



**Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species
of Wild Animals**



Report of the fourth meeting of the Scientific Council

Bonn, Germany, 17-19 May 1993

(Prepared by the Secretariat)

Opening remarks by the Chairman and Secretariat

1. The Chairman opened the meeting and introduced the members of the Secretariat, whom he thanked for the meeting preparations. He informed the Council that Dr. Nowak (Germany) was expected to be seconded to the Secretariat by his Government for a period of two years, beginning perhaps as soon as June 1993. The Chairman then welcomed the participants, who introduced themselves. He noted that the present meeting would be the best-attended of any Scientific Council meeting held to date. The list of participants appears at Annex 1.
2. The Chairman reminded Councillors that, following past practice, the meeting would be conducted in English, but that some of the documents had also been prepared in French and Spanish. The Secretariat added that a number of documents had been prepared in addition to those circulated before the meeting. The complete list of documents considered by the meeting appears at Annex 2.

Adoption of the agenda

3. The agenda (document CMS/ScC.4/1 (Rev.1)) was adopted without any amendments and is shown at Annex 3. The report of the third meeting of the Scientific Council (Geneva, September 1991) was also adopted without any amendments (document CMS/ScC.4/Inf.2).

Report on intersessional activities

4. The Secretariat elaborated briefly on document CMS/ScC.4/3, pointing out that the Convention would enter into force in Monaco on 1 June 1993, and that the accession of Guinea - represented at the meeting by an observer - was imminent. The nomination of a Councillor by Saudi Arabia - represented at the meeting by two observers - remained to be clarified. The Secretariat also drew attention to a new CMS brochure which was now available in English, French and Spanish.

Matters concerning Agreements currently under development

5. Dr. Moser provided an overview of activities that had been taken in relation to each of the draft waterfowl Agreements currently under development: the Agreement on the Conservation and Management of Waterfowl in the African /Eurasian Region (AEWA) –

formerly the "Western Palearctic Waterfowl Agreement" - and the Agreement on the Conservation of Asian/Australasian Waterfowl (AAWA). He explained that the European Economic Community (EEC) had been unable to undertake the necessary work on the AEWA and had therefore withdrawn its sponsorship in early 1993 in favour of the Secretariat of the Convention. In the meantime, the Secretariat had drafted a text of a comparable Agreement for Asian/Australasian Waterfowl which had been considered by a working group of the Scientific Council. The International Waterfowl and Wetlands Research Bureau (IWRB) had been contracted to prepare a number of supporting documents for each Agreement, including a comprehensive Management Plan for each and specific Action Plans for various waterfowl groups. The preliminary work on the AAWA had led to the conclusion that it was essential for the Agreements to be harmonized with one another, and this had already necessitated some changes to the AEWA. The Co-ordinator explained that further work was needed to put the text of the AEWA, Management Plan and Action Plans in their final form. It was hoped that the documents would be finalized in the coming weeks and would be circulated to all Range States in June or July. He considered that February 1994 was now a more realistic target for holding a negotiation session for that Agreement.

6. The Secretariat explained that although the political discussions on the AAWA were somewhat less advanced, it was planned to give Range States an opportunity to consider all of the documents related to the AAWA at a meeting to be held in association with the forthcoming Ramsar conference in Japan (June 1993). As the text of the AAWA and an Action Plan for Asian Anatidae were to be made available later in the day, it was decided to defer further discussion until Councillors had had an opportunity to consider them.

7. Mr. Dey pointed out the urgency of taking initiatives with respect to the western and central populations of the Siberian crane (*Grus leucogeranus*). He considered it important to ascertain the legal status of an Agreement that India had concluded with the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), as regards its applicability to the now independent States. The Secretariat explained that a Bonn Convention agreement had been drafted in 1992 by the International Crane Foundation (ICF), but that it considered a less formal Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) among the Range States concerned to be a more practical way of promoting short-term actions. Longer-term initiatives could eventually be incorporated in the AAWA. A number of Councillors expressed support for developing the MoU at this meeting, and it was agreed that a small working group should meet during the evening. A first draft of the MoU was prepared by the working group and the Secretariat, and it was agreed that the Secretariat should circulate a final version, together with a letter of introduction from the Chairman of the Standing Committee, to as many of the Range States as possible with a view to having further discussions in Kushiro, Japan, in association with the Ramsar conference being held in early June.

8. The Secretariat informed the meeting of progress on a draft Agreement on the conservation of Mediterranean/Black Sea small cetaceans. It expected to be in a position to circulate a revised draft in the autumn of 1993, after taking account of comments received during and after a consultation meeting held in Athens in October 1992. In this connection, Dr. Ford emphasized the importance of having Parties taking the initiative to sponsor Agreements through the difficult negotiation phase. He drew particular attention to the species and populations listed in Appendix 11 at the last meeting of the Conference of the Parties and to Resolution 3.3, which urges Parties that sponsor proposals to list species to take the lead in developing Agreements. In the case of the small cetaceans in question, Mr. Rao considered it essential to obtain information on their migratory patterns before attempting to elaborate specific Agreements. Dr. Perrin agreed that knowledge about the migration of small cetaceans was primitive and proposed that the Scientific Council adopt a recommendation calling for further research. Mr. Dey expressed the view that such research should focus on marine species,

while the Chairman considered freshwater species to be those most urgently in need of protection measures. The Council adopted the recommendation shown at Annex 4, and agreed that it should be redrafted in the form of a conference resolution to be considered first by the Council at its next meeting, and then transmitted to the Conference of the Parties. A summary of species in the Southeast Asia/Indo-Malay region which would benefit from conservation research appears at Annex 5.

9. In response to a question concerning the competence of the International Whaling Commission (IWC) as regards small cetaceans, the Co-ordinator explained the role of that body's small cetacean sub-committee. He pointed out that the IWC lacked the political framework - which CMS can offer - to follow through on its recommendations. Dr. Perrin added that the IWC was unlikely to come to a decision in the near future on the sensitive issue of competence for small cetaceans.

10. In the absence of the Councillor from the EEC, it was decided that no further discussion was needed on the draft Agreement for the Conservation of the White Stork since there had been no further progress to report. The EEC, which had offered to sponsor the Agreement, had not been in a position to develop it further. It had been suggested in various fora that the question of whether or not to incorporate specific provisions from that Agreement in the AEWA be raised at a negotiation session involving the Range States concerned.

