about other topics to be considered besides hunting and wildlife watching.

56. Ms. Deda explained that the Secretariat expected an assessment of the applicability of the Addis Ababa Principles to CMS and outline terms of reference for the development of guidelines on the impacts of wildlife watching and tourism on wildlife. To facilitate the working group's deliberations inter-sessionally, dedicated pages could be established on the CMS website, where the convenor could invite comments to be posted.

57. The following participants offered to join the working group: councillors Baker, Bankovics, Beudels-Jamar de Bolsee, Biber, Blanco, Camara, Clausen, Devillers, Galbraith, Mundkur, Opermanis, O'Sullivan, Oteng Yeboah, Perrin and Spina and observers Althaus, Davies, Grillo-van Klaveren, Morgan, Stroud, Vié (provisionally) and Wollscheid.

58. The group met in the afternoon of 15 March 2007. Dr. Devillers was elected Chairman of the working Group. During the afternoon session of 17 March, Dr. Devillers gave an account of the outcome of the meeting. The Working Group had agreed on a workplan until ScC15/COP9 focusing on (i) the assessment of the applicability of the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines in the CMS context and (ii) the development of general guidance for wildlife watching activities. Further details on the workplan are included in the report of the meeting of the Working Group, which is appended to this report as Annex 9.

**b) *Resolution 8.7: Assessing the contribution of CMS in achieving the 2010 Biodiversity Target***

59. The chair opened the discussion observing that the 2010 Biodiversity Target was an important priority for all biodiversity related conventions. Migratory species were an important component of biodiversity and CMS had a full part to play. The Convention needed to be able to measure its achievements.

60. Dr. Barbieri introduced paper CMS/ScC14/Doc.17, an account of the Secretariat's activities since COP8. Further relevant papers were at documents CMS/ScC14/Inf.10 and CMS/ScC14/Inf.15.

61. Resolution 8.7 made several requests of Scientific Council, including the development in collaboration with the Secretariat of a Migratory Species Index within the context of Living Planet Index in conjunction with BirdLife International, IUCN, UNEP-WCMC, WWF and other relevant institutions. The CMS Secretariat had joined the 2010 Biodiversity Indicator Partnership in 2006 along with 40 other agencies and organisations coordinated by the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC). GEF funding had been obtained. The technical support of councillors would be appreciated as the project progressed. The Secretariat was also envisaging to cooperate with Ramsar STRP in the area of development of indicators to assess the achievements of the Convention, as it was known that the Ramsar Convention was already making solid progress.

62. Mr. Stroud (Ramsar Convention) said that 2010 indicators were an important issue for the Ramsar STRP. Indicators had been identified and were being refined. A further meeting was

planned to develop the next stages and information was being gathered to help inform the debate. Availability of information was reviewed, with some countries better placed than others. Ramsar would of course be happy to collaborate with CMS on developing indicators.

63. Mr. Fragoso (UNEP-WCMC) warned about gathering information for its own sake and not sharing data when it had been collected. It was important to decide on relevant indicators that would help inform policy development and benefit migratory species.

64. Dr. Barbieri said that CMS would try to elaborate indicators in conjunction with other MEAs, but realising that time was pressing at the meeting, suggested that he should liaise with the coordinators of the taxonomic working groups to discuss the detail of the advice the Secretariat would be seeking.

65. The chair summarised by saying that the Secretariat would inform the Scientific Council of its plans for statements relating to 2010 targets and would let the Scientific Council know what the wider UNEP view was. The Secretariat would explore the possibility of developing joint indicators with other MEAs, such as Ramsar. CMS and WCMC would examine how best to use existing data in developing indicators and the coordinators of the taxonomic working groups would stand ready to advise on their taxonomic areas of expertise.

**c) *Resolution 8.13: Climate change and migratory species***

66. Prof. Galbraith opened the discussion by stating that Climate Change was recognised as one of the major threats to biodiversity, and migratory species were no exception. The UK had taken the lead on investigating the problem and Prof. Galbraith invited Mr. Blencowe to describe what actions had been taken.

67. Mr. Blencowe reminded councillors of the study on climate change and migratory species commissioned by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) of the Government of the United Kingdom which had been presented at the 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the CMS Conference of the Parties in Nairobi in 2005. The study, carried out by the British Trust for Ornithology, had found clear links between Climate Change and altered behaviours in birds and changes to species' range and abundance. Data on birds was more plentiful than on other taxa but there was no standardised collection methodology so read-across to other taxa was difficult. Ten proxy species had been identified, and projections could be made for some other species. These considerations had led DEFRA to commission a further research project aiming to (i) identify a set of species whose attributes could act as indicators of likely climate change impacts on the range of migratory species; and (ii) develop standardised international protocols for monitoring the effects of climate change on populations of these migratory indicator species. The study, for which an approximate budget of £70,000 had been set out, was being tendered and it was expected to start in April 2007. The selected contractor would be asked to liaise with the Scientific Council.

68. Dr. Devillers recalled that at COP8 Dr. Blanke had stressed that Climate Change was just one factor affecting migratory species, and Dr. Limpus said that turtles which had survived previous major climate changes were failing to adapt because of other factors impinging on them simultaneously.

69. Mr. Davies (WWF) announced that WWF was doing some research work regarding hawksbill turtles and Climate Change, while Dr. Jean-Christophe Vié (IUCN) said that his organisation had funding available for a wide study of the effects of Climate Change on 2000 species in three different groups and would want to liaise with CMS.

70. Dr. Borja Heredia (Councillor for Spain) welcomed the UK study which was urgently needed and timely. He highlighted the case of the trumpeter finch (*Rhodopechys githaginea*) which had been publicised in “Ibis” magazine. Previously largely confined to North Africa, it was becoming increasingly common in Spain. The trumpeter finch might prove to be a good case study for the U.K. research. Prof. Galbraith agreed saying that as a relatively numerous species it might prove easier to study. In summarising, Prof. Galbraith thanked the U.K. for their research, noted the need to develop indicators of Climate Change and the need to avoid looking at Climate Change in isolation, as migratory species were being affected by a combination of factors. He called for volunteers for the inter-sessional working group and the following offered to serve: councillors Al-Harogi, Bankovics, Blanke, Clausen, Dehörter, Eissa Darwich, Flousek, Galbraith, Limpus, Micevski, Mundkur, Spina and Wołoszyn and observers: Davies, Dereliev, Stroud, van Waerebeek, and Vié.

71. The group met in the afternoon of 15 March 2007. In the absence of other volunteers, Prof. Galbraith had agreed to chair the Working Group on an interim basis. During the afternoon session of 16 March, Prof. Galbraith gave an account of the outcomes of the meeting. The group had confirmed that climate change was indeed a major factor in terms of the ecology and migration route for migratory species in future and therefore was appropriate for the Council to form an intersessional working group. The increasing involvement from the scientific community and also from the political community in the issue was noted. The group had also noted the complexity of climate change when set along side other threats to the particular species. Threats to habitats and populations in other ways compounded by climate change will make it even harder for migratory species to survive into the future. There were particular issues related to the survival of the Appendix I species. The group noted also the excellent proposal brought by the UK Government to develop specific indicators for species in relation to climate change and looked forward to seeing the results from that study. Prof. Galbraith concluded by noting that the high number of participants in the meeting of the group was very encouraging, as there was a great deal of experience and expertise on which to draw in the further work of the group. In relation to the chair of the group, he stood ready to be the interim chair of the group unless anyone else wanted to volunteer at the meeting or intersessionally.

**d) Resolution 8.14: By-catch**

72. Dr. Barbieri reminded councillors that COP8 had broken new ground by deciding to appoint a councillor for a thematic rather than taxonomic or regional area of expertise by seeking someone to lead on bycatch. Mr. Baker, former councillor for Australia, had been appointed.

73. Mr. Baker noted that bycatch was an issue that threatened most of the marine species listed on the Appendices of the Convention. He thanked the government of the U.K. which had recently provided funding to support a global review of bycatch as a threat to migratory species and the government of Australia which had provided 150,000 AUS to support the work of the bycatch councillor over the 2006-2008 triennium. With these resources available to CMS, he was hopeful that significant progress could be made in progressing conservation action to reduce bycatch in many of the world’s fisheries.

74. Turning to Resolution 8.14, Mr. Baker informed the meeting that he had prepared a draft work plan for the position of Appointed Councillor for Bycatch, which was being tabled as a meeting document (CMS/ScC14/Doc.25). The work plan had a number of thrusts:

- firstly, it looked to establish a small working group to ensure thorough coverage of faunal groups and access to technical expertise on mitigation techniques and application. It was proposed that membership of the working group should be expertise based and could

comprise members not directly involved with the CMS Scientific Council. The working group aimed to assist in implementing the Work Programme and the actions which the CMS had committed to carry out in Res. 8.14.

- secondly, it was proposed that CMS should conduct a study to assess bycatch in global fisheries. This study should assess the available information on bycatch of seabirds, marine turtles, sharks and marine mammals, focusing particularly on CMS-listed species and the importance of bycatch as a threat to migratory species; it should also provide an overview of priority fisheries, regions and species which will benefit from international action through CMS. Draft specifications for the review were submitted to the meeting for consideration as document CMS/ScC14/Doc.19.
- Thirdly, there was a need to work closely with other international competent bodies such as FAO and relevant RFMOs, groups and organizations with which CMS had not had much contact in the past. Attendance at key meetings of these bodies was essential to influence adoption of mitigation strategies and implementation of independent observer programmes, necessary for improving knowledge of bycatch issues and influencing changes in management approaches.

75. Many of the other activities on the draft work plan related to developing and disseminating the essential tools and information required to bring about reductions in bycatch. Mr. Baker suggested that the details of the Work Programme be discussed in a working group to be established at the meeting.

76. Mr. Baker concluded by saying that, while the work in addressing bycatch of migratory species was considerable, fortunately CMS was not alone in its endeavours, with some of the CMS daughter agreements already working on this matter. There were complementary actions that CMS, ACAP, ASCOBANS and ACCOBAMS and MoUs on turtles could take, and the members of the CMS family were expected to collaborate closely to avoid duplication of effort and wasting resources. The considerable effort taken by many friends of the CMS in addressing bycatch was also to be acknowledged, with special reference to be made to the Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society, WWF and BirdLife International.

77. The Chair welcomed Mr. Baker's appointment stressing that bycatch was affecting a wide range of species. He agreed that CMS and its Agreements needed to engage with other organisations, especially fisheries management bodies. Mr. Omar Rocha (Councillor for Bolivia) stated that bycatch was not confined to marine environments but it was an issue too in the freshwater environment, referring in particular to the example of Lake Titicaca.

78. Ms. Pamela Toschik (observer from USA) first thanked the Secretariat for the invitation to participate as an observer and pointed out that the FAO Fisheries Committees had agreed to cooperate with organisations such as CMS to work on methods to reduce bycatch.

79. Dr. Althaus (WAZA) again speaking from his experience on the CITES Animals Committee, pointed out that not many shark species were listed on CITES but they were of growing concern and their status under CITES was under review. Sharks suffered from bycatch and direct taking too.

80. Mr. Tasker (ACAP) welcomed Mr. Baker's appointment and raised a question about the Resolution. It referred to best practice techniques for mitigating bycatch but was silent on governance. By and large, the same countries were represented at CMS and at Fishery

Management Meetings, but the conservation message did not seem to be coming through in RFMOs. Internal communication needed to improve.

81. Ms. Vicki Cronan (observer from Australia) stressed that her government took bycatch seriously and had therefore provided funding to assist Mr. Baker in his role. Bycatch was a complex and global issue and she asked other potential donors to come forward.

82. Dr. Grillo-Van Klaveren (ACCOBAMS) promised that her secretariat and scientific committee would fully cooperate with the working group. She agreed that it was important for Mr. Baker to attend as many regional meetings as possible, and she would pass on details of meetings in the Mediterranean and Black Seas dealing with bycatch issues. Dr. Perrin similarly promised to keep Mr. Baker informed about the work of the IWC Scientific Committee.

83. Dr. Davies (WWF) commended CMS on Mr. Baker's appointment. WWF took bycatch seriously and pointed out that it was also a problem for juveniles of targeted species such as tuna.

84. Dr. Biber said that AEWA's Technical Committee had considered proposals to extend its scope to include seabirds and would therefore take an increasing interest in bycatch issues.

85. Mr. Baker agreed with ACAP's point on governance and urged CMS focal points to put pressure on their fisheries colleagues to ensure that the conservation message was heard in RFMOs. He assured the Bolivian councillor that lake fishery bycatch would not be overlooked. He was disappointed that at the FAO recent Committee on Fisheries (COFI) meeting, only five countries had complied with a requirement to produce mitigation plans for seabird bycatch. He invited interested councillors to let him know if they wished to join a working group and he reiterated his intention to involve other experts not connected with the Scientific Council. Those who volunteered were councillors: Biber, Galbraith, O'Sullivan, Perrin and Wolff and observers: Davies, Grillo-van Klaveren, Tasker, van Waerebeek and Vié.

86. The chair thanked the Australian government for its generous support of Mr. Baker and the U.K. for the financial support to the review of bycatch. He urged councillors to support Mr. Baker in his work, supported his intention to draw on expertise outside CMS and recognised the complex and global nature of his task.

87. During the afternoon session of 17 March, Mr. Baker reported on the discussions held within the working group. The Group had discussed the draft Bycatch Work Plan and specifications for the project, both of which had been adopted subject to minor changes. The report of the Working Group, including the finalized version of the work plan for the bycatch councillor, is appended as Annex 10. The revised version of the specifications for the review of bycatch of migratory species in global fisheries is appended as Annex 11.

**e) *Resolution 8.22: Adverse human induced impact on cetaceans***

88. Dr. Barbieri introduced document CMS/ScC14/Doc.22 and referred to Resolution 8.22 contained in document CMS/ScC14/Inf.10. The Resolution required the Secretariat and the Scientific Council to draft a work programme to investigate the impacts of human activities on cetaceans to be presented to COP9. The Secretariat was already working on the draft work programme which it would submit to the Aquatic Mammals Working Group for comment.

89. Those who had attended COP8 might recall the offer by WDCCS to coordinate an expert group to support the Scientific Council and Dr. Perrin. The "Cetacean Liaison Group" had already met once and the meeting report was contained in document CMS/ScC14/Inf.21.

90. The Secretariat invited comments on the report, a draft outline of which was contained in document CMS/ScC14/Doc.22. Comments were particularly sought on the structure (e.g., whether the chapter on CMS and Agreements should be merged with the previous chapter) as well as its content.

91. Mr. Tasker (ASCOBANS) commented that the overlap between human induced impacts and bycatch did not seem to have been acknowledged and there was a risk of duplication of effort. Dr. Grillo-van Klaveren (ACCOBAMS) reported that the ACCOBAMS work plan was being developed for presentation at the ACCOBAMS MOP in October 2007 and she undertook to liaise with the Secretariat over progress of the CMS work plan.

92. The draft work programme to implement CMS Resolution 8.22 (CMS/ScC14/Doc.22) was reviewed by the taxonomic Working Group on Aquatic Mammals during its meeting. The Group considered that the programme was meeting the needs specified by the resolution, and supported it. The Group recognized the considerable and valuable assistance contributed by the Cetacean Liaison Group and hoped that it would continue.

## **6. Proposals for Amendments to Appendices I and II of the Convention**

### ***Consideration of draft listing proposals***

93. Dr. Barbieri explained that a number of draft proposals to add species to the Appendices had been tabled. Those were not to be considered as formal proposals, as under the Convention, that was the prerogative of the Parties. The Scientific Council could however make recommendations to the Parties on species worthy of being included. The proposals were set out in meeting documents CMS/ScC14/Doc.4-8 covering cetaceans, CMS/ScC14/Doc.13 covering mammalian species in Asia and a draft proposal from Yemen on the Arabian leopard (*Panthera pardus nimr*). The main scrutiny of the proposals would take place in the relevant taxonomic working group rather than the plenary but the working groups would report back on their deliberations.

94. The taxonomic working groups considered the submitted draft proposals in their respective meetings. Their relevant conclusions concerning recommendation of listing of species in the Appendices are illustrated in the reports of the working groups, attached as Annexes 2, 3, 4 and 6. All recommendations of the working groups were endorsed by the meeting.

### ***New taxonomic reference for Mammals***

95. Under the same item, the meeting considered a suggested new taxonomic reference for mammals.

96. At the Scientific Council's 13<sup>th</sup> meeting in Nairobi, the Terrestrial Mammal Working Group had encountered taxonomic problems with regard to the latest views on the gorilla and its subspecies.

97. Dr. Ebenhard (Councillor for Sweden) had produced a paper (CMS/ScC14/Doc.3) reviewing the latest taxonomies, and was proposing: either the adoption of the latest version of Wilson-Reeder 2005 which affected 12 CMS species; or the addition of the new information contained in this version as a series of footnotes to the CMS appendix listings. Dr. Ebenhard had no strong preference between the two options, but felt that adopting Wilson-Reeder 2005 would bring the Convention up to date with the most recent thinking (and the confusion concerning gorillas would

be avoided in future). He stressed however that neither option had any practical effects on conservation, as they merely changed the way the species listed were described. The chair, who also had no clear preference between the two options, invited comments from the floor.

98. Dr. Devillers agreed that whichever taxonomic reference were adopted, there would be no detriment to conservation, and species listed under the old system would remain on the appendices. He thought for the purposes of clarity and comprehensibility the Convention should use the most modern terminology, on the understanding that in five years, a further revision would have been made and the Scientific Council would have to adopt that when the time came.

99. Mr. Morgan (CITES) said that changing taxonomies made the conservation message confusing to lay-people but what made matters worse was when related Conventions used different taxonomic terminology. For its part, CITES had referred Wilson-Reeder 2005 to its nomenclature committee and it had been adopted. One exception was the new treatment of the African Elephant. Mr. Morgan referred to the CMS-CITES Memorandum of Cooperation, one element of which was the agreement to use compatible terminology.

100. While Dr. Blanke and Dr. Beudels agreed with Dr. Devillers that Wilson-Reeder 2005 should be adopted, Dr. Perrin advocated the second option on the grounds that no taxonomic reference was ever perfect. He pointed out that the 2005 revision of Wilson-Reeder had only just been published (12 years after the previous edition) and as far as aquatic mammals were concerned it was already outdated. One cetacean sub-species had been omitted from the review, apparently an oversight. Dr. Perrin thought it preferable for the Scientific Council to review the latest thinking at each meeting and not tie itself to particular references which quickly went out of date.

101. Prof. Wołoszyn agreed that soon after the new reference was applied, more changes would make it obsolete. The Scientific Council should decide a general policy on adopting taxonomies and he felt that Dr. Perrin's approach was more flexible.

102. In the light of Dr. Perrin's comments on cetacean coverage in the new reference, Dr. Devillers suggested that Wilson-Reeder 2005 should be adopted for terrestrial mammals and agreed with Prof. Wołoszyn that it would be useful for Scientific Council to adopt a general policy on updating taxonomic references.

103. Dr. Vié (IUCN) said that the exercise of updating the Red Data List covered 50,000 taxa which were under constant review. It was important that everyone knew which species were being referred to and therefore the IUCN would use Wilson-Reeder 2005, except where the species experts advised differently.

104. The chair suggested that the relevant Taxonomic Working Groups should consider the appropriate way forward for the species for which they were responsible.

105. The working groups for aquatic and terrestrial mammals considered the proposed revision of the taxonomic reference in their respective meetings. Their recommendations are included in the reports of the working groups, attached as Annexes 2 and 3. Following reporting of the relevant recommendations of the working groups in the plenary, the Scientific Council confirmed that Rice 1998 would remain the reference for marine mammals while for other mammal groups Wilson-Reeder 2005 would be adopted.

## *Review of Sharks*

106. Dr. Fowler (Chair of the IUCN Shark Specialist Group) referred councillors to CMS/ScC14/Doc.14 which she had prepared. The emphasis of her presentation on the shark review would focus primarily on the process rather than the outcomes, on the grounds that the shark review might be useful as a model for similar exercise for other taxa.

107. The review had been made possible through funding from both CMS and DEFRA (UK). Its scope encompassed the creation of a migratory shark database, compilation of a report on the conservation status of the species and suggestions for potentially fruitful cooperative actions to be reported to the proposed intergovernmental meeting in 2007. The review covered flat sharks as well.

108. The CMS review coincided with the IUCN Red Data List assessment process, covering the entire taxonomic group (ca. 1200 species). A series of workshops had taken place and 550 species were now on the list with a further 400 under review. Of all species listed 19% were in the three threatened categories, 17% near threatened, 26% least concern and the rest data deficient. However, when broken down between migratory and non-migratory shark species, the figures showed a higher degree of threat for the migratory species. One reason was that a large number of Australian endemic species were categorised as “least concern” or data deficient.

