



CONVENTION ON MIGRATORY SPECIES

Distribution: General

UNEP/CMS/ScC17/Report

Original: English

17TH MEETING OF THE
SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL
Bergen, 17-18 November 2011

REPORT OF THE MEETING*

Agenda Item 1: Opening Remarks

1. Mr. John Mshelbwala (Nigeria), Chair of the Scientific Council, welcomed all participants, including Councillors, Appointed Councillors, Observers and the Secretariat. A particular welcome was extended to Councillors attending for the first time, or rejoining after many years, including the members from Australia, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, Israel, Kazakhstan, Montenegro, Poland, Tajikistan and Uganda. He warmly thanked the Government of Norway for its efforts in hosting the meeting.

2. Mr. Mshelbwala stressed that Council's deliberations would be key to the decisions soon to be taken by CMS COP10. He noted that the number of Scientific Councillors had not grown in line with the number of Contracting Parties, and reminded all Parties of their right to appoint a Scientific Councillor. He thanked the Vice-Chairmen, Mr. Colin Galbraith (United Kingdom) and Mr. Pierre Devillers, the Appointed Councillors for taxonomic, thematic and regional matters, and the Chair of the Standing Committee, Mr. Mohammad Saud A. Sulayem (Saudi Arabia) for their support. Unfortunately, the Appointed Councillor for Neotropical Fauna, Mr. Roberto Schlatter, had announced his intention to step down from the Council for health reasons. Thanks were due to Mr. Schlatter for his immense contribution to the work of the Scientific Council and CMS over the years.

3. Mr. Galbraith expressed concern that many migratory species and their habitats were still highly threatened, in both terrestrial and marine environments. Climate change was also having a huge impact on species, habitats and people around the world. Aligning its agenda with the needs of people was a particular challenge for CMS. On the positive side, the Convention had shown that it could be hugely effective. CMS had strengthened synergies and collaboration with other Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs), and the development of the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) was promising. Given the budgetary situation faced by every government, there was a need for the Council to provide clear scientific advice with regard to future focus and prioritization.

4. Mr. Devillers thanked the Chair for his leadership during the past triennium. He nevertheless feared that the world was becoming more and more utilitarian and less and less concerned with the wider values of natural heritage. Part of the Convention's task was to

* Note: this report covers the Agenda Items dealt with by Scientific Council in its Plenary Sessions. Other items on the Agenda of the Scientific Council were dealt with through the Working Groups, whose reports were presented under Agenda item 20 and attached as Annexes II to IX to this report.

rekindle public support for the conservation of nature; something that was not the priority of the Council.

5. Speaking on behalf of the Norwegian Nature Management authorities, Mr. Øystein Størkersen (Norway) welcomed all participants to Bergen. At the start of the UN Decade of Biodiversity, there were serious governance challenges to be addressed at both country and global scales. The CMS was an experienced body that had adopted many resolutions and issued extensive guidance over the years, but implementation was not doing well in many parts of the world. There needed to be drastic changes of approach; otherwise it would be too late for many species and habitats. Threats to biodiversity, such as powerlines, marine debris, unsustainable hunting, and the global impacts of climate change needed immediate action; ‘business as usual’ was not a way forward. Better tools and innovative solutions were needed and conservation and sustainable use had to go hand-in-hand. CMS has to focus its efforts on what it was good at. Norway was prepared to play its part, but the whole Convention needed to work together – as a network.

6. Ms. Elizabeth Maruma Mrema, CMS Executive Secretary, added her welcome to participants and thanks to the Government of Norway – as well as to all those who had been involved with preparations for COP10 and its associated meetings. She underlined her conviction that the Scientific Council had played an essential role to date; a role that would need to be further strengthened as the Convention itself continues to grow. In 2010, COP10 of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) had adopted a new Biodiversity Action Plan to 2020, which confirmed the lead role of CMS in the conservation of migratory species.

7. The slogan of CMS COP10 “*Networking for Migratory Species*” was designed to shift from a traditional species-based focus to habitat conservation through ecological networks and networks of critical sites. CMS was not proposing to set up new networks of its own but to complement and fill gaps in existing networks.

8. Ms. Mrema welcomed Councillors who had joined during the last triennium, including those from new Contracting Parties, and encouraged all Parties that have yet to appoint a Scientific Councillor to do so. She noted that several Councillors would be stepping down after COP10, including some with long histories of service. Thanks were due to all of them for their support to CMS, and especially to the Appointed Councillor for Birds, Mr. John O’Sullivan, and the Appointed Councillor for Neotropical Fauna, Mr. Roberto Schlatter.

9. Speaking at the UN Conference on Science and World Affairs, held in Berlin in July 2011, the UN Secretary General had emphasized a need to bring scientists and politicians together to further the common interests of humanity. The IPBES had been set up to play an advisory role equivalent to that of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). The CMS and other MEAs continued to follow closely the first steps of this emerging platform.

10. One of the challenges to be addressed by the Scientific Council in the coming years would be to increase its efficiency through optimizing its intersessional work and strengthening engagement of Councillors in the day-to-day work of CMS. The Future Shape process provided a framework for this and it might be time for the Council to instigate its own institutional reforms. Meetings of the Scientific Council were beginning to resemble a ‘mini-COP’. Was this the best way for the Scientific Council to continue? The Council therefore also needs to look inward and to reflect upon itself.

11. Migratory species were now at greater risk of extinction than when global targets for biodiversity were first set. The role of CMS and the advice of the Scientific Council were therefore more important than ever. Conservation success stories, for example the Vicuña (*Vicugna vicugna*) in the High Andes, or the Spanish Imperial Eagle (*Aquila adalberti*) in the Iberian Peninsula, proved that the mission was not impossible.

Agenda Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda

12. The Chair invited substantive comments or proposed amendments to the Provisional Agenda and the Provisional Annotated Agenda and Meeting Schedule. As there were no comments from the floor, the Agenda was adopted as presented and is attached as Annex I to the present report.

Outcomes and actions

Documents UNEP/CMS/ScC17/Doc.1/Rev.2 *Provisional Agenda* and UNEP/CMS/ScC17/Doc.2/Rev.1 *Provisional Annotated Agenda and Meeting Schedule* were adopted by consensus, without amendment.

Agenda Item 3: Report on 2009-2011 Intersessional Activities

13. The Chair referred participants to document UNEP/CMS/Conf.10.8: *Report of the Chair of the Scientific Council*, which presented a full account of the Scientific Council's intersessional activities.