Possible assistance of Scientific Councillors vis-à-vis existing CMS Agreements

11. Dr. Ford informed the meeting of developments concerning the Agreement on the Conservation of Bats in Europe, noting that only one more ratification was needed for the Agreement to enter into force. The Council then considered ways in which it might be of assistance in promoting the Agreement, and it was suggested that efforts be concentrated on encouraging non-member States to sign the Agreement. Mme. Engel announced that Luxembourg's ratification of the Agreement was about to be considered by the parliament and that ratification was anticipated in July 1993. Dr. Bankovics stated that he would propose that Hungary join, and Dr. Teixeira said that it was simply a matter of time before a political decision was taken in Portugal.

12. Drs. Edelstam and Ford briefed the Council on the status of the Agreement on the conservation of small cetaceans of the Baltic and North Seas, which is somewhat further from entry into force - having obtained only two of the necessary six ratifications. However, the Secretariat had been advised that ratification of the Agreement would be considered by the German and Danish parliaments later this year. (*Note from the Secretariat: it was learned after the meeting ended that Belgium ratified the Agreement on 14 May 1993.*)

13. In the context of the small cetaceans Agreement, Dr. Edelstam noted the financial impediments to participation by the Baltic States and asked whether any solution had been envisaged. The Co-ordinator explained that although this question had been considered in various fora, no practical solution had yet been found; it was hoped that the Global Environment Facility (GEF) might hold some promise. Such Agreements might also be made more attractive to developing countries if they provided for their involvement in research programmes.

14. The Chairman reported briefly on the Agreement on the Conservation of Seals in the Wadden Sea, referring to a summary of initiatives that had been prepared by the Common Wadden Sea Secretariat.

15. There was a general discussion of the role of the Council vis-à-vis existing CMS Agreements. It was suggested that the primary role of the Council ought to be in facilitating the development of new Agreements, and that CMS would benefit from participation in

meetings on a regional level. It was pointed out that Councillors often had particular specialities, which meant that they were competent in some areas and not in others. The Chairman concluded by suggesting that while the involvement of the Council as a whole in existing Agreements ought to be limited, individual Councillors might be of assistance.

Establishment of priorities for the development of future Agreements

16. The Chairman introduced document CMS/ScC.4/6 in which he proposed a number of criteria of importance for establishing priorities for the development of future Agreements. These include, *inter alia*: availability of information, migratory behaviour, conservation status, and the existence of other species with similar migratory behaviour or conservation status. The Secretariat indicated that the criteria would be revised, as necessary, and included as an input from the Scientific Council in the CMS strategy paper currently being developed.

17. There was a general discussion of the criteria that had been proposed. Dr. Moser disagreed with the suggestion in the document that no Agreement should be proposed in the absence of sufficient information on the species, and suggested that the criteria be ordered in a hierarchical fashion. Moreover, he felt that priority ought to be given to ensuring that the existing and soon-to-be concluded Agreements work effectively, and that any new Agreements to be developed ought to be limited to a manageable number. Dr. Schlatter stressed the importance of drawing up "Red Lists" of threatened species, which were available for only a few countries in Latin America. He believed that conservation status ought to be the most important criterion, since endangered species tended to attract the most interest and financing from international non-governmental organizations. There was a general discussion about the definition of "migratory" in the biological sense and the Convention's interpretation of the term. Dr. Pfeffer cited a number of examples of land-based mammals whose inclusion in or exclusion from the Appendices seemed questionable.

18. The meeting broke into regional sub-groups (representing Africa, the Americas, Asia/Oceania and Europe) in order to develop a list of species or groups warranting the development of Agreements, taking account of the agreed criteria. After the groups reported on their findings, the Chairman summarized the suggestions and invited individual Councillors to take responsibility for preparing a background paper which would give the rationale for developing an Agreement for one or more of the species or groups identified. Annex 6 lists all of the species or groups proposed as possible candidates for Agreements. In some cases, individual Councillors who agreed to work on the development of an Agreement are identified; in others, an alternative course of action is proposed.

19. The Secretariat stressed that it would be necessary to establish priorities for undertaking work on further Agreements, as it was unrealistic for the Convention to oversee the development of 10 or 15 Agreements at the same time, particularly as resources are already limited. It was agreed that the main task of Councillors before the next meeting would be to survey, in greater depth, the possibilities that existed for Agreements to be developed. There was a general consensus that Agreements for sahelo-saharan mammals and albatrosses (globally) ought to be among the first new initiatives to be considered. It was noted, however, that given the present circumstances in the sahelo-saharan region, it was unlikely that an Agreement could be finalized before the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties. Dr. Teixeira suggested that consideration be given to eventually fusing the Baltic/North Sea and Mediterranean/Black Sea small cetacean agreements, so as to incorporate the coastal waters of Portugal, Spain and France.

Matters concerning Agreements currently under development (continuation)

20. The Secretariat introduced the draft Agreement on the Conservation of Asian/Australasian Waterfowl (AAWA), drawing attention to a number of new elements contained in the present draft. These included a hierarchical system of appendices listing the species covered by the Agreement, provision for the creation of an Executive Committee, changes to the preamble and definitions in order to harmonize them with the AEWA, and the inclusion of a various suggestions that had been submitted by Australia. Councillors made a number of general points which the Secretariat undertook to incorporate in the revised draft to be circulated in June 1993 to Range States. Dr. Moser suggested that the reference to the preparation of Flyway Conservation Plans be amended to read "Species Conservation Plans", to reflect standard terminology and to avoid giving a misleading impression of their content. Dr. Edelstam considered that the main text of the Agreement should be limited to basic principles, leaving more specific provisions to the Action Plans. This might also have the advantage of simplifying the task of extending the Agreement to groups other than waterfowl, should that be considered appropriate. He also stressed the importance of making reference to the assistance that might be required by developing countries to implement the Agreement.

21. Mr. Rao suggested that Parties to the Agreement have the opportunity to make amendments to the Management Plan and that where two alternatives had been given in Article IV for species conservation measures, the first, less specific formulation was preferable. He also suggested that the linkage between the Agreement and the parent Convention be strengthened through the inclusion of a reporting requirement. Mr. Rao considered it inappropriate to link co-operative actions for raptors within the framework of an expanded AAWA due to overlap with the African/Eurasian Agreement. Dr. Moser indicated that development of a broader migratory birds Agreement would pose considerable difficulties. Dr. Devillers suggested that work on the waterfowl Agreement proceed as planned, and that consideration be given to incorporating other species later. The Chairman concluded that raptors should be dealt with at a later stage, either within or outside of the AAWA. Although there was no consensus as to how the Agreement might be extended to other groups, such as raptors or passerines, or whether this was even desirable, it was suggested that the text be drafted in such a way as not to exclude this possibility. Dr. Devillers pointed out the existing text required only limited changes in this regard.