109. The database had been compiled using “Excel” and 140 migratory (or possibly migratory) species had been included, 14% of the total number of cartilaginous species. The data fields included habitat, migration, range states, threat analysis and IUCN status, global and regional management status and legal protection. A list of taxa which would benefit from CMS attention had been prepared – some at species, some at genus and others at family level. The database would be posted on the web for peer review and for updating.

110. Dr. Heredia congratulated Dr. Fowler on the excellent work and asked, as many shark species were subject of commercial fisheries, how easy it would be to acquire information on the impacts of these fisheries, how the fisheries were managed and how much biomass was affected.

111. Dr. Fowler agreed that fisheries were a major threat. This information was needed for the Red Data listing but many fisheries did not collate such data, and those which did, did so in an inadequate manner. One potential role for CITES and CMS would be to persuade RFMOs that data collection should be a higher priority.

112. Dr. Hogan (Appointed Councillor for Fish) saw a possible read-across for freshwater species and Dr. Fowler agreed that the review methodology could be adapted for other taxa. She did though point out that the review had been labour intensive with workshops held across the world. Some savings had been achieved through carrying out the exercise in conjunction with the Red Data review.

113. Dr. Biber asked how CMS would deal with shark species which were clearly migratory but which did not cross national or international jurisdictions. He also asked what follow-up action would be needed regarding the many data deficient species and whether UNCLOS would be involved, as there were likely to be many migratory species inhabiting deep seas.

114. Dr. Devillers agreed that Dr. Biber had raised an interesting point. He sought clarification from Dr. Fowler about her definition of “migratory” to see whether it coincided with the definition used by the Convention. Some non-migratory species might still qualify under the CMS definition if they regularly crossed jurisdictions, by leaving the 200-mile national limits and entering



international waters for instance. The Convention also extended Parties' obligation to their flag vessels operating in international waters.

115. Dr. Fowler confirmed that she had used the Convention's definition and had used the EEZ and continental shelf to define national waters. Many species were pelagic (e.g. the blue shark) and frequented the open sea but did enter some EEZs. In the Mediterranean where there was no EEZ, territorial waters extended to 6-12 miles from the coast. Some species frequented oceanic basins and possibly never entered EEZs, coastal waters or the continental shelf.

116. Mr. Tasker (ICES) welcomed the review and congratulated Dr. Fowler for her excellent work and CMS for commissioning the study. He suggested that the review be peer-reviewed before publication, as the study would be closely scrutinised by fisheries interests. He said that CMS was breaking new ground in dealing with fish, and there were other species (e.g. tuna and swordfish) which were migratory and were being exploited by multi-million dollar fisheries. With regard to defining migration, he thought that the limits of different RFMOs might be used. In any case, the principle was the same: conservation effort on one side of the line would be undermined if excessive exploitation continued on the other side. He concluded by adding that while some shark species were targeted by fisheries, others were suffering from bycatch.

117. Dr. Biber did not think that the applicability of the Convention to the High Seas was quite so easy to solve. CMS needed to follow and become involved in the debate elsewhere in the UN system, such as the UN General Assembly debates on Deep Sea Biodiversity.

118. The chair thanked Dr. Fowler for her presentation, and on the issue of bycatch, felt that the problem was being exacerbated by countries not exercising sufficient responsibility for the actions of their fishing fleets.

119. Dr. Barbieri in conclusion, thanked the U.K. for helping to finance the review and pointed to the efficiencies achieved through the CMS review taking place alongside the IUCN exercise. He also asked the Scientific Council for guidance as to which further taxonomic reviews were desirable and feasible in the short term, and the Fish Taxonomic Group to consider the review in greater detail.

120. Dr. Fowler's report was further considered within the taxonomic working group on fish. The relevant deliberations are included in the report of the group (Annex 6)

## **7. Small Scale Projects funded by CMS**

121. Dr. Barbieri explained that no new call for project proposals had been made for this meeting, as many of the approved projects seen at the 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> meetings were still awaiting funding. Previously, most of the project funding had come from surpluses in the CMS Trust Fund, but this source was no longer available and the Secretariat was now dependent on voluntary contributions. Some projects were more interesting to sponsors than others and sometimes the priorities of the donors were different from those of the Scientific Council. The Secretariat's fund-raising effort since the last COP had been generally successful but the Small Grant Programme had attracted less interest than other components of the programme of activities.

122. Ms. Deda provided an overview of the Secretariat's fund-raising efforts. She reported that progress had been made since the last COP in 2005 which had given the Secretariat a reasonably generous settlement but not one which allowed small projects to be funded from the core budget. Fund-raising was being undertaken to bridge the gap. The recent meeting on Priorities in Implementing the Programme of Work 2007-2008, held just before the last Standing Committee,

had illustrated how CMS was working towards its 2010 targets and further voluntary contributions had been promised as a result. The list of projects awaiting funding was regularly updated and circulated and each month there was usually some progress to report with offers of money or in kind support. Projects recommended for funding by the Scientific Council under the Small Grant Programme were included in a specific section of the list.

123. New initiatives being undertaken included the recent formation of the “Friends of CMS”, a not-for-profit organisation based in Germany and chaired by former UNEP Executive Director, Prof. Klaus Töpfer. A contribution of €100,000 had just been secured from Bayer and more members were being recruited. A partnership with the travel firm TUI had resulted in the production of the CMS brochure *“Wildlife Watching and Tourism: A study on the benefits and risks of a fast growing tourism activity and its impacts on species”* and in TUI’s sponsorship of the “Year of the Dolphin 2007” campaign, involving workshops, posters, an educational manual, leaflets and a dedicated web-page. TUI would also be marketing special “Year of the Dolphin 2007” products and a percentage of the proceeds would be earmarked for conservation projects.

124. Traditional fundraising was also being pursued, by collaborating with like-minded organisations, and applying for grants from UNEP (for the CMS Family Guide, an encyclopaedia of the Convention), the European Commission (Antelopes project), FAO (for avian influenza) and GEF.

125. The chair commended the Secretariat on its efforts to raise funds which he knew was a difficult job. He hoped that good news would soon follow on funding for some of the outstanding projects on the Scientific Council’s priority list.

126. Dr. Devillers stressed how important the Small Grants Programme was to the work of the Convention in general and Scientific Council in particular. The projects funded represented real conservation work in the field as well as vital research. He regretted having to adopt a negative tone, but the Small Grants Programme was the victim of COP decisions from 2002 and 2005. The predicted consequences had arisen with projects now at the mercy of donors rather than a reliable budget line. There was no guarantee that the donors’ priorities would match the Convention’s, so popular projects were more likely to succeed than important ones. He suggested that the Scientific Council prepare a strongly worded statement to be conveyed to the COP deploring the lack of financial resources for important seed-corn and pilot projects.

127. Mr. Mshelbwala agreed entirely with the sentiments expressed by Dr. Devillers as he saw great benefits in having a constant flow of small, preparatory projects which were useful in attracting interest and funding for larger-scale conservation efforts. Parties had to be persuaded to fund core activities, especially seed corn projects. A small group was set up with the task of assisting the chairman in producing a statement to be conveyed to the Parties.

128. Ms. Herrenschmidt (observer from France) who had chaired the COP8 budget committee was less pessimistic than Dr. Devillers. The Secretariat was successfully finding other funding partners, like the EU and the Fonds Français pour l’Environnement Mondial. The Secretariat should build on its links with TUI and find other partners in the travel and transport sector. She also believed that biodiversity was climbing up the international, political agenda and it would be easier to fund-raise. The Secretariat’s efforts were a good example for other MEAs to emulate.

129. Dr. Roberto Schlatter (Appointed Councillor for Neotropical Fauna) agreed that the situation was not ideal. He said that when financial resources were short, it was necessary to prioritise. He did not think that the prioritisation process was as transparent as it should be and asked for clear criteria to be set. In particular, the Latin American countries thought that the Ruddy-headed goose

(*Chloephaga rubidiceps*) was a high priority but the Scientific Council did not seem to share this view entirely.

130. Ms. Deda noted the comments. She went on to explain that CMS had formalised its relations with TUI through a Memorandum of Understanding and a letter of intent, so it was envisaged that the partnership would develop further. She did stress that fund-raising was a time-consuming business and that there was no dedicated fund-raising officer in the Secretariat. In producing the lists of projects the Secretariat did try to match Parties' priorities with those of the Convention, and the process had, for instance, led to funding for the West African cetacean meeting for which voluntary contributions had been obtained and the free use of a venue had been promised.

131. During the afternoon session of 17 March the chairman read the following statement on financing of research and conservation projects recommended by the Scientific Council, which was endorsed by the meeting.

*“Having reviewed, in part through the analysis conducted by its taxonomic working groups, the achievements of the first half of the 2005-2008 triennium, the Scientific Council reiterates its opinion that the concrete conservation actions that it has identified selected, prioritized and recommended for funding have been and are one of the principal assets, and a unique trademark of the Convention, as well as the main pathway through which the convention will contribute to the 2010 target. The Council thus expresses its deep concern at the difficulties of funding that have impeded during the first half of the triennium both the continuation of ongoing actions and the initiation of new ones, in sharp contrast with the situation of past periods. The Scientific Council regards the guarantee of secure funding for the actions it reviews and recommends a vital requirement if the quality of the implementation of the Convention and its relevance to effective conservation are to be maintained and if the credibility and the usefulness of the work of the Scientific Council are to be preserved. Such a secure and predictable level of funding existed in the past as a fixed budget allocated by each COP, taken from Convention reserves.*

*Two possible ways to recreate this situation appear to exist:*

- Either the COP undertakes to again allocate a fixed budget, taken from its resources, and this without reducing the support given to other necessary Convention activities;*
- Or the secretariat expands its present fund-raising programme to generate sufficient resources allowing a fixed sum to be reserved for projects selected by the Council procedure.”*

## **8. Progress on other matters requiring the Scientific Council's advice**

### **8.1 Potential New Agreements (including Memoranda of Understanding and Action Plans)**

132. Mr. Blencowe made a presentation on the potential new agreement for raptors. The UK and the United Arab Emirates (UAE), which was not yet party to CMS, were leading the negotiations on a regional agreement for migratory birds of prey covering Africa and Eurasia. Some delegates might have remembered the presentations made by DEFRA's Nick Williams at the Scientific Council meeting in Glasgow and at the COP in Nairobi and the recommendation of COP8 to support the negotiation of an instrument. Since COP, the UK had written to all range states to identify the appropriate authorities. Forty replies had been received, both from CMS Parties and non-parties alike. A leaflet had been produced in English, French and Russian and the UAE was working on an Arabic version. A dedicated page had been set up on the CMS web-site.

133. A first inter-governmental meeting had been arranged for 22-25 October 2007 at Loch Lomond, near Glasgow, and the second had been provisionally scheduled for 2008 to be hosted by the UAE. Initial research indicated that 50% of the species had an unfavourable conservation status and some of the others were data deficient. The main problems seemed to be: habitat loss, persecution, poisoning and electrocution. It was still an open question whether the instrument would be an MoU or an Agreement. As an MoU it would be the largest concluded under CMS, as the geographic range of the instrument was similar to that of AEWa.

134. Mr. Lyle Glowka (CMS Secretariat, Agreements Officer) gave a general presentation on the Secretariat's current work on servicing existing agreements and negotiating new ones. As some councillors were attending their first meeting, he gave a short retrospective account of the development of agreements.

135. Objective 2 of the Strategic Plan called for the best conservation measures to protect migratory species. A need for fifteen new instruments had been identified and progress was being made on eleven. Progress was again being made on the houbara bustard (*Chlamydotis undulata macqueenii*). An MoU was being considered to back up the action plan already operating for the Sahelo-Saharan Antelopes. The range states were showing an interest in an instrument for the Mongolian gazelle (*Procapra gutturosa*). In South East Asia, there were plans for a small cetacean agreement. An agreement for bats in Africa had been under consideration for some time and there was an existing framework to build on for the Central Asian Flyway, for which an action plan existed. Two other processes were also progressing: an instrument on migratory sharks was developing well and a meeting had been arranged for December 2007 in the Seychelles, and probably next year, initial steps would be taken on an MoU for turtles in the Pacific Basin.

136. A 64% success rate had already been recorded on "process oriented engagement". Regarding concerted action species, 38 of the designated 47 species were already benefiting from some practical conservation initiatives under the Convention. The Convention was moving to more action-oriented work – action plans setting priorities and coordinating mechanisms to deliver more conservation work. CMS had identified more partners capable of providing this practical assistance (e.g. ICF on Siberian cranes, SPREP on Pacific cetaceans), better geared to turning talk into action.

137. The financial and human resources of the Secretariat were finite. Arranging meetings of parties/signatories and potential parties was a labour-intensive and costly exercise, but the Secretariat was currently servicing 11 extant MoUs and negotiating a further two. In Africa, the Turtle MoU had been reenergised with the help of the NEPAP office in Senegal. Other initiatives in the region were for cetaceans, gorillas, antelopes and elephants, which indicated the importance attached to Africa by the Convention. Elsewhere, the Siberian Crane MoU was about to hold its 6<sup>th</sup> Meeting of Signatories; Australia had committed 150,000 AUS for a Dugong MoU; in Europe the Great Bustard MoU would have a meeting in 2008.

138. Mr. Tasker (ACAP) referred to CMS/ScC14/Doc.15, the summary of recent progress in the work of the Advisory Committee of the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels. The Agreement had 11 parties with more likely to join. Its Advisory Committee had four working groups; one dealing with taxonomy (a major issue with albatrosses and petrels); one with status and trends; one on breeding sites (a list had been drawn up and was now being prioritised for factors such as alien species) and one dealing with by-catch under the chairmanship of Mr. Baker. Capacity building exercises were being targeted at those Parties with economies in transition, and assistance was being offered to Ecuador and Peru who shared one species, the waved albatross (*Phoebastria irrorata*) to improve its endangered status.

## **8.2 *Global Register of Migratory Species (GROMS) and CMS Information Management Plan***

139. Dr. Rilla Manta (CMS Secretariat, Information and Capacity Building Officer) reported briefly on progress on the Global Register of Migratory Species (GROMS), the CMS Information Management Plan (IMP) and national reporting.

140. The national reporting process was an essential component of the CMS Information Management Plan. COP8 had adopted Resolution 8.24 requiring the adoption of a format of reporting compatible with the Convention's strategic aims. The Secretariat was working towards an online system accessible through the CMS website, and this system would be harmonised across the CMS family to include Agreements and MoUs alike. The aim was to eliminate duplication and secure the highest degree of harmonisation.

141. GROMS had started as a collaborative project between the German Government, the Museum Koenig in Bonn and CMS. Management of the project was being transferred to CMS, as had been envisaged in Resolution 8.24. The stage had been reached where feedback and peer review were invited. Managing new data would be a challenge but a web-based resource compatible with CMS reporting requirements would be an asset for Parties as they compiled their national reports.

## **8.3 *Range State List***

142. Due to time constraints, and considering that the issue was not of immediate urgency, it was agreed to postpone consideration of this item to the next meeting of the Scientific Council.

## **8.4 *Migratory species as vectors of diseases (e.g. Avian Influenza)***

143. Turning to Avian Influenza, Dr. Rilla Manta explained that a Scientific Task Force on Avian Influenza and Wild Birds had been established in August 2005. The Task Force drew on the expertise of 13 organisations and a great deal of information was available on the H5N1 virus and the role of migratory birds in spreading it. The Task Force was developing strategies for preventing the spread of the disease and countering the misinformation about migratory birds as vectors. The Task Force met remotely with the next meeting due next week. CMS collated the information and coordinated and maintained a dedicated website, the Avian Influenza, Wildlife and Environment Website (AIWEB). The Secretariat prepared and issued press releases, statements and advice to Parties on avian 'flu and attended other relevant meetings. CMS, Ramsar and AEWa had all adopted Resolutions on avian 'flu, resisting counterproductive "quick fixes" that would not achieve the desired aims and would involve culling large numbers of birds and destroying valuable wetland habitat. Protecting the health of humans, domestic poultry and wild birds were paramount concerns, and measures were needed to stop the spread of the virus including investigation of the role of animals as vectors and how human practices enabled the disease to flourish and spread.

144. A leaflet on the actual role of wild birds in the transmission of avian influenza had been produced in English, French and Spanish, and versions in Russian, Chinese, Arabic and other languages would follow.

145. A meeting had been arranged in Aviemore, Scotland 25-27 June 2007 at the invitation of the Scientific Council's vice-chair Prof. Galbraith and with financial support from the Scottish Natural Heritage, to exchange information and review the lesson learned to date. The Scientific Council was invited to note the Secretariat's work so far.

146. Mr. Christian Grovermann (CMS consultant, Task Force Coordinator-AIWEb webmaster) then gave a demonstration of the AIWEb website. It had been created in August 2006 by UNEP in collaboration with CMS and AEWA and was now managed by CMS. The main features were an introductory page with a media centre, which contained press cuttings on various outbreaks and statements from relevant organisations, together with updates on research findings. Information emanating from the Scientific Task Force was also available along with thematic research, regional reports and seminar outcomes. The site also contained key documents like the leaflet and the text of CMS and AEWA Resolutions. The site was under constant review and would shortly undergo some design changes to make it more user-friendly.

147. Mr. Ankara reiterated his concern that the Scientific Council should broaden its scope beyond Avian Influenza and that the working group led by Dr. Schlatter considering animal diseases should draw on wider global experiences, given the problems being seen with apes in Africa dying from Ebola and other illnesses.

148. Mr. O'Sullivan thanked the secretariat for their presentations and for the efficient and effective bringing together of the Task Force to counter the sometimes hysterical response from authorities to the avian 'flu outbreaks. It was vital that the response to avian 'flu was right and the Task Force had at least achieved that the wrong course was not taken, which would have been detrimental to conservation interests and not contributed to combating the disease.

149. Dr. Mundkur thanked the Secretariat for the presentations and mentioned the GAINS programme (Global Avian Influenza Network for Surveillance) being managed by the WCS with support from USAID.

150. Mr. Hepworth had been personally involved in the Task Force, having served as chairman of the teleconferences. He was grateful for the support of various Scientific Councillors (Dr. Mundkur, Mr. O'Sullivan and Prof. Galbraith in particular). The Task Force had succeeded in getting its message across because it had been based on good science provided by the 13 participating organisations. The work of counteracting prejudice was not complete, and even the most recent outbreaks had led to ill-advised calls for culling and wild birds had again wrongly be blamed. Mr. Hepworth thought that the Congolese Councillor's idea to widen the Scientific Council's remit was interesting, although resource implications needed to be examined. The Task Force had been supported by a large investment of CMS and AEWA staff time, and the AIWEb had been made possible by funding from Belgium. Mr. Hepworth thought that the time might have come for CMS to share the work of leading the Avian Influenza Task Force, given that the secondary role of wild birds in transmitting the disease had been clearly established.

151. Dr. Pulido (Councillor for Peru) congratulated the Secretariat on its work on Avian Influenza and for the presentation. He welcomed the translation into Spanish of the leaflet. He reported that in Latin America, the FAO had initiated a partnership to alert the public to the dangers of avian 'flu. While some understood that wild birds were not responsible, this was not clear to everyone, but he felt that the authorities in South America were now better informed and that the mistakes made elsewhere would not be repeated. Dr. Rilla Manta added that a joint workshop organised in Panama by Ramsar and CMS would dedicate a half-day session to Avian Influenza.

152. Dr. Biber noted that CMS/ScC14/Doc.12 requested the Scientific Council to note developments and consider further actions. He felt that the Secretariat had everything under control and was not clear what further action the Scientific Council could take. Mr. Hepworth suggested that a wider working group looking at animal diseases would be useful, and its first meeting would take place during the lunch break, but given the delicacies of the subject, careful consideration should be given to its name. Prof. Wołoszyn said the remit should cover rabies and histoplasmosis

as well as AI, as these diseases too had a high cost to human and animal health with financial consequences. The chair called for volunteers to serve on the Working Group led by Dr. Schlatter, and councillors Ankara, Camara, Custodio, Lamptey and Wołoszyn came forward.

153. Dr. Schlatter said that while avian ‘flu was not yet a problem in his native South America, public education measures were required to deter human contacts with wild migratory birds and people should be discouraged from feeding them. Prof. Galbraith agreed that public awareness was an important issue, both in terms of animal welfare and especially in the context of concerns about avian ‘flu.

154. During the afternoon session of 17 March Dr. Schlatter reported back on the first discussions of the “Migratory Species Disease Working Group”. The Group had discussed a number of diseases spread by virus or bacteria which affect migratory species and where migratory species might be vectors.

155. The Working Group intended to build on the excellent working relationship already established with Dr. Rilla Manta and the AIWEb team. The Group needed input from all regions and regional coordinators. Lists of outbreaks of different diseases in different areas had to be compiled. Mr. Ankara suggested that if possible the regional representatives should be identified straight away.