14. He invited Mr. Galbraith (Vice-Chair, UK) to present a brief update concerning his participation at the recent IPBES meeting held in Nairobi in October 2011.

15. Mr. Galbraith noted that the meeting had addressed four main issues: (i) the establishment of IPBES as a UN body or an independent body supported by the UN – a subtle distinction that had yet to be resolved; (ii) whether IPBES should be served by a centralized or dispersed secretariat and where the secretariat should be located; (iii) how the scientific assessments of IPBES would be communicated to policy makers; (iv) how MEAs and other stakeholders should work together in the framework of IPBES. A further meeting would be held in April 2012, by which time some of the policy and structural issues may have been clarified, giving the opportunity for CMS to input more to the debate on technical matters.

16. In response to a question from Mr. Devillers, Mr. Galbraith confirmed that there was a need for the Scientific Council, and CMS as a whole, to find a way of feeding information into the IPBES process in such a way that it could be blended into overall IPBES assessments.

Outcomes and actions

Council took note of document UNEP/CMS/Conf.10.8 *Report of the Chair of the Scientific Council* and of the oral update on IPBES provided by Mr. Galbraith (Vice-Chair)

Agenda item 4: Information on the Intersessional Process regarding the Future Shape of CMS

17. The Chair of the Future Shape Working Group, Mr. Olivier Biber (Switzerland) referred participants to documents UNEP/CMS/Conf.10.20: *Convention on Migratory Species: Future Shape Phase III* (summary report) and UNEP/CMS/Inf.10.14.10: *Convention on Migratory Species: Future Shape Phase III* (extensive supporting documentation). He briefly summarized the three-phase process that had been followed, namely, assessment of key issues identified by Contracting Parties; formulation of potential measures to address these issues; and development of three proposed options that COP10 would be invited to consider.

18. The three options were:

- Option 1 Essential reforms that could be largely accomplished in a single intersessional period if commenced immediately after COP10
- Option 2 Option 1 reforms, plus additional measures that would take up to two intersessional periods and have some additional cost implications
- Option 3 Option 1 & Option 2 reforms, plus additional measures that would be more long-term, since they might require amendments to the legal texts of instruments within the CMS family. There would also be additional cost implications

19. Mr. Devillers (Vice-Chair, European Union), supported by Mr. Spina (Italy), congratulated Mr. Biber and the Future Shape Working Group for the enormous amount of detailed work undertaken, but cautioned against a drive for ‘efficiency’ potentially resulting in a less effective Convention. The CMS had an extremely modest budget and urgently needed to be enabled to do more at a time when biodiversity was facing unprecedented threats. It was also important that the structure and functioning of the Scientific Council itself should not be hastily altered, having served the Convention well for many years. The principle of Councillors being nominated by a Contracting Party but not representing that Contracting Party, was especially important and it would be a backward step if the Council became highly politicized, as was the case with scientific bodies under some other international conventions.

20. The Chair considered that it was not so much a question of changing the Council’s structure, but improving its *modus operandi*. It was becoming more and more costly to convene the Scientific Council twice intersessionally and it might be necessary to look for alternative solutions.

21. Mr. Devillers concurred that it might be possible to replace the mid-term Council meeting with a meeting of a smaller group which should also be open to Contracting Parties who wished independently to support attendance by their appointed Councillor. However, it was vital for the pre-COP meeting of the Council to remain a forum to which all Councillors were not only invited but also actively encouraged to attend.

22. Mr. Williams (United Kingdom) endorsed the Chair’s comment concerning the Scientific Council’s *modus operandi* and expressed concern that the deliberations of the Council were not always as broadly based as they ought to be.

23. Responding to requests for clarification from several participants, Mr. Biber explained that the differences between the three options arising from the Future Shape process

concerned primarily issues of timescale and cost. He noted, however, that the higher short-term costs of Option 3 would be largely offset by future savings and stressed the need to take a long-term view.

24. The Chair appointed Mr. Biber (Chair of the Future Shape Working Group) to lead a small drafting group, consisting of Mr. Barirega (Uganda), Mr. Devillers (Vice-Chair, European Union), Ms. Montgomery (Australia) and Ms. Qwathekana (South Africa). The Group was tasked with preparing a concise summary of the three Future Shape Options tabled for consideration by COP10. Based on this summary, the Scientific Council would conclude this item on the second day of its meeting.

25. Mr. Biber (Switzerland) presented his condensed summary of the Future Shape process under the title “The Scientific Council has identified the following activities and sub-activities contained in Options 1 and 2 as relevant to the Scientific Council’s work and future”. The document consisted of information extracted from document UNEP/CMS/Inf.10.14.10 *Convention on Migratory Species: Future Shape Phase III*. Mr. Biber briefly explained the content of the summary document.

26. Discussion on the document included interventions from Mr. Barirega (Uganda), Mr. Galbraith (Vice-Chair), Mr. Devillers (Vice-Chair, European Union), Mr. Siblet (France), Ms. Qwathekana (South Africa), Mr. Spina (Italy), Mr. Routh (Australia and Vice-Chair of the Future Shape Working Group) and Ms. Prideaux (Migratory Wildlife Network).

27. Mr. Biber suggested that the following proposal should be presented to COP10: “The Scientific Council has identified the following Activities and Sub-activities of Options 1, 2 & 3 as relevant to the work of the Scientific Council, especially Activity 3 of Option 1 and Activities 7 and 15 of Option 2. The Scientific Council also wishes to be involved with future discussion and implementation of these Activities.”

Outcomes and actions

Mr. Biber was asked to finalize his proposal for input to COP10.

Agenda item 5: Extension to 2014 of the Strategic Plan of the Convention 2006-2011

28. Mr. Borja Heredia (CMS Scientific and Technical Officer) introduced documents UNEP/CMS/Conf.10.21 *Contribution of the CMS Secretariat to the implementation of the Strategic Plan 2006-2011 (Triennium 2008-2011)*; UNEP/CMS/Conf.10.22 *Updated Strategic Plan 2006-2014*; and UNEP/CMS/Res10.5/Rev.1 *Draft Resolution on CMS Strategic Plan 2015-2020*.

29. He explained the process to be followed for drawing up a new Strategic Plan. The need for this process has been discussed at the last Standing Committee Meeting as a result of discussion of the Future Shape process. It was also agreed at that Meeting to extend the current plan to 2014 with certain amendments to update it. Document Conf.10.21 summarized the activities implemented by the Secretariat to fulfil the 2008-2011 Plan. Document Conf.10.22 was a proposal to extend the plan to 2014. Finally, Draft Resolution 10.5/Rev.1 covered the establishment of a Working Group and Terms of Reference for drafting a new Strategic Plan for 2015 to 2020.

