

1st Meeting of the Sessional Committee of the CMS Scientific Council (ScC-SC1)

Bonn, Germany, 18 – 21 April 2016

UNEP/CMS/ScC-SC1/Report

REPORT OF THE MEETING

Opening of the Meeting and Organizational Matters

1. Opening of the Meeting

1. The Chair of the Sessional Committee of the Scientific Council, Fernando Spina (Italy), welcomed participants, noting that there was a wide representation of Scientific Councillors, partner IGOs and NGOs present at the meeting.
2. The Convention was entering new territory with this being the first meeting of the Sessional Committee of the Scientific Council, established by the Parties at COP11. One of the tasks of the meeting would be to agree a Programme of Work (POW) for the Committee and establish how it would work with the wider Scientific Council. At the mid-point of the triennium, the Committee would also have to consider the advice that it would be giving to Parties at COP12 in 2017.
3. Documents relating to the meeting had been posted online but some had been subject to revision and participants were asked to ensure that they had access to the most recent versions.
4. Bradnee Chambers, the Executive Secretary of CMS, also welcomed participants to Bonn and the facilities of the UN Campus, which had been provided by the German Government and housed several UN bodies including the UNFCCC Secretariat and. He explained that the Sessional Committee had been established as part of the implementation of the recommendations arising from the “Future Shape” process initiated at COP9. It was hoped that the Committee would make the Scientific Council a more effective tool and it was important to have the new structures fully operational and to complete the transition as soon as possible. The Sessional Committee should be more streamlined and focused as a tool for identifying and addressing the priorities of the Convention as well as being less costly to operate.
5. In addition to dealing with the transitional arrangements of the Sessional Committee, the meeting also had some substantive issues to address in the run-up to COP12, and these included connectivity and species culture.
6. Some people that were unable to attend the meeting in person would have the opportunity of participating through a Webex connection which had been kindly set up by the UNFCCC technical staff. This facility would further enhance the reputation CMS enjoyed for openness and inclusion. Thanks were due to the Host Government, Germany, for providing interpretation.
7. The Chair pointed out that the CMS Standing Committee was represented at the meeting in the person of Øystein Størkersen, who was the Chair of that body.
8. Mr Størkersen congratulated Mr Spina on his appointment to the Chair of the Committee, expressing confidence that the Committee was in capable hands and noting that present at the meeting were many familiar faces and some new ones which provided a mix of experience and

new perspectives. The Committee needed to be set up quickly so that it could continue delivering the high quality service provided in the past by the full Council. He suggested that the Committee should review its tasks and concentrate on the important issues such as climate change, renewable energy and illegal killing.

2. Adoption of the Agenda and Meeting Schedule

9. Marco Barbieri (Scientific Adviser, CMS Secretariat) introduced the latest versions of the two documents, the provisional agenda and documents UNEP/CMS/ScC-SC1/Doc.2.1/Rev.2 and the provisional annotated agenda and meeting schedule UNEP/CMS/ScC-SC1/Doc.2.2/Rev.1.
10. Mr Barbieri gave further explanations of how it was proposed to conduct the meeting. The Committee would meet in plenary dealing with all agenda items up to Agenda Item 11 (Progress on other matters requiring Scientific Council advice) until the afternoon of Wednesday, 20 April. A series of Working Groups would be established which would meet for half a day before the plenary was reconvened to conclude business on the final day. The schedule could be amended if the need arose.
11. Regarding the running order, one change was proposed and Item 10.3 on terrestrial species would be taken on Tuesday morning rather than afternoon because of the availability of the member of staff leading on the issue.
12. There were two "open" agenda items – item 11 (Progress on other matters requiring Scientific Council advice) and item 13 (Any other business). Members of the Committee were invited to flag any issues that needed to be raised under these items. Barry Baker (COP-appointed Councillor for Bycatch) felt that given the number of resolutions passed over the years at successive sessions of the Conference of the Parties on the problem of bycatch, this issue should be given greater prominence. He also thought that the Strategic Plan was a matter primarily for the Standing Committee to consider and questioned whether it was commensurate for the Sessional Committee to dedicate so much time to discussing it.
13. The Executive Secretary said that the Scientific Council as the main technical advisory body had a significant role to play in the development of the Strategic Plan and the Chair of the Strategic Plan Working Group was keen to conduct as wide a consultation as possible. He did not think that the time allocated was excessive. The Chair of the Strategic Plan Working Group would be attending the meeting the following day and this would present an opportunity to discuss the Plan with her. Mr Barbieri also pointed out that Resolution 11.2 identified a specific role for the Scientific Council in developing the indicators relating to the implementation of the Strategic Plan.
14. One document which had been produced after the List of Documents had been finalized was the indicator factsheet relating to the Strategic Plan (Agenda item 5.2). Parties had been officially informed that the factsheet was available through CMS Notification 2016/008.
15. Malta Qwathekana (Vice-Chair of the Scientific Council, South Africa) raised concerns about the addition of new agenda items that were not accompanied by supporting documentation. There was also a risk of overburdening the Committee when it already faced a heavy agenda. She asked whether an iterative process could be devised to allow wider consultation for the preparation of the agenda, which would enable new items to be raised in a timely way allowing Committee Members to consider the issues in advance.
16. Mr Barbieri said that the first draft of the agenda had been published well in advance and had been accompanied by a request that Committee Members propose additional items as they saw fit. However, a more formal procedure could be considered when the agenda item concerning the Rules of Procedure was discussed (agenda Item 3.2).

Documents had been prepared by the Secretariat for matters of substance that had been notified in advance. Members wishing to raise additional items were invited to produce supporting documentation.

17. James Williams (UK) returned to the point of the input of the Scientific Council into the development of the Strategic Plan indicators. He said that it was important that the work of the Scientific Council should relate clearly to the Strategic Plan and the links should be made explicit. He also agreed with Ms Qwathekana that the early publication of documents was helpful for conducting national consultations before meetings.
18. Nicola Crockford (BirdLife International) raised the issue of the task forces on energy and illegal killing, reporting that good progress had been made with establishing both since the adoption of the Resolutions at COP11. Neither of the task forces seemed to be fully covered in the POW, and Ms Crockford requested that the Secretariat provide an update on developments.
19. Giuseppe Notarbartolo di Sciara (COP-appointed Councillor for Aquatic Mammals) asked that as well as bycatch a number of other issues might be raised under agenda Item 11, notably boat-based wildlife watching, marine debris and swim-with-dolphin operations. Mr Barbieri said that these issues could be raised at appropriate times throughout the meeting and could be added as emerging issues to the POW.
20. The Chair agreed that guidance on activities such as boat-based wildlife watching and swimming with dolphins was important, as the public participated in such activities in good faith because of their interest in nature without being aware of the potential harm they were doing.
21. Mr Baker, in his capacity as putative Chair of the Aquatic Working Group said that he had assumed that these issues would be raised when that Working Group met. Mr Barbieri said that either agenda item 11 or during each of agenda items relating to the species groups seemed appropriate.
22. Dieudonné Ankara (Republic of Congo) said that diseases such as ebola and avian 'flu were important issues in Africa and should be discussed.
23. The Chair pointed out that CMS was actively addressing animal disease and saw no reason not to include the issue on the agenda if time allowed.