#### **8.5 *Invasive Alien Species (IAS) and migratory species***

156. Dr. Barbieri explained that invasive alien species were one of the threats to migratory species for which the Strategy Implementation Plan for the Scientific Council provided for a review to be undertaken. Funding from the Italian Government had enabled a report to be commissioned which will later appear in the CMS Technical Series. A contractor had been appointed with the task of identifying the migratory species most under threat from invasive aliens. The Scientific Council would be invited to review the report in due course.

157. Dr. Ebenhard pointed to potential funding from the Global Invasive Species Programme. Mr. Ankara had evidence of invasive species entering Congo along the Nile. Prof. Wołoszyn was aware of similar studies being undertaken and would ensure that the information ascertained there could be accessed. Dr. Dehörter admitted this was not his area of expertise but could contact colleagues who were better informed. Mr. Dereliev (AEWA) stated that reporting on non-native species was a requirement of AEWA and a review was being undertaken, the results of which would be available at the end of the year. Mr. Blanco explained that his country had a specialist working group dealing with alien species and he would put them in touch with the Secretariat. Mr. Custodio made a similar offer. Dr. Mundkur undertook to identify relevant case studies, such as the water hyacinth.

### **Regional Working Groups**

#### **Africa**

158. Prof. Oteng Yeboah had chaired this Working Group which had considered ways of improving communications between councillors from the region and ways of increasing the input of the African region into the Convention.

159. Mr. Lamptey asked whether similar arrangements were being considered for the African Elephant MoU as had been made for the Atlantic Turtle MoU, where the offices of NEPAD in Senegal were going to be used for coordination purpose. Mr. Glowka (CMS Secretariat,

Agreements Officer) replied that CMS had a working arrangement with the IUCN African Elephant Specialist Group and they were working on developing the outline work plan. Mr. Mshelbwala added that the \$10,000 referred to by Dr. Beudels would help finance this work.

## **Asia**

160. Dr. Mundkur reported on the discussions of the Asia Working Group. It had decided that as an informal group, it did not need to elect a chair.

161. The importance of communication within the group, notably between meetings, was considered valuable, to enable consultation of issues of regional interest, sharing of new information and related ideas. This was particularly relevant given the low frequency of physical meetings and limited opportunity of organising regional meetings involving all counsellors. It was noted that there was currently regular communication on issues either bilaterally with secretariat staff or consultants involved in project proposal development. The possibility of organising a one day regional meeting that could be tagged on to meetings of the Scientific Council was discussed; it was recognised that the added financial implications meant that at the current time this may not be a feasible option.

162. The group had agreed that development of a web-based Intranet on the CMS website was a high priority.

- It should have regional pages to encourage discussion of regional issues. The Secretariat would serve as moderator.
- It should enable uploading of documents and papers of interest to the group.
- It may be either password protected (only to counsellors) or not (which allowed open access to scientists from the region).

163. It was recognised that there were an increasing number of ongoing (including turtles, Siberian Crane and AEWA) or developing regional initiatives (including CAF, dugong, sharks, cetaceans and Houbara Bustard) that offer the opportunity for counsellors to be actively involved and engaged.

164. The indicative TOR for Conference appointed Scientific Councillors that was provided by the CMS Secretariat and the recommendations from the Conference appointed regional Councillors was reviewed. There was agreement of these, recognising that the list needed to be prioritised.

165. The value of a concise “regional priorities document” was briefly discussed. The document could respond to the Scientific Council Implementation Plan, synthesise priorities from national reports produced for COP (the issue of timing and timely submissions would need to be considered). Further consideration of this would be required.

166. The Counsellor from Pakistan had brought to the attention of the meeting a new initiative of Dr. George Schaller and the Wildlife Conservation Society, a Peace Park, linking protected areas for the conservation of the Marco Polo Sheep and Snow Leopard in the Pamir region. The initiative covered Pakistan, Afghanistan, China, Tajikistan and nearby countries. Such an initiative offered the opportunity for conservation of important species and habitats listed on the CMS appendices.

## **Europe**

167. Dr. Biber reported that the European group concentrated its attention on two issues: the energy crisis and the response to climate change with increased interest in wind power and biofuel



production, both of which had impacts on migratory species and their habitats and secondly land-use change, with the loss of agricultural land, especially in central and eastern Europe. A third issue had just occurred to him and had not discussed, namely the water crisis.

168. Dr. Devillers commented that none of these problems were exclusively of concern to Europe and the Scientific Council might wish to take them up globally, given CMS's unique role and remit for the common natural heritage.

169. Dr. Devillers was concerned about spatial pressures with land being given over to oil palms, sugar canes and other monocultures in the name of "green" progress. Dr. Mundkur agreed and pointed out that loss of forest for production of oil palm was a pressing problem in Malaysia and Indonesia. Mr. Mshelbwala added that even in oil-rich Nigeria, some regional governments were promoting the cultivation of biofuel plants. Prof. Oteng Yeboah said that it was a challenge for CMS to raise awareness of such issues in higher political echelons. The meeting agreed that that was an important issue deserving the attention of the Council and of the Convention. Dr. Blanke offered to produce a paper for more detailed consideration by the 15<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Scientific Council.

### **Latin America**

170. Dr. Schlatter reported on a well-attended session of the Regional Working Group for Latin America. The session had agreed on the elements of an inter-sessional work programme for the group, that would have been finalized and communicated to the other members by him short after the conclusion of the meeting.

171. Dr. Barbieri had noted that many of the groups had mentioned improving communication, which pre-empted an announcement he had intended to make concerning the establishment of a Scientific Council forum. Establishing such a forum would be one of the tasks of an IT specialist currently being recruited by the Secretariat. The forum should be operational in advance of Scientific Council's 15<sup>th</sup> meeting before COP.

## **9. Collaboration with other intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations**

172. Ms. Deda gave a brief overview of her work, focusing on collaboration with MEAs and NGOs.

173. CMS was a member of the Biodiversity Liaison Group (BLG) along with CBD, Ramsar, CITES and the WHC. It met annually, the last meeting having been in September 2006. Its main task was to discuss 2010 Target implementation. CMS was also a member of the Heads of Agency Task Force, which again concentrated on the 2010 target. This group also included FAO, UNDP and NGOs and dealt with communication issues (both internal and external). A joint webpage had been created and was about to be launched.

174. CMS was liaising with other MEAs on reporting requirements while developing its own online system (SONAR) which would be used across the CMS family. In keeping with Resolution 8.11, CMS was working with CBD to ensure that migratory species issues were integrated into National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans and a workshop was planned for later in the year to prepare guidance.

175. Mr. El Kabiri (CMS Secretariat, Deputy Executive Secretary) was liaising closely with UNCCD over the antelope initiatives, and a joint project was being developed for implementation

in key countries. CMS was working with UNESCO, notably the Man and Biosphere (MAB) initiative and the World Heritage convention (WHC). Further work with WHC was planned to promote collaboration over species conservation as part of the world's common heritage. UNEP was supporting the production of the CMS Family Guide. A large coalition was cooperating with regard to the Year of the Dolphin 2007 Campaign, and CMS's joint work programme with CITES would lead to a CMS side-event at the next CITES COP.

176. Among the NGOs, CMS was working with the Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society (WDCS) on the Year of the Dolphin and other initiatives in the Pacific and Western Africa. The Global Nature Fund (GNF) had assisted with the response to avian influenza and in organising a seminar on that subject in the People's Republic of China. Joint activities were being identified to enhance cooperation with the Zoological Society of London (ZSL); cooperation with the Italian offices of international NGOs was likely to increase in the run-up to COP9 in Rome in 2008. A partnership agreement had recently been signed with World Association of Zoos and Aquariums (WAZA).

177. Specific projects helped cement relations better than vague statements of intent. The Year of the Dolphin had helped identify partners and supporters in MEAs, NGOs, governments and the private sector. Over 100 applications had been received to register support of Year of the Dolphin and to have actions recognised as part of the campaign. Processing the applications was taking time, as they needed to be vetted carefully. Those which had been accepted came from NGOs as diverse as WWF, Naturenet, Oceancare, GNF.

178. Dr. Mundkur (Wetlands International) explained that WI was a partner of CMS and a member of the AEWA Technical Committee. WI was also involved in the Wings Over Wetlands (WOW) GEF project, the editing of the 4<sup>th</sup> Bird Populations Estimates and the production of the "Waterbirds around the World" book following the Edinburgh Conference. WI had also assisted at the New Delhi meeting in 2005 which had produced the new Central Asian Flyway Action Plan. WI welcomed the new initiative in the East Asian/Australasian flyway and the hemispheric initiative in the Americas for migratory waterbirds. Balanced advice was needed on interactions between humans, domestic poultry and waterbirds, especially after the avian influenza scares. Good, clear scientific advice was needed to inform policy decisions.

179. Dr. Van Waerebeek (WDCS) referred to CMS/ScC14/Doc.21 which reported on the outcomes of the WDCS-led Cetacean Liaison Group (CLG). The CLG was in the process of drafting its forward strategy. CLG took a close interest in CMS work, especially on cetacean species listing proposals, bycatch and mitigation of human interactions.

180. Dr. Perrin (IWC observer) referred to CMS/ScC14/Doc.9, his report as the CMS observer at the IWC Scientific Committee. Dr. Barbieri made a call for councillors who regularly attended other scientific bodies to volunteer to act as the CMS focal point, as Dr. Perrin did for IWC and as Dr. Schlatter had done for the Ramsar STRP while he was serving on that body. Prof. Oteng Yeboah volunteered to liaise with CBD, CITES and the UNESCO Man and Biosphere initiative.

### ***9.1 Relationships between the CMS Scientific Council and the IUCN Species Survival Commission***

181. Dr. Barbieri explained that CMS had entered many partnerships with like-minded organisations, one such being IUCN in its various guises. CMS and IUCN had an umbrella Memorandum of Cooperation, setting a framework for collaboration between the Convention and the IUCN, its Species Specialist Groups, the Environmental Law Centre and its regional offices.

182. There was obvious scope for close collaboration between the two organisations on assessing the status of species for the Red Data lists and for inclusion on the appendices, a recent example having arisen with the CMS move to develop an instrument on sharks. IUCN also had a working group on sustainable use.

183. Dr. Vié (IUCN) confirmed that the MoC covered a wide range of activities of mutual interest. The majority of the overlap related directly to species issues, but there were also many cross-cutting themes such as climate change, invasive alien species, sustainable use and the development of indicators, where collaboration would be helpful. Funding was a problem for IUCN as it relied on an extensive network of volunteers.

184. Dr. Fowler commended the energy and enthusiasm of the IUCN experts who showed great dedication to the subject and gave their time willingly. She welcomed the opportunity of working more closely with CMS.

185. Dr. Perrin mentioned the work of the IUCN on the global mammal assessment, reviewing all mammalian species for the IUCN lists. Prof. Galbraith praised the good work achieved by CMS and IUCN, especially on sharks and flamingos.

## **10. Date and Venue of the 15 meeting of the Scientific Council**

186. Mr. Hepworth said that as the options were still open for the modus operandi of the Scientific Council, it was not entirely clear what the arrangements would be, even though the Working Group had indicated a preference for one model.

187. He hoped that a venue could be found for Scientific Council to meet in Rome immediately before COP, but this would have to be discussed with the Italian Government as hosts. The worst that could happen is that the Secretariat would have to cover the marginal costs of the Scientific Council meeting. A separate meeting two months before COP would be prohibitively expensive.

188. The absolute worst case would be that there would be insufficient funds for a Scientific Council meeting before COP9. The prospect of this would concentrate minds and ensure that sufficient fund-raising effort was made to secure the necessary funds. On a show of hands, there was no support whatsoever for abandoning the pre-COP Scientific Council.

## **11. Any Other Business**

### ***Presentation of the final outputs of the Flyway Conference “Waterbirds around the World”***

189. Prof. Galbraith reported on the Waterbirds around the World Conference held in Edinburgh in 2004. It had been supported by governments, IGOs and conservation and hunting organisations and had been attended by 450 delegates from 90 countries. One outcome of the meeting was the recently published book which contained contributions from over 400 authors.

190. Prof. Galbraith outlined the development of international cooperation on wetland birds, starting with the St. Andrews conference in 1963 which had been followed later by the signing of the Ramsar Convention, AEWa and much EU legislation such as the Birds Directive. The focus of conservation had shifted over time. In the 1960s and 1970s, population size, distribution and sustainable hunting were the key issues; in the 1980s, integrated monitoring and the marine environment; in the 1990s and 2000s, disease, climate change and public awareness and training.

191. The recognised flyways led to the realisation that migratory birds linked countries and were part of our joint heritage requiring international cooperation to survive.

192. It was widely recognised that avian ‘flu and other diseases had brought bird migration under scrutiny, that key data was required for all flyways on population status and that growing human population density was putting great pressure on habitats. In the marine environment, fisheries, pollution and habitat degradation were the main concerns.

193. The Edinburgh Conference agreed that the albatross, an iconic species, had to be restored to favourable conservation status, that pollution levels must be reduced and that harvesting of marine resources had to be sustainable. Wetland loss and degradation had to be reversed, so that the habitat’s cultural and ecological value would survive. The cause was helped by the support of H.R.H. The Prince of Wales. Special thanks were also owed to Dr. Gerard Boere.

194. Conservation faced many challenges; some old, some new. Partnerships were being forged to help meet these challenges and policy-makers and practitioners were aware that their cause would be helped by enlisting the support of the public, by showing them how relevant conservation was to them.

195. Several participants commended the Conference and stressed the value of its outcomes for CMS. It was considered appropriate for the Scientific Council to issue a formal statement in support of the implementation of the recommendation of the conference. Prof. Galbraith undertook to prepare a draft of the statement with the support of a few other participants.

196. A draft Resolution “Implementing the Conclusions of the *Waterbird around the World* Conference” was circulated on March 16<sup>th</sup> for the consideration of the meeting as document CMS/ScC14/CRP.4. The draft was presented by Prof. Galbraith and was endorsed by the meeting. It is attached to the present report as Annex 12.

#### ***Presentation of a Partnership for the East Asian-Australasian Flyway***

197. Referring to document CMS/ScC14/Inf.12, Ms. Cronan described a recently launched partnership to promote conservation of waterbirds and their habitats in East Asia and Australasia. The East Asian-Australasian Flyway was one of eight in the world, and the range states recognised that cooperative effort was needed to conserve the birds migrating along it.

198. Twenty-three countries were involved (five of which were CMS parties) from the USA, Russia, through East and South East Asia to Australia and New Zealand. 10 million birds of 250 species migrated along a flyway in a region experiencing high economic growth and which was home to 30% of the world’s human population.

199. There was a large range of arrangements operating in the region – some bilateral agreements, some multilateral, some legally binding, others cooperative. There were three avian action plans covering cranes, shore birds and anatids. The migratory waterbird partnership had been launched in Indonesia in November 2006, with a network of 600 sites, 97 of which were formally recognised under the partnership strategy. The previous regional strategy had covered two flyways, whereas the new partnership bringing together governments and NGOs concentrated on just one. It was a WSSD Type II partnership and addressed the needs of local people and built on national networks. It covered all waterbirds, not just the three groups for which action plans had been developed.

200. The partnership had been endorsed by many of the range states and international and national NGOs (including ICF, WI and IUCN) and it was being integrated into other networks and conventions, like WSSD, Ramsar and CMS. An interim secretariat had been established in Australia with support from the Republic of Korea.

201. In reply to a question from Prof. Galbraith, Ms. Cronan confirmed that the flyway was facing critical threats as a result of growing human pressures. Dr. Mundkur commented that while the partnership was a less formal structure than a CMS Agreement, it did at least bring various key actors together and was seeking to strike a balance in developing countries between conservation and human aspirations by promoting sustainable development.

***Presentation: Sea Migrants Project***

202. Referring to document CMS/ScC14/Doc.18, Dr. Spina described a long-standing project that had been conducted in the Mediterranean over 19 years as a voluntary initiative. The Italian Government was now endorsing and supporting it as part of its implementation of the Convention.

203. Migratory species faced a great many threats and barriers and it was necessary to monitor these carefully. Many species, particularly birds, were affected and for their cyclical journeys they needed to build up reserves of energy and often had to move fast, especially when crossing features like the Sahara and the Mediterranean where there were no opportunities to feed.

204. The Italian Ringing Centre had launched a small islands project, which had identified 46 sites in 7 countries and relied on the voluntary effort of enthusiasts. 700,000 birds were now on the database and the information available helped understand habitat needs and the effects of climate change.

205. Dr. Spina presented a graph showing body mass and distances travelled. It was clear that birds were highly dependent on favourable environmental conditions to build up the energy reserves necessary to complete their journeys. Stop-over sites, especially on Mediterranean islands were vital for birds on their way to Europe. Species with different habitat preferences fared differently, with those frequenting open habitats doing better than species preferring forests and wooded habitat.

206. Climate change did alter bird behaviour, but it was clear that some bird species were unable to adapt fast enough to changing conditions. Migration routes had been established over thousands of generations, but the combination of climate change, desertification and other human impacts was impinging on birds' ability to survive. The growth of the Sahara was making it more difficult for birds to traverse it successfully. The option of eating more before departure was not viable as the birds would become too heavy to fly.

207. Spain and Italy were cooperating well. The Mediterranean was a bottleneck for migratory species and human pressures around the coasts were high, from direct hunting to urbanisation. Public awareness raising and education were important. Young children were being involved in ringing to give them experience of living birds, where older generations had been more accustomed to dealing with dead ones through hunting and trapping.

208. Parallels were being drawn with other regions beyond the Mediterranean. The University of Mississippi was examining bird migration in the Gulf of Mexico. The Italian Government was also hoping to use the bird project as a pilot to be extended in due course to turtles and other pelagic species.

209. In response to a question from Mr. O'Sullivan on the advantages and disadvantages of working mainly on islands, Dr. Spina explained that just over half of the project's effort took place on islands and the rest in coastal areas of the mainland.

210. The chair welcomed the project, which was making a very good point on a potential impact of climate change, whose rate could be faster than previously thought. The project also placed emphasis on international collaboration between Europe and Africa and the education work was helping to engage the next generation. The Scientific Council was supporting the project, and CMS could support Italy in developing cooperation with Mediterranean states.

***Presentation: Arabian leopard (*Panthera pardus nimr*)***

211. Dr. Mohammed Abubakr (observer from Yemen) gave a presentation on the Arabian leopard, the largest carnivore in the Arabian peninsula which was declining as a result of direct persecution, by hunters for the animal's fur and livestock farmers protecting their flocks and herds, and habitat degradation and desertification. Its historic range spread from Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Oman and the UAE. There were probably 200 left across the range. Numbers in Yemen were unknown because of the difficulty of the terrain.

212. The species was protected under national wildlife legislation but enforcement was difficult in remote areas. Internationally, the Arabian leopard was listed as critically endangered by the IUCN and was on CITES Appendix I. Captive breeding programmes had been established in zoos, and releases would be considered as soon as suitable habitat was available.

213. Mr. El Kabiri recalled efforts made by the Moroccan authorities to protect the Barbary leopard (*Panthera pardus panthera*) and hoped experience could be exchanged. Mr. Mshelbwala welcomed this initiative especially as it came from one of CMS's newest parties.

***Lesser-White Fronted Goose Workshop, Xanten***

214. Dr. Blanke gave a report on the Lesser White-fronted Goose workshop, which took place during the 10<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Wetlands International Goose Specialist Group in Xanten, Germany in January. Some of the findings of that workshop were relevant to the discussions at the 13<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Scientific Council in Nairobi in 2005 on this species.

215. Under the chairmanship of Dr. Boere, the Xanten workshop heard new evidence of the genetic make-up for the Fennoscandian population of the Lesser White-fronted Goose (*Anser erythropus*) to see whether there was a link to the wild Russian populations and whether it would be advisable to release captive stocks into the wild. It had previously been decided to advise against releasing captive birds into the flyways where the species did not occur naturally.

216. The meeting had three main outcomes. Research findings of Michael Wink, based on 270 samples from Germany, Sweden, Finland (all captive birds) and Russia (wild birds) had shown a high genetic diversity of the captive stock, but the breeding populations from Germany, Sweden and Finland also showed some similarities to the Russian birds. On the basis of these findings, captive stocks (except for hybrids) had to be considered suitable for release. Mr. Dereliev noted some new research showing that half of the male birds in the Fennoscandian wild population were similar to the Western Russian population, reducing the justification for treating the Fennoscandian population as a separate genetic unit. Mr. Johan Mooij had collated previous records from Germany and Sweden covering the flyway from southern Sweden over eastern Germany into southern Europe, including a bird tracked by satellite in December 1996 which started out in Norway and went missing between Halle and Leipzig.

217. In summary, Dr. Blanke suggested that the draft action plan for the species should incorporate these new findings.

218. Dr. Schlatter asked that the Scientific Council note the deaths of two key conservationists who had been active in South America. Prof. Raul Vaz-Ferreira of Uruguay and Dr. Sandra Caziani of Argentina had both made considerable contributions to the scientific work carried out across the region. A minute's silence was observed in their memory.