30. The Standing Committee recommended that there should be no substantial changes to Document Conf.10.22, which extended the structure and objectives of the existing plan to 2014, with the addition of activities related to Resolutions to be adopted by COP10, e.g., those relating to climate change, ecological networks and wildlife diseases. The document also incorporated some pending activities from past years e.g., Invasive Alien Species. This was a crosscutting issue affecting many migratory species. Also covered were barriers to migration such as powerlines and transport infrastructure for which guidelines were needed. Draft Resolution 10.5/Rev.1 set out the process for drawing up a new Strategic Plan for approval by COP11.

31. The Chair invited comments from the Councillors.

32. Ms. Qwathekana (South Africa), referring to Operative Paragraph 4 of draft Resolution 10.5, asked if it would be possible to request the Secretariat to facilitate the external assessment. She also asked whether, in relation to the Terms of Reference of the Strategic Plan Working Group, it would be possible to submit a schedule of activities for the group.

33. Ms. Mrema (Executive Secretary) responded that it was not intended that the Secretariat should undertake the external assessment as this would need input from the Secretariat itself, from Parties and partners, on what all have done to implement the current Strategic Plan. The Secretariat would, however, support the work of the external assessment.

34. Ms. Qwathekana requested that delegation of responsibility should be made explicit in the Resolution. Mr. Mshelbwala suggested that after the paragraph beginning with the words “and further requests” in the draft resolution to add a new paragraph or sentence stating “and therefore requests the Secretariat to facilitate the external assessment”.

35. Reflecting on the intervention of Ms. Qwathekana, Mr. Størkersen (Norway) supported her suggestion for amending the Terms of Reference of the Working Group and added that it would be important for the Working Group to take on recommendations of other MEAs. He then raised the question of what kind of Working Group it should be: Open-ended? Appointed? A consultancy? It might be best to appoint members from the Standing Committee, e.g., one from each region. This would probably be preferable than to using more expensive consultants.

36. Mr. Williams (UK) voiced his concern about the future formulation and measurement of the Strategic Plan. He would like to see a more outcome-focused Strategic Plan with targets against which progress can be measured. The relation between the Strategic Plan and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets should be absolutely clear.

37. Mr. Sibley (France) questioned the need to include Invasive Alien Species in the list of most serious threats to migratory species under Target 2.6 of document Conf.10.22. He stated that the Convention cannot be active everywhere on all fronts and expressed the belief that alien species are well covered by other instruments.

38. Mr. Devillers agreed with Mr. Sibley that CMS should concentrate more on fields in which it has greater expertise, and that other bodies were covering Invasive Alien Species.

39. A number of subsequent interventions stressing that the negative impacts of Invasive Alien Species on migratory species were substantial, were made by Mr. Baker (Appointed Councillor for By-catch), Mr. Mundkur (Appointed Councillor for Asiatic Fauna speaking in

his capacity as Chair of the Flyways Working Group), Ms. Agreda (Ecuador), Mr. Sivakumar (India) and Mr. Diouck (Senegal).

40. Mr. Oteng-Yeboah (Appointed Councillor for African Fauna) asked how CMS could best work with other MEAs on the issue of Invasive Alien Species to ensure synergy in dealing with the concerns of the Scientific Council.

41. Mr. Morgan (CITES) responded that CITES engages with the Ad-hoc Working Group under CBD on this issue rather than working on it separately.

42. The Chair concluded that Invasive Alien Species had considerable impacts on migratory species. Other bodies were, however, dealing with the issue through various intervention measures and he wondered whether this should be an implementation priority for the next COP to address.

43. Mr. Heredia thanked all Councillors for their comments and assured them that a good note had been taken of all interventions. He stressed that CMS would work in a targeted manner on the impact of Invasive Alien Species on migratory species. There was no intention of duplicating the efforts of other initiatives such as CBD, the Bern Convention in Europe, or the Barcelona Convention in the Mediterranean. The intention was to provide added value in studying the concrete impacts of Invasive Alien Species on migratory species. This is the process to follow for the next triennium.

44. Mr. Devillers suggested the use of wording such as addressing problems of Invasive Alien Species “within the specificities of CMS” to make the focus on migratory species clearer.

45. Mr. Heredia (Secretariat) introduced an amendment to Draft Resolution 10.5/Rev.1 that had been requested by Ms. Qwathekana (South Africa).

46. The amendment consisted of a new operative paragraph, after Paragraph 5, as follows: “*Further requests* the Secretariat to facilitate the assessment process”.

47. The Chair invited Councillors to endorse the Draft Resolution for the consideration of COP10, subject to inclusion of the amendments proposed.

Outcomes and actions

The Secretariat took note of the discussion on the issue of Invasive Alien Species.

The Scientific Council endorsed draft Resolution 10.5/Rev.1 for forwarding to COP10.

Agenda item 6: The Potential contribution of the Scientific Council to the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES)

48. Mr. Galbraith (Vice-Chair, UK) expressed a wish to make some amendments to document UNEP/CMS/Resolution 10.8 *Cooperation between the Intergovernmental Science-policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) and CMS*. He undertook to do this in time for perusal by the Council on the second day of the Meeting (18 November).

49. Referring to draft Resolution 10.8, Mr. Galbraith (Vice-Chair, UK) reported that he had incorporated a small number of amendments arising from the IPBES meeting held in

Nairobi in October. These amendments were presented for participants to review on-screen with tracked changes.

Outcomes and actions

Draft Resolution 10.8, as revised by Mr. Galbraith, was endorsed by the Scientific Council for forwarding to COP10.

Agenda item 9: *Modus operandi* in cases of emergencies for CMS species

50. Ms. Kühl (Secretariat) introduced documents UNEP/CMS/Conf.10.38 *Modus operandi for conservation emergencies* and UNEP/CMS/Resolution10.2 *Modus operandi for conservation emergencies*. She recalled that Article V of the Convention text foresees emergency action and these documents are now calling for a corresponding mandate from COP10. There was a need to determine when the CMS Secretariat should intervene and alert Parties and relevant organizations to an emerging situation such as the recent mass mortality events of Saiga Antelope (*Saiga tatarica*) or the spread of Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza H5N1.