Progress on review reports for selected Appendix I species (*Addax nasomaculatus*, *Gazella dorcas*, *Gazella leptoceros*, *Chlamydotis undulata*, *Numenius tenuirostris*, *Dendroica kirtlandii*, *Bos sauveli*, and Indo-Pacific populations of marine turtles)

22. The Secretariat introduced document CMS/ScC.4/8 concerning the preparation of review reports for selected Appendix I species, noting that the final reports should be submitted to the Secretariat by January 1994 to allow sufficient time for translation and reproduction. The meeting agreed that before they are put in their final form, the reports should be circulated to all members of the Council for review and comment, since they would be presented to the Conference of the Parties as Scientific Council documents.

Addax nasomaculatus*, *Gazella dorcas*, *Gazella leptoceros

23. Dr. Pfeffer introduced the draft review reports for the three species named above which, he reported, are threatened by uncontrolled hunting. This has been facilitated by the use of four-wheel drive vehicles and a proliferation of weapons. His recommendations for action were similar for all three species: strengthening legislative protection in the Range States concerned, prohibiting hunting from vehicles, carrying out new surveys and monitoring as soon as conditions

allowed (since much of the information on the species is now obsolete), establishing in situ captive-breeding programmes and co-ordinating governmental policies with respect to conservation and development. Apart from the species for which review reports had been prepared, Dr. Pfeffer considered that several other antelopes warranted listing in the CMS Appendices.

24. The Council welcomed Dr. Pfeffer's information that the Government of France had indicated its willingness to contribute to the development of an Agreement for sahelo-saharan mammals. It was agreed that a small working group should be established consisting of the following Councillors: Beudels, Bigan, Devillers, Ngog and Pfeffer. It would be charged, *inter alia*, with: (1) finalizing the review reports by the end of 1993; (2) elaborating an Action Plan including recommendations for specific measures to be implemented in accordance with Resolution 3.2 on Appendix I species; (3) investigating the potential for developing a CMS Agreement for sahelo-saharan mammals; and (4) developing proposals for the listing of additional species, as necessary. It was agreed that the working group would determine its own chairman and that the Secretariat should be contacted if it were necessary to convene another meeting.

Chlamydotis undulata

25. A small working group (Dey, Felemban, Frankenberg, Gayyed and Rao) was established to consider how best to proceed with work on the houbara bustard. Dr. Frankenberg reported that the population of houbara bustard in Israel was non-migratory and had stabilized at about 400 birds in total. Dr. Felemban reported that the population of Saudi Arabia (also about 400 birds) is migratory. Few records of breeding in the wild were available, however, and captive-bred birds had experienced difficulty adapting to wild conditions. Mr. Rao announced that IUCN intended to arrange a workshop in Pakistan in the coming months, which would serve to introduce CMS and its potential role vis-à-vis houbara bustard conservation.

26. It was agreed that the Councillors from each of the countries concerned would prepare a national review report on the species and submit it to the Secretariat by the beginning of October 1993. The Secretariat undertook to contact the Birdlife International Steppe and Grassland Birds Group in order to obtain additional information for the other Range States not represented in CMS. Thereafter, the Secretariat would compile the available information and circulate it to the members of the working group. The observer from Saudi Arabia agreed to investigate, in the meantime, what initiatives had already been taken in his country to develop an Agreement for houbara bustard, and to report his findings to the Secretariat by the end of July 1993. It was agreed that, if no Saudi Arabian initiative was forthcoming, the Secretariat would endeavour to work on a first draft of an Agreement, with the assistance of the Birds Group of Birdlife International.

Numenius tenuirostris

27. Dr. Devillers reported that an EEC project for *Numenius tenuirostris* had been developed in the light of Resolution 3.2, paragraph 4, and that the Scientific Council had been involved through Dr. Nowak. A contingency plan had been developed focussing on determining the location of the wintering grounds, developing a management plan for key staging areas (e.g. in Albania) and identifying the historical breeding range. The Council requested Dr. Devillers to finalize the review report with inputs from Birdlife International (which had produced a summary report for the last meeting of the Parties) and Dr. Nowak.

Dendroica kirtlandii

28. Dr. Nowak stated that there was no new information to report on this species. It was agreed that the Secretariat would look into obtaining further information, as requested by the Conference of the Parties, perhaps with the assistance of the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSBP).

Bos sauveli

29. Dr. Edelstam reported that there had been recent aerial sightings of koupreys in the border area of Cambodia, Laos, Thailand and Viet Nam and that trophies had been appearing in local markets in Thailand. He agreed to send a report to the Secretariat after compiling further information, some of which might be available through contacts in Thailand. Dr. Pfeffer indicated that two nuclei of koupreys had been identified in Viet Nam which, he said, was very interested in co-operating in a protection programme.

Indo-Pacific populations of marine turtles

30. Ms. Weaver informed the meeting that Australia had commissioned a comprehensive report on each of the marine turtles listed in Appendix I, which would be completed in two phases. Part I was expected to be completed by the end of 1993 and Part II in 1994. The report would summarize the life histories of the five species, and would give details of population status and trends, research and monitoring priorities, and conservation strategies. In addition, the proceedings of a workshop on marine turtle conservation, held in Australia in November 1990, would be published shortly and would be made available to Scientific Councillors.

31. The meeting considered that the question of what could be done for Appendix I species required further examination. A small committee was set up to examine the species listed in Appendix I with a view to recommending which ones ought to be the focus of concerted actions in accordance with Resolution 3.2, and to assess what had already been accomplished for the species and groups identified at the last meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The recommendations of the committee, which were adopted by the Council, are given in Annex 7. Specifically, it was agreed that four species currently listed in Appendix I (*Monachus monachus*, *Gazella dama*, *Chloephaga rubidiceps* and *Grus leucogeranus*) should be the focus of concerted action, and that four other species which have not yet been listed also warrant attention, subject to their inclusion in Appendix I (*Otis tarda*, *Oryx dammah*, *Chlamydotis undulata* (the entire species) and *Oxyura leucocephala*). Dr. Teixeira expressed support for the proposal to include *Monachus monachus* in the group species for which concerted action would be taken. Similarly, Dr. Moser supported the inclusion of *Chloephaga rubidiceps*. He added that IWRB had developed a project proposal for possible implementation by Dr. Schlatter and the nongovernmental organization: Wetlands for the Americas. The Chairman suggested that an Action Plan for the species be developed.