## **12. Closure of the Meeting**

219. Dr. Barbieri drew participants' attention to a questionnaire that had been circulated and asked that councillors find a couple of minutes to complete and return the sheets which would help the secretariat improve its service to Scientific Council.

220. Mr. Mshelbwala summarised the highlights of the meeting, notably the high turnout and high level of participation and interest shown by councillors. The Scientific Council was already taking its own advice on improving working methods by establishing working groups on a number of issues. Progress had been made on developing terms of reference for important reviews of bycatch, barriers to migration and invasive alien species. Excellent work had been carried out on sharks by Dr. Fowler which had helped CMS increase its understanding of these species and would lead to listing proposals at COP9. The meeting had endorsed several draft proposal for the listing of species on the Appendices, and Kenya would work on a proposal to list the African Wild dog (*Lycaon pictus*). The meeting had issued a statement in support of the Edinburgh Declaration. It had also called for better financial resources to implement the Convention through small projects.

221. Mr. Hepworth was confident that the more active inter-sessional working groups would provide added value. The Secretariat would make good its promise to support the Scientific Council through dedicated forum pages on the CMS web-site. He echoed Mr. Mshelbwala's praise of Dr. Fowler's work on sharks and hoped that the report would be published in the CMS Technical Series. He thanked the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman for deputising at short notice. He thanked Dr. Devillers who had retired from the IRSNB but continued to work hard for the Convention, and in recognition of his long and continuing service, presented him with a token of the Convention's gratitude.

222. Mr. Mshelbwala after the customary vote of thanks to the organisers, especially Dr. Barbieri, the hosts and interpreters closed the meeting at 16:34.

**AGENDA OF THE MEETING**

1. Opening remarks
2. Adoption of the agenda
3. Resources and working practices of the Scientific Council
4. Review of Strategy Implementation Plan for the Scientific Council 2006-2011
5. Scientific Council tasks arising inter alia from resolutions, recommendations and other decisions of the Conference of the Parties
  - 5.1. Concerted actions for selected Appendix I species/groups (Res. 3.2, 4.2, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1 and 8.29 refer)
  - 5.2. Cooperative actions for Appendix II species (Recommendations 5.2, 6.2, 7.1 and 8.28 refer)
  - 5.3. Other resolutions and recommendations (not already covered under previous agenda items)
    - a) Resolution 8.1: Sustainable Use
    - b) Resolution 8.7: Assessing the contribution of CMS in achieving the 2010 Biodiversity Target
    - c) Resolution 8.13: Climate change and migratory species
    - d) Resolution 8.14: By-catch
    - e) Resolution 8.22: Adverse human induced impact on cetaceans
6. Proposals for amendments to Appendices I and II of the Convention
  - (a) Discussion and evaluation of draft proposals
  - (b) Review of taxonomic groups of migratory species to identify candidate species for listing on CMS Appendices
7. Small scale projects funded by CMS
8. Progress on other matters requiring Scientific Council advice
  - 8.1 Potential new Agreements (including Memoranda of Understanding and Action Plans)
  - 8.2 Global Register of Migratory Species (GROMS) and CMS Information Management Plan
  - 8.3 Range State List
  - 8.4 Migratory Species as vectors of diseases (e.g. Avian Influenza)
  - 8.5 Invasive Alien Species (IAS) and migratory species
9. Collaboration with other intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations
  - 9.1 Relationships between the CMS Scientific Council and the IUCN Species Survival Commission
10. Date and venue of the 15th meeting of the Scientific Council
11. Any other business
12. Closure of the Meeting



**REPORT OF THE TAXONOMIC WORKING GROUP ON AQUATIC MAMMALS  
WILLIAM PERRIN: CHAIR**

1. **(Agenda item 4)** Review of Strategy Implementation Plan for the Scientific Council 2006-2011

1.1. Format of reports on the conservation status of CMS App. I species

The Group agreed that the list of items as proposed by the Secretariat to be covered in the data sheets is appropriate, with the following changes:

- a. addition of a taxonomic reference.
- b. change of trends choices in parentheses to “increasing, declining, no significant change”.
- c. deletion of designation of “core” range states, as this would be difficult to define consistently for many species.

It is recommended that the categories of information be aligned as much as possible with the categories used in the ongoing IUCN global species assessments, to facilitate incorporation of information developed in those assessments.

1.2. Review of taxonomic groups to identify candidate species for listing

It was noted that the Cetacean Liaison Group has taken on this task for cetaceans; the draft listing proposals presented at this meeting had their genesis in this ongoing review. No candidate species among the carnivorous aquatic mammals or the sirenians are identified currently.

2. *(Agenda item 5.1) Concerted Actions for Appendix I species/groups*

2.1. Review of implementation of Concerted Actions

Spain reported on progress on the Mediterranean monk seal. The action plan reviewed and endorsed by the ScC and the COP has been published. The implementing working group is active and plans to meet this year in Madeira. The populations are being actively monitored. Last year was a good year for the Mauritania population; it is apparently recovering from the mortality suffered in 1997.

Current efforts are to conclude the MoU among the four range states (Mauritania, Morocco, Spain and Portugal). A draft has been prepared in five languages; the goal is signing by all four states this year.

Emphasis in Mauritania is on collaboration with fishermen and education programs; Spain is committed to continued support of these efforts.

Chile presented updates on Concerted Actions on South American marine mammals. Research on the Franciscana continues in Argentina; a CMS-funded project has been completed. Research on the marine otter continues in southern Chile. Information on the status of a CMS-funded project in Peru was not available. Research on the

southern river otter continues in southern Chile; the risk of habitat loss continues to be high.

2.2 Possible identification of new species for Concerted Actions

No new species were identified.

2.3 Identification/confirmation of focal point councilors for Concerted Action species

No action taken.

3. *(Agenda item 5.2) Cooperative Actions*

3.1 Review of implementation of Cooperative Actions

Chile reported on South American dolphins. The Chilean dolphin and Peale's dolphin in the area of Chiloe Island in Chile have been the subject of three undergraduate and one graduate thesis. Research continues with international funding.

3.2 Identification/confirmation of focal point councilors for Cooperative Action species

No action taken.

4. *(Agenda item 5.3) Resolution 8.22: Adverse human induced impact on cetaceans*

The Group reviewed the proposed Programme of Work to Implement CMS Resolution 8.22 (CMS/ScC14/Doc.22) and believed it to meet the needs specified by the resolution. The work program promises to produce the product in a timely fashion. The Group recognized the considerable and valuable assistance contributed by the Cetacean Liaison Group and hoped that it would continue.

5. *(Agenda item 6a) Discussion and evaluation of draft proposals (CMS/ScC14/Doc.4, 5, 6, 7, 8)*

5.1 Proposals for inclusion in Appendix I

5.1.1 Atlantic humpback dolphin *Sousa teuszii* (Doc. 6) – Recognizing the apparently fragmented range (into 8 or possibly 9 small subpopulations), bycatch in fisheries and apparent recent population decline of this coastal species, the Group endorsed the proposal.

CMS range states are Mauretania, Senegal, The Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Guinea, Cameroon, and Angola.

5.1.2 Irrawaddy dolphin *Orcaella brevirostris* (Doc. 8) – The recent split of the species into *O. brevirostris* (South Asia and Southeast Asia exclusive of Papua New Guinea) and *O. heinsohni* (Australia and PNG) leaves *O. brevirostris* as a species with precarious conservation status. Five regional populations have been classified as Critically Endangered by the IUCN. The species qualifies for Appendix I and the proposal was endorsed by the Group.

CMS range states are India and the Philippines, although of course it is not a requirement that the proponent of a listing be a range state.

The need was noted for a short paper at the next ScC describing the species split so that the appropriate changes can be made in the Appendices and the list of Range States.

We've just had some information from Nicola Hodgins of WDCS, a member of the Cetacean Liaison Group, to the effect that development of ecotourism based on Irrawaddy dolphins in Chilika Lake in India may be imposing unsustainable mortality on that critically endangered population. This is disturbing, and we hope that there will be some clarification and report on the situation at the next meeting of the Council.

## 5.2 Proposals for inclusion in Appendix II

5.2.1 The Group endorsed two cetaceans in West African waters proposed for Appendix II: the Clymene dolphin *Stenella clymene* (Doc. 5) and the Northwest African population of the harbour porpoise *Phocoena phocoena* (Doc. 7). The conservation status of both could benefit from regional action under the prospective MoU on marine mammals of the eastern tropical Atlantic.

CMS range states for the clymene dolphin are Mauritania, Senegal, the Gambia, Congo and Angola and potentially several others (the range is not that well known).

For the harbour porpoise, the CMS range states are Morocco, Mauritania, Senegal and possibly the Gambia.

5.2.2 The Group endorsed the proposed inclusion in Appendix II of the regional populations of five small-cetacean species exploited in drive hunts in the Solomon Islands: the spinner dolphin *Stenella longirostris*, the pantropical spotted dolphin *S. attenuata*, the striped dolphin *S. coeruleoalba*, the melon-headed whale *Peponocephala electra*, and Fraser's dolphin *Lagenodelphis hosei*. (Doc. 4). Conservation status of these cetaceans could benefit from cooperative regional research carried out under the recently concluded MoU on Pacific Island cetaceans to estimate population abundance and determine sustainable levels of mortality in the indigenous drive hunts. It was noted that the Government of the Solomon Islands has developed a draft action plan to accomplish this.

CMS range states are potentially France (New Caledonia) and potentially Australia.

## 6. *(Agenda item 7) Small scale projects*

Three previously endorsed marine mammal small projects remain on the list of projects awaiting funding (Nos. 17, 18 and 19 in Inf. 13). All propose workshops to increase capacity and develop plans to improve research and management of cetaceans: in the Bay of Bengal, in Southeast Asia, and in the southwestern Indian Ocean. The Group continues to support these proposals. Madagascar noted that serious problems of cetacean bycatch exist in his country and that no research is presently addressing the situation. In view of this, the Group re-ranked the three proposals in the following order of decreasing priority: 17, 19, 18, with the first two

being of High priority. No. 19 deals with the region that includes the waters of Madagascar. The Group also briefly reviewed an unsolicited proposal for creation of two community-based protected areas for the critically endangered Irrawaddy dolphin in Kalimantan, Indonesia and noted that should the species be designated for inclusion in Appendix I as proposed, this project would merit serious consideration as an action that would likely contribute significantly to improvement of the conservation status of the species.

It was noted that all of the four above-discussed projects deal to greater or lesser degree with bycatch in fisheries and should be considered for attention by the Bycatch Working Group as well.

7. *Nomenclature* - It is proposed for marine mammals to continue use of Rice (1998) as a standard nomenclatural reference, with deviations from that usage noted and explained as they occur.

With reference to page 9 in CMS/ScC14/Doc.3, it was noted that the spelling of *Sousa teuszii* as *Sousa teuszi* in one place in Rice (1998) was a typographical error; it was spelled correctly in other places in the publication. This has been confirmed with the author.

## REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON TERRESTRIAL MAMMALS

### A. Review of Strategy Implementation Plan for the Scientific Council 2006-2011

#### 1. Format of reports on the conservation status of Appendix I species

Adoption of the format proposed in doc CRP.1 is recommended by the Working Group, with the following changes:

- List of Range States indicating legal status in each country, and indicating adequate monitoring information that is available to CMS.
- List of Concerted Actions by CMS and others, including National Action Plans if they exist.

#### 2. Review of taxonomic groups to identify candidate species for listing

The Working Group noted the availability of several existing or ongoing reviews which are of interest in this framework.

The Working Group considers that the necessary syntheses and analyses can be performed using the Scientific Council expertise. In particular, a review of the mammals and identification of candidates for listing or delisting will be performed on a triennium basis by the Group.

For Bats, the arrangements agreed upon at the last ScC remain pertinent.

#### 3. Nomenclature reference

The working group recommends adoption of option 1 of Document 3 on the Taxonomy and nomenclature of mammals listed on the Appendices of CMS, thus Wilson and Reeder 2005, in lieu of Wilson and Reeder 1993, as a reference for terrestrial mammals.

The group takes the opportunity to note that the choice of a nomenclatural reference does not imply support or non support for a taxonomic decision or taxonomic change, and that a change of nomenclature does in no way affect the status under CMS of the population concerned. It further notes that for conservation purposes, it is Evolutionary Significant Unit (ESUs) that are the relevant basis of action, whatever their taxonomic or nomenclatural status.

### B. Concerted Actions and Cooperative Actions

#### 1. Review of implementation of Concerted and Cooperative Actions

- **Sahelo-Saharan Concerted Action:**

In 2006, many activities have taken place as part of the Sahelo-Saharan Concerted Action, in particular a workshop in northeast Niger with a view to launch the proposed Termit-TinToumma PA project with all local communities as well as our main

partner, the Sahara Conservation Fund. The establishment of a system of surveillance for this enormous area is the top priority in the coming months.

A second highlight this year was a major translocation operation in Tunisia for *Oryx dammah* and Addax, with a view to recreate metapopulations of those two emblematic species in their original habitats in northern Sahara. This is a first step towards reintroduction of the Addax in the Great Oriental Erg; it should allow the development of a future transborder project between Algeria and Tunisia, with enormously important repercussions such as the implementation of conservation measures for the Slender-horned Gazelle (*Gazella leptoceros*), currently not protected anywhere. The operation was covered by a 3 pages article in Libération, in France, early March. Finally, a new CMS Technical Serie publication (n°11) was published and launched at the Biodiversity and Development workshop organised in Paris by IUCN in September 2006.

The Working Group noted the progress of the **Sahelo-Saharan Antelopes Concerted Action**. The WG confirms the need for an extension of the Sahelo-Saharan Antelopes Concerted Action to other species of large mammals occurring within the range, in particular the Saharan Cheetah, and possibly Soemmering's Gazelle, African Wild Ass and Barbary sheep. Steps will be taken to that effect before the next COP.

- **Central EurAsian Mammals Concerted Action:**

The Working Group reviewed the progress made on the Concerted Action on Central Asian mammals. The Councillor for the European Union summarized the main objectives, philosophy and overall orientation of the project (cfr CMS/ScC14/Doc.24). He indicated that the steps to be completed between this meeting and the next meeting of the Scientific Council were the constitution of a Partnership under UN WSSD which will pilot the Action, the circulation of a draft Action Plan and supporting documents, and the holding of a meeting of Range States and other interested partners. He indicated that the list of ESU (Evolutionary Significant Units) included in Doc 24 represented a first, incomplete inventory of the baseline fauna of the area, presently threatened or not, and that, evidently, only a fraction of these ESUs would need to be included in CMS appendices to constitute the backbone of the Action. It is noted that among species already on the Appendices and which are addressed by the Action, the Bactrian Camel, the Snow Leopard and the Mongolian Gazelle are particularly noteworthy. A list of the species not presently on Appendices and which would need to be added from the onset the programme will be circulated and discussed as soon as the Partnership is constituted. It is hoped that formal action to propose inclusion of these species can then be taken by Parties before the next COP.

The possibility of extending the geographical scope of the action to include the entire aridland belt of Eurasia was considered and it was decided that this should be further considered, in cooperation with Parties concerned by the needed, relatively modest extension. Liaison will be made with the Bern Convention Emerald network, and with the PanEuropean Ecological network of the PanEuropean Biological and Landscape diversity strategy.

- **The Huemul or Southern Andean Deer Concerted Action:**

Information and new research are being carried out between Chile and Argentina on a permanent basis, as this is an endangered species with high conservation priority.

Councillors and researchers from both countries are developing new projects hopefully under the umbrella of CMS.

- **West African Elephant Cooperative Action:**

The WG noted the good progress made on the West African Elephant Cooperative Action. Cooperative work is progressing among the 12 Parties of the MoU signed in Nairobi at last CoP. Wildlife migration corridors have been established between Togo, Burkina Faso and Ghana. Further corridors are being developed between Ghana and Ivory Coast. Liberia and Guinea are currently working to finalize their National Conservation Strategy.

## **2. Possible identification of new species for Concerted Actions**

The councillor for Kenya recommends consideration of the Wild Dog, *Lycaon pictus*. The WG endorses his proposal and notes that it is indeed a priority concern for CMS action in Africa. The councillor for Kenya will prepare the work for the listing of the species in Appendix I. He indicates that Kenya would probably be in a position to make the formal proposal.

## **3. Identification / Confirmation of focal point councillors for Concerted Action Species**

The WG confirms continuation of the work of the focal point councillors for Concerted and Cooperative Actions. The acting focal point councillors for the Central Asian Mammals are the councillor for Mongolia and the European Union. The focal point councillor for the West African Elephant is the councillor for Nigeria, presently chairman of the Scientific Council.

## **4. Funds (agenda item 7)**

The WG confirms the funding needs identified for the first half of the triennium at the 13<sup>th</sup> ScC meeting, and the level of priority of the actions to which there are allocated. They have not yet been fully available. Additional funds will be needed to complete the second half of the triennium. They are evaluated at 100.000 dollars for the Central Eurasian CA, and at 35.000 dollars for the Sahelo-Saharan Antelopes CA, and at 10.000 dollars for the West African Elephant.

## **C. Discussion and evaluation of draft proposals**

*Panthera pardus nimr*, the Arabian leopard

A draft of a possible proposal was introduced by Yemen, and accompanied by a presentation. The WG considered the document useful and noted the comment by the Councillor for Yemen that further information was needed. The WG suggested that the matter is further pursued, perhaps best in the framework of the Concerted Action on Central Asian Mammals, to include other populations within the range of that action, thus within the full range of *Panthera pardus nimr*, as understood by Wilson and Reeder 2005.

## **REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON BIRDS**

John O'Sullivan, Appointed Councillor

The Working Group on Birds met on Friday 16<sup>th</sup> March, from 1145 to 1500 and from 1800 to 1900 (the former session with interpretation). This provided less time than at previous meetings of the Scientific Council, and cut short the discussions somewhat. Nevertheless, the main areas of the necessary work were covered, as well as some items of a non-routine nature.

### **Agenda item 4**

#### **Format of reports on the conservation status of CMS Appendix I species:**

The Working Group examined the Proposed List of Contents tabled by the Secretariat, and gave broad support to its suggestions. It was suggested that a useful addition would be provision for a reference list of publications. It was further suggested that consideration be given to dividing Range States into core and other states, using a 1% criterion, as can be seen, for instance, in the draft Action Plan for the Lesser Flamingo, which was also before the Working Group.

#### **Review of taxonomic groups to identify species for listing:**

The Appointed Councillor had prepared an *ad hoc* list of birds that appeared to qualify for Appendix I, based on a rapid analysis by him of BirdLife data, and applying considerations relating to the CMS definition of migration and the present membership of the Convention. This was intended mainly to stimulate discussion at the meeting, which it did. After an exchange of experience, and the elimination of some species, it was agreed to investigate a number of species further, using e-mail between appropriate Councillors, before the 2008 deadline for proposals relating to COP9. A list of the relevant species is attached as an appendix to this paper. There remains a clear need for a full review of migratory bird species, as envisaged in the Strategy Implementation Plan (as for other taxonomic groups). On the possibility of removing species from Appendix I, the suggestion was made that the status of *Haliaeetus albicilla* be investigated, as several populations have shown a strong recovery.

#### **Recommendation of Appendix I species for the preparation of new Action Plans:**

The Secretariat had asked for the Working Group's advice on two proposals received which might fit the requirements of a donation of 42,000 Euros from the Government of Italy. It was agreed that the proposals, to produce Action Plans for *Ardeola idae* and *Sarothrura ayresi*, were appropriate and could be supported. It was noted that the donor had a preference for species covered by AEWA; had this not been the case, there were several other species, for instance, in the Latin American region, which would certainly have merited such support.