51. She invited comments on the Draft Resolution and reminded Councillors that the Standing Committee had already approved a previous version.

52. Proposed amendments were suggested by Ms. Qwathekana (South Africa), Mr. Spina (Italy), Mr. Størkensen (Norway), Mr. Barirega (Uganda), Mr. Mundkur (Appointed Councillor, Asiatic Fauna), Ms. McCrickard (FAO) and Ms. Crockford (BirdLife International).

53. Mr. Devillers emphasized the need to establish a procedure to ensure that something is done if there is a real crisis, but to avoid distracting the Secretariat with less important problems. Whether and how to act were the key issues.

54. The Chair invited Councillors Ms. Qwathekana, Mr. Spina, Mr. Barirega, Mr. Størkensen and Mr. Mundkur, and Observers Ms. Crockford and Ms. McCrickard, to meet with Ms. Kühl in order to finalize their suggested amendments so that a revised version of draft Resolution 10.2 could be discussed by the Scientific Council on 18 November.

55. Ms. Kühl (Secretariat) presented proposed amendments to Draft Resolution 10.2 on-screen with track changes.

56. Mr. Baker (Appointed Councillor for By-catch) indicated the need for some language amendments in references to the High Seas.

57. Mr. Barirega (Uganda), supported by Mr. Devillers (Vice-Chair, European Union) considered that the definition of 'emergency' was rather restrictive; it ought to refer to range size, ecological integrity and animal health.

58. Mr. Baker (Appointed Councillor for By-catch) commented that it would be important to leave flexibility for working on a case-by-case basis and not to be too prescriptive.

Outcomes and actions

The revised version of draft Resolution 10.2 was endorsed by the Scientific Council for forwarding to COP10 subject to inclusion of a further amendment to address the concern flagged by Mr. Barirega.

Agenda item 10: Critical sites and ecological networks for migratory species

59. Mr Heredia (Secretariat) introduced documents UNEP/CMS/Conf.10.39/Rev.1 *Critical sites and ecological networks for migratory species* and UNEP/CMS/Resolution 10.3/Rev.1 *The role of ecological networks in the conservation of migratory species*. He noted in particular that draft Resolution 10.3/Rev.1 called *inter alia* on the Scientific Council to carry out, during the next triennium, an evaluation of current networks, in terms of how they responded to the needs of migratory species.

60. During discussion, amendments were proposed by Mr. Ebenhard (Sweden), Mr. Limpus (Appointed Councillor for Marine Turtles), Mr. Mundkur (Appointed Councillor for Asiatic Fauna), Mr. Williams (UK), Ms. Grillo-Compulsione (ACCOBAMS), Ms. Prideaux (Migratory Wildlife Network) and Ms. Crockford (BirdLife International).

Outcomes and actions

The Meeting endorsed the draft Resolution subject to the incorporation of further amendments addressing the points raised in the discussion. The Chair invited all those who made contributions to liaise with the Secretariat to ensure that their comments were taken into account.

Agenda item 14: Impacts of marine debris on migratory species

61. Mr. Routh (Australia) made a presentation on the background to UNEP/CMS/Resolution 10.4 *Marine debris*. This topic had initially been introduced at ScC16, since then the draft Resolution had been reworked and reviewed by the Standing Committee at its last meeting.

62. Some 60-80 percent of marine debris was plastic and 80 percent derived from land-based sources. Marine debris was nevertheless a hidden problem with an estimated 70 percent remaining on the seabed. Volumes and impacts were therefore likely to be vastly underestimated. Global climate change was likely to exacerbate the problem, for example, through increased flood outwash. The impacts of marine debris have consequences for migratory species including CMS-listed species and groups such as Loggerhead Turtle, Green Turtle, seabirds, sharks, whales, dugongs and seals. Overall more than 250 species were affected. There were also major economic, social and cultural costs. However, marine debris was also an avoidable problem, but one requiring regional and global solutions.

63. During discussion, interventions were made by Mr. Routh (Australia), Mr. Størksen (Norway), Mr. Kasiki (Kenya), Mr. Custodio (Philippines), Mr. Sivakumar, (India), Mr. Baker (Appointed Councillor for By-catch), Mr. Oteng-Yeboah (Regional Councillor for African Fauna), Mr. Williams (UK) and Mr. Simmonds (Observer for Luxembourg).

Outcomes and actions

The meeting endorsed the draft Resolution in principle, pending the incorporation of further amendments arising from the discussion. The Chair invited all those who made contributions to liaise with Mr. Routh to ensure that their comments were taken into account.

Agenda item 15: Small Grants Programme (SGP)**Agenda Item 15.1: Report on the Small Grants Programme (SGP)****Agenda Item 15.2: Revised guidelines for the SGP**

64. Mr. Heredia (Secretariat) introduced documents UNEP/CMS/ScC.17/Doc.10 *Report on the Small Grants Programme* and UNEP/CMS/Conf.10.43 *Revised guidelines for the operation of the Small Grants Programme*.

65. The latter document contained proposed guidance on how the SGP could function over the coming triennium. Mr. Heredia emphasized that while the SGP would continue to rely on additional voluntary contributions, such donors could be found for good projects.

66. Ms. Morales Palarea (Paraguay) and Mr. Hogan (Appointed Councillor for Fish) expressed strong support for the Small Grants Programme (SGP) and the proposed guidelines.

67. Mr. Rocha (Bolivia) presented a brief report on the High Andean Flamingo project that had received support from the SGP.

68. Mr. Williams (UK) suggested where improvements could be made in three specific places within the proposed guidelines.

Outcomes and actions

The Meeting noted the *Report on the SGP* and endorsed the *revised Guidelines for Operation of the SGP* for forwarding to COP10.

Agenda item 16: Conservation status of CMS Appendix I Species

69. Ms. Kühl (Secretariat) introduced document UNEP/CMS/ScC17/Doc.7/Rev.1 *Conservation status of Appendix I species* and invited comments from participants, especially in relation to Table 1 of the document.

70. Mr. Hogan (Appointed Councillor for Fish) reported that Table 1 had been considered by the Aquatic Mammals Working Group, which had concluded that the approach and format seemed effective for meeting the information needs of Parties. Research was needed to cover species not yet assessed through the Red List or other processes. Maintaining an online database with regular updates would be the best way to allow Parties access to the data. The Working Group recommended that the Secretariat should seek the resources for the necessary IT support.