2.1 Provisional Agenda and Documents

24. The provisional agenda and the list of documents were adopted

2.2 Provisional Annotated Agenda and Meeting Schedule

25. The provisional annotated agenda and the meeting schedule were adopted.

Strategic and Institutional Matters

3. Scientific Council Organizational changes

26. The Chair introduced this item by stating that significant reforms had been approved by COP11 and the Secretariat would explain the implications.

3.1 Developments since COP11 and next steps until COP12

27. Mr Barbieri (CMS Secretariat) gave an illustrated presentation pointing out that the Scientific Council still existed but the new entity, the Sessional Committee, had taken over responsibility for certain tasks.
28. The task of selecting members of the Sessional Committee had been assigned to the Conference of the Parties with the exception of the initial appointments in the transitional period which had been devolved to the Standing Committee at its 44th meeting. The Terms of Reference (TOR) for the Sessional Committee had been drafted by the Secretariat in consultation with the Scientific Council and had been submitted to the Standing Committee which had endorsed them for adoption by the next COP.
29. On those areas where the Resolution was not explicit regarding procedures, the Secretariat had sought guidance from the Standing Committee. In relation to the appointment of Sessional Committee members, Resolution 11.4 requested the Secretariat to provide for a consultative process in order to elaborate, in consultation with the Standing Committee, its recommendation to the Conference of the Parties on the composition of the Sessional Committee (Res.11.4, § 7). From the discussion at StC44 a broad consensus had emerged for an option providing for the identification of candidate Party-appointed members by the regions through a consultation process among the Parties in the regions, coordinated by the relevant members of the Standing Committee, and the submission of definite recommendations on the candidates to be appointed to the COP, formulated in consultation between the Secretariat and the Standing Committee. Further details can be found in paragraphs 112-122 of the draft [StC44 report](#).
30. A few issues still needed to be clarified. The Secretariat would also make recommendations on how to implement the provision of the Resolution which foresaw that half of the members of the Committee should be (re-)elected at each COP. Normally the term of a Committee Member would be two triennia but in the transitional phase, to establish the staggered elections, half of the members would have to serve just for a triennium. The Resolution was also silent regarding the election of replacement members where the original appointee resigned. This was the case for one of the Members chosen from South and Central America and the Caribbean, who had changed job and was no longer able to serve on the Committee. The Resolution also made no provision for alternate members to substitute for appointees unable to attend a particular meeting.
31. The Chair thanked the Secretariat for its assistance in guiding the Council and the Sessional Committee through these uncharted waters.
32. Mr Williams (UK) pointed out the arithmetical problems presented by the Resolution which required that half of the members of the Committee should be elected at each COP which posed a difficulty given that there was an odd number of regional representatives (15) with three members from each of five regions. He added that account should also be taken of both regional balance and scientific expertise in determining which of the councillors should step down.
33. Ms Qwathakana (South Africa) asked whether people retiring from the Scientific Council could continue to serve on the Sessional Committee. Mr Barbieri said that the Resolution establishing the Committee made it clear that members of the Committee should also be members of the full Council. It was also clear that appointment to the Sessional Committee was a personal one and that the replacement as nationally appointed councillor would not take over the place on the Sessional Committee. There was also an expectation that on accepting appointment, Members of the Sessional Committee were committed to serving their full term of two triennia. With regard to the rotation and identifying the half of the members to step down after a single triennium, Ms Qwathakana suggested asking for volunteers first.

34. Mr Baker asked whether it was also the intention that the COP-appointed Councillors would also be subject of rotation with half having to step down at each COP and whether they would have to leave the Council, which would be detrimental to continuity. Mr Barbieri said that on the subject of rotation the Resolution made no distinction between the COP-appointed councillors and the regional representatives so could not give a definitive answer. The issue would be raised with the Standing Committee for clarification.
35. Mr Williams (UK), who had served on the working group dealing with this subject at COP11 recalled that the number of COP-appointed councillors on the Sessional Committee was set at nine, because there were currently nine such positions. There was, however, no expectation that should further COP-appointed positions be created that all new appointees would automatically become members of the Sessional Committee. Factors such as balance and workload would determine whether to increase the membership.
36. Alison Wood (WDC) commented that it was difficult to find people with the broad expertise required to contribute to the different issues covered by the Convention and agreed that it was important to ensure continuity.

3.2 Revision of the Rules of Procedure of the Scientific Council

37. Mr Barbieri (CMS Secretariat) explained that a prerequisite for the operationalization of the Sessional Committee was a review of the Rules of Procedure (ROP) of the Scientific Council. A preliminary analysis of the sections of the extant ROP in need of revision was contained in Document ScC-SC1/Doc 3.2. The Standing Committee had already adopted the Terms of Reference of the Scientific Council and the ROP needed to be consistent with these.
38. Mr Barbieri suggested that the ROP be dealt with in an intersessional process rather than in plenary and that the Working Group dealing with institutional matters be given the task of deciding how to proceed.
39. Mr Williams (UK) said that while the subject was rather dry it was extremely important, especially during the infancy of the new structure. Dedicating time to ensuring that everything was set up correctly at the outset would save time in the long run. There were some time constraints, as the draft ROP had to be presented to the Standing Committee and the deadline for documents for its 45th meeting was approaching. He also suggested that, as far as documentation for the meetings were concerned, CMS might follow the lead of CITES by imposing an upper limit of 12 pages for each document; this helped focus the writers' minds and reduced translation costs.
40. Mr Siblet (France) agreed that the ROP were important but they also needed to be practical. The ROP and administrative and institutional matters should be resolved as quickly as possible so that attention could be turned to more pressing conservation issues like those that had already been mentioned such as Mongolian gazelles and lions (see agenda item 10.3).
41. Further discussion on the revision of the ROP took place in Working Group 1. The outcomes of the discussion were reported to the plenary on the last day of the meeting, and are reflected in the Programme of Work for the Sessional Committee of the Scientific Council 2016-2017 appended to this report as Annex 1.