### **Agenda item 5.1**

#### **Review of implementation of Concerted Actions:**

As is the usual practice, the Working Group received reports from several Scientific Councillors on bird species listed for Concerted Action. There were reports, followed by questions and comments, on *Falco naumanni*, *Chlamydotis undulata*, and *Numenius tenuirostris*, and more detailed coverage of (with the affiliation of the Councillor shown in



brackets) *Chloephaga rubidiceps* (Argentina), *Oxyura leucocephala* (Spain), *Grus leucogeranus* (Asiatic fauna), *Otis tarda* (Hungary), *Phoenicopterus andinus* and *Phoenicopterus jamesi* (Bolivia), *Acrocephalus paludicola* (Birds), *Spheniscus humboldti* (Peru), *Aythya nyroca* (Latvia) and *Calidris canutus rufa* (Argentina). It was agreed that the more detailed reports would be provided in writing to the Secretariat by the Councillor concerned, in order to be put onto the CMS website. It was decided not to report on *Anser erythropus* at the Working Group, as the species appeared on the plenary agenda. The Working Group briefly considered three draft Action Plans which had been provided to the Scientific Council meeting (covered by Doc. 16) on the Concerted Action Species *Platalea minor*, *Eurynorhynchus pygmaeus*, and *Sterna bernsteini*. The Group noted with satisfaction the progress on these reports, considered that their content was appropriate (though it was noted that the format appeared not to be the same as that of other CMS Action Plans), and looked forward to seeing the final versions in due course. No reports were received on *Sarothrura ayresi* and *Hirundo atrocaerulea*, as the appropriate Councillors were not present at this meeting of the Scientific Council; it was agreed to make a particular effort to obtain reports on these species for the next meeting, just before COP9. In response to a request from the meeting, certain Councillors kindly agreed to take on the Focal Point role for the taxa shown; *Grus leucogeranus* (Asiatic fauna), *Acrocephalus paludicola* (Czech Republic), *Puffinus mauretanicus* (Spain), and *Calidris canutus rufa* (Argentina). Other Councillors would continue in the Focal Point role as indicated above. At this stage, no further species were proposed for Concerted Action to be added at COP9, but Councillors will consider this issue intersessionally.

Particular points to note: *Otis tarda* Asian population (possible action in connection with existing MoU on the species; consider inviting an expert on this population to comment or present to the Council). *Chloephaga rubidiceps* now in serious trouble; we may need to reconsider priorities. For *Aythya nyroca*, provision of artificial nesting sites has been shown to result in poor success. For *Phoenicopterus andinus* and *Ph. jamesi*, good progress is being made on an MoU, with the assistance of the Secretariat. A report from India of a single *Numenius tenuirostris* awaits elucidation; confirmation of the identification would be of considerable significance.

## **Agenda item 5.2**

### **Cooperative Actions for Appendix II species:**

Brief reports were made on *Crex crex*, and *Coturnix coturnix coturnix*, and a more detailed report on *Cygnus melanocorypha* (Councillor for Neotropical fauna). The Working Group briefly considered a draft Action Plan for *Phoenicopterus minor* provided under cover of Doc. 23. The draft was welcomed, and its content felt to be promising; Councillors looked forward to seeing the final version in due course.

Attention was drawn by one Councillor to threats to several species of larks (Alaudidae) and pipits (Motacillidae), particularly from illegal taking in Europe.

Councillors noted the importance of keeping the species information in the Convention's List of Range States up to date.

## Annex to report of Working Group on Birds

*Some species to be investigated for possible listing on Appendix I*

Note: all are on the IUCN Red List and all occur in the territory of at least one CMS Party. In several cases, precise international migratory status needs to be elucidated/confirmed.

### African species

*Grus carunculatus*  
*Egretta vinaceigula*  
*Gyps coprotheres*  
*Circus maurus*  
*Falco cherrug* (also occurs in other regions)  
*Glareola ocularis*  
*Grus paradisea*

### Eurasian species

*Aythya baeri*  
*Leptoptilos javanicus*  
*Leptoptilos dubius*  
*Heliopais personatus*  
*Rhynchops albicollis*  
*Gallinago nemoricola*  
*Saxicola insignis*  
*Pelecanus philippensis*  
*Columba eversmanni*  
*Megalurus pryeri*  
*Locustella pleskei*  
*Acrocephalus sorghophilus*  
*Acrocephalus orinus* (newly rediscovered)  
*Turdus feae*  
*Emberiza sulphurata*  
*Ficedula subrubra*  
*Phylloscopus ijimae*

### Australasian/Pacific species

*Numenius tahitiensis*

### American species

*Dendroica cerulea*  
*Procnias tricarunculatus*  
*Cephalopterus glabricollis*  
*Sterna lorata*  
*Piprites pileata*  
*Cinclus schultzi*  
*Anthus nattereri*  
*Progne murphyi*  
*Conirostrum tamarugense*

**REPORT OF DISCUSSIONS OF TURTLE TAXONOMIC WORKING GROUP  
16 March 2007**

1. The group considered the proposed list of contents for fact sheet on the conservation status of CMS Appendix 1 species.
  - It is recommended that the marine turtles be considered from the perspective of genetic stocks (Management Units) within each species when critical sites are being identified.
  - It is recommended that summary of action plans be presented in tabular form that addresses each of the four “Regional Agreements” (see below), with signatory states being identified for each agreement.
  
2. Strong concern is expressed that the small grants program is being constrained through funding limitations. This is severely limiting the capacity of the CMS Scientific Council to catalyse strategic actions with regards to Appendix 1 turtle species.
  
3. Review of actions
 

Four “Regional Agreements” embrace the global distribution of marine turtles.

  - a. **West African MoU:** Signed 1999, 22 signatory states with only South Africa as a range state not signed. Interim secretariat SINEPAD/Env has been formed within Senegal (CMS signed an MOU in 2005 to establish this coordination for 3 years). Additional support for this action is coming from UNEP.
    - Workshop in January 2007 established a work program for the next 2 years with a working group, URTOMA.
    - Plans are underway for a 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting of Signatory States later this years. There is discussion towards modifying the text of the MOU so that other partners can be signatories. There are plans to form an advisory committee with both main language groups represented. Bycatch will be specifically addressed within the action plan.
    - Satellite telemetry tracking of leatherback turtles in progress.
  
  - b. **IOSEA MoU:** Commenced in 2001, >20 signatory states. Many of the signatory states are not signatories to CMS. It has a secretariat that is co-located with UNEP in Bangkok. It has a high quality website for reporting and updating on activities. There have been five annual meetings of Signatory States, with the next likely to occur later this year. 2006 was successfully celebrated as the Year of the Turtle.
    - In Sri Lanka there is evidence of recovery following the damage to turtle nesting and foraging habitat by the Dec 2004 Tsunami. Also the impact of coastal development on Sri Lanka’s turtle nesting beaches has been reduced with Government action to reduce construction of houses close to the beaches.
    - Many satellite telemetry tracking and genetic stock analysis projects are in progress throughout the region.
  
  - c. **Turtle Islands Heritage Protected Area MoU:** Signed in 1996; Joint management of the Turtle Island Group (9 islands) between Philippines & Malaysia (Sabah) for the conservation of turtles. The Joint Management Committee is chaired alternatively by the 2 countries.

- Turtle egg collection on Philippines side.
- Sabah Parks has no turtle egg collection but a highly regulated ecotourism at Selingan Island.

- d. **Inter-American Agreement:** (not a CMS/UNEP agreement, legally binding): Addresses the turtle conservation and management through North, Central and South America.
- e. **South Pacific Region Environment Programme:** Under the APIA Agreement; Regional Marine Turtle Conservation Project has been functional since 1990; encompasses the Pacific island nations (Melanesia and Micronesia) of the central and western Pacific including PNG (excludes Hawaii, NZ). Dialogue is in progress between CMS and SPREP towards developing a CMS based turtle conservation agreement. 2006 was successfully celebrated as Year of the Turtle.

4. The group identified what it considered to be major threats to turtles at global / regional levels. The challenge is to effectively address these issues through CMS actions and the actions of the above agreements.

**Fisheries bycatch** is being addressed by CMS current actions (Resolution 8.14) and we endorse these actions and look forward to collaboration between the Fisheries Bycatch Councillor and the Turtle MoUs.

- However, most emphasis in the recent past has been directed to reducing bycatch in trawl and long line fisheries. Turtle mortality in coastal gill net fisheries remains a major threat in many African, Asian and eastern Central American countries. This mortality factor requires actions to reduce its significant impact on many turtle stocks.
- There is a need for regulatory bodies (National and International) to take positive action to research and implement bycatch reduction in their respective fisheries.
- Gear modification may not always be the solution for reducing turtle mortality. Other solutions to reducing bycatch such as time & area closures or reducing fishing effort that are adapted to the specific fisheries need to be seriously considered and implemented.

**Climate change** is being addressed by current actions (Agenda item 5.3). We urge that sea turtles be included among the species selected as index species for assessing the impact of climate change.

**Collection of eggs and killing of turtles** by coastal communities is wide spread and, for many areas, these mortality factors are excessively high and exceed sustainable levels. There is a very high priority for finding a means for reducing this threat to our turtle populations. Responses to address this significant issue need to be addressed within the context of CMS actions in progress (Resolution 8.1; ScC Inf.13 Project 4).

**Excessive egg predation** by feral/domestic/wild predators is significant for many populations (pigs, dogs, foxes, ...). International cooperation in developing solutions for cost effective methods for control of these predators is needed.

**Synthetic marine debris pollution** is a continuing problem resulting in significant turtle mortalities. This issue includes the mortality of turtles in “ghost” (lost or discarded) fishing gear. Increased international cooperation is needed for reducing this

pervasive source of mortality that crosses national boundaries as the debris is dispersed by ocean currents.

**Coastal development** that is negatively impacting turtle nesting and foraging habitats is an issue in some regions and should not be neglected.

**Civil unrest** in some countries is hampering local turtle conservation activities: northern Sri Lanka, Somalia. The international conservation community is urged to assist where possible in supporting turtle conservation actions in these areas.

5. The CMS/WCMC “Turtle mapping database & website” that is currently accessible via the IOSEA Turtles.org website is suitable for summarising and displaying the distribution, abundance, migration and trends of the world’s marine turtles. Ongoing support for this project is encouraged.

**Some good news stories:**

Within long line fisheries, projects such as circle hook work being conducted through the collaborative work of NOAA, IATTC, and WWF are in progress. Through this and other projects there has been great progress made within industry engagement and educating and increasing awareness of the marine turtle bycatch issue.

In the Philippines, new nesting populations of olive ridley, hawksbill and green turtles are being discovered and local communities are being involved in the conservation of these small populations.

Monitoring of Eastern Australian loggerhead turtles nesting sites has demonstrated that the compulsory use of turtle exclusion devices (TEDs) in prawn trawls in 2001 has been effective in stopping the past 25yr decline in breeding numbers. TEDs have been effective in stopping the excessive mortality of loggerhead in Australian prawn trawl fisheries.

**CMS SCC14**  
**REPORT OF THE TAXONOMIC WORKING GROUP ON FISHES**  
**MARCH 17, 2007**

The CMS Scientific Council Taxonomic Working Group on Fishes held its first formal meeting on March 16, 2007. The agenda for the Taxonomic Working Group on Fishes included agenda item 4 (Review of Strategy Implementation Plan for the Scientific Council 2006-2011), agenda item 5.2 (Cooperative Actions), and agenda item 6b (Review of the Migratory Chondrichthyan Fishes CMS/ScC14/Doc.14).

Agenda Item 4 (Review of Strategy Implementation Plan for the SC 2006-2011)

- Format of Reports on the Conservation Status of CMS Appendix I Species

The Taxonomic Working Group on Fishes discussed the format of reports that are required of species listed on Appendix I of the CMS. It was decided that the Taxonomic Working Group on Fishes will follow a slightly edited version format of the “List of Contents” put forth by the CMS Secretariat. The Appointed Councillor for Fish (Dr. Zeb Hogan) will be responsible for the development and maintenance of these reports.

- Review of the Taxonomic Groups to Identify Candidate Species for Listing

The review of fish to identify candidate species for listing was combined with agenda item 6b (Review of the Migratory Chondrichthyan Fishes CMS/ScC14/Doc.14). It was decided that 35 species of sharks, rays and sawfish meet the criteria for listing in Appendix I or Appendix II of the CMS.

Agenda Item 5.2 (Cooperative Actions)

The Councillor from Germany (Reiner Blanke) made a presentation on the current status of sturgeons and paddlefish with an emphasis on European species. He noted that sturgeon species are in decline worldwide due to harvest for caviar, mortality from by-catch, loss of habitat (dams, reservoirs, and channels), and loss of access to spawning sites. The Councillor for Germany expressed interest in convening an international workshop or organizing an international agreement on the conservation of sturgeon. The Appointed Councillor for Fish will follow up with the Councillor for Germany to further discuss these options.

Agenda Item 6b (Review of the Migratory Chondrichthyan Fishes CMS/ScC14/Doc.14)

Ms. Sarah Fowler presented a report on the results of an analysis on the conservation status of migratory chondrichthyan fishes. The Taxonomic Working Group on Fishes agreed that 35 species of sharks, rays, and sawfish meet the criteria for listing in Appendix I or Appendix II of the CMS due to their 1) migratory behaviour and 2) threatened status. Sarah Fowler will prepare nomination documentation for the 35 species.

Plenary of the Scientific Council (March 17, 2007)

It should be noted that several Scientific Councillors expressed interest in a review of the conservation status of migratory freshwater fish. The likely candidates of such an assessment would be the sturgeons, salmon, and migratory fish of large, transboundary river systems.

The representative from Wetlands International suggested a partnership between the IUCN/WI Specialist Group for Freshwater Fish and the CMS Taxonomic Working Group on Fishes.

I would like to express my appreciation to all those that participated in the Working Group.

This report was prepared by Dr. Zeb Hogan, CMS Appointed Councillor for Fish.

Participants:

Zeb Hogan (Appointed Councillor - Fish/Chair)  
Barry Baker (Appointed Councillor - Bycatch)  
Sarah Fowler (IUCN Shark Specialist Group, NatureBureau)  
Mark Tasker (ACAP, ASCOBANS, ICES)  
Pamela Toschik (USA)  
David H.W. Morgan (CITES)  
Vicki Cronan (Australia)  
Rainer Blanke (Germany)

## **SPECIFICATION OF REQUIREMENTS**

### ***Review of the effects of barriers to migration on migratory species***

#### **AIMS AND OBJECTIVES**

Based on Document UNEP/CMS/ScC 5.3, carry out a comprehensive review of the effects of barriers to migration on migratory species.

Identify all important barriers to migration for each species listed on Appendix I of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals. Make suggestions how to remove these barriers or how to mitigate the effects of such barriers.

Prepare a report that identifies the importance of barriers to migration as a threat to migratory species in general and to Appendix I species in particular. Next, report on measures suggested to remove or mitigate the effects of barriers to migration. Advise on international action through the CMS.

#### **ISSUES AND SCOPE**

The Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS) is an intergovernmental environment treaty which aims to conserve terrestrial, marine and flying species over the whole of their migratory range. To achieve this, the Convention provides a framework for enhancing the conservation status of migratory species through the cooperative efforts of the range states of those species. There are currently 102 Contracting Parties to the Convention.

Migratory species are considered important as they can act as linkages between ecosystems, and therefore can be indicators of ecological change. CMS seeks to conserve threatened migratory species by endeavouring to protect habitats, remove obstacles that hinder migration, and lessen the impact of identified threats.

Barriers to migration are recognised by CMS as a major threat to many migratory species. It is a threat that occurs both on land and in the sea, and affects many species listed under CMS. To date, research and implementation of barrier mitigation has largely been conducted on an ad hoc basis, with advice given on a species by species basis rather than a general perspective.

Although there is significant conservation and barrier mitigation action occurring at the national level, links between these actions at the international level are often poor, leading to weakening of international effort. To date, despite many projects and activities within CMS agreements and other organizations/instruments, there is insufficient overall progress from these efforts, and barriers to migration remain a critical threat to many migratory species.

Knowledge of where and when barriers to migration occur, and the scale that they are occurring, are critical information gaps that hinder progress in minimising the impacts of this threat. At the 13<sup>th</sup> meeting of the CMS Scientific Council and the ensuing 8<sup>th</sup> Conference of



Parties, it was agreed that there is a need for an assessment of the migratory taxa affected, especially those listed on Appendix I of CMS, as a precursor to stimulating the development and promulgation of effective general solutions. This project seeks to take forward these issues, which in turn will help CMS, its subsidiary daughter agreements, their party states and others play a more active part in addressing the threats to migratory species from barriers to migration.

## **USES AND USERS OF THE RESULTS**

The results will lead to the collection of important data that should help set policy and priorities for CMS and its Parties. The findings will be made available to CMS, its regional agreements, other conservation organisations, the NGO community, the scientific community and others.

## **DETAILED REQUIREMENTS**

Carry out a comprehensive review of the effects of barriers to migration on migratory species starting from CMS document UNEP/CMS/ScC 5.3. While there is a general interest in all migratory species, of particular concern are species listed on the CMS Appendix I, many of which are threatened with extinction.

For each Appendix I species:

- Identify the barriers to migration;
- Estimate the possible magnitude of the effects;
- Suggest ways to remove the barriers of to mitigate their effects.

Prepare a report that identifies the importance of barriers to migration as a threat to migratory species in general and to Appendix I species in particular. Next, report on measures suggested to remove or mitigate the effects of barriers to migration. Advise on international action through the CMS.

The report and its recommendations must receive the endorsement of the Convention on Migratory Species.

## **OUTPUTS**

It is the intention of CMS to publish the results of the work through one or more routes, such as:

**A final report** covering the policy and scientific background to the work, the methodologies employed, results, conclusions and recommendations suitable for publication on the Internet. The report will contain a non-technical executive summary of not more than three pages and should be written in Plain English containing headline results and recommendations. If appropriate, papers for refereed scientific journals may also be prepared.

In addition, the contractor shall provide an **Executive Summary** of no more than two A4-sized pages.

The approved final report suitable for publication must be provided by the contract end date.

CMS may occasionally request summaries of interim results during the contract, which may be required in an electronic format to be agreed.

## **QUALITY ASSURANCE**

The final report will be subject to independent peer review and the contractor will be expected to respond in detail to reviewers' comments and amend the final report as appropriate.

## **MANAGEMENT**

The Contract will be managed in accordance with the CMS's 'Standard Terms and Conditions for Research and Development Contracts'.

The contractor will be managed by the CMS Scientific Officer. The CMS Scientific Officer will act as Contract Manager responsible for the day to day management of the contract. The contractor will appoint a project manager who will act as the principal point of contact.

Before the end of the contract, the contractor shall attend a meeting with CMS to discuss the management and performance of the contract with a view to informing each other of any strengths and weaknesses exposed.

## **TIMING**

The contract will be expected to last approximately xx months from the date of award of a contract. The anticipated start date is stated in the invitation to tender letter.

## **PROGRAMME OF WORK AND MILESTONES**

The scope of this project is ambitious, and the budget amount may not be sufficient to complete the work as envisaged. Tenderers are invited to propose a work programme designed to meet the above objectives, requirements and timetable. Tenders should include a time schedule for the work that identifies the main tasks and key milestones that will be used to monitor progress. If necessary, proposals to reduce the scope of the work to fit the project budget (EU xx,xxx) will be considered.

## **PROJECT TEAM (INCLUDING SUB CONTRACTORS)**

Details of the project team should be supplied indicating the experience of the individuals. The organisation of the project team should be linked to the work programme, indicating the grade of staff and number of days allocated to specific work areas.

## **ELECTRONIC SECURITY**

Electronic media of any type or format supplied to CMS by the Contractor must be checked for viruses before shipment. The Contractor must provide details of the computer virus detection and virus eradication software (or hardware) that is used to prevent infection and the frequency at which it is updated.

## **EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Tenders will be assessed against the criteria set out below. It is worthwhile trying to assess your own proposal against these criteria before you submit it. It is important to realise that CMS will score proposals against each of these criteria. For example, if your proposal is of high quality, but does not provide an adequate description of how the results will be transmitted to the appropriate audience, it will probably be unsuccessful.

The Criteria are:

### *Quality of proposal*

- relevance to specified requirements
- scientific merit
- clear work plan with realistic testable milestones
- clear deliverables
- probability of success

### *Details of contractor*

- expertise, infrastructure
- project planning and management
- past experience with contractor

### *Cost*

- reasonable & competitive costs
- co-funders

**WORKING GROUP ON THE REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE  
STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (SIP) 2006-2011  
FOR THE SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL**

The Working Group met a first time on 15/03/07 for about 90 minutes, and a second time on 16/03/07 for about 45 minutes.

The following members of the Council participated in at least one of the meetings:

1. Richard Bagine - Kenya (chair)
2. Olivier Biber - Switzerland
3. Carlo C. Custodio - Philippines
4. Colin Galbraith - UK
5. Veronique Herrenshmidt - France
6. Branko Micevski - The FYR of Macedonia
7. John O'Sullivan - Appointed Councillor
8. Marco Barbieri - Secretariat

Terms of Reference of the WG:

- Consider progress in the implementation of the Strategy Implementation Plan 2006-2011 using as reference the document CMS/ScC14/Doc.21 prepared by the Secretariat;
- Consider the opportuneness of a revision of the SIP at this stage;
- Give advise on the structure and content of document CMS/ScC14/Doc.21, and guidance on future reporting on SIP implementation.

The group could not undertake a systematic review of the implementation of the SIP activity by activity due to time constraints. It could however note that, while progress in implementation had been made on several activities scheduled for the triennium 2006-2008, for several others progress appeared to be modest or absent. This could be related at least in a certain number of cases to lack of necessary financial resources.