71. Mr. Limpus (Appointed Councillor for Marine Turtles) informed the Meeting that a global assessment of turtles had been carried out through IUCN's Red List. However, a weakness of the Red List was its use of the whole species approach. Finer scale approaches related to management units were needed for many species. Assessment of marine turtles was

recently facilitated by the WCMC marine turtle online database. Unfortunately this had recently been decommissioned due to a change of platform. This approach could be adapted for most species. It allowed mapping of distribution, abundance, breeding sites, population trends and migration routes. It could be further enhanced by inclusion of satellite telemetry data. Mr. Limpus would be very supportive of the Secretariat making efforts to deliver something along these lines.

72. Ms. Kühl suggested that there was a need for experts in this field to meet, to establish a baseline and look for gaps in current listings of migratory species. Existing databases that would provide a clear starting point included the IUCN Red List and the Living Planet Index.

73. Mr. Devillers stressed the risk of duplicating effort. He also considered that the volume of work needed for the approach outlined by Mr. Limpus was probably excessive. The new, more detailed IUCN Red List should remain the standard reference and CMS should act only when IUCN data were considered to be insufficient. It would be important to consider species at the level of evolutionary or management units.

74. Mr. Hogan (Appointed Councillor for Fish) suggested that CMS could add value by collecting information on migratory behaviour, which was often neglected in the IUCN Red List process. It would be useful to work with IUCN to facilitate collection of this information, for example during Red List assessment workshops.

75. Further supportive interventions were made by Mr. Spina (Italy), Mr. Fouda (Egypt) and Mr. Perrin (Appointed Councillor for Aquatic Mammals).

76. Ms. Kühl concluded by mentioning that the MoveBank database project based at the Max Planck Institute for Ornithology could add considerable value by storing and analyzing animal movement data from satellite tracking. One of the leaders of MoveBank, Mr. Martin Wikelski, would make a presentation at a side event during COP10.

Outcomes and actions

Council took note of document UNEP/CMS/ScC17/Doc.7/Rev.1 *Conservation status of Appendix I species* and endorsed the proposed format.

The Secretariat took note of the discussion on conservation status assessment and later in the session received comments improving the document from Mr. Mundkur (Appointed Councillor for Asiatic Fauna)

Agenda item 17: Scientific Council tasks arising from resolutions, recommendations and other decisions of the Conference of the Parties:

UNEP/CMS/Resolution 10.23 *Concerted and cooperative actions*

Agenda Item 17.1: Concerted actions for selected Appendix I species/groups

UNEP/CMS/Conf.10.12 *Progress on concerted and other actions for CMS species that are not covered by an Article IV instrument*

UNEP/CMS/Inf.10.28 *Activities reported by Parties on the concerted action species*

Agenda Item 17.2: Co-operative actions for Appendix II species/groups

UNEP/CMS/Conf.10.36 *Enhancing the effectiveness of measures to promote the conservation and sustainable management of Appendix II species – reflections on the CMS “cooperative actions” process*

77. Ms. Kühl presented the above-listed documents, recalling that Concerted Actions relate to Appendix I species and Cooperative Actions applied to Appendix II species. Only COP8 had ever taken species off the Concerted and Cooperative Action Lists; all other COPs had added species but implementation was often lacking. Draft Resolution 10.23 sought to address this.

78. Mr. Perrin (Appointed Councillor for Aquatic Mammals) reported that the Aquatic Mammals Working Group had discussed draft Resolution 10.23 at length and endorsed it in principle with suggestions for minor changes. The Working Group had proposed the addition of Narwhal (*Monodon monoceros*) and the resident North Pacific subspecies of Killer Whale (*Orcinus orca*) to Appendix I (see document UNEP/CMS/ScC17/Doc.9 *Species of aquatic mammals for which agreements are not anticipated during the coming Triennium but which may require attention by the Scientific Council* for status summary).

79. Mr. Mundkur (Appointed Councillor for Asiatic Fauna, in his capacity as Chair of the Flyways Working Group) noted some minor points relating to listing of species within Annex 1 of document ScC17/Doc.7/Rev.1. Marbled Teal (*Marmaronetta angustirostris*), Ferruginous Duck (*Aythya nyroca*) and White-headed Duck (*Oxyura leucocephala*) were all covered by the Central Asian Flyway instrument, and so “Yes” needed to be added to the appropriate column for these 3 species.

80. Mr. Devillers clarified the circumstances under which species could be removed from the Appendices. Distinction needed to be made between Appendix I and Appendix II species. For Appendix II, Parties would endeavour to conclude agreements. It was legitimate to remove them once an agreement was concluded, or if the Scientific Council deemed that it would not be necessary to establish an agreement. The list should be dynamic. Appendix I was a list of species for which it was considered desirable to have an instrument and species could not normally be removed. The Scientific Council was responsible for Concerted actions, but not for Agreements, MOUs and other instruments. The list of Concerted action species should not lose species over the course of time unless the conservation status of a given species improved dramatically.

81. Mr. Limpus (Chair of the Marine Turtles Working Group) expressed the support of the Working Group for Draft Resolution 10.23. He noted that there were large areas of oceans where no CMS instruments applied, but where there might be other instruments such as SPREP for Pacific island nations, functioning in parallel with CMS. The potential effectiveness of such instruments was exemplified by the Critically Endangered Kemp’s Ridley Turtle (*Lepidochelys kempii*), which has benefited from concerted action by the United States and Mexico. There was a need to avoid duplication of effort and a mechanism was needed to indicate whether a species was covered by another instrument, even if it was not addressed directly through CMS. Globally, turtles were best conserved through ocean basin-level management and the Working Group therefore recommended that reporting should be by ocean basin rather than by species. For the Indian Ocean and Atlantic there were existing CMS instruments. Their secretariats could be charged with ocean basin reporting, and perhaps the Barcelona Convention could report for the Mediterranean and SPREP for the Pacific. The

Working Group had drafted a number of amendments to draft Resolution 10.23, including a new paragraph on reporting by ocean basin.

82. In response to a question from Mr. Hogan, Ms. Kühl replied that document Conf.10.36 called for more prioritization, picking up those species most in need of conservation action.

83. Mr. Devillers added that Appendix II should list species in a ‘waiting situation’ where it was considered that their status deserves action but none is yet in the pipeline.

84. Mr. Mundkur recalled his presentation on Resolution 10.10 the previous day in the Birds Working Group where one of the priorities was the need to update Appendices with species that need to be listed.

85. Mr. Hogan asked whether the Small Grants Programme could facilitate work on some of these species. He also called for action on the 18 Sturgeon species that were listed, but which had no concerted Action and no focal point.