32. With respect to the species not yet listed in Appendix I, Dr. Bankovics offered to investigate the possibility of preparing a proposal to list *Otis tarda* and to develop an Agreement for the species. Dr. Teixeira recommended that such an Agreement integrate the Iberian peninsula and offered to provide inputs from Portugal. The Sahelo-Saharan mammal working group was requested to look into the listing of *Oryx dammah*. It was agreed that further steps with respect to the listing of *Chlamydotis undulata* would be considered within the houbara bustard working group which had just been established. Further initiatives with respect to *Oxyura leucocephala* are described in paragraph 37, below.

Scientific Council activities arising from resolutions of the Conference of the Parties and other recommendations

33. The Chairman drew attention to the reference in document CMS/ScC.4/7 to a Conference resolution directing the Scientific Council to give priority to recommending conservation and management measures for sirenians. The Secretariat reminded the Council of a decision taken at its third meeting to establish a working group on sirenians, which had not yet been done. Ms. Weaver reported that Australia was not in a position to fund any work on sirenians this year, but offered to investigate the possibility of giving higher priority to this group if the Scientific Council considered it important. The Secretariat noted that an IUCN/SSC Action Plan for sirenians was being developed, however, it was not clear when it would be ready. Dr. Sylla reported that manatees in West Africa (e.g. Senegal, Gambia, Guinea and Guinea-Bissau) probably migrated across international borders, but that additional information about their migratory behaviour was needed.

34. Referring to the same resolution, Ms. Weaver reported that Australia had given priority to initiatives with respect to albatrosses. A report was being prepared which would include recommendations on the listing of albatrosses in Appendices I and II as well as an examination of the problem of mortality caused by longline fishing. The report is expected to be completed in June 1993 and will be circulated to all Councillors before the next meeting. Prof. Vaz Ferreira expressed the view that albatrosses are threatened globally by tuna fisheries, and that the development of a global agreement would also be of interest to the fisheries concerned. A number of Councillors shared the view that oceanic birds in general would benefit from an international Agreement.

Draft outline for a paper on artificial barriers to migration

35. The Chairman introduced document CMS/ScC.4/9, an outline of a paper requested by the Council at its last meeting, concerning the problem of artificial barriers to migration. Dr. Moser considered that too much emphasis had been placed on the problem of the barriers themselves, and that the more general problem of habitat fragmentation needed to be addressed. A number of other Councillors made suggestions for minor additions or changes. A revised version of the outline appears at Annex 8. The Council agreed with the Chairman's suggestion that the paper be prepared through a consultancy and circulated in a condensed form to Councillors for comment. It would then be revised for the Council to consider at its next meeting.

Proposals for amendments to Appendices I and II

36. The Secretariat reminded the meeting that proposals for amending the CMS Appendices must be submitted by a Party to the Convention at least 150 days before the start of the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties. As the next meeting is likely to take place in May/June 1994, proposals should be ready by December 1993 or January 1994 at the latest.

37. Dr. Moser then introduced a proposal prepared by the International Waterfowl and Wetlands Research Bureau and The Wildfowl and Wetland Trust to list the White-headed duck, *Oxyura leucocephala*, in Appendix I (document CMS/ScC.4/10 Annex 1). The total population now numbers about 19,000 birds and is highly fragmented. The species is threatened by hybridization with the introduced species, *Oxyura jamaicensis*, whose range has been expanding. A Species Conservation Plan is being prepared which will provide guidance on a range of measures that Parties could take to benefit the species. Dr. Devillers indicated that the EEC would be willing to consider sponsorship of the proposal after consultation with the member

States. The Chairman suggested that the Species Conservation Plan be submitted along with the proposal for listing in order to encourage Parties to take immediate actions.

Proposal for a mechanism to review the CMS Appendices

38. The Chairman introduced document CMS/ScC.4/11, stressing the need for the Council to review the Appendices to ensure that they provide a sound basis for the Convention's activities. He proposed that the first step should be to survey each taxonomic group with a view to identifying those which include migratory species. Consideration should be given to listing, at the next meeting of the Parties and beyond, currently non-listed migratory species that are endangered or which would benefit from the elaboration of Agreements. He reminded the meeting that the Conference of the Parties had directed the Council to give particular attention to the listing of neotropical species. The Chairman proposed the following taxa as requiring urgent attention, in terms of their consideration for possible listing in the Appendices: Primates, Carnivora, Sirenia, Equidae, Bovidae, Diomedidae, Procellariidae, Ciconiidae, Threskiornithidae, Gruidae and Otidae. Dr. Frankenberg considered that the songbirds had not been given adequate attention under the Convention. Dr. Perrin indicated that information about the migratory status of many small cetaceans not listed in Appendix II was lacking and that further study of their listing would be needed in the future.

39. As there was general agreement with the taxa that had been identified, the Chairman requested the assistance of individual Councillors to examine first the question of whether species were migratory or non-migratory, and second to assess the extent to which they are threatened. Dr. Moser offered to work on the Ciconiidae and Threskiornithidae, with the assistance of the relevant IWRB specialist groups, and the Gruidae with the help of the International Crane Foundation. It was agreed that Dr. Bankovics, and the Chairman would work together on the Diomedidae and Procellariidae. It was suggested that the Chairman contact the Birdlife International Steppe and Grassland Birds Group to consider the Otidae and various IUCN/SSC specialist groups for the other taxa identified.

Proposals for amendments to Appendices I and II (continuation)

40. The Council considered some preliminary proposals prepared by Prof. Vaz Ferreira concerning the listing in Appendix 11 of: (1) the Uruguayan and Argentine populations of the black-necked swan, *Cygnus melancoryphus*; (2) all species of the genus *Diomedea*; and (3) the Uruguayan populations of the sea lion, *Otaria flavescens* Shaw. The meeting agreed that the black-necked swan was already covered by current listing of Anatidae; that the possible listing of albatrosses could be dealt with by Dr. Bankovics and through the work being carried out in Australia, with assistance from Prof. Vaz Ferreira; and that the possible listing of sea lions be considered at a future meeting.