Although it was already evident that a certain number of targets for the current triennium would inevitably be missed, a revision of the SIP at this stage, just a bit more than one year since its adoption, was considered not appropriate. However, identification of realistic, attainable targets with a view to ScC15 and COP9 was seen as helpful for the purpose of activity-planning for the remaining part of the triennium.

In relation with the previous point, the report prepared by the Secretariat was generally considered a helpful document, and a good basis on which to work to devise the format and content of the report on the implementation of the SIP to be submitted to COP9. A specific suggestion of the group in this regard is to incorporate in the report an estimate for the financial needs of individual activities when relevant.

With a view to (i) the further elaboration of the structure of the report, and (ii) the identification of priority activities to be implemented, and targets to be attained by ScC15/COP9, the group recommended a wider consultation within the Council. This should be accomplished by making a revised version of document CMS/ScC14/Doc.21 available

online through a password-protected section of the website. Councillors will be invited to provide their input directly online. This consultation process should be commenced shortly after the meeting, and be completed by summer 2007.

It was also noted that some of the activities included in the SIP might need some clarification with a view to their possible implementation. Identification and definition of such activities is recommended as one of the targets to be attained by ScC15.

## REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON SUSTAINABLE USE

### Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines

1. The ScC 14<sup>th</sup> established a Working Group on Sustainable Use (SUWG) and agreed that it will carry on work intersessionally, through electronic means. The group will be tasked with the assessment of the applicability of the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines in the CMS context. In particular, for each of the 14<sup>th</sup> principles the group will assess:

- compatibility with relevant articles of the Convention;
- rationale for applicability/non-applicability;
- problems related to applicability;
- practical examples;
- issues to be addressed; and
- guidance.

2. The Secretariat will call for and gather comments from members of the SUWG by December 2007. Results will be compiled by the end of March 2007, and then circulated for a second round of comments. The final assessment will be completed by May 2008.

3. While undertaking this assessment, SUWG members will be also asked to provide information on the impact of hunting on migratory species.

### Wildlife watching

4. The meeting welcomed the study undertaken by the CMS Secretariat on the subject and noted some shortcomings and issues that need to be addressed, in order to provide a balanced assessment of the potential impacts of wildlife watching activities on migratory species.

5. The meeting decided that the SUWG, assisted by the Secretariat, will work at the development of general guidance for wildlife watching activities. Such guidance will address the following aspects:

1. *Conditions and criteria for wildlife watching development;*
2. *Impact assessment;*
3. *Monitoring needs and mechanisms;*
4. *Predicted conservation benefits of activities;*
5. *Assessment of disturbance and habitat damage;*
6. *Planning and management;*
7. *Rules and regulations for wildlife watching activities (incl. existing guidelines);*
8. *Visitors management;*
9. *Management of impacts.*

6. Guidance will not be site or species specific (as there exist already guidelines for activities focusing on those, such for instance those developed under ACCOBANS on

cetaceans), but more generically the development of wildlife watching activities, their desirability or incompatibility with some conservation situations as well as monitoring and management requirements. CMS guidance should address wildlife watching activities from the moment of planning and approval (or refusal) to the monitoring of activities once established.

7. Guidance developed by the group will be based on (i) the outcome of the CMS study; (ii) existing site and species-specific guidelines; (iii) other relevant literature.

8. Guidance developed by the group will be presented to the next meeting of the COP in November 2008, for endorsement and/or as the basis for further work to be developed by the CMS.

**REPORT OF THE BYCATCH WORKING GROUP**

*Prepared by Barry Baker, Conference-appointed Councillor - Bycatch*

The Bycatch Working Group met to discuss a draft work program for the Bycatch Councillor (Doc CMS/ScC14/Doc.25) and a draft Specification of Requirements for Assessment of Bycatch in Global Fisheries (Doc CMS/ScC14/Doc.19). These two documents were endorsed by the Working Group with minor amendments to clarify the intent of the Work Plan and the scope of the proposed global review of bycatch in fisheries.

A number of matters were raised during the discussion. The Working Group identified the need to agree upon a terminology for 'bycatch', noting that words such as 'byproduct', 'accidental mortality', 'incidental mortality', 'non-target catch', 'un-regulated catch' and other terms are frequently applied to various portions of fishing catch that has not been specifically targeted. A number of suggestions were made, and the importance of adopting a definition of bycatch widely understood within the fishing industry noted. The Working Group agreed to develop this inter-sessionally through an informal Correspondence Group, and Dr Robin Davies subsequently agreed to prepare a short working paper to assist the Group's considerations.

There was discussion on the high workload associated with addressing the bycatch issue, and the complexities associated with this threat. The Bycatch Councillor noted that the task was beyond the capacity of one person, and stated his intention on seeking strong support from members of both the Working Group and the informal Correspondence Group. I was pleased to receive many offers of support from Working Group. An ACCOBAMS workshop scheduled for the end of 2007 will provide relevant information on cetacean bycatch with the Agreement's area of competency. The Appointed Councillor for Marine Turtles noted that bycatch information relating to trawling and longlining, for which there was considerable data, has seen a focus on the development of mitigation efforts for these gear types. However, artisanal coastal fisheries involving gillnets are killing large number of turtles, and have no equivalent mitigation focus. The Appointed Councillor for Marine Mammals also noted the need to make a distinction between true bycatch and non-target catch. He noted that because bycatch is often kept and utilized, it can lead to development of a directed fishery for what started as a bycatch species. He provided several examples, including development of an unregulated and unsustainable dolphin fishery. Another participant noted the need to consider how to prevent new forms of bycatch as new fishing technology evolves and is developed.

In reviewing information on mitigation measures the group noted the need for sound scientific support and rigorous evaluation before encouraging the widespread adoption of a measure. Technical solutions proven to be effective for one fishery may not be effective in another fishery. This can be for a range of reasons —other species with different behaviours are encountered, fishing effort occurs at a different spatial or temporal scale, or there are subtle differences in fishing methods that reduce the effectiveness of the mitigation measures.

In discussions on the specifications for the global assessment project, one participant asked why the assessment will be broader than species listed in CMS Appendices I and II. The Chair explained that the study is intended to provide a general overview of bycatch and identify unknown problems. Because new species are being continually added to the Convention, it was desirable to get ahead of the game. It was agreed that other CMS daughter Agreements such as ACAP, ACCOBAMS, ASCOBANS and the turtle and marine mammal MOUs have



considerable expertise in managing bycatch, and coordination with these instruments should be undertaken. The goals for the assessment were discussed and will be subsequently clarified to emphasise the intent of obtaining an overview of priority fisheries, regions and species which will benefit from international action through CMS. Clarity will also be provided through defining terminology, particular “bycatch” and what constitutes a “fishery,” seeking input of fisheries experts in doing so. Issues that are not to be addressed in the study, (e.g. ghostnets), will be clearly stated so that they can be addressed elsewhere. It will also be emphasised that the project is primarily a desktop study, with information to be sourced from literature reviews and the websites of RFMOs and national governments. It was not the intent to duplicate the efforts of other research projects, such as the Duke University initiative which has an emphasis on accurate quantification of bycatch levels through the use of spatial and statistical modelling.

In closing I would like to express my appreciation to all those that participated in the Working Group, and to Pam Toschik who took notes of the meeting.

Participants:

Barry Baker (Appointed Councillor - Bycatch/Chair)  
Olivier Biber (Switzerland),  
Preben Clausen (Denmark),  
Vicki Cronan (Australia),  
Robin Davies (WWF),  
Shannon Dionne (USA),  
Colin Galbraith (U.K),  
Zeb Hogan (Appointed Councillor - Fish),  
Ernest Lamptey (Ghana),  
Colin Limpus (Appointed Councillor – Marine Turtles),  
Bill Perrin (Appointed Councillor – Marine Mammals),  
Mark Tasker (ACAP, ASCOBANS, ICES),  
Pamela Toschik (USA),  
Wim Wolff (Netherlands),  
Jean-Christophe Vie (IUCN)

**DRAFT WORK PROGRAM 2007-2008 FOR BYCATCH COUNCILLOR**

	<b>Topic/Task</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>	<b>Detail</b>
1	Establish a small informal correspondence group of interested parties and technical experts to assist the Scientific Councillor	August 2007	<p>A small working group will be established to ensure thorough coverage of faunal groups and access to technical expertise on mitigation techniques and application.</p> <p>Membership of the correspondence group will be expertise based and may comprise members not directly involved with the CMS Scientific Council. The working group will assist the Scientific Councillor on Bycatch in implementing the Work Program.</p> <p>Scientific Councillor to approach relevant experts in bycatch and bycatch mitigation and seek their involvement.</p>
2	Conduct a study to assess bycatch in global fisheries	<p>Commission study August 2007</p> <p>Complete study September 2008</p>	<p>Commission a consultant to carry out a comprehensive review of all global commercial and artisanal fisheries. Study will assess the available information on bycatch of seabirds, marine turtles, sharks and marine mammals, focusing particularly on CMS listed species. It will assess the importance of bycatch as a threat to migratory species and provides an overview of priority fisheries, regions and species which will benefit from international action through the CMS.</p> <p>The scope (spatial or taxonomic coverage) of the study will be modified, if necessary, to suit available funding.</p>

3	Work closely with other international competent bodies such as FAO and relevant RFMOs	Ongoing  Request observer status at meetings of key RFMOs and FAO COFI— May 2007	FAO and RFMOs have direct management responsibility for most of the global high seas fisheries. Attendance at key meetings of these bodies is essential to influence adoption of mitigation strategies and implementation of independent observer programs, necessary for improving knowledge of bycatch issues.  Key RFMOs are CCSBT, CCAMLR, ICCAT, IATTC, IOTC, WCPFC.  Adoption of mitigation strategies by RFMOs may lead to flow-on effects to EEZ fisheries of RFMO members.
4	Work closely with CMS daughter agreements and other relevant conservation bodies	Ongoing  Write to daughter agreements — May 2007	ACAP, ACCOBAMS, ASCOBANS, Waddensea Seals, Marine Turtles Africa, Marine Turtles IOSEA, Pacific Islands Cetaceans
5	Risk assessments. Continuously review and utilise available information on the at-sea distribution of migratory species to assess overlap with fishing operations and hence the risk of bycatch in fishing regions	Ongoing	Fishing regions include RFMO areas of competence, and national EEZs.  Risk assessments carried out annually by the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources provide an excellent model.

6	Review information on mitigation measures for fishing methods known to impact migratory species	Ongoing	<p>Concise reviews of current knowledge on mitigation measures to reduce seabird bycatch in longline fishing have been produced over the last few years, but do not exist for other faunal groups or fishing methods.</p> <p>Work with fishery managers and RFMOs is required to comprehensively assess fishing techniques and gear used in EEZ and high seas fisheries, to identify those elements that have been shown to reduce or eliminate by-catch mortality of migratory species.</p> <p>Products of review are described in Item 9 (below)</p> <p>Initial work should focus on pelagic longline methods for seabirds and turtles. Ensure mitigation methods developed for one taxonomic group do not lead to bycatch of other taxa.</p>
7	Develop and maintain a database of relevant scientific literature on bycatch	<p>By end 2007</p> <p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Develop a bibliographic database on published references to bycatch and mitigation research to assist the work of the Bycatch Working Group and the Scientific Council</p> <p>Maintain the bycatch bibliographic database and regularly update to reflect current literature</p>

8	Develop a bycatch webpage	By end 2007	<p>Develop a page for the CMS website providing information on CMS activities to ameliorate the impacts of bycatch on migratory species.</p> <p>The website could also provide a ‘toolbox’ of best practice species-specific techniques to reduce bycatch in fishing operations, such as FAO publications <i>Expert consultation on interactions between sea turtles and fisheries within an ecosystem context</i>, and <i>The Incidental catch of seabirds by longline fisheries: Worldwide review and technical guidelines for mitigation on the interactions between sea turtles and fisheries</i>.</p>
9	In consultation with CMS daughter agreements, develop products to assist RFMOs and other relevant international and national bodies in reducing bycatch.	Ongoing	These could include: observer programme designs including protocols for the collection of bycatch data, analytical methods for assessing bycatch, best-practice mitigation measures
10	Develop materials and guidelines to assist CMS representatives attending RFMO and other relevant meetings to maximise effective participation and consideration of issues relevant to the minimisation of bycatch	Ongoing	<p>These could include technical information to be delivered through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— concise reports that are based on sound, scientifically supported peer-reviewed papers</li> <li>— presentations and submission of relevant papers to meetings to support the information being conveyed, together with active participation at meetings;</li> <li>— workshops with industry to progress uptake of mitigation in particular</li> <li>— building relations with fishers, national fisheries managers, RFMO Secretariats and UN FAO officials</li> </ul>

11	Assist in the preparation, adoption and implementation of FAO NPOA-Seabirds and FAO NPOA-Sharks	Ongoing	This may include: — development of best practice guidelines, an initiative adopted by FAO COFI in March 2007 for IPOA-Seabirds — providing assistance to Parties and Range States in the development of NPOA-Seabirds and FAO NPOA-Sharks.
12	Provide report to Scientific Council on Bycatch Councillor activities	SC 15	Provide a report to 15th meeting of the Scientific Council on the activities of the Bycatch Councillor during the inter-sessional period

## **SPECIFICATION OF REQUIREMENTS**

*Assessment of Bycatch in Global Fisheries.*

### **AIMS AND OBJECTIVES**

1. Carry out a comprehensive review of all global commercial and artisanal fisheries to assess the available information on the bycatch of seabirds, marine turtles, sharks and marine mammals, under the stewardship of the CMS Conference-appointed Scientific Councillor for by-catch.
2. For each fishery, examine recent fishing effort and bycatch information and evaluate the level of impact on non-target species, particularly CMS listed species.
3. Prepare a report that identifies the importance of bycatch as a threat to migratory species and provides an overview of priority fisheries, regions and species which will benefit from international action through the CMS

### **ISSUES AND SCOPE**

The Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS) is an intergovernmental environment treaty which aims to conserve terrestrial, marine and avian species over the whole of their migratory range. To achieve this the Convention provides a framework for enhancing the conservation status of migratory species through the cooperative efforts of the range states of those species. There are currently 101 Contracting Parties to the Convention.

Migratory species are considered important as they can act as linkages between ecosystems, and therefore can be indicators of ecological change. CMS seeks to conserve threatened migratory species by endeavouring to protect habitats, remove obstacles that hinder migration, and lessen the impact of identified threats.

Bycatch is recognised by CMS as a major threat to marine migratory species and is the subject of Resolutions 6.2 and 8.14, and Recommendation 7.2. It is a threat that extends throughout all ocean basins of the world, and affects many species listed under CMS – including cetaceans, seabirds, marine turtles and sharks. To date, research and implementation of bycatch mitigation has largely been conducted on a fishery-by-fishery basis, with advice given on a species by species basis rather than a “whole-of-fishery” perspective.

Although there is significant conservation and bycatch mitigation action occurring at the national, fishery or species-specific level, links between these actions at the international level are often poor, leading to weakening of international effort. To date, despite many projects and activities within CMS agreements and other organizations/instruments, there is

insufficient overall progress from these efforts, and bycatch remains a critical threat to many migratory species.

Knowledge of where and when bycatch occurs, and the scale that it is occurring, are critical information gaps that hinder progress in minimising the impacts of this threat. At the 13<sup>th</sup> meeting of the CMS Scientific and the ensuing 8<sup>th</sup> Conference of Parties, it was agreed that there is a need for a global assessment of the migratory taxa affected, as a precursor to stimulating the development and promulgation of solutions which are effective for all taxonomic groups, rather than one at a time as currently occurs. This project seeks to take forward these issues, which in turn will help CMS, its subsidiary daughter agreements, their party states and others play a more active part in addressing the threats to migratory species from bycatch. It should be noted that CMS daughter agreements (ACAP, ACCOBAMS, ASCOBAMS, Waddensea Seals) and Memoranda of Understanding (Marine Turtles IOSEA, Marine Turtles Africa, Pacific Islands Cetaceans) have an active interest in minimising bycatch and may have information that can assist in this study.

## **USES AND USERS OF THE RESULTS**

The results will lead to the collection of important data that should help set policy and priorities for CMS and its Parties. The results will also be used by CMS as a contribution to global efforts to help tackle the adverse effects of bycatch. The findings will be made available to CMS, its regional agreements, Regional Fisheries Management Organisations, fishery managers, fishers, the NGO community, the scientific community and others.

## **DETAILED REQUIREMENTS**

1. Carry out a comprehensive review of all global fisheries to assess the available information on the bycatch of seabirds, marine turtles, sharks and marine mammals, under the stewardship of the CMS Conference-appointed Scientific Councillor for by-catch. While there is a general interest in all migratory species, of particular concern are species listed on the CMS appendices, many of which are threatened with extinction.
2. For each fishery:
  - describe the fishery, principal target species and the gear types employed;
  - describe the level of annual fishing effort over the last 5 years;
  - assess the level of independent observer coverage provided for the fishery, if any;
  - assess the level of knowledge of bycatch of seabirds, turtles, sharks and marine mammals, together with an indication of any trend in bycatch;
  - provide information on the use of bycatch mitigation strategies to mitigate the incidental take of non-target species; and
3. Prepare a report that identifies the importance of bycatch as a threat to migratory species and provides an overview of priority fisheries, regions and species which will benefit from international action through the CMS. The report and its recommendations must receive the endorsement of the Convention on Migratory Species.

In carrying out this study it will be necessary to develop a definition of 'bycatch', noting that terms such as 'byproduct', 'accidental mortality', 'incidental mortality', 'non-target catch', 'un-regulated catch' and other terms are frequently applied to various portions of fishing catch



that has not been specifically targeted. The consultant will also be required to develop a definition of the term 'fishery' for this study, noting that there is no single approach taken to this across jurisdictions. Typically fisheries may be defined by gear type, target species, geographical area, season, or some combination of these. Some artisanal fisheries in particular may cross jurisdictions but are known by different names within each jurisdiction.

'Ghost fishing', the ongoing capture of marine wildlife by discarded fishing gear, is acknowledged as a significant threat to migratory species that can be considered as a bycatch problem, but does not form part of this study.

## **OUTPUTS**

It is the intention of CMS to publish the results of the work through one or more routes.

**A final report** covering the policy and scientific background to the work, the methodologies employed, results, conclusions and recommendations suitable for publication on the Internet. The report will contain a non-technical executive summary of not more than three pages and should be written in Plain English containing headline results and recommendations. If appropriate, papers for referred scientific journals may also be prepared.

In addition, the contractor shall provide an **Executive Summary** of no more than two A4-sized pages.

The approved final report suitable for publication must be provided by the contract end date.

CMS may occasionally request summaries of interim results during the contract, which may be required in an electronic format to be agreed.

## **QUALITY ASSURANCE**

The final report will be subject to independent peer review and the contractor will be expected to respond in detail to reviewers comments and amend the final report as appropriate.

## **MANAGEMENT**

The Contract will be managed in accordance with the CMS's 'Standard Terms and Conditions for Research and Development Contracts'.

The contractor will be managed by the CMS Scientific Officer (in consultation with the Conference Appointed Scientific Councillor on Bycatch). The CMS Scientific Officer will act as Contract Manager responsible for the day to day management of the contract. The contractor will appoint a project manager who will act as the principal point of contact.

Before the end of the contract, the contractor shall attend a meeting with CMS to discuss the management and performance of the contract with a view to informing each other of any strengths and weaknesses exposed.

## **TIMING**

The contract will be expected to last approximately 12 months from the date of award of a contract. The anticipated start date is stated in the invitation to tender letter.

## **PROGRAMME OF WORK AND MILESTONES**

The scope of this project is ambitious, and the budget amount may not be sufficient to complete the work as envisaged. Tenderers are invited to propose a work programme designed to meet the above objectives, requirements and timetable. Tenders should include a time schedule for the work that identifies the main tasks and key milestones that will be used to monitor progress. If necessary, proposals to reduce the scope of the work to fit the project budget (EU 25,000) will be considered.

## **PROJECT TEAM (INCLUDING SUB CONTRACTORS)**

Details of the project team should be supplied indicating the experience of the individuals. The organisation of the project team should be linked to the work programme, indicating the grade of staff and number of days allocated to specific work areas.

## **ELECTRONIC SECURITY**

Electronic media of any type or format supplied to CMS by the Contractor must be checked for viruses before shipment. The Contractor must provide details of the computer virus detection and virus eradication software (or hardware) that is used to prevent infection and the frequency at which it is updated.

## **EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Tenders will be assessed against the criteria set out below. It is worthwhile trying to assess your own proposal against these criteria before you submit it. It is important to realise that the Panel will score proposals against each of these criteria. For example, if your proposal is of high quality, but does not provide an adequate description of how the results will be transmitted to the appropriate audience, it will probably be unsuccessful.