86. Mr. Heredia (Secretariat) added that in the revised guidelines for the Small Grants Programme, species listed for Concerted or Cooperative actions were highlighted as a priority, but there is a need for good proposals. The intention was not to do away with the concept of Concerted and Cooperative Actions, but to make them more efficient. Improved coordination and communication between existing mechanisms and initiatives were part of the key to achieving this.

87. Ms. Qwathekana (South Africa) observed that listing *per se* did not seem to effectively address the threats faced by species since most of the species on the Appendices continued to decline. She considered that species-based conservation programmes would be more effective.

88. The Chair concurred that the listing process was imperfect and the Scientific Council needed to take action when a species was further endangered due to lack of action.

89. Mr. Morgan (CITES) referred to page 10 of Draft Resolution 10.23 where the African Elephant was split into two species, *Loxodonta africana* and *L. cyclotis*, whereas CITES only recognized *L. africana*. This difference could be problematic.

90. Mr. Devillers recalled that CMS nomenclature must follow Wilson & Reeder 2005.

91. Ms. Crockford (BirdLife International) proposed that Bristle-thighed Curlew (*Numenius tahitiensis*) be considered for inclusion in Appendix I and for Concerted Action. This proposal was supported by Mr. Sibley (France) and by Mr. O’Sullivan (Chair of the Working Group on Birds).

92. At the invitation of the Chair, the Scientific Council endorsed the proposal for Bristle-thighed Curlew to be included as a Concerted Actions species.

93. Ms. Crockford reported that BirdLife International had formally offered to undertake an objective assessment of all Globally Threatened bird species in relation to CMS Appendices.

94. Mr. Galbraith (Vice-Chair, UK) noted that the Scientific Council needed formally to endorse any proposals for listing species for Concerted and Cooperative action that were to go forward for consideration by COP. This should be done through adoption by the Scientific Council of the relevant Working Group reports.

Outcomes and actions

Subject to the incorporation of amendments proposed by the Working Groups and further discussed in plenary, the Scientific Council endorsed draft Resolution 10.23 for consideration by COP10.

**Agenda item 19: Progress on other matters requiring Scientific Council advice:
Agenda Item 19.1: Sustainable use**

95. Mr. Devillers (Vice-Chair, European Union), introduced UNEP/CMS/ScC.17/Doc.12 *Applicability of the Addis Ababa Principles to activities conducted under CMS*. He noted that this document had resulted from a process initiated at COP8 where there had been a proposal for CMS to endorse the Addis Ababa Principles. A Working Group had been established by the COP and ScC.17/Doc.12 was a report summarizing the conclusions of the Working Group.

96. The Working Group's general consensus was that the Addis Ababa Principles themselves posed little difficulty, but the text accompanying them raised numerous problems in the context of CMS. Some of the Principles, in terms of their practical application, applied to things that only CBD could do. Furthermore, some of the wording used could be interpreted in many different ways and appeared to be contradictory in some places.

97. Mr. Routh (Australia) stated that while Australia supported collaborative work between CMS and CBD, it would not accept the applicability of the Addis Ababa Principles to CMS and could not agree to the adoption or endorsement of the Addis Ababa Principles by CMS.

98. Mr. Devillers responded that Australia's position was well known and had been very much taken into account in the preparation of the document under discussion.

99. Mr. Morgan (CITES) noted that the document did not explicitly state that it was the outcome of the Working Group established by the COP. It did not reflect his recollections of discussions in Rome.

100. Mr. Biber (Switzerland) pointed out that the Scientific Council was expected to provide advice on the future work of the Convention with regard to sustainable use of CMS species. This needed to be on the agenda at the Scientific Council's next meeting.

Outcomes and actions

The Scientific Council decided that through its preparation of document UNEP/CMS/ScC.17/Doc.12 *Applicability of the Addis Ababa Principles to activities conducted under CMS*, the Working Group had fulfilled its Terms of Reference. Any further work needed would require new Terms of Reference and this issue should be taken up by Council at its 18th Meeting.

Agenda Item 19.2: Criteria for listing Appendix II species

101. Document UNEP/CMS/Conf.10.37 *Application of the IUCN Red List categories to evaluate CMS listing proposals* was introduced by Mr. Baker (Appointed Councillor for By-catch).

102. He reported that Australia considered it would be preferable to deal with the issue intersessionally after COP10, as the document had only been made available to Parties very recently.

103. The UK had provided largely supportive, detailed comments, but had cautioned against CMS listing becoming a 'dumping ground'. The UK had also noted that not all CMS species had been assessed recently by IUCN.

104. Mr. Størkersen (Norway) expressed his regret at the late availability of the document. Norway felt that Council could only take note of it at this stage, but should recommend preparation of a draft Resolution and guidelines for adoption at COP11. The guidelines would need to be broader than as at present, for example to cover the issue of de-listing.

105. Mr. Ebenhard (Sweden) asked what should be done in cases where CMS and IUCN used differing taxonomies.

106. Mr. Baker replied that the proposal was to use the Red List categories, not the Red List itself.

107. Mr. Fouda (Egypt) felt this was a key point. In his view many IUCN assessments had not been adequately verified at national level.

108. Mr. Williams (UK) thanked those who had been involved in preparing the document. The UK agreed strongly with Norway that this was a very important issue for CMS but one that would probably require further work before a COP decision could be recommended.

109. Mr. Størkersen and Mr. Routh (Australia) concurred and recommended that the Scientific Council should conclude its work on Criteria for listing Appendix I and Appendix II species intersessionally.

110. Mr. Sibley (France) stressed the urgent need for CMS to have clear guidelines on this matter, which had been delayed for many years. He recognized that it was too late to take a decision at COP10 but the Convention needed to make certain that guidelines would come forward for adoption at COP11.

111. Mr. Morgan (CITES) observed that as both CITES and CMS dealt with endangered species it would be helpful to the outside world if the two Conventions used similar approaches.

112. Mr. Heredia said that this issue was tabled for discussion at COP and that, strictly speaking, a Resolution was not needed and the request for criteria could be reflected in the COP report.

113. Following further discussion, Mr. Størkersen suggested that Mr. Baker and other interested Councillors should draft Terms of Reference for an intersessional Working Group

and that the Scientific Council should request the COP to establish such a Working Group tasked with finalizing criteria for listing.