Implications for CMS of work being carried out by IUCN on "Categories of Threat"

41. The Chairman drew attention to work being carried out by IUCN concerning the redefinition of the categories of threat used for including species in the IUCN Red List. An IUCN paper on the subject had been circulated as document CMS/ScC.4/Inf.4. The Secretariat considered it useful to raise the matter in the Scientific Council since the work had implications for CMS. Dr. Devillers was critical of some of the ideas that had been proposed in the IUCN paper, about which there was still considerable uncertainty since they had yet to be adopted. In the light of this uncertainty, he felt the Scientific Council should recommend that CMS decouple itself from the IUCN criteria and develop its own definition of "endangered". Dr. Ford agreed broadly with this suggestion, adding that the definition adopted should be fairly broad

so as not to exclude species which might not otherwise qualify for consideration under a more rigid criterion. He suggested that the resolution linking CMS to the 1988 IUCN definition of endangered - Resolution 2.2 - be amended but not repealed entirely, as certain parts of the resolution were still of value. Drs. Ford and Frankenberg considered the definition provided in the text of the Convention adequate.

42. Mr. Rao considered it premature to take a final decision on the matter before the IUCN criteria were formally adopted, which might take place at the time of the IUCN General Assembly in January 1994. The Council decided that individual Councillors should send their comments on the criteria directly to IUCN, that the concerns expressed in this meeting should be conveyed to the CMS Standing Committee, and that a working group (comprised of Bankovics, Devillers, Ford, Perrin and Rao) should prepare a document for the next meeting of the Council explaining the full implications of the IUCN criteria for CMS. Dr. Ford was requested to prepare, in the meantime, a draft resolution that would serve to remove the linkage with the IUCN definition. The text of the draft resolution is reproduced at Annex 9, together with commentary by the Secretariat.

Scientific Council inputs to a strategy for the future development of the Convention

43. The Secretariat introduced document CMS/ScC.4/12, an abridged version of a strategy paper for the future development of the Convention, prepared at the request of the third meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The Standing Committee had reviewed a first draft of the longer, yet still incomplete document in February 1993, and had considered it useful to receive inputs from other concerned bodies, including the Scientific Council. To that end, the Chairman of the Scientific Council had prepared a short paper outlining what he considered to be the Council's primary tasks in the coming years. The meeting agreed that the strategy paper should incorporate these ideas as part of the Council's input.

44. Dr. Edelstam. complimented the Secretariat on the paper. Several Councillors had specific comments on various sections, among them: the need to emphasize actions for Appendix I species through Resolution 3.2, the form and content of an overview report on Party reports, and the respective roles of the Scientific Council and the Scientific Committee established during each meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The comments are summarized in Annex 10.

Organization of a scientific symposium

45. The Chairman introduced document CMS/ScC.4/13 containing an outline of a draft programme for the scientific symposium that has been proposed to be held during the fourth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. Councillors made a number of specific suggestions, among them:

- invite a speaker to introduce the topic of migration (however some Councillors had reservations about this idea)
- begin with an introduction to the Bonn Convention, explaining what the Convention has to offer potential Parties, in terms of measures for Appendix I species and Appendix II species, respectively
- emphasize what has been done or is being done within the framework of the Convention (for example, initiatives for the Siberian crane) rather than emphasize initiatives for migratory species conducted independently

Dr. Ford expressed reservation about using as case studies the Greenland white-fronted goose - because it had already been cited frequently - and migratory salmon. Other Councillors suggested that the symposium highlight the problem of oceanic birds and hunting/fishing disturbance, which was also of importance to marine species.

46. The Chairman concluded the discussion by suggesting that the symposium have an African orientation. He agreed to prepare, in consultation with Dr. Boere (of the Netherlands) and the Secretariat, a second draft of the programme which would be circulated to Councillors for comment. He requested Councillors, in the meantime, to provide suggestions for possible speakers, bearing in mind that there may be financial implications.

List of common names for CMS species

47. The Secretariat had distributed at the beginning of the meeting document CMS/ScC.4/14 - a list of English, French and Spanish common names of species in the CMS Appendices - and had requested Councillors to provide their comments in writing during the meeting. As only a few comments had been received, Councillors were asked to submit any further comments to the Secretariat after the meeting. The Secretariat requested the assistance of french- and spanish-speaking Councillors in particular, to fill in the missing common names and to provide any editorial corrections.

Date and venue of the next meeting of the Scientific Council

48. The Secretariat informed the Council of arrangements for meetings to be held in association with the fourth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, which would likely take place in the first half of June 1994 at UNEP headquarters in Nairobi. At present, the plans provided for a meeting of the Scientific Council of 1 1/2 days' duration, to be preceded by the scientific symposium and perhaps a negotiation session for the African/Eurasian Waterfowl Agreement, and to be followed by the meeting of the Parties.

Any other business

49. The Chairman raised the question of whether a proposal should be submitted to the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties giving Parties the opportunity to nominate an alternate representative to the Scientific Council who would act as a substitute when the regular Councillor is prevented from attending. Some Councillors considered it important for there to be continuity in the Council's membership in order to facilitate constructive discussion from one meeting to the next. However, it was recognized that it was also in the Council's interest for all Parties to be represented at each meeting. It was agreed that the Secretariat should formulate a proposal to the effect that Parties have an opportunity to formally nominate an alternate representative authorized to participate in the absence of the regular Councillor, but that the nomination of an alternate Councillor be left to the discretion of individual Parties. It was further agreed that no provision should be made for alternates to the Conference-appointed Councillors, as they are appointed to serve on the Council on account of their specialized expertise.

50. Before closing the meeting, the Chairman thanked the participants and the Secretariat staff for their contributions, noting that there was much work to be accomplished before the Council's next meeting.

List of Participants

Chairman:	Dr Wim Wolff	Netherlands
Members:	Dr Attila Bankovics	Hungary
	Dr Roseline Beudels (part-time)	Belgium
	Dr Michael Cohen	South Africa
	Dr Pierre Devillers (part-time)	Belgium
	Mr Shri S C Dey	India
	Dr Carl Edelstam	Sweden
	Ms Edmée Engel	Luxembourg
	Dr Michael Ford	United Kingdom
	Dr Eliezer Frankenberg	Israel
	Dr Michael Moser	Conference-appointee
	Dr Jean Ngog Nje	Cameroon
	Dr Eugeniusz Nowak	Germany
	Ms Gunn Paulsen (part-time)	Norway
	Dr William Perrin	Conference-appointee
	Dr Pierre Pfeffer	Conference-appointee
	Mr Gerald Ajongbah Punguse	Ghana
	Mr Adbul Latif Rao	Pakistan
	Dr Roberto Schlatter	Conference-appointee
	Dr Seydina Issa Sylla	Senegal
	Dr António Teixeira	Portugal
	Mr Namory Traore	Mali
	Prof Raúl Vaz Ferreira	Uruguay
	Ms Karen Weaver	Australia
Observers:	Mr Abdel Kader Bangoura	Guinea
	Dr Abdelrhman El-Hawawi (part-time)	Saudi Arabia
	Dr Hassan M. Felemban	Saudi Arabia
	Dr Mervat M. Gayyed	Egypt (on behalf of Dr Fouda)
	Dr Ved Mitra (part-time)	India
Secretariat:	Mr Arnulf Müller-Helmbrecht	Co-ordinator
	Mr Douglas Hykle	Programme Officer

Apologies were received from the following Councillors: Bel Hadj Kacem (Tunisia), Bigan (France), Grillo (Monaco, CMS Party as of 1.6.93), Helle (Finland), Madsen (Denmark), Morillo (Spain), Spina (Italy), Torres (Chile) and Wilson (Ireland).