The Criteria are:

### *Quality of proposal*

- relevance to specified requirements
- scientific merit
- clear work plan with realistic testable milestones
- clear deliverables
- probability of success

*Details of contractor*

- expertise, infrastructure
- project planning and management
- past experience with contractor

*Cost*

- reasonable & competitive costs
- co-funders

**IMPLEMENTING THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE  
*WATERBIRDS AROUND THE WORLD* CONFERENCE**

---

---

*Aware* that the governments of The Netherlands and the United Kingdom with Wetlands International organised a major international conference - *Waterbirds around the World* — in Edinburgh, Scotland during April 2004;

*Noting* the support for this conference given by many inter-governmental, governmental and non-governmental organisations, as well as multilateral environmental treaties, including the Convention on Migratory Species;

*Aware also* that this conference was attended by 456 participants from 90 countries across the world, thus bringing together a unique mix of current expertise concerning the policy and practice of waterbird conservation;

*Recalling* that there were conference technical sessions on many topics of direct relevance to the implementation of the CMS on both a national and international scale;

*Further noting* the recent re-assessment of waterbird population estimates and trends by Wetlands International which found that at a global level 44% of populations for which trend data is available are decreasing or have become extinct, whilst 34% are stable, and only 17% are increasing. Asia is the continent where concern is greatest, with, 62% of waterbird populations now decreasing or have become extinct, and only 10% show an increasing trend. In Oceania one in six waterbird species have already become extinct; and

*Conscious also* that the recently published conclusions of the Conference - *Waterbirds around the world* - not only further document the multiple threats to waterbirds, but also provide new data for 170 globally threatened species and gives examples of best conservation practice from around the world.

*The Scientific Council:*

1. *Congratulates* the organisers of the Conference, and *Notes* the priorities for waterbird conservation highlighted in the concluding statement from the *Waterbirds around the World* conference (appended to this Resolution); and
2. *Urges* Contracting Parties, inter-governmental, governmental and non-governmental organisations to implement these conclusions and other technical outputs from the *Waterbirds around the World* conference, as appropriate.



## The Edinburgh Declaration

An international conference on waterbirds, their conservation and sustainable use was held in Edinburgh, Scotland, from 3-8 April 2004, and was attended by 456 participants from 90 countries.

**Conscious that** waterbird flyways are biological systems of migration paths that directly link sites and ecosystems in different countries and continents;

**Recalling that** the conservation and wise-use of waterbirds is a shared responsibility of nations and peoples and a common concern of human-kind;

**Recalling also** the long history of international co-operation for waterbird conservation developed over a hundred years with treaties such as that concerned with migratory birds in 1916 between USA and UK (on behalf of Canada), and that over 40 years ago, the first European Meeting on Wildfowl Conservation held in St. Andrews, Scotland in 1963, started a process leading to the establishment of the Convention on wetlands especially as waterfowl habitat in Ramsar, Iran, in 1971;

**Noting that** major international conferences in Noordwijk aan Zee, The Netherlands (1966), Leningrad, USSR (1968), Ramsar, Iran (1971), Astrakhan, USSR (1989), St. Petersburg Beach, Florida, USA (1992), Kushiro, Japan and Strasbourg, France (1994), have further developed international technical exchanges on waterbird conservation;

**Aware of** the development of further inter-governmental co-operation through the establishment and implementation of further treaties, agreements, strategies and programmes; and of the development of considerable non-governmental national and international co-operation in waterbird conservation and monitoring;

**Conscious that** at the World Summit on Sustainable Development, Johannesburg, South Africa, in 2002, world leaders expressed their desire to achieve “*a significant reduction in the current rate of loss of biological diversity*” by 2010, and that in February 2004 this target was further developed by the Seventh Conference of the Parties to the Biodiversity Convention, and **aware that** achieving this target will require significant investments and highly focused and co-ordinated conservation activity on all continents, and **recognising that** communication, education and public awareness and capacity building will play a key role in achieving this target;

**Further conscious** of the urgent need to strengthen international co-operation and partnerships between governments, inter-governmental and non-government organisations, local communities and the private sector;

**Alarmed at** the perilous state of many populations of waterbirds, in both terrestrial and marine ecosystems, and at the continued decline in quality and extent of the world’s wetlands;

**Noting** the conclusions and priorities for further action identified by the many technical workshops and presentations made at this conference, and recorded subsequently in this Declaration.

**Welcoming** the joint initiative of Wetlands International, and government authorities in the United Kingdom and The Netherlands, with the support also of Australia, Denmark, USA, Japan, Germany, Sweden, Ireland, Belgium, Switzerland, UNEP/CMS, UNEP/AEWA, FACE, and CIC and with the input of many other organisations and individuals, in convening the conference *Waterbirds Around the World* in Edinburgh so as to review the current status of the world's waterbirds;

***The Conference Participants, assembled together in Edinburgh —***

**Consider that** although significant progress has been made to conserve waterbirds and their wetland habitats leading to some major successes, overall there remain important challenges, which, together with uncertainties about implications of future changes, requires further efforts and focused actions;

**Reaffirm that**, in the words of the Ramsar Convention, “*waterbirds, in their seasonal migrations may transcend frontiers and so should be regarded as an international resource*” and “*that the conservation of wetlands and their flora and fauna can be ensured by combining far-sighted national policies with co-ordinated international action*” and accordingly **urge that** efforts between countries to conserve waterbird populations and their wetland habitats are extended, not only for the values that waterbirds have in sustaining human populations, but also for their own sakes;

**Consider that** flyway conservation should combine species- and ecosystem-based approaches, internationally co-ordinated throughout migratory ranges;

**Acknowledge that** the conservation and sustainable use of waterbirds and wetland resources require co-ordinated action by public and private sectors, dependent local communities and other stakeholders;

**Call in particular** for urgent action to:

- Halt and reverse wetland loss and degradation;
- Complete national and international wetland inventories, and promote the conservation of wetlands of importance to waterbirds in the context of surrounding areas, especially through the participation of local communities;
- Extend and strengthen international networks of key sites for waterbirds along all flyways;
- Establish and extend formal agreements and other co-operation arrangements between countries to conserve species, where possible within the frameworks provided by the Conventions on Migratory Species, Biological Diversity and Wetlands;
- Fund and implement recovery plans for all globally threatened waterbird species;
- Halt and reverse recently revealed declines of long-distance migrant shorebirds through sustainable management by governments and others of human activities at sites of unique importance to them;
- Restore albatross and petrel populations to favourable conservation status through urgent and internationally co-ordinated conservation actions, especially through the framework provided by the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels;
- Substantially reduce pollution in the marine environment and establish sustainable harvesting of marine resources;
- Underpin future conservation decisions with high-quality scientific advice drawn from co-ordinated, and adequately funded, research and monitoring programmes notably the

International Waterbird Census, and to this end, urge governments and other partners to work together collaboratively and supportively;

- Develop policy-relevant indicators of the status of the world's wetlands, especially in the context of the 2010 target, using waterbird and other data generated from robust and sustainable monitoring schemes;
- Invest in communication, education and public awareness activities as a key element of waterbird and wetlands conservation;
- Assess disease risk, and establish monitoring programmes in relation to migratory waterbird movements, the trade of wild birds, and implications for human health.

**Urge that** particular priority be given to capacity building for flyway conservation in countries and territories with limited institutions and resources, given that the wise-use of waterbirds and wetlands is important for sustainable development and poverty alleviation;

**Strongly encourage** countries to ratify and implement relevant conventions, agreements and treaties so as to encourage further international co-operation, and to make use of available resources including the Global Environment Facility in order to finance action required under this Declaration;

**Consider that**, with the long history of co-operative international assessments, waterbirds provide excellent indicators by which to evaluate progress towards achievement of the 2010 target established by world leaders in 2002, and to this end **Call on** the Conventions on Migratory Species, Biological Diversity and Wetlands, and other international agreements to work together and with other partners on such assessments, and in particular with Wetlands International to further develop the analytical content, of the triennial publication *Waterbird Population Estimates* and its use;

**Stress** the need for wide international dissemination of this Declaration and the technical outcomes of this Conference<sup>2</sup>; and

**Agree** to meet again as a conference in ten years time to review progress.

Edinburgh  
7 April 2004

---

<sup>2</sup> A full technical summary will be published during summer 2004 and will be available on the conference web-site – [www.wetlands.org/GFC](http://www.wetlands.org/GFC). Papers presented to the conference will be published in a proceedings volume in 2006.

**In support of the recommendations above, the Conference concluded the following:**

- For the Flyways of the Americas, collaboration between North, Central and South America and Caribbean nations is developing, based on conclusions of the conference of nations to consider the status of migratory birds held during the VIII<sup>th</sup> Neotropical Congress in Chile, and in the recent completion of a Waterbird Conservation Plan for the Americas. Despite more than a century of conservation efforts in North America and emergence of a shared vision for biologically-based, landscape orientated partnerships, it is clear that international co-operation amongst Pan-American countries sharing migratory birds should increase.
- In African-Eurasian Flyways, the generally good knowledge of waterbirds is not being effectively transferred into necessary national and local actions. Nor have conservation efforts led to maintaining or restoring the health of many waterbird populations, including globally threatened species. There are urgent needs to integrate waterbird conservation as part of sustainable development, to the greater benefit of local communities and other stakeholders dependent on wetlands as well as benefiting biodiversity. The African-Eurasian Waterbird Agreement (UNEP/AEWA) provides a good basis to achieve this.
- Intra-African Flyways are extremely poorly known and would benefit from greater attention.
- Many of the waterbirds of the Central Asian Flyway appear to be declining, although information on status and trends is generally poor. In most countries there has been little previous investment in conservation and low involvement of local stakeholders in the sustainable management of wetlands. An international framework for the development of conservation initiatives for migratory waterbirds in Central Asia is urgently required to promote co-operative action. Better information is needed to identify priority conservation issues and responses.
- The waterbirds of Asian-Australasian Flyways are the most poorly known, and the greatest number of globally threatened waterbirds occur here. This flyway extends across the most densely populated part of the world, where there are extreme pressures not only on unprotected wetlands but also on protected sites. Effective protection of wetlands of major importance is a critical need, as in other regions of the world. There are huge, and crucial, challenges in ensuring effective wise-use of key sites, as well as ensuring that consumptive uses of waterbirds are sustainable.
- Conservation of pelagic waterbirds in the open oceans gives a range of unique challenges. The entry into force of the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels is a most welcome development, and its full implementation is an urgent need. Addressing issues of seabird by-catch, especially by illegal and unregulated fisheries remains a critical need to reverse the poor conservation status of many species, as is the general need to achieve sustainable marine fisheries.
- Most of the world's known flyways originate in the Arctic. The recent development of international co-operation between arctic countries is welcome, as is the recognition of the crucial need to involve local communities and their traditional local knowledge in waterbird management. Austro-tropical Flyways also require research.
- Climate changes are already affecting waterbirds. The consequences of climate change for waterbirds will be multiple, and will greatly exacerbate current negative impacts such as habitat loss and degradation. There is a need for wide-scale planning, at landscape and flyway scales, to reduce or mitigate the impacts on waterbird populations and their habitats. Research that explores a range of potential future scenarios will be required to underpin this planning and will need data from long-term monitoring and surveillance.



- The conservation status of non-migrant waterbird populations around the world in many cases is poorer than that of migrants, and these waterbirds generally have less focused international attention than migrants. Addressing conservation requirements of non-migrant waterbirds should also be given national and international priority.
- On a densely populated planet it is crucial that waterbird conservationists focus on their relationships with communities and governments as the means both of reversing the causes of poor conservation status, and of resolving conflicts with protected species. Adequately funded programmes of communication, education and public awareness need to be the core of all waterbird conservation initiatives.
- Science has identified the critical importance of a small number of key sites to long-distance migrant shorebirds and that human activities at some of these are responsible for recent dramatic declines in certain shorebird populations.
- Recent research has highlighted the genetic and demographic risks incurred by species that have small populations. These have implications for the design of species recovery programmes.
- The frequency and magnitude of disease losses among waterbirds (from emerging or re-emerging disease agents) have increased to the extent that they demand attention. These diseases not only affect waterbirds but have impacts on humans. Solutions require a multi-disciplinary approach.
- An integrated approach to the monitoring of waterbirds gives cost-effective identification of the reasons for waterbird population changes. There are good examples of the collection of demographic information and its integration with census data. Further such national and especially international schemes should be strongly encouraged and funded.
- Systematic analyses for atlases confirm the value of ringing studies in assessing the conservation status of breeding, wintering and stop-over sites within flyways. To this end, there should be integration of data from conventional ringing and colour-marking, telemetry, stable isotope analyses and genetic markers.

## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS / LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS / LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES

**Chairman/President/Presidencia**

Mr. John H. **Mshelbwala**  
 Assistant Director (Wildlife Management)  
 Federal Ministry of Environment  
 Plot 293/294, Off Solomon Lar Way  
 Utako District  
 P.M.B. 468  
 Abuja, F.C.T.  
 NIGERIA

Tel.: (+234 9) 8033 287 039  
 Fax: (+234 9) 523 4014  
 E-Mail: johnmshelbwala2@yahoo.com

**Vice-Chairmen/Vicepresidents/Vice-Presidentes**

Prof. Dr. Colin A. **Galbraith**  
 Director of Scientific and Advisory Services  
 Scottish Natural Heritage  
 2/5 Anderson Place  
 Edinburgh EH6 5NP  
 UNITED KINGDOM

Tel.: (+44 131) 446 2404  
 Fax: (+44 131) 446 2277  
 E-Mail: colin.galbraith@snh.gov.uk

Dr. Pierre **Devillers**  
 Institut Royal des Sciences Naturelles de Belgique  
 11, avenue de l'oiseau bleu (private)  
 1150 Brussels  
 EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

Tel: (+32 2) 770 77 77  
 Fax: (+32 2) 649 48 25  
 E-mail: pierre.devillers@naturalsciences.be

**Members/Membres/Miembros**

Mr. Galal Hussein **AL-Harogi**  
 Manager Migratory Species Unit at EPA  
 Environment Protection Authority  
 Ministry of Water and Environment  
 P.O. Box 10442  
 Sana'a  
 REPUBLIC OF YEMEN

Tel: (+967 1) 540 669  
 Fax: (+967 1) 207 327 / 309 075  
 E-mail: [ghn4@gawab.com](mailto:ghn4@gawab.com); [g\\_hng@yahoo.com](mailto:g_hng@yahoo.com)

Ing. Agr. Ibelice **Añino**  
 Tecnica Cientifico  
 Autoridad Nacional del Ambiente  
 Albrook, Edificio 804, Ciudad de Panama  
 Panama  
 REP. DE PANAMA

Tel: (+507) 500 0855 ext: 1102  
 Fax: (+507) 500 0860  
 E-mail: [i.anino@anam.gob.pa](mailto:i.anino@anam.gob.pa); [ianino\\_n@hotmail.com](mailto:ianino_n@hotmail.com)

M. Dieudonné **Ankara**  
 Point Focal du Projet pour la survie de grands singes  
 Conseiller Scientifique pour le Congo  
 Ministère du Tourisme et de l'Environnement  
 (Direction générale de l'environnement)  
 B.P. 958, 54, rue Bordeaux Oeunzé  
 Brazzaville  
 REPUBLIQUE DU CONGO

Tel.: (+242) 551 6750  
 Fax: (+242) 551 6750  
 E-Mail: [graspcongo@yahoo.fr](mailto:graspcongo@yahoo.fr)

Dr. Lhagvasuren **Badamjav**  
 Institute of Biology  
 Mongolian Academy of Sciences  
 Ulaanbaatar-51  
 MONGOLIA

Tel.: (+976 11) 453 583  
 Fax: (+976 11) 451 781  
 E-Mail: [ecolab@magicnet.mn](mailto:ecolab@magicnet.mn); [lhagvabad@yahoo.com](mailto:lhagvabad@yahoo.com)

Dr. Richard K. **Bagine**  
 Deputy Director Biodiversity Research and Monitoring  
 Kenya Wildlife Service  
 Ministry of Tourism and Wildlife  
 P.O. Box 40241  
 Nairobi  
 KENYA

Tel.: (+254 20) 60 08 20  
 Fax: (+254 20) 60 37 92  
 E-Mail: [rkbagine@kws.org](mailto:rkbagine@kws.org); [research@kws.org](mailto:research@kws.org);  
[rkiomen@yahoo.com](mailto:rkiomen@yahoo.com)

Dr. Attila **Bankovics**  
 Head of Bird Collection  
 Hungarian Natural History Museum  
 Baross u. 13  
 H-1088 Budapest  
 HUNGARY

Tel.: (+36 1) 210 1075 ext 5044  
 Mobile: (+36 30) 295 1703  
 Fax: (+36 1) 334 2785  
 E-Mail: [bankovic@zool.nhmus.hu](mailto:bankovic@zool.nhmus.hu)

Dr. Roseline C. **Beudels-Jamar de Bolsee**  
Coordinator Terrestrial Mammals  
Institut Royal des Sciences Naturelles de Belgique  
29, rue Vautier  
1000 Bruxelles  
BELGIQUE

Tel: (+32 2) 627 4354  
Fax: (+32 2) 649 4825  
E-mail: [roseline.beudels@naturalsciences.be](mailto:roseline.beudels@naturalsciences.be)

Dr. Olivier **Biber**  
Head International Biodiversity Matters Unit  
Swiss Agency for the Environment (FOEN)  
CH-3003 Bern  
SWITZERLAND

Tel: (+41 31) 323 0663  
Fax: (+41 31) 324 7579  
E-Mail: [olivier.biber@bafu.admin.ch](mailto:olivier.biber@bafu.admin.ch)

Lic. Daniel Eduardo **Blanco**  
South America Programme Leader  
Wetlands International  
25 de Mayo 758 10 "I"  
(1002) Buenos Aires  
ARGENTINA

Tel.: (+54 11) 4312 0932  
Fax: (+54 11) 4312 0932  
E-Mail: [deblanco@wamani.apc.org](mailto:deblanco@wamani.apc.org)

Dr. Rainer **Blanke**  
Leiter des Fachbereichs Ökologie und Naturhaushalt  
Bundesamt für Naturschutz  
Konstantinstr. 110  
53179 Bonn  
GERMANY

Tel: (+49 228) 1564 1400  
Fax: -  
E-mail: [blanke@Bfn.de](mailto:blanke@Bfn.de)

Dr. Almamy **Camara**  
Director of Parks and Wildlife Management  
C/o Abuko Nature Reserve  
Banjul  
GAMBIA

Tel: (+220) 437 6972/3  
Fax: (+220) 439 2179  
E-mail: [wildlife@gamtel.gm](mailto:wildlife@gamtel.gm), [almamoc@hotmail.com](mailto:almamoc@hotmail.com)

Mr. Preben **Clausen**  
Senior Researcher, Ph.D.  
National Environmental Research Institute  
Department of Wildlife Ecology & Biodiversity  
University of Aarhus, Grenavej 14  
8410 Ronde  
DENMARK

Tel: (+45) 89 201 519  
Fax: (+45) 89 201 515  
E-mail: [pc@dmu.dk](mailto:pc@dmu.dk)

Mr. Carlo C. **Custodio**  
Chief Ecosystems Management Specialist  
Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau (PAWB)  
Department of Environment and Natural Resources  
Quezon Avenue, Diliman  
Quezon City 1100  
PHILIPPINES

Tel.: (+6 32) 921 429 7676 / 924 6031  
Fax: (+6 32) 925 8948 / 924 0109  
E-Mail: [custodiocarlo@yahoo.com](mailto:custodiocarlo@yahoo.com)

Dr. Akram **Eissa Darwich**  
Director of Biodiversity and Protected Areas  
Ministry of Local Administration and Environment  
B.O.P 3773 - General Commission for Environmental Affairs  
Eman Mosque Square  
Damascus-Mazraha  
SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

Tel: (+963 11) 444 7608  
Fax: (+963 11) 444 7608  
E-mail: [akramisa@scs-net.org](mailto:akramisa@scs-net.org)

Dr. Torbjörn **Ebenhard**  
Deputy Director  
Swedish Biodiversity Centre  
P.O. Box 7007  
SE-75007 Uppsala  
SWEDEN

Tel.: (+46 18) 67 22 68  
Fax: (+46 18) 67 35 80  
E-Mail: [torbjorn.ebenhard@cbm.slu.se](mailto:torbjorn.ebenhard@cbm.slu.se)

Dr. Jiri **Flousek**  
Deputy Director  
Krkonoše National Park and Biosphere Reserve  
Dobrovského 3  
543 11 Vrchlabí  
CZECH REPUBLIC

Tel.: (+420 499) 456 212  
Fax: (+420 499) 422 095  
E-Mail: [jflousek@krnap.cz](mailto:jflousek@krnap.cz)

Dr. Borja **Heredia**  
Jefe de area de Acciones de Conservacion  
Dirección General para la Biodiversidad  
Ministerio de Medio Ambiente  
Gran Vía de San Francisco, 4  
28005 Madrid  
ESPAÑA