Outcomes and actions

The proposal of the Councillor from Norway was endorsed by the Scientific Council. The Chair invited those interested to liaise with Mr. Baker to prepare Terms of Reference for the development of criteria to assist the Convention in assessing proposals to list taxa on the Appendices of CMS. This process shall bring forward a draft Resolution and guidelines for adoption at COP11.

The intersessional Working Group met and developed the following Terms of Reference:

“Develop a set of criteria to assist the Scientific Council and the COP in assessing proposals for the listing of taxa to, and the de-listing of taxa from, the Appendices of the Convention.

The proposed criteria should be developed in sufficient time for review by the 18th Meeting of the Scientific Council and subsequent consideration by the COP.”

Agenda Item 19.4: Survey of expertise of Scientific Council members

114. Ms. Kühl (Secretariat) introduced document UNEP/CMS/ScC.17/Doc.6 *Analysis of expertise of members of the Scientific Council*. She highlighted the need to address the gaps identified, such as the relatively low number of Scientific Councillors with expertise on marine species, to make CMS more effective. It was vital to engage other experts informally and to set up regional networks.

115. Mr. Devillers felt that the survey showed a remarkable balance of expertise within the Scientific Council. One of the great achievements of CMS had been to put migratory taxa other than birds on the map. It would not be very logical to change the structure of Council significantly.

116. Mr. Fouda (Egypt), Ms. Qwathekana (South Africa), Ms. Morales Palarea (Paraguay) and Ms. Agreda (Ecuador) stressed the need for Scientific Councillors to engage with national and regional expert networks and referred to relevant examples from their own countries.

117. Mr. Mundkur (Appointed Councillor for Asiatic Fauna) described how the intersessional Working Group on Flyways had reached out to other expert networks, and suggested that this approach could be applied by other taxonomic Working Groups. It would be particularly important for the Scientific Council to see how it could embrace the large body of knowledge within IUCN’s Species Survival Commission more strategically.

118. Mr. Biber (Switzerland) drew attention to the Scientific Council’s relative lack of expertise on migratory invertebrates.

119. Mr. Devillers suggested that the Appointed Councillor mechanism might be used to help fill gaps; for example to increase expertise on invertebrates.

120. The Chair noted that the first step was to see what expertise already existed in the Scientific Council and secondly what expertise was available to the Scientific Council. However, as fewer than half of Councillors had responded to the survey, it was impossible to come to a properly informed view.

Outcomes and actions

The Secretariat was asked to redistribute the survey questionnaire electronically to those who had not so far responded. The Councillors concerned were urged to provide completed questionnaires to the Secretariat by 19 November 2011.

Agenda Item 19.5: Invasive alien species

121. Document UNEP/CMS/ScC.17/Doc.11 *Invasive alien species and migratory species* was presented by Ms. Aguado (Secretariat).

122. The Chair noted that the Scientific Council was expected to advise the Convention on future work on this issue.

123. During discussion, interventions were made by Mr. Sibley (France), Mr. Krüss (Germany), Mr. Spina (Italy), Ms. Morales Palarea (Paraguay), Mr. Baker (Appointed Councillor for By-catch), Mr. Fouda (Egypt), Mr. Devillers (Vice-Chair, European Union), Mr. Ebenhard (Sweden), Mr. Sivakumar (India), Mr. Mundkur (Appointed Councillor for Asiatic Fauna), Mr. Rocha (Bolivia), Mr. Galbraith (Vice-Chair, UK), Mr. Diouck (Senegal) and Mr. Heredia (Secretariat).

124. While all those speaking agreed that the problem of invasive alien species was a priority for the biodiversity conservation community, there was disagreement around whether it should be a priority for CMS and on what activities should be undertaken to address the issue from a CMS viewpoint.

125. Mr. Heredia clarified that invasive species were mentioned in the text of the Convention as a major threat for CMS species.

126. Mr. Galbraith suggested that the issue should be taken forward in the framework of the Convention's Strategic Plan.

127. The Chair noted the Council's agreement with this suggestion and asked Mr. Galbraith to propose specific wording for reporting back to COP10 on this issue.

Outcomes and actions

The Scientific Council endorsed the conclusion proposed by the Vice-Chair, as follows "The Scientific Council noted the overall importance of the impact of alien species on biodiversity and on migratory species in particular. It recommended that a review of this impact, and of the priority actions required to reduce any effects, should be undertaken intersessionally".

Agenda item 20: Presentation of the reports of the taxonomic and thematic working groups

128. The Chair invited the Chairs of the taxonomic Working Groups to present their reports.

129. Ms. Roseline Beudels (Belgium, Chair of the Terrestrial Mammal Working Group, presented her report, attached as Annex II to the present report.

130. Mr. Morgan (CITES) requested clarification concerning the recommendation that CMS listing should be extended to wild native populations included under *Ovis aries*. He cautioned that CITES had run into taxonomic problems in this context. He asked whether it was being recommended that COP10 should decide on this issue, or whether it would come to a future COP.

131. Mr. Devillers considered it important to separate scientific advice of the Scientific Council as to whether listing of a given taxon was scientifically desirable, from the formal decision by COP on whether Parties found it practical to implement the scientific advice received. He concurred with Mr. Morgan that the particular case in question could raise difficulties, but all the Council needed to do was to advise whether it was scientifically desirable.

132. Mr. Størkersen (Norway) did not entirely share this view. There was a need to evaluate any proposal carefully and this particular suggestion, referring to wild populations included under *Ovis aries*, seemed hasty. The situation showed once more the urgent need for very clear criteria for listing.

133. The Secretariat highlighted that only listing proposals which had been submitted 150 days prior to the COP were eligible for adoption by Parties.

134. The Chair concluded that the report of the Working Group had simply stated that listing of wild populations included under *Ovis aries* was desirable. This did not constitute a formal submission for listing.

135. Mr. Bill Perrin, Chair of the Working Group on Aquatic Mammals, presented his report, attached as Annex III to the present report.

136. Mr. Zeb Hogan, Chair of the Working Group on Fish, presented his report, attached as Annex IV to this report.

137. Mr. Colin Limpus, Chair of the Working Group on Marine Turtles, presented his report, attached as Annex V to the present report.

138. Mr. John O'Sullivan, Chair of the Working Group on Birds, presented his report, attached as Annex VI to the present report.

139. Mr Sibley (France) and Mr. Morgan (CITES) expressed regret that the Working Group had not been able to recommend a decision on taxonomy of birds.