4. Development of a Programme of Work for the Sessional Committee of the Scientific Council for 2016-2017

42. The Chair said that the development of a POW for the Sessional Committee was an important task for the remainder of the triennium and the Scientific Council and the Sessional Committee had been given a specific mandate from the COP. The Secretariat had prepared a table containing various COP mandates.

43. The Chair proposed to have first a discussion on the format of the template, after which he suggested examining the content in greater detail. The template foresaw the creation of six Working Groups, including three dealing with taxonomic groups. Mr Barbieri suggested looking at the mandates and deciding the timeframes within which they could be delivered. While the Sessional Committee was an innovation for CMS, it was modelled on the advisory bodies of other instruments (e.g. the Scientific and Technical Review Panel of the Ramsar Convention, the Technical Committee of AEWA and the Scientific Committee of ACCOBAMS) and lessons could be learned from how they operated and applied to developing a modus operandi for the relationship between the Committee and the full Council. These bodies all had a POW and the template produced by the Secretariat for the Sessional Committee's POW was based on these examples.
44. The Chair opened the floor for comments.
45. Mr Baker said that he had already raised some issues with the Secretariat and had pointed out that some mandates dating from earlier COPs had been omitted from the table. Resolutions on bycatch passed at COP8, COP9 and COP10 were still valid and as bycatch was a threat to many species from different taxa in all regions of the world, he requested that all be mentioned, as not all Resolutions were time-bound to the triennium after their adoption.
46. Mr Barbieri said that suggestions for adding references to other extant Resolutions were welcome to ensure that the table was comprehensive. In filling in the table, the Secretariat had concentrated on the more recent COPs. The intention had been to ensure that the template was simple enough to fit onto A4 landscape format, with eight columns and fields replicated for the six Working Groups.
47. Mr Ankara suggested adding a column identifying indicators which would help determine when a task had been completed successfully.
48. Sergey Dereliev (AEWA) responded drawing on his experience from the POW used by the AEWA Technical Committee, suggesting that some information could be included in the regular report of the Sessional Committee to the Parties. He also felt that it was rather late in the cycle to identify indicators, a process that would require some time to complete.
49. Simone Panigada (ACCOBAMS) said that the template presented by the Secretariat was similar to the format that had evolved for ACCOBAMS. He suggested to make a distinction between leading player and other contributors for each task.
50. Mr Williams (UK) thought that the basic template was fine but needed some minor adjustments and could be refined further as work proceeded. He also proposed making linkages to the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species and cautioned that where a task fell to two Working Groups there was a risk of it either being double counted or not counted at all. On the question of costing, it should be recognized that some work was done *pro bono* by Councillors as part of their regular work, but other projects would need to be funded if they were to progress. Mr Williams said that he would prefer to have a programme which could be delivered rather than an unrealistic one which would run the risk of bringing the Convention into disrepute.
51. The Chair said that the POW had been based on existing COP mandates and as well as some tasks being carried out without funding, the COP Resolutions frequently contained the provision "when resources allowed".
52. The Executive Secretary reminded the meeting that COP11 had adopted a stand-still budget with very little increase above adjustments for inflation. The cost of implementing the POW of the Convention in full were four times greater than the resources in the core budget, which necessitated some prioritization.

Higher priority could be assigned to work where the Sessional Committee had expertise or someone was prepared to take a lead. The Secretariat would then focus its fund-raising efforts, which now brought in approximately one third of the Convention's revenue.

53. Mr Barbieri welcomed the suggestions on improving the template and would try to accommodate them if the confines of the format allowed, but he felt that adding indicators at this stage might not be practical. He was also open to suggestions for better titles for the various Working Groups. He acknowledged that some items appeared to have been duplicated but certain activities applied to avian, terrestrial and aquatic species, so the repetition was justified.
54. Jean-Philippe Sibley (France) thanked the Secretariat for its work on this document which he considered to be an important tool. He stressed the need to keep the table simple so that it could fit on a standard page size. He agreed that it would be better to wait before devising indicators and suggested a simple traffic light system for assessing progress.
55. Graeme Taylor (New Zealand) said that he could find no criteria for setting priorities and asked how this aspect would be addressed. Guidance would be required to ensure that the different Working Groups operated to the same standard, and certain tasks might involve two Working Groups cooperating.
56. Mr Barbieri said that there were no pre-prepared criteria and it would be necessary to develop case by case. With regard to determining the level of priority, the scale used for the POW of the Secretariat (core, high, medium) could be used as a model.
57. Mr Williams (UK) asked why certain tasks had been assigned to particular sections, pointing out that marine debris would probably sit better under the aquatic heading than under cross-cutting issues.
58. Mr Barbieri replied that, as far as marine debris was concerned, some avian species were affected by marine debris, the species involved including albatrosses and petrels which spent much time at sea. More in general, an attempt had been made to assign tasks to the Taxonomic Working Groups to reflect the division of labour within the Secretariat. However, in some cases it was not entirely clear where best to place tasks and adjustments could be made.
59. Ms Crockford (BirdLife International) asked for clarification of the relationship between the POW of the Sessional Committee and the wider work of the Convention on flyways.
60. Mr Barbieri said that he expected such details to be added during the course of the meeting after the Working Groups had made their input. He said that it would now be an opportune time to consider the composition of the six Working Groups and to identify lead members and the liaison staff from the Secretariat.
61. The first Working Group would deal with institutional and legal matters and Alfred Oteng-Yeboah had been identified as a possible convener. On his arrival at the meeting, having encountered flight delays, he confirmed his agreement to serve. Mr Williams (UK) had agreed to substitute for Mr Oteng-Yeboah if necessary, but stressed that he thought that Working Groups should ideally be led by members of the Committee.
62. Zeb Hogan (COP-appointed Councillor for Fish) asked whether it would be feasible to lead one Working Group and participate in another. Mr Barbieri said that the Chairs would have overall responsibility for their Working Groups but were not expected to lead on each task or activity. Members of the Committee could join more than one Working Group, and in order to assess the degree of coordination and scheduling that multiple membership could entail, members of the Committee were asked to send expressions of interest to the Secretariat.