Tel.: (+34 91) 596 4658  
Fax: (+34 91) 596 4809  
E-Mail: [bheredia@mma.es](mailto:bheredia@mma.es)

M. Mahamat **Hassane Idriss**  
Chef de Service de Sensibilisation, Information et de  
Formation  
Direction de Conservation de la Faune et des Aires Protégées  
du Ministère de la Pêche  
B.P. 905  
N'Djamena  
TCHAD

Tel: (+235) 621 9340  
Fax: -  
E-mail: mhthassan@hotmail.com, mhi1962@yahoo.fr

Mme. Véronique **Herrenschmidt**  
Responsable des affaires internationales à la Direction de la  
Nature et des Paysages  
Ministère de l'Ecologie et du Développement Durable  
20, avenue de Ségur  
75302 Paris 07 SP  
FRANCE

Tel: (+33 1) 4219 1948  
Fax: (+33 1) 4219 1906  
E-mail: veronique.herrenschmidt@environnement.gouv.fr

M. Abdou Malam **Issa**  
Chef Division Faune et Chasse  
Direction de la faune, pêche et pisciculture  
Ministère de l'Environnement et de la Lutte Contre la  
Désertification  
B.P. 721  
Niamey  
NIGER

Tel.: (+227) 2176 8362  
Fax: (+227) 2073 6012  
E-Mail: malam\_ia@yahoo.fr

M. Namory **Keita**  
Directeur National de la Protection de la Nature  
Ministère de l'Environnement  
BP 761  
Conakry  
REPUBLIQUE DE GUINEE

Tel: (+224) 6026 9520 / 6430 0838  
Fax: -  
E-mail: namory54@yahoo.fr

Mr. Umeed **Khalid**  
Conservator (Wildlife)  
National Council for Conservation of Wildlife (NCCW)  
Ministry of Environment  
Building No.14-D, 2nd Floor, F-8 Markaz  
Islamabad  
PAKISTAN

Tel.: (+92 51) 926 2270  
Fax: (+92 51) 926 2270  
E-Mail: nccw@isb.paknet.com.pk,  
umeed\_khalid@hotmail.com;  
umeed\_khalid@yahoo.com

Dr. Jelena **Kralj**  
Assistant, Institute of Ornithology  
Croatian Academy for Science and Arts  
Gunduliceva 24  
HR-10000 Zagreb  
CROATIA

Tel: (+385 1) 4825 401  
Fax: (+385 1) 4825 392  
E-mail: zzo@hazu.hr

Mr. Ernest L. **Lamptey**  
International Conventions Manager  
Wildlife Division of Forestry Commission  
P.O. Box M 239  
Accra  
GHANA

Tel.: (+233 21) 662 360 / 666 129  
Fax: (+233 21) 666 476  
E-Mail: ellamptey@yahoo.com, lamptey@wd.feghana.com

Dr. Jean **Maharavo**  
Directeur de Recherche Associé  
Centre National de Recherche sur l'Environnement (CNRE)  
B.P. 1739 - Fiadanana  
Antananarivo (101)  
MADAGASCAR

Tel: (+261 20) 2226 469  
Fax: (+261 20) 2240 646  
E-Mail: maharavo@simicro.mg

Dr. Branko **Micevski**  
President of National Bonn Committee  
Bird Study and Protection Society of Macedonia  
Bul. ASNOM-58, 2/4  
1000 Skopje  
MACEDONIA, THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF

Tel.: (+389 22) 432 071  
Fax: (+389 2) 243 2071  
E-Mail: brankom@ukim.edu.mk

Ms. Maria Cristina **Morales Palarea**  
Coordinadora del Programa Especies  
Asociacion Guyra Paraguay  
cnel. Franco No. 381 C/ Leandro Prieto  
Brrio. Seminario  
Asuncion  
PARAGUAY

Tel: (+595 21) 227 777  
Fax: (+595 21) 227 777  
E-mail: cristinam@guyra.org.py;  
cmorales\_py@yahoo.com

Dr. Otars **Opermanis**  
Programme Manager  
UNDP  
LATVIA

Tel: (+371) 2948 5626  
Fax: -  
E-mail: otars.opermanis@undp.org

Dr. Victor **Pulido**  
Consejero Científico  
Instituto Nacional de Recursos Naturales (INRENA)  
Paseo Los Eucaliptos 285  
Camacho, La Molina  
Lima 12  
PERU

Tel.: (+51 1) 9867 2369  
Fax: (+51 1) 4351 570  
E-Mail: wetperu@amauta.rcp.net.pe

Lic. Omar **Rocha**  
Director Ejecutivo  
Centro de Estudios en Biología Teórica y Aplicada - BIOTA  
Av. Aranjuez No.100  
Condominio Los Sauces de Aranjuez  
Casa No. 2  
La Paz  
BOLIVIA

Tel: (+51 2) 2740 592  
Fax: (+51 2) 2740 592  
E-mail: orocha@entelnet.bo

Dr. Fernando **Spina**  
Istituto Nazionale per la Fauna Selvatica  
(National Wildlife Institute)  
Via Ca' Fornacetta 9  
40064 Ozzano Emilia (BO)  
ITALY

Tel: (+39 051) 6512 214 / 215  
Fax: (+39 051) 7966 28  
E-mail: fernando.spina@infs.it

Dr. Gajadeera Arachchige **Tharaka Prasad**  
Deputy Director  
Wildlife Health Management  
Department of Wildlife Conservation  
No.382 Delco courts, New Candy Road  
Malambe  
SRI LANKA

Tel: (+94 11) 269 8557  
Fax: (+94 11) 269 8556  
E-mail: tharaka@dwlc.lk, tharakaprasad@yahoo.com

Prof. Dr. Wim J. **Wolff**  
Professor  
University of Groningen  
Dept. of Marine Benthic Ecology and Evolution  
Postbus 14  
9750 AA Haren  
THE NETHERLANDS

Tel: (+31 50) 363 2260  
Fax: (+31 50) 363 2261  
E-mail: w.j.wolff@rug.nl

Prof. Bronislaw **Woloszyn**  
Academia Polaca de Ciencias  
Instytut de laistematika y Evolucion de Animales de la  
Academia Polaca de Ciencias de Cracovia  
(Polish Academy of Sciences)  
ul. Slawkowska 17  
31.016 Kraków  
POLAND

Tel.: (+48 12) 422 6410  
Fax: (+48 12) 422 6410  
E-Mail: woloszbr@isez.pan.krakow.pl

**Scientific Councillors appointed by the Conference of the Parties/  
Conseillers Scientifiques nommés par la Conference des Parties/  
Consejeros Científicos designados por la Conferencia de las Partes**

Mr. G. Barry **Baker**  
Appointed Councillor for Bycatch  
114 Watsons Road, Kettering  
Tasmania 7155  
AUSTRALIA

Tel: (+61 3) 6267 4079 / (+61) 418 626711(M)  
Fax: -  
E-mail: barry.baker@latitude42.com.au

Dr. Zeb S. **Hogan**  
Appointed Councillor for Fish  
University of Nevada, Reno  
Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Science  
Mail Drop 186, 1000 Valley Road  
Reno, NV 89512  
U.S.A.

Tel: (+1 530) 2190 942  
Fax: -  
E-mail: zebhogan@hotmail.com

Dr. Colin J. **Limpus**  
Appointed Councillor for Marine Turtles  
Queensland Environmental Protection Agency  
P. O. Box 541, Capalaba  
Queensland 4157  
AUSTRALIA

Tel.: (+61 7) 3245 4056  
Fax: -  
E-Mail: col.limpus@epa.qld.gov.au

Dr. Taej **Mundkur**  
Appointed Councillor for Asiatic fauna  
Coordinator, Waterbirds  
Wetlands International  
Swarankit, Plot No. 6  
Mahatma Housing Society, Kothrud  
Pune City-411038  
INDIA

Tel: (+91 20) 2536 3372  
Fax: (+91 20) 2536 3372  
E-mail: taejmundkur.wi@vsnl.net

Prof. Alfred **Oteng Yeboah**  
Appointed Councillor for African Fauna  
Chairman National Biodiversity Committee  
Council for Scientific and Industrial Research  
P.O. Box M32  
Accra  
GHANA

Tel: (+233 24) 4772 256  
Fax: (+233 21) 777 655  
E-mail: otengyeboah@yahoo.co.uk

Mr. John **O'Sullivan**  
Appointed Councillor for Birds  
c/o RSPB The Lodge  
Sandy, Bedfordshire SG19 2DL  
UNITED KINGDOM

Tel.: (+44 1 767) 680 551  
Fax: (+44 1 767) 683 211  
E-Mail: john.osullivan@rspb.org.uk

Dr. William F. **Perrin**  
Appointed Councillor for Aquatic Mammals  
Senior Scientist  
US National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
8604 La Jolla Shores Drive  
La Jolla CA 92037  
U.S.A.

Tel: (+1 858) 546 7096  
Fax: (+1 858) 546 7003  
E-mail: william.perrin@noaa.gov

Dr. Roberto P. **Schlatter**  
Appointed Councillor for Neotropical fauna  
Instituto de Zoología  
Universidad Austral de Chile  
Casilla 567  
Valdivia  
CHILE

Tel.: (+56 63) 22 14 08  
Fax: (+56 63) 22 13 15  
E-Mail: [rschlatt@uach.cl](mailto:rschlatt@uach.cl)

**Governmental Observers / Observateurs de Gouvernements /  
Observadores Gubernamentales**

**AUSTRALIA**

Ms. Vicki **Cronan**  
Assistant Director, Marine Environment Policy  
Australian Government Department of The  
Environment and Water Resources  
PO Box 787  
Canberra, ACT, 2601

(+61 2) 62741879  
(+61 2) 62742455  
Vicki.cronan@deh.gov.au

**FRANCE**

M. Olivier **Dehörter**  
Ingenieur de Recherche  
Muséum national d'histoire naturelle  
'CRBPO/MNHN Casa postale 51,  
55 rue Buffon  
75005 Paris

Tel: (+33 1) 4079 3083  
Fax: (+33 1) 4079 3835  
E-mail: dehörter@mnhn.fr

**GERMANY**

Dr. Christiane **Paulus**  
Head of Division  
International Nature Conservation  
Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation  
and Nuclear Safety (BMU)  
Referat / Division N I 4  
International Nature Conservation  
P.O. Box 120629  
53048 Bonn

Tel: +49 1888 3052632  
Fax: +49 1888 3052684  
E-mail: paulus.christiane@bmu.bund.de

Mr. Oliver **Schall**  
Assistant Head of Division  
Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation  
and Nuclear Safety (BMU)  
Referat / Division N I 4  
International Nature Conservation  
P.O. Box 120629  
53048 Bonn

Tel: (+49 228) 305 2632  
Fax: +49 1888 3052684  
E-mail: oliver.schall@bmu.bund.de

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Ms. Shannon **Dionne**  
International Affairs Specialist  
(US) National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration  
14th and Constitution Ave NW  
NOAA OIA Room 6224  
Washington DC 20230

Tel: (+1 202) 482 3638  
Fax: (+1 202) 482 4307  
E-mail: shannon.Dionne@noaa.gov

Ms. Pamela **Toschik**  
International Affairs Specialist  
(US) National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration  
14th and Constitution Ave NW  
NOAA OIA Room 6224  
Washington DC 20230

Tel: (+1 202) 482 4347  
Fax: (+1 202) 482 4307  
E-mail: Pamela.Toschik@noaa.gov

REPUBLIC OF YEMEN

Dr. Mohammed **Abubakr**  
Environment Protection Authority  
P.O. Box 12092  
Sana'a

Tel: (+967) 7337 60025  
Fax: -  
E-mail: hishamyem@yemen.net.e

UNITED KINGDOM

Mr. Eric **Blencowe**  
Head, Zoos and International Species Conservation  
Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs  
Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay  
Bristol BS1 6EB

Tel: (+44 117) 372 8295  
Fax: (+44 117) 372 8373  
E-mail: eric.blencowe@defra.gsi.gov.uk

**Intergovernmental and Non-Governmental Organization Observers /**  
**Observateurs d'Organisations Intergouvernementales et Non**  
**Gouvernementales / Observadores de Organizaciones**  
**Intergubernamentales y No Gubernamentales**

**Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses & Petrels -  
ACAP**

Mr. Mark **Tasker**  
Chair, Advisory Committee to ACAP  
Joint Nature Conservation Committee  
Dunnet House  
7 Thistle Place  
Aberdeen AB10 1UZ  
SCOTLAND

Tel: (+44 1224) 655 701  
Fax: (+44 1224) 621 488  
E-mail: mark.tasker@jncc.gov.uk

**Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans of the Black  
Sea, Mediterranean Sea and Contiguous Atlantic Area -  
ACCOBAMS**

Dr. Marie-Christine **Grillo-van Klaveren**  
Executive Secretary  
ACCOBAMS Permanent Secretariat  
Les Jardins de l'UNESCO 2  
Terrasses de Frontvieille  
98000 Monaco  
MONACO

Tel: (+377) 9898 2078  
Fax: (+377) 9898 4208  
E-mails: mcvanklaveren@accobams.net

**Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian  
Migratory Waterbirds - AEWA**

Dr. Jelena **Kralj**  
Vice-Chair  
AEWA Technical Committee  
Gunduliceva 24  
HR-10000 Zagreb  
CROATIA

Tel: (+385 1) 4825 401  
Fax: (+385 1) 4825 392  
E-mail: zzo@hazu.hr

Mr. Sergey **Dereliev**  
Technical Officer  
UNEP/AEWA  
Hermann-Ehlers-Str.10  
53113 Bonn  
GERMANY

Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2415  
Fax: (+49 228) 815 2450  
E-Mail: sdereliev@unep.de

**Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans of the Baltic and North Seas ASCOBANS**

Mr. Mark **Tasker**  
Chair, Advisory Committee to ASCOBANS  
Joint Nature Conservation Committee  
Dunnet House  
7 Thistle Place  
Aberdeen AB10 1UZ  
SCOTLAND

Tel: (+44 1224) 655 701  
Fax: (+44 1224) 621 488  
E-mail: mark.tasker@jncc.gov.uk

**CIC - International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation**

Mr. Kai **Wollscheid**  
Director General  
CIC - International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation  
P.O. Box 82  
H-2092 Budakeszi  
HUNGARY

Tel: (+36 23) 453 830  
Fax: (+36 23) 453 832  
E-mail: k.wollscheid@cic-wildlife.org

**Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora - CITES**

Mr. David **Morgan**  
Chief, Scientific Support Unit  
CITES Secretariat  
International Environment House  
Chemin des Anémones  
1219 Châtelaine-Geneva  
SWITZERLAND

Tel: (+41 22) 9178 123  
Fax: (+41 22) 7973 417  
E-mail: david.morgan@cites.org

**International Council for the Exploration of the Sea - ICES**

Mr. Mark **Tasker**  
Chair, ICES Advisory Committee on Ecosystems  
Joint Nature Conservation Committee  
Dunnet House  
7 Thistle Place  
Aberdeen AB10 1UZ  
SCOTLAND

Tel: (+44 1224) 655 701  
Fax: (+44 1224) 621 488

**IUCN Species Survival Commission**

Dr. Sarah L. **Fowler**  
Co-Chair Shark Specialist Group  
IUCN Species Survival Commission  
C/o Naturebureau International  
36 Kingfisher Court  
Hambridge Road, Newbury  
Berkshire RG14 5SJ  
UNITED KINGDOM

Tel: (+44 1635) 550 380  
Fax: (+44 1635) 550 230  
E-mail: sarahfowler@naturebureau.co.uk

**Ramsar Convention, Scientific and Technical Review Panel - STRP**

Mr. David A. **Stroud**  
Senior Ornithologist  
UK Joint Nature Conservation Committee  
Monkstone House, City Road  
Peterborough PE1 1JY  
U.K.

Tel: (+44 1733) 56 26 26  
Fax: (+44 1733) 55 59 48  
E-mail: david.stroud@jncc.gov.uk

**International Whaling Commission**

Dr. William F. **Perrin**  
Senior Scientist  
US National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
8604 La Jolla Shores Drive  
La Jolla CA 92037  
U.S.A.

Tel: (+1 858) 546 7096  
Fax: (+1 858) 546 7003  
E-mail: william.perrin@noaa.gov

**Memorandum of Understanding concerning Conservation Measures for Marine Turtles of the Indian Ocean and South-East Asia - IOSEA**

Dr. Colin J. **Limpus**  
Queensland Environmental Protection Agency  
P. O. Box 155, Capalaba  
Queensland 4157  
AUSTRALIA

Tel.: (+61 7) 3245 4056  
Fax: -  
E-Mail: col.limpus@epa.qld.gov.au

**UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre**

Mr. Gerardo **Fragoso**  
Head of MEA-Support Programme  
UNEP World Conservation Monitoring  
219 Huntingdon Road  
Cambridge CB3 0DL  
UNITED KINGDOM

Tel.: (+44 1223) 277 314  
Fax: (+44 1223) 277 136  
E-Mail: gerardo.fragoso@unep-wcmc.org



**United Nations, International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR)**

Mr. Douglas **Pattie**  
Coordinator  
United Nations, International Strategy for Disaster Reduction  
Platform for the Promotion of Early Warning  
Hermann-Ehlers-Str.10  
53113 Bonn  
GERMANY

Tel.: (+49 228) 815 0301  
Fax: (+49 228) 815 0399  
E-Mail: [pattie@un.org](mailto:pattie@un.org)

**World Association of Zoos and Aquariums - WAZA**

Dr. Thomas **Althaus**  
Project Officer  
World Association of Zoos and Aquariums (WAZA)  
Postfach 23  
CH-3097 Liebefeld-Bern  
SWITZERLAND

Tel: (+41 31) 300 2035  
Fax: (+41 31) 300 2031  
E-mail: [waza.conservation@bluewin.ch](mailto:waza.conservation@bluewin.ch)

**World Conservation Union - IUCN**

Dr. Jean-Christophe **Vié**  
Deputy Head, Species Programme  
IUCN The World Conservation Union  
28, rue Mauverney  
1196 Gland  
Switzerland

Tel: (+41 22) 999 0208  
Fax: (+41 22) 999 0015  
E-mail: [jcv@iucn.org](mailto:jcv@iucn.org)

**Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society - WDCCS**

Dr. Koen **Van Waerebeek**  
Observer  
Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society  
Peruvian Centre for Cetacean Research (CEPEC)  
Museo de Delfines  
Pucusana  
Lima 20  
PERU

Tel.: (+51 1) 430 9406  
Fax: (+51 1) 430 9406  
E-Mail: [cepec@speedy.com.pe](mailto:cepec@speedy.com.pe); [wafriacetacea@skynet.be](mailto:wafriacetacea@skynet.be)

**World Wide Fund for Nature - WWF International**

Dr. Robin **Davies**  
Manager  
Global Bycatch Initiative  
World Wide Fund International  
Avenue du Mont-Blanc  
1196 Gland  
SWITZERLAND

Tel: (+41 79) 611 2635  
Fax: -  
E-mail: [rdavies@wwfint.org](mailto:rdavies@wwfint.org)

**Secretariat/Secretaria**

Dr. Marco **Barbieri**  
Technical Officer  
UNEP/CMS Secretariat  
Hermann-Ehlers-Str.10  
53113 Bonn  
GERMANY

Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2424  
Fax: (+49 228) 815 2449  
E-Mail: [mbarbieri@cms.int](mailto:mbarbieri@cms.int)

Mr. Robert **Hepworth**  
Executive Secretary  
Hermann-Ehlers-Str.10  
53113 Bonn  
GERMANY

Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2410  
Fax: (+49 228) 815 2449  
E-Mail: [rhepworth@cms.int](mailto:rhepworth@cms.int)

Mr. Moulay Lahcen **El Kabiri**  
Deputy Executive Secretary  
Hermann-Ehlers-Str.10  
53113 Bonn  
GERMANY

Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2407  
Fax: (+49 228) 815 2449  
E-Mail: [lelkabiri@cms.int](mailto:lelkabiri@cms.int)

Mr. Lyle **Glowka**  
Agreements Officer  
UNEP/CMS Secretariat  
Hermann-Ehlers-Str.10  
53113 Bonn  
GERMANY

Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2422  
Fax: (+49 228) 815 2449  
E-Mail: [lglowka@cms.int](mailto:lglowka@cms.int)

Dr. Francisco **Rilla Manta**  
Information Officer  
Hermann-Ehlers-Str.10  
53113 Bonn  
GERMANY

Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2460  
Fax: (+49 228) 815 2449  
E-Mail: [frilla@cms.int](mailto:frilla@cms.int)

Ms. Paola **Deda**  
Inter-Agency Liaison Officer  
Hermann-Ehlers-Str.10  
53113 Bonn  
GERMANY

Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2462  
Fax: (+49 228) 815 2449  
E-Mail: [pdeda@cms.int](mailto:pdeda@cms.int)