List of documents considered by the meeting

Provisional agenda	CMS/ScC.4/1 Rev. 1	
Annotated provisional agenda	CMS/ScC.4/2	Annexes 1, 2
Report on intersessional activities	CMS/ScC.4/3	
Matters concerning draft Agreements currently under development	CMS/ScC.4/4	
Possible assistance of Scientific Councillors vis-à-vis existing CMS Agreements	CMS/ScC.4/5	Annexes 1, 2, 3
Establishment of priorities for the development of future Agreements	CMS/ScC.4/6	
Scientific Council activities arising from conference resolutions and other recommendations	CMS/ScC.4/7	
Progress on review reports for selected Appendix 1 species	CMS/ScC.4/8	Annexes 1, 2, 3
Draft outline for a paper on artificial barriers to migration	CMS/ScC.4/9	Annex 1
Proposals for amendments to Appendices I and II	CMS/ScC.4/10	Annex 1
Proposal for a mechanism to review the CMS Appendices	CMS/ScC.4/11	
Scientific Council inputs to a strategy for the future development of the Convention	CMS/ScC.4/12	Annexes 1, 2
Organization of the scientific symposium to be held during the 4th meeting of the Conference of the Parties	CMS/ScC.4/13	Annex 1
List of common names for CMS species	CMS/ScC.4/14	
Date and venue of the next meeting of the Scientific Council	CMS/ScC.4/15	Annex 1
Text of the Convention, Appendices I and II, List of Parties	CMS/ScC.4/Inf.1	
Report of the third meeting of the Scientific Council	CMS/ScC.4/Inf.2	
Scientific Council membership list	CMS/ScC.4/Inf.3	
Implications for CMS of work being carried out by IUCN on "Categories of Threat"	CMS/ScC.4/Inf.4	
Revised standard formats for reports by Parties	CMS/ScC.4/Inf.5	

Other documents

Agreement on the Conservation of Asian/Australasian Waterfowl, Action Plan for Asian Anatidae (working drafts, May 1993)

Agreement on the Conservation of Bats in Europe

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

Note on Siberian cranes (submitted by India)

Article: Seabirds in Strife (*Forest & Bird*, November 1990)

Draft proposals to include in Appendix II: *Otaria flavescens* Shaw (Uruguay populations), *Cygnus melancoryphus* (Uruguay and Argentina populations), and all species of the genus *Diomedea* (prepared by Prof. Vaz Ferreira)

List of species to be considered for the Appendices (prepared by Dr. Schlatter)

(BOLD PRINT SIGNIFIES DOCUMENT IS AVAILABLE IN SPANISH AND/OR FRENCH)

Fourth Meeting of the CMS Scientific Council

17-19 May 1993, Bonn

Agenda

1. Opening remarks by the Chairman and Secretariat
2. Adoption of the agenda
3. Report on intersessional activities
4. Matters concerning draft Agreements currently under development:
 - African/Eurasian Waterfowl Agreement
 - Asian/Australasian Waterfowl Agreement
 - Mediterranean/Black Sea Small Cetacean Agreement
5. Possible assistance of Scientific Councillors vis-à-vis existing CMS Agreements:
 - European bats
 - Baltic/North Sea small cetaceans
 - Wadden Sea seals
6. Establishment of priorities for the development of future Agreements
7. Scientific Council activities arising from resolutions of the Conference of the Parties and other recommendations
8. Progress on review reports for selected Appendix I species (*Addax nasomaculatus*, *Gazella dorcas*, *Gazella leptoceros*, *Chlamydotis undulata*, *Numenius tenuirostris*, *Dendroica kirtlandii*, *Bos sauveli*, and Indo-Pacific populations of marine turtles).
9. Draft outline for a paper on artificial barriers to migration
10. Proposals for amendments to Appendices I and II
11. Proposal for a mechanism to review the CMS Appendices
12. Scientific Council inputs to a strategy for the future development of the Convention including an assessment of the relative importance of Range States in terms of the occurrence of migratory species within their jurisdiction
13. Organization of a scientific symposium to be held during the fourth meeting of the Conference of the Parties
14. Implications for CMS of work being carried out by IUCN on "Categories of Threat"
15. List of common names for CMS species
16. Date and venue of the next meeting of the Scientific Council
17. Any other business

Recommendation of the Scientific Council concerning small cetacean research

Whereas the Bonn Convention concerns itself with wild animal populations that migrate across international boundaries;

Whereas the Bonn Convention and certain existing and contemplated regional international Agreements under its auspices include small cetaceans;

Recognizing that the migratory behaviour of most small cetaceans in most regions is scientifically very poorly known, making the nature and scope of international conservation problems difficult to determine, and making regional and international co-operation difficult to achieve;

It is resolved that the Parties to the Bonn Convention be urged to carry out scientific studies to investigate and describe the migrations of small cetaceans in their waters, giving priority to species and populations of threatened or uncertain status;

Furthermore it is resolved that those member states having the technical expertise and resources necessary for such studies advise and assist other members in planning and carrying out needed studies including, for example, sighting surveys conducted over seasons and years, tagging, use of natural marks, conventional radio-tracking or satellite-based radio-tracking.

Small Marine Cetaceans of the Southeast Asia / Indo-Malay Region

(Prepared by Dr. Perrin)

Known or suspected migratory species that would benefit from conservation research and assessment:

<i>Tursiops truncatus</i>	II*
<i>Stenella attenuata</i>	II*
<i>Stenella longirostris</i>	II*
<i>Stenella coeruleoalba</i>	II*
<i>Delphinus delphis</i>	II*
<i>Globicephala macrorhynchus</i>	
<i>Grampus griseus</i>	II*
<i>Peponocephala electra</i>	
<i>Pseudorca crassidens</i>	
<i>Steno bredanensis</i>	
<i>Lagenodelphis hosei</i>	
others ?	