63. Mr Baker said that he had been asked to lead Working Group 3 (Aquatic species conservation issues) while Mr Notarbartolo di Sciara had been asked to lead Working Group 6 (Cross-cutting conservation issues) and both had an interest in participating in the other's group. Mr Barbieri said that ways would be found to accommodate such needs.
64. The Leading members and Secretariat contacts for each Working Group were:
Group 1 (institutional and legal matters): Alfred Oteng-Yeboah and Marco Barbieri
Group 2 (Strategic issues): Fernando Spina and Marco Barbieri
Group 3 (Aquatic species conservation issues): Giuseppe Notarbartolo di Sciara and Melanie Virtue
Group 4 (Terrestrial species conservation issues): Lkhagvasuren Badamjav and Bert Lenten
Group 5 (Avian species conservation issues): Rob Clay and Borja Heredia
Group 6 (Cross-cutting species conservation issues): Barry Baker and Marco Barbieri, Borja Heredia and others
65. It was suggested that the Committee, in addition to developing a POW for the current triennium, should consider working towards developing a POW for the next intersessional period as was the practice in other MEAs.
66. The Working Groups met in parallel in the morning of 21 April 2016, with the task of further developing the Programme of Work for the section of their competence, and reported to plenary on the outcome of their work in the afternoon of the same day. The version of the Programme of Work for the Sessional Committee of the Scientific Council 2016-2017 incorporating the input from the Working Groups is appended to this report as Annex 1.

5. Strategic Plan

67. The Chair introduced this item by describing the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species (SPMS) as the backbone of CMS. The Plan was the product of a lengthy process and a large amount of work led by the Chair of the Strategic Plan Working Group (SPWG), Ines Verleye.

5.1 Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023

68. Ms Verleye explained that, similarly to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, the Strategic Plan adopted by COP11 covered the conservation of migratory species in general and was not limited to the implementation of CMS. It aimed at being a tool for the entire CMS Family and all conservationists engaged in the conservation of migratory species and at raising their political profile. The Strategic Plan was itself a solid political document drawing from the Aichi Targets. Two further elements needed to be developed, namely indicators to assess progress in the implementation of the Strategic Plan and the Companion Volume to advise Parties and other stakeholders on the implementation of the Plan.
69. The Secretariat had compiled a list of existing instruments under the CMS Family and started work on indicators. It had been agreed that whenever possible existing tools should be used and not spend time "reinventing the wheel". Reflecting the fact that the Strategic Plan was aimed at the entire CMS Family, useful contributions had already been made by Agreements and MOUs. In addition, the issue of revising the format of National Reports to align them better to the Strategic Plan had been raised.
70. At a meeting of the SPWG in October 2015 work related to indicators in other frameworks including the Sustainable Development Goals had been reviewed, with a view to identify already existing indicators that could be used in the context of the SPMS. It had been decided that it would not be necessary to measure every activity but just a representative sample, drawn from a broad range of activities to provide the general narrative. There were no resources to devise new methods.

71. The Chair of the Working Group, the consultant (David Pritchard) and some of the Councillors had prepared a zero draft in the form of factsheets presenting the rationale underlying each of the proposed indicators. The zero draft was being presented to the Sessional Committee, the input from which would be essential. The public consultation process would run from May until September 2016, during which time it was hoped that a wide audience of scientists and policy-makers could be reached. There were still gaps which could usefully be filled with specific indicators.
72. The outline of the Companion Volume (CV) intended as a tool to aid with implementation was set out in Chapter 4 of the Strategic Plan and general areas of activity had been identified through the headings (e.g. capacity-building, resource mobilization). There were 16 targets to be covered, and in addition to the Convention, the seven Agreements and nineteen MOUs were potential sources of material. Given the quantity of information and the likely need to make frequent updates, it had been decided to explore the option of making the CV an online tool. This would also make it easier to search. Marshalling available information and choosing the most relevant sources would be important to keep the CV to a manageable size. Gaps where information was not available would have to be identified. Some existing resources might not need to be adapted for CMS purposes; there might for instance be guidance on resource mobilization from other forums that could be adopted.
73. Work had also started on designing the online structure of the CV and it was expected that a clearer picture would emerge after consultations had begun. This part of the work was breaking new ground and some resources might be needed to facilitate it. If successful, it might also be a model that other MEAs might follow.
74. The Chair thanked Ms Verleye for the presentation commenting that migratory species were a distinct and complex element of biodiversity, the conservation of which was made more difficult because of the different locations the animals used. The Convention had strong political component as it required international agreement on policies to achieve its aims. He added that he was sure that other MEAs would be interested in seeing how the CV developed. The exercise of transposing the Aichi Targets to the context of migratory species had been an interesting one.
75. Ms Qwathekana (South Africa) thanked Ms Verleye and Mr Pritchard for all their work and commented that a key element of implementing the Convention was mainstreaming it by incorporating international targets into national programmes. She suggested that the Secretariat should send a notification to Parties asking them to develop national targets from their international obligations. This was being done under the Ramsar Conventions, where Parties had until December 2016 to submit their targets.
76. The Chair concurred recalling that much the same point had been raised at the Working Group meeting in October 2015. Parties should be urged to treat the Strategic Plan as a tool to be implemented through transposition into national programmes, and not a document to gather dust on the shelf and a notification to this effect should be considered.
77. The Chair said that given the high degree of cross membership of the biodiversity Conventions, this would apply to many MEAs including CBD and CITES.
78. Mr Galbraith (COP-appointed Councillor for Climate Change) made some general comments about the nature of strategic plans. There needed to be some means of determining whether the plan was being successfully implemented and a decision taken as to whether to monitor processes or the biological effect of work on the ground. A choice had to be made between adopting an aspirational plan or a realistic one. Much depended on the resources being made available to carry out the programme of work. In concluding his remarks, he said that with strategic plans simplicity was usually an asset.

79. Ms Crockford (BirdLife International) made some initial comments on the fact sheets which she said were very good. She questioned how realistic some of the proposed targets were given the limited resources available. She would submit formal comments in writing.

5.2 Strategic Plan Indicators

80. Dave Pritchard, the consultant engaged to help develop the indicators and the Companion Volume, made a presentation, reminding the meeting that the Scientific Council had already made some preliminary inputs at its 18th meeting, where parallels with similar processes in other forums such as CBD, the Ramsar Convention and the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership had been identified.

81. The Strategic Plan Working Group (SPWG) had met in October 2015. The similarity between the work under CMS and the Ramsar Convention had become apparent. One question that had been raised was how the successful completion of targets could be measured and a decision reached that the indicators should cover a representative range of activities rather than the entire scope of the Strategic Plan. A small workshop had been held in London in February 2016 to consider the indicators further. Sixteen factsheets had been sent out to Parties the previous week via [Notification 2016/008](#).

82. Mr Pritchard described the template for the factsheets for which the basic structure was now set with four headings common to all of the factsheets. The content would be updated as required. The elements of the Aichi Targets relevant to migratory species had been extracted and adapted as necessary. The format of national reports could be adjusted and restructured to be better aligned with the Strategic Plan.