140. CITES had no doubt about the technical quality of the BirdLife International taxonomic checklist, but this had a level of sophistication and frequency of change that made it unsuitable for use by MEAs. Draft Resolution 10.13 should still be considered by COP10.

141. Mr. Limpus and Mr. Biber (Switzerland) underlined that the Working Group's advice had been clear that draft Resolution 10.13 should not go forward to COP10. Mr. Biber asked the Chair of the Working Group on Birds, Mr. O'Sullivan, to read out the Group's recommendation on this issue, as follows:

“The Working Group requests the Chair of the Scientific Council to liaise with the Chairs of Scientific Advisory Bodies of the biodiversity-related Conventions, the secretariats of relevant MEAs, and relevant international organizations including IUCN, BirdLife

International, Wetlands International and UNEP-WCMC with the aim of evaluating the possible adoption of a single nomenclature and taxonomy for birds and to inform the Scientific Council at its 18th Meeting”

142. The Chair concluded that this recommendation should stand and invited the Scientific Council to adopt the reports of the Chairs of the taxonomic Working Groups.

Outcomes and actions

Council adopted the reports of the taxonomic Working Groups

143. The Chair invited the Chairs of the thematic Working Groups to present their reports.

144. Mr. Colin Galbraith, Chair of the Working Group on Climate Change impacts on migratory species and implications for adaptation, presented his report, which is attached as Annex VII to the present report.

145. Mr. Barry Baker, Chair of the Working Group on Bycatch, presented his report, which is attached as Annex VIII to the present report.

146. In response to a question from Mr. Sibley (France), regarding the source of data used for French fisheries in the sub-Antarctic region, Mr. Baker stated that the information had been submitted to CCAMLR at its meeting in October 2011. Mr. Baker undertook to engage bilaterally with Mr. Sibley to discuss the matter further.

147. Mr. Alfred Oteng-Yeboah, Chair of the Working Group on Wildlife Disease, presented his report, which is attached as Annex IX to the present report.

Outcomes and actions

Council adopted the reports of the taxonomic Working Groups

Agenda item 21: Elections of the chair and vice-chair of the Scientific Council for the period 2012-2014 and nominations for Appointed Councillor of Birds and the Appointed Councillor of Neotropical Fauna

148. This agenda item was chaired by the Executive Secretary. The current officers, Mr. Mshelbwala, Mr. Devillers and Mr. Galbraith, were invited to leave the room during the elections.

149. The Executive Secretary referred the Meeting to document UNEP/CMS/ScC17/Inf.2 *Rules of Procedure of the CMS Scientific Council* and specifically to Rule 8 that referred to the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Scientific Council. She noted that exceptionally there had been two Vice-Chairs during the last triennium, but that the expectation was that there would be a single Vice-Chair for the coming triennium, as specified in the Rules of Procedure. Council confirmed this expectation.

150. The Executive Secretary invited nominations for the position of Chair of the Scientific Council, which would be taken up at COP10 under the appropriate agenda item.

151. Ms. Kralj (Croatia) nominated Mr. Fernando Spina (Italy). This proposal was seconded by Mr. Fouda (Egypt) and endorsed by acclamation. Mr. Spina thanked the Scientific Council and committed to doing his best.

152. The Executive Secretary invited nominations for the position of Vice-Chair of the Scientific Council, reminding the Council of the need to take into account regional and gender balance.

153. Mr. Barirega (Uganda) nominated Ms. Malta Qwathekana (South Africa). This proposal was seconded by Ms. Beudels (Belgium) and endorsed by acclamation. Ms. Qwathekana thanked the Councillors for their trust and confirmed her readiness to accept the challenges of the role of Vice-Chair.

154. Mr. Heredia (Secretariat) noted that the Scientific Council also had to recommend new Appointed Scientific Councillors for Birds and for Neotropical Fauna. It had been traditional for the Appointed Councillor for Birds to be a person belonging to the BirdLife International family. It had been proposed that Mr. Leon Bennun, the Head of Science for BirdLife, should be recommended. This proposal was supported by the current Appointed Councillor for Birds, Mr. John O'Sullivan.

155. Mr. Rodrigo Medellín (Mexico) had been proposed as the new Appointed Councillor for Neotropical Fauna. He enjoyed wide support in the region and was well known to the CMS family in his role as Ambassador for the Year of the Bat. Mr. Rocha (Bolivia) supported the candidature of Mr. Rodrigo Medellín in the name of the Neotropical region.

156. The Scientific Council endorsed both proposals.

Agenda item 22: Adoption of the report and action points

157. The Chair confirmed that a draft report of the meeting, including outcomes and action points, would be made available in time for participants to review and amend where necessary, prior to the report's submission as an input to COP10. The taxonomic and thematic Working Group reports would be annexed to the report for the plenary sessions, as done in previous Scientific Council meetings.

Agenda item 23: Date and venue of the 18th Meeting of the Scientific Council

158. The Scientific Council concurred with the Executive Secretary's proposal that the Secretariat should confer with the new Chair and Vice-Chair and inform Councillors of proposed dates as soon as possible.

Agenda item 24: Any other business

159. The Appointed Councillor for Asiatic Fauna recalled that the taxonomic Working Group on Birds had been mandated to review draft Resolutions 10.10 and 10.3. Many important improvements had been forwarded to the Secretariat as a result.

160. The Chair ruled that time did not permit the plenary session to further consider these amendments, but asked that the Secretariat should ensure that they were all taken into account in the revision of the draft Resolutions concerned.

161. The Chair expressed his strong conviction that two days had not been sufficient for the Scientific Council to do justice to its work; many of the draft Resolutions had not even been addressed in the plenary and there had not been time for discussion of the Working Group reports. He strongly recommended to the incoming Chair and Vice-Chair that they should insist on a three-day meeting immediately prior to COP11.

Agenda item 25: Closure of the Meeting

162. The Scientific Council expressed its thanks to the current Chair and two Vice-Chairs for their efforts over the last triennium.

163. The Executive Secretary expressed her own thanks to the Chair and Vice-Chairs, as well as to all Councillors, Appointed Councillors, partners, NGOs, and the CMS extended family. She presented gifts of appreciation to the outgoing Chair, Vice-Chairs, and Appointed Councillor for Birds. (The list of participants is contained in Annex X of the present Report).

164. The Chair thanked the Council warmly, and noted his particular gratitude to the two Vice-Chairs and to the Secretariat for their invaluable support. Special thanks were once more expressed to the Government of Norway as host of the Meeting.

165. The Meeting was closed at 2000 hrs. on 18 November 2011.