* but only some populations presently listed in Appendix II

Problems

1. Incidental catches in fisheries - growing rapidly (partly documented)
2. Directed catches (partly documented)
3. Live captures (in Thailand and elsewhere)
4. Fauna is very poorly known (distribution and abundance)
5. Some populations may be over-exploited (need to document abundance and catches)

Range States

CMS Parties: Australia, UK (Hong Kong), Portugal (Macao)

Signatories: Philippines

Others: Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, China (southern coasts) including Taiwan, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand, Vietnam

See also: "REPORT OF IWC SUB-COMMITTEE ON SMALL CETACEANS" (Kyoto, 1993)

Possible new Agreements to be developed for Appendix II species

Species / group

Cameroon river dolphins / West African manatees	Sylla
Sahelo-saharan mammals	Working Group
African elephants	
Wild dogs	Sylla (perhaps)
African raptors	(possibly incorporate in AEWA)
Marine turtles (West Africa)	
Cheetahs	
Gorilla ssp.	Ngog
Chimpanzee	Sylla
African bats	
Derby eland	Sylla
Pelicans (global)	(incorporate in AEWA / AAWA)
Asian raptors	(possibly incorporate in AEWA / AAWA)
Fruit bats (Asia)	
Small cetaceans (southeast Asia - cf. Annex 5)	Perrin
Marine turtles (Indo-Pacific)	Weaver
Houbara bustard	Working group
Patagonian coastal species	Schlatter
Altiplano species (flamingoes)	Schlatter
South American waterfowl (southern)	Schlatter
Manatees (America)	
Mediterranean monk seal	
Great bustard	Bankovics
Other European migratory birds	(incorporate in AEWA)
Albatrosses / Other oceanic birds (global)	Weaver (Oceania) / Vaz Ferreira
<u>Migratory river species</u>	
Mekong	Edelstam
Pantanal / La Plata	Vaz Ferreira / Schlatter
Danube	
Iberian rivers	

Notes:

The suggestions of possible candidates for Agreements are shown in the left-hand column. The right-hand column shows the name of a Councillor who has offered to prepare for the next meeting a background paper on the species or group and to investigate the possibility of developing an Agreement. In some cases, no Councillor was identified to carry out this work. In others, the Council agreed on an alternative course of action - i.e., the species or group might eventually be incorporated in one of the Agreements currently under development (the African/Eurasian Waterfowl Agreement (AEWA) or Asian/Australasian Waterfowl Agreement (AAWA)).

Recommendations of the Scientific Council concerning concerted actions for Appendix I Species

(cf. Resolution 3.2, paragraph 4, of the third meeting of the Conference of the Parties)

1. The Scientific Council reiterated the urgent need to promote and assist concerted action, under the provisions of the Bonn Convention, for Appendix I species.
2. The Council thus reemphasized the particular importance of implementing Resolution 3.2, paragraph 4, of the third meeting of the Conference of the Parties.
3. The Council noted that such action, to be fully effective, must be directed at a small number of highly threatened species for which action under the Bonn Convention is possible and adequate.
4. The Council reviewed the list of priority species identified by the third meeting of the Conference of the Parties as candidates for attention under Resolution 3.2 in order to determine which should and can realistically, in the sense of paragraph 4, be the object of concerted action by the Parties.
5. Of these species, the Scientific Council identified the following as fulfilling these conditions: *Addax nasomaculatus*, *Gazella dorcas*, *Gazella leptoceros*, *Chlamydotis undulata*, *Numenius tenuirostris* and Indo-Pacific marine turtles. It considers *Dendroica kirtlandii* and *Bos sauveli* as not, in the main, fulfilling these conditions since none of the Range States is a Party to the Convention.
6. Of the species identified, the Scientific Council:
 - noted that *Numenius tenuirostris* is currently the object of concerted action in accordance with Resolution 3.2, paragraph 4;
 - delegated to an *ad hoc* working group it constituted - comprising the Councillors for Belgium, Cameroon, the European Community, France, and the Conference-appointed Councillor, Dr. Pfeffer - the task of preparing a concerted action plan for sahelo-saharan antelopes; and
 - urged the undertaking of similar plans for *Chlamydotis undulata* and Indo-Pacific marine turtles.
7. The Scientific Council further considered Appendix I with a view to identifying additional species that might need concerted actions under Resolution 3.2. It selected to this effect: *Monachus monachus*, *Gazella dama*, *Chloephaga rubidiceps* and *Grus leucogeranus*.
8. The Scientific Council also took into consideration species that are not presently listed in Appendix I, but which appear to be in urgent need of concerted action. On the evidence presented, the Council selected: *Otis tarda*, *Oryx dammah*, *Chlamydotis undulata* (entire species) and *Oxyura leucocephala*.
9. The Scientific Council thus recommends to the Conference of the Parties the inclusion of *Monachus monachus*, *Gazella dama*, *Chloephaga rubidiceps*, *Grus leucogeranus* among species to be considered under paragraphs 1 and 4 of Resolution 3.2.
10. It further recommends to the Conference of the Parties the consideration of *Otis tarda*, *Oryx dammah*, *Chlamydotis undulata* (entire species) and *Oxyura leucocephala*, subject to the submission and acceptance of a formal recommendation for their inclusion in Appendix I. The Council recommends that if the species are included in Appendix I they also be retained in Appendix II to encourage the conclusion of Agreements.

Revised outline for paper on artificial barriers to migration

1. Introduction; concepts of resistance and connectivity of the environment
2. Altered landscapes
 - 2.1 Water
 - 2.2 Land (including establishment of townships)
3. Localized barriers (i.e., "permanent" structures) and potential consequences
 - 3.1 In water
 - 3.1.1 Hydroelectric dams
 - 3.1.2 Weirs, sluices and locks
 - 3.1.3 Barrages
 - 3.2 On land
 - 3.2.1 Fences (e.g. veterinary fences)
 - 3.2.2 Major roads
 - 3.2.3 Canals
 - 3.2.4 Ditches (brief review: less important for international migration)
 - 3.2.5 Pipelines (e.g. oil, gas) (brief review)
 - 3.2.6 Overhead electric power lines, pylons (brief review)
 - 3.2.7 Other high structures (television/radio towers)
4. Case studies
 - examples of each type of barrier
5. Remedial measures, recommendations
 - 5.1 General
 - physical planning, EIA, baseline surveys, determination of genetic variability
 - 5.2 Specific
 - measures to mitigate disturbance during construction
 - design features: e.g. fish ladders, creation of semi-natural conservation areas etc.
6. Conclusions pertinent to the aims of the Bonn Convention

Draft Resolution on Guidelines for Application of the Term "Endangered"

(Prepared by the Scientific Council for the consideration of the Conference of the Parties)

The Scientific Council discussed at its fourth meeting (Bonn, 17-19 May 1993) an IUCN proposal to revise its "categories of threat" for species. The proposal is still under consideration by IUCN, whose General Assembly may adopt the new criteria in January 1994.