83. The Chair thanked Mr Pritchard for the initial explanation of the ideas underlying the approach that had been adopted and of the structure. It was important that CBD Parties took account of migratory species when transposing their international obligations into national programmes and the adaptation of the Aichi Targets to the ends of CMS would help achieve this.

84. Mr Simmonds (HSI) asked how reliant the Convention was on deducing the conservation status of some species (notably cetaceans, many of which were categorized as Data Deficient on the IUCN Red List). He feared that some would become extinct before proper censuses could be conducted.

85. Mr Pritchard said that it was possible to make comparisons over time and between localities without having to undertake comprehensive assessments. Proxies could be used such as harvest figures rather than population estimates.

86. The Chair agreed that the absence of data on species made it more difficult to establish indicators for them. He urged that the Convention should adopt a precautionary approach. He also recalled that the last meeting of the chairs of advisory bodies had recommended that the IUCN add a data field to identify species that were migratory *sensu* CMS.

87. Mr Siblet (France) said that there was a problem with the Red List and the references used by the IUCN which used population changes over decades as a criterion. In Europe, however, there were species that had declined severely in the 1950s, '60s and '70s before stabilizing at a low level. This raised the question of which population level to use as the baseline.

88. Ms Qwathkana (South Africa) said that despite the great efforts of the IUCN there were many species considered Data Deficient. These included the Flatback Turtle *Natator depressus* which was almost certainly in decline. The Convention should use its influence to have more research overseen by IPBES directed at migratory species.

89. Mr Notarbartolo di Sciara (COP-appointed Councillor for Aquatic Mammals) agreed with Mr Simmonds regarding the problem of the IUCN categorization of marine mammals and other oceanic species, many of which were listed as Data Deficient. Cuvier's beaked whales *Ziphius cavirostris* were no longer Data Deficient because of the research commissioned by ACCOBAMS into the effects on the species of marine noise. Parties were able to undertake conservation work for species even if they were categorized as Data Deficient.
90. Mr Vié (IUCN) noted and welcomed the frequent references made to the Red List but stressed that it should not be seen as a panacea. He acknowledged that there were many gaps particularly concerning marine species and this would require time to address. Sharks were about to be reassessed and BirdLife as the IUCN's partner for bird species was constantly undertaking reviews. The IUCN had done a Red List index for migratory species and freshwater fish. He pointed out that the Red List cycle was based on three generations which varied from species to species. Small constant declines of 1 per cent per annum were unlikely to trigger uplisting.
91. The Chair said that IUCN and CMS used different definitions of the term "migratory" with the Convention adding the political dimension of crossing international borders. Gorillas were therefore considered migratory by the Convention despite the small distances the animals moved.
92. Mr Williams (UK) said that there were alternatives to the IUCN Red List available, such as the Living Planet Index, which had some geographic and taxonomic bias and was confined to protected areas, but provided some data. Judgements would have to be made over the weighting of direct and proxy measurements. He said that it was not necessary to seek perfection at the outset as workable solutions could be found and enhanced as time progressed. Lessons could be learned from good news and bad news stories which could also help focus efforts on areas where they were effective and where they were needed. He also agreed with Mr Pritchard that the national report format should be designed to address the Strategic Plan's objectives. Measuring progress against stated goals was one of the main purposes of national reports.
93. Mr Oteng-Yeboah (COP-appointed Councillor for African Fauna) noted that reference had been made to IPBES but pointed out that that organization did not commission original research but rather undertook assessments of the state of knowledge of biodiversity and ecosystems, relying on the expertise of bodies such as the CMS Scientific Council. The Chair added that every effort was being made to promote CMS within IPBES.
94. Ms Malsch (UNEP-WCMC) expressed her organization's willingness to assist in the review of the national reporting format and said that UNEP-WCMC was involved in the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership.
95. Mr Barbieri (CMS Secretariat) summed up saying that Resolution 11.2 requested that changes be made to the National Report format aligning it to the Strategic Plan. The first round of revisions would be done before the next Standing Committee meeting in preparation for COP12. There would not be time for a full revision before COP12 as work was still being done identifying the indicators. The revised format would be used for the reports submitted to COP13 and beyond.
96. With regard to populating the table in the POW, there was a clear mandate for Working Group 2 from the Resolution which asked the Scientific Council to review the indicators in the current draft. A further review would be necessary after the next meeting of the Strategic Plan Working Group, for which the next draft would be prepared. The lead responsibility was assigned to the Chair of the Scientific Council and the task was considered a core duty and no resources would be required.

Interpretation and Implementation of the Convention

6. CMS Instruments

6.1 Concerted and Cooperative Actions

97. The Chair described Concerted and Cooperative Actions as having been important instruments as catalysts for measures undertaken by the Convention.
98. Mr Barbieri (CMS Secretariat) proceeded to give a presentation outlining the history of the two initiatives and proposals for how they would be conducted in future. Concerted and Cooperative Actions had been established by COP3 and COP5 respectively, and COP10 and COP11 undertook a review culminating in a recommendation from COP11 to consolidate the two initiatives into one, to be known henceforth as Concerted Actions. The Cooperative Action “brand” would be discontinued. Previously Concerted Actions applied to Appendix I species while Cooperative Actions were directed at Appendix II species. Under the new arrangements Concerted Actions could be applied to species on either Appendix. The measures undertaken under the two types of Action had to be reviewed and an assessment made on whether those species on the two lists should be retained, the prime candidates for deletion being those for which nothing was actively being done.
99. There were currently 56 Appendix II taxa comprising 4 birds, 18 fish, 21 aquatic mammals and 13 terrestrial mammals on the list for Cooperative Action. Resolution 10.23 requested that an expert be nominated for each listed species or higher taxon and that this expert should give progress reports. The Sessional Committee was now being asked how to proceed with fulfilling this mandate.
100. COP11 had established clear guidelines on how proposals for the designation of species for Concerted Actions should be assessed and the Scientific Council was expected to devise the means to ensure that this guidance was complied with.
101. With regard to the POW, the tasks proposed related to the identification of an expert for each species or higher taxon and recommendations on whether to retain or delete species from the consolidated list.
102. Mr Baker (COP-appointed Councillor for Bycatch) said that the review process could either be very simple or very complex. He recalled the concerns expressed at the COP that species had been added to the lists but no action had resulted. Parties that nominated a species should be expected to take the lead in ensuring that some activities ensued. The Sessional Committee should report that no action had been taken towards delisting any species as this might provoke a response from the Parties.
103. The Chair said that it should be ascertained why no action had been started in some cases since inaction might contribute to a species becoming extinct.
104. Mr Hogan (COP-appointed Councillor for Fish) said that 18 species of sturgeon had been added without any activities ever having been undertaken. He asked what the Scientific Council was expected to do to initiate actions.
105. Ms Qwathekana (South Africa) said that many species listed for which no actions were taking place were still in decline. There was a need to identify appropriate measures for such species and in future proposals to add species should be accompanied by a draft plan of action.
106. Mr Galbraith (COP-appointed Councillor for Climate Change) said that the initial idea of both types of action was to breathe life into the Convention and to ensure that something was done for the listed species, reinforcing the already strong message that was sent when a species was added to the Appendices.

He recalled that Pierre Devilliers, the former Chair of the Scientific Council, was a strong advocate of the two types of action. It was important to signal that the Convention intended to take action and that listing was more than a paper exercise.

107. Mr Baker was concerned that the review process would be too time-consuming and he suggested a simple desk study running through the 56 taxa listed and that making a swift decision on whether the species should be retained or deleted was all that was required.

108. Mr Baigún (Argentina) said that the Scientific Council should have clear criteria upon which to base the decision to retain or delete a species. In the case of the Vicugna, downlisting would be justified because the conservation measures had led to the species' recovery.

109. Mr Williams (UK) agreed with Mr Baker that the review of the existing list of species did not need to be a major exercise, but there was little point in having lists of species designated for concerted action if nothing was subsequently done. There was a separate but related issue included on the agenda regarding proposals for listing species on the Appendices; these too would in future have to indicate what actions were envisaged for the species concerned. Mr Williams also stressed that removal of a species from the Concerted Action list did not mean that the species should be removed from the Appendices.

110. Mr Vié (IUCN) asked whether Parties were required to report on their activities under Concerted and Cooperative Actions and how any such reports were disseminated.

111. Mr Barbieri asked what constituted implementation of action for the species concerned, as most were listed with no specific plan or a target. Cooperative Actions were originally a means of providing a framework for action without the need for negotiating an agreement. There had been some confusion from having two processes and the conclusion was reached that consolidating them into one would be better. It could also not be excluded that some Parties had acted unilaterally as a result of a species being listed for Concerted or Cooperative Action, and a simple means of assessing whether this was the case would be to check entries in Parties' national reports. The question of whether to retain species on the CMS Appendices was entirely separate from their status on the lists for Concerted or Cooperative Action.

112. Ms Malsch (UNEP-WCMC) confirmed that the national reports contained sections on Concerted and Cooperative Actions and 14 Parties had entered something here in their most recent reports.

113. Ms Frisch (CMS) said that the Aquatic Mammals Working Group had attempted to report on the species for which it was responsible using a standard template. The feedback received indicated that some actions went unreported as reporting depended on the compiling author being aware of what was happening. Keeping all actions under review would be a considerable burden on volunteer species coordinators.

114. Mr Chambers said it was clear that the Concerted and Cooperative Actions were useful as they bestowed a status on species but they needed to be deployed even more effectively. It was unlikely that there would be any new MOUs, and there was some pressure to discontinue some of the existing ones. The consolidated Concerted Actions, along with a possible review mechanism for the Convention as first suggested at COP11, were among the innovative and flexible tools being developed.

7. Amendment of CMS Appendices

115. The Chair commented that the listing of species on the CMS Appendices was an important means of steering conservation efforts in the field. The two Appendices were flexible tools which could help initiate rapid responses while leaving open the possibility of delisting where circumstances justified this.

This agenda item covered the revision of the template and guidelines for the drafting of listing proposals and the interpretation of the term “significant proportion” which appeared in Article 1, paragraph 1 of the Convention text.

7.1 Guidelines for assessing listing proposals to Appendices I and II of the Convention

7.1.1 Revision of the template and guidelines for the drafting of listing proposals

116. Mr Barbieri (CMS Secretariat) introduced document UNEP/CMS/ScC-SC1/Doc.7.1.1. COP11 had adopted Resolution 11.33 which contained guidelines for the assessment of Appendix I and II listing proposals and a request that the Secretariat and Scientific Council review the template for the submission of proposals. A draft revised format prepared by the Secretariat was attached to the document in an annex and was modelled in part on the equivalent document developed by CITES. The deadline for submitting the final draft of the template to the Standing Committee for consideration at its 45th meeting was 9 September 2016.
117. The Chair identified some challenging concepts in the draft such as the role of a taxon in its ecosystem, data on trends and an assessment of risks and benefits; some of this information might be difficult to provide
118. Mr Baker (COP-appointed Councillor for Bycatch) expressed his satisfaction at the document and with the additional notes.
119. Mr Medellín (COP-appointed Councillor for Neotropical Fauna) said that the document was particularly useful in that it set improved preconditions for proposals to amend the Appendices. He noted, however, that the lesser categories of the IUCN Red List were excluded as a criterion, but the process for reviewing the Red List was complex with some teams responsible of many hundreds of species. A species not included in one of the higher categories might still be worth considering for listing under the Convention.
120. Ms Qwathekana (South Africa) asked how any perceived gaps in the listing under CMS were to be addressed and recalled that the guidelines included a requirement that the proponent outline the actions to be taken in order to avoid adding species to the Appendices with no conservation benefit.
121. Mr Williams (UK) described the draft as an excellent step forward. Some adjustments were required to improve clarity. He suggested promoting the reference to the Red List to the beginning of section 4. Regarding the use of the Red List category as a criterion for listing, the guidelines did state that if IUCN data were not available, other sources could be used. As further guidance to Parties, Mr Williams suggested that some worked up examples be prepared and posted on the web to serve as models.
122. Mr Kasiki (Kenya) suggested that an indicative timeline for the consultations required under section 8 would be useful.
123. Mr Notarbartolo di Sciara (COP-appointed Councillor for Aquatic Mammals) referred to the discussions going on in the wider UN framework concerning biodiversity outside national boundaries, which included the High Seas which accounted for 40 per cent of the planet’s surface. Many fish, birds, mammals and turtles migrated across the High Seas, and if this made them eligible for inclusion on the Appendices, it should be explicitly stated.
124. Mr Simmonds (HSI) stressed that Data Deficient meant that there was not enough information to assess the status of a species. The guidelines seemed to imply that species categorized as Data Deficient should not be listed on Appendix I. He advised against tying the Convention’s hands especially as events could develop quickly and there could be good grounds to list a Data Deficient species on Appendix I.

A great many cetacean species were categorized as Data Deficient but more information was available for certain populations and some of them did fall into more threatened categories.