Concern was expressed about the possible implications for CMS of the new IUCN definition of "endangered". Several Councillors supported the view that CMS ought to decouple itself from the IUCN definition, while one Councillor considered it premature to take a decision now to sever CMS's link with the 1988 IUCN criteria, since the new criteria are still under development. It was agreed that individual Councillors should send their comments on the criteria to IUCN, and that a working group of five Councillors should prepare a document for the next meeting of the Council. In addition, at the Council's request Dr. Ford prepared the following draft resolution which could serve to remove the linkage with the IUCN definition, should this course of action be agreed by the Scientific Council and the Conference of the Parties when they next meet:

Draft Resolution on Guidelines for Application of the Term Endangered

Recognising that the term 'endangered' is interpreted in Article I.1.(e) of the Convention;

Recognising that a number of species currently listed on Appendix I are not classified as 'endangered' by IUCN but benefit from the protection offered by Appendix I listing;

Considering that it is inappropriate that responsibility for the interpretation of a key term in the Convention text should be assigned to another organisation;

The fourth meeting of the conference of the Parties hereby:

REPEALS sub-paragraph 1 (b) of Conference Resolution 2.2.

Note: If, at its next meeting, the Scientific Council decides to elaborate further guidelines for the application of the term 'endangered,' additional operative paragraphs may be inserted.

Comments of the Secretariat

It could be disadvantageous both for IUCN and CMS to have different, perhaps incompatible definitions of the term "endangered". While a common approach is desirable, the interpretation that is finally agreed upon by the Scientific Council, and ultimately by the Conference of the Parties, must not contradict the definition already given in the text of the Convention.

The Secretariat assumes that the draft resolution, above, will be considered by the working group in the context of its report to the Council, which should include an evaluation of the final version of the IUCN definition. The following considerations might be discussed by the working group in order to find an appropriate solution:

1. In adopting Resolution 2.2, the Conference of the Parties apparently considered the definition of "endangered" in Article I 1. (e) as not sufficiently self-explanatory. If the definition in the text is now considered adequate, justification should be given.
2. If the final version of the new IUCN definition of "endangered" turns out to be a suitable interpretation of what is meant in Article I 1. (e) of the Convention, a proposal could be considered to amend Resolution 2.2 in that sense.
3. If the new IUCN definition is not acceptable, the Conference might consider:
 - a) leaving Resolution 2.2 as is stands (linking CMS to the 1988 IUCN definition of endangered), or
 - b) amending Resolution 2.2 in such a way that it states explicitly the following definition of "endangered" (or a variation thereof) which is given in the 1988 IUCN Red List of Threatened Animals, but removes the mention of the 1988 IUCN Red List which has, in any case, been superseded:

ENDANGERED:

"Taxa in danger of extinction and whose survival is unlikely if the causal factors continue operating.

Included are taxa whose numbers have been reduced to a critical level or whose habitats have been so drastically reduced that they are deemed to be in immediate danger of extinction. Also included are taxa that may be extinct but have definitely been seen in the wild in the past 50 years."

Comments on the strategy paper for the future development of the Convention

(Abridged version: document CMS/ScC.4/12)

- paragraph 86, dealing with the definition of the term "endangered" should be redrafted, in order to reflect the decision taken at this meeting.
- noting that a proposal to delete a number of species from the Appendices at the last meeting had been withdrawn, largely due to a lack of information, Dr. Edelstam suggested that better supporting documentation for deletion proposals be provided in future.
- Dr. Devillers expressed the view that Section 5.1 should give greater emphasis to the concerted actions called for in Resolution 3.2, paragraph 4. Dr. Moser felt that this section should also reflect a longer-term vision of the usefulness of review reports, perhaps including the establishment of a database.
- the proposal in paragraph 95 to gather information on existing projects sponsored by other organizations and of relevance to migratory species was considered too ambitious; a more pragmatic approach was needed (e.g. calling upon other organizations to report to CMS).
- Dr. Ford expressed strong support for the idea of creating a special "Migratory Species Conservation Fund" through which to finance small-scale projects that would benefit migratory species; the Secretariat noted, however, that some resistance to the idea had been expressed in the Standing Committee.
- Dr. Schlatter emphasized the importance of Party reports. There was support for the idea of preparing an overview of reports submitted. The overview should highlight the state of the species concerned and provide an overall assessment of the available information, rather than be a critique of each Party report, since deficiencies in individual reports would be self-evident. It was suggested that the overview be done by the Secretariat if resources allowed, or at least be done under its supervision, but that only a modest amount of funds should be expended for this purpose.
- it was agreed that paragraph 123 should be revised to reflect the discussions at this meeting, and should give a realistic view of what can be developed by the Convention. Dr. Perrin pointed out that there was now a regional Agreement for small cetaceans in the eastern tropical Pacific mediated by the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission. He agreed to send a copy to the Secretariat.
- Dr. Schlatter suggested that CMS take advantage of international networks to promote the Convention, including for example, an FAO/UNEP publication "*Flora, Fauna y Areas Silvestres*" published in Santiago.
- Dr. Ford proposed that consideration be given to the relationship between the Scientific Council and the sessional Scientific Committee of the Conference of the Parties, which essentially reconsiders the issues discussed by the Scientific Council only a few days earlier.
- Councillors expressed a range of views on the question of which language(s) meetings of the Scientific Council ought to be conducted in. Some Councillors, while recognizing the high cost of interpretation, felt that the discussion was impoverished by a lack of interpretation for french- and spanish-speaking Councillors. Several others considered that poorly executed interpretations - as a result of unfamiliarity with technical terms - often caused even more misunderstanding in meetings of this kind. It was proposed that at least the basic documents for the meeting be translated into French and Spanish.