125. Ms Crockford (BirdLife International) welcomed the excellent document and announced that a proposal for adding the Steppe whimbrel (*Numenius phaeopus alboaxillaris*) was being developed and this could be used as the model using the new template. There were possibly as few as 100 individuals left. She added that it could be made clear that it would not be necessary in every case for all sections of the template to be completed.
126. Vincent Hilomen (Philippines) raised the issue of the baseline level threats mentioned in section 4.1 in the context of habitat modifications such as mudflats.
127. Mr Baker recalled the discussions at COP where some Parties were concerned that species that were not particularly threatened were being considered for listing. After nine years of discussions, agreement had been reached on precise wording and now it seemed that there were already moves to unravel the text.
128. Mr Williams concurred, also agreeing that there should be some flexibility on the possibility of listing Data Deficient species, since this category indicated that while there was insufficient evidence to make the case for listing, there was also a lack of evidence indicating that the species should not be listed. It should be for the COP to decide on listing based on the evidence provided and the advice of the Scientific Council. It was important that proposals were sound and convincing and on occasion the quality of the proposals received were not of a high standard.
129. Ms Malsch (UNEP-WCMC) suggested a cross-reference to CITES and the addition of fecundity to the attributes contributing to a species' vulnerability.
130. Ms Pauly (CMS Sharks MOU) recalled a similar discussion over listing at the recent Meeting of Signatories to the Sharks MOU. The MOU provided a means for CMS Parties to meet their obligations for Appendix II-listed species, but some Signatories to the MOU were not CMS Parties, and it had been agreed that there should be not automatic adoption on the MOU annex of species listed on CMS. Ms Pauly also agreed that the listing of species categorized as Data Deficient should be considered for listing in the light of threats. Mr Notarbartolo di Sciarra suggested that species living in open seas should be treated as a special case.
131. Mr Baigún (Argentina) said that there was flexibility in allowing regional considerations to be taken into account. The Chair cited the example of the Saker Falcon (*Falco cherrug*), which had been listed but one population had been excluded because active management was already in place.
132. Mr Siblet (France) said that the Scientific Council should consider whether the paper presented by the Secretariat allowed sufficient flexibility in listing species. The French version made it clear that the Red List was not a limitation and where other evidence existed, that too was admissible.
133. Responding to the points raised, Mr Barbieri said that the wording used was based on that of Resolution 11.33 to the extent possible. A species' status on the Red List was neither meant to lead to automatic inclusion or automatic exclusion from the Convention's Appendices. Account should be taken of the status of particular populations, which could be listed separately. Regarding species in the High Seas, it was clear that the CMS definition of migration included them.
134. Mr Barbieri would produce a revision on basis of comments received for the Sessional Committee to review for adoption.

7.1.2 Interpretation of the phrase “significant proportion” in Article I, Paragraph 1 (a) of the Convention text

135. The Chair was aware that with birds some species were partial migrants and climate change was not only a threat to wintering grounds, breeding grounds and stop-over sites but was also affecting migration, as some species changed their behaviour. The main parameter to be considered in this instance was the number of animals concerned but demographics also played a role. Natural mortality was rarely uniform in time or place, with age groups (e.g. breeding or non-breeding animals) affected differently.
136. Mr Barbieri (CMS Secretariat) said that the Resolution requested that the Scientific Council consider the term “significant proportion” and the Secretariat was seeking the advice of the Sessional Committee on how to proceed with the submission to COP. This term had not been subject to scrutiny before but other terms in the definition of “migratory species” such as “cyclically” and “predictably” had been examined and an interpretation provided.
137. Mr Siblet (France) agreed with the Chair’s opening comments. He pointed out that the English and French texts of the Convention differed in that the French used *importante* where *significantive* would have been closer to the English. He felt that the Scientific Council should be both practical and pragmatic and species should be listed if their conservation status justified it.
138. Mr Biber (Chair, AEMLWG) wondered why the Parties had asked for this debate. In terms of jurisprudence, the question should be asked what the drafters’ intention was. Migration which led animals to cross national borders needed to be protected through measures agreed internationally and the Convention was not meant as an instrument for endemic species. CMS as the only Convention specifically dealing with species conservation also had a mandate from CBD by which it was recognized as a lead partner.
139. Mr Williams (UK) recalled that the question had been raised at COP and no answer could be readily provided hence the request for an opinion. His initial view was that the percentage threshold should be reasonably high but as circumstances for each species and taxon differed, he thought each case should be considered on its merits.
140. Mr Galbraith (COP-appointed Councillor for Climate Change) said in some cases a single animal or a single pair crossing one boundary might be considered significant. Such small numbers might be required to maintain a population.
141. Mr Baker (COP-appointed Councillor for Bycatch) said that the example of Ramsar with a set 2 per cent threshold should not be followed.
142. Mr Ankara (Congo) said that a strict interpretation of the term might lead to the de-listing of species such as gorillas. The Chair however thought that the agreed definition of migration had more bearing on these species.

7.2 Taxonomy and Nomenclature of species listed on the CMS Appendices

7.2.1 Implications of adopting as standard reference for Passerine bird taxonomy and nomenclature the Illustrated Checklist of the Birds of the World Vol. 2: Passerines

143. The Chair opened the discussion on this item by stating that Volume II of the Birds of the World publication which covered passerines would be published shortly. A decision would then be required whether to adopt this as the Convention’s standard taxonomic reference.
144. Mr Heredia (CMS Secretariat) said that at COP11 in Quito bird taxonomy had been discussed and agreement reached on all bird species with the exception of the passerines. CMS had aligned itself with BirdLife International and the IUCN with regard to the other bird species.

Resolution 11.19 requested the Scientific Council to consider the implications of adopting as a standard reference for passerine birds the Handbook of the Birds of the World/BirdLife International Illustrated Checklist of the Birds of the World, Volume 2: Passerines, which was due to be published in late 2016. He suggested to prepare an analysis of the changes to the Appendices that this new reference would entail.

145. Mr Clay (COP-appointed Councillor for Birds) agreed that it would make sense to proceed in the manner suggested. It would be helpful if the Council could have sight of the final draft of Volume II before it was published. Appendix II of CMS contained a number of higher taxon entries and there were likely to be consequences for the families so listed. It might be necessary to split some species from the higher taxon and list them specifically.

146. Mr Sibley (France) commented that in the previous debate he had held the minority view that it was not necessary to adopt the same taxonomic reference, because the references should be a tool and not a straight-jacket. There was merit in having a large degree of stability and avoiding constant changes as taxonomic thinking evolved.

147. The Chair had some sympathy with Mr Sibley's view but pointed out that the BirdLife reviews were carried out at reasonable intervals and the taxonomy was therefore not constantly changing. It would also be confusing to use one reference for one group of birds and a different one for others.

7.2.2 Standard reference for fish taxonomy and nomenclature

148. Ms. Virtue reported that the Standard reference for fish taxonomy and nomenclature had already be discussed at the Council's meeting in 2014. The reference used for fish since COP6 (Eschmeyer, W.N. (1990). Catalogue of the Genera of Recent Fishes. California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco, California) was no longer in print and was outdated. It had been replaced by an online version which was being updated regularly. The proposed way of dealing with this was to refer to the online version whenever a fish species was newly listed to the Appendices, keeping an excerpt of the relevant part of the online version at the time of the listing in the file for future reference. CITES faced the same issue and was following a similar approach, so adopting the same procedure would also help to keep CMS and CITES taxonomic references aligned, which was in line with the desire express by CMS and CITES Parties through the CITES-CMS joint work programme that the two conventions strive to harmonize their taxonomic reference to the extent possible. She proposed to add an activity to the Programme of Work and that a short paper be prepared for COP.

149. Mr Notarbartolo di Sciara (COP-appointed Councillor for Marine Mammals) asked whether similar arrangements were envisaged for other taxa, and if not to consider this possibility. For marine mammals, a list was maintained by the Committee on Taxonomy of the Society of Marine Mammalogy which was chaired by his predecessor as COP-appointed councillor for aquatic mammals, Bill Perrin. The names of some of the species of cetaceans listed on the Appendices were actually outdated.

150. The Chair suggested that information on processes such as the one mentioned for marine mammals be gathered and shared within the Sessional Committee for further consideration of the matter.

7.3 Potential amendments for COP12 consideration

151. Mr Barbieri (CMS Secretariat) said that the Scientific Council had always had a role in advising Parties on potential amendments to the Appendices and this would continue to be case as confirmed in the new terms of reference approved by the Standing Committee. In the past the Scientific Council had initiated proposals which a Party had then agreed to submit formally since the Scientific Council itself had no power to do so.

152. The Sessional Committee was to decide how to take this forward. Mr Barbieri asked whether any members of the Committee were aware of any proposals being formulated or wanted to make a suggestion for one. The deadline for receipt of proposals was 150 days before the COP (which was scheduled to start on 22 October 2017) so the process of working up a proposal would have to start by early 2017 at the latest.
153. Mr Hogan (COP-appointed Councillor for Fish) said that a review of freshwater fish had been submitted to COP10 in 2011. Then the advice of the Scientific Council had been to update the review in the light of the work being done by the IUCN. The IUCN Freshwater Fish Specialist Group had continued to do its assessments and Mr Hogan suggested adding an update of the review considering the latest IUCN findings to the POW. The Freshwater Fish Specialist Group had developed a proposal for a global analysis of the conservation status of all migratory freshwater fish, including salmon and sturgeon, and the Scientific Council could acknowledge the importance of this work.
154. Mr Siblet (France) was aware that a proposal was being prepared to have Laniidae (shrikes) added to Appendix II. Ms Vicky Jones (BirdLife International) said that her organization, which was the IUCN Authority for birds, would willingly review the proposal in due course.
155. Mr Crockford (BirdLife International) was aware of moves to add further raptor species to the CMS Appendices following the addition of six Asian and four African vulture species to the Annex of the Raptors MOU. All these species were categorized as Endangered or Critically Endangered by the IUCN and recent tracking projects had established that all were migratory.
156. The second World Seabird Conference (Cape Town, October 2015) had considered the status of the gadfly petrels, the most threatened group of seabirds after those covered by ACAP.
157. There had been some exciting news of the rediscovery of the Steppe Whimbrel *Numenius phaeopus alboaxillaris*, which was thought to be extinct. A couple of birds had been found on a beach in Mozambique and one specimen that had been tagged was now in Yemen. The entire population of the subspecies was estimated to count about 100 birds, and BirdLife was interested in working with Range States from East Africa and the Middle East towards a proposal for its listing on Appendix I.
158. Ms Virtue (CMS Secretariat) said that in the margins of the recent Meeting of Signatories to the Sharks MOU a proposal to add the Whale Shark to Appendix I had been discussed. It was currently on Appendix II.
159. Mr Størkersen (CMS Standing Committee Chair) suggested that Scientific Councillors be asked to review those species for which they had particular knowledge or responsibility to assess the repercussions of splits resulting from the adoption of new taxonomies. The Secretariat could be asked to lead a strategic evaluation of whether species should be added to address gaps in the Appendices.
160. The Chair said that it was possible that some of the candidate species might be better dealt with under one of the other CMS Family instruments. However, this would be taken into account because of the new requirement that proposals be accompanied with an outline of the actions to be undertaken.
161. Mr Barbieri clarified the role of the Secretariat which did not include advocating the listing of species. The Secretariat was ready to facilitate the process but it was for either the Council or a Party to initiate a listing proposal. He saw merit in Mr Størkersen's suggestion in terms of establishment of a regular review process of the existing listings. The development of a report on the conservation status of species listed in the Appendices, that was expected to be discussed later in the agenda, could fulfil that purpose.

Another way in which the Secretariat had in the past supported the listing process was through reviews of the conservation status and migratory behaviour of specific species groups, but again had not advocated any changes itself.

162. Coming to the possible role of the Council, an additional way in which it had supported the listing process in the past was by reviewing early drafts of listing proposals being prepared by Parties or other stakeholders. There was a role for the three taxonomic working groups in advising on whether any of the species proposed were worth pursuing.

163. The Chair said that the Council and the Sessional Committee should be ready to advise on any proposals that emerged from Parties.

8. Activities in the Programme of Work for the Triennium 2015-2017 (Annex V to Res. 11.1) requiring Scientific Council input

8.1 Conservation status of species included in CMS Appendices (Activity 30)

164. The Chair said that listing a species on the CMS Appendices was only the start. The species' conservation status had to be monitored afterwards.

165. Mr Barbieri (CMS Secretariat) recalled that at the eighteenth meeting of the Scientific Council the question of monitoring the conservation status of listed species had been discussed and an item added to the POW of the Secretariat for the triennium 2015-2017, but progress had been limited because of the lack of resources. The Government of Switzerland had provided a voluntary contribution to fund a small Working Group to undertake a scoping exercise for the remit of the report. The idea was to adopt a modular approach, devising a few options for the remit of the report with different requirements in terms of resources needed and time frame. Discussions were being held with UNEP-WCMC over arrangements for a Workshop at which key players such as BirdLife International, IUCN and representatives of the Scientific Council would participate. The role of the Council, besides giving input to the workshop through its representatives, would be to review and endorse the outputs of the scoping workshop for submission to COP12. In a longer-term perspective, the Council was expected to have a role in overseeing the production of the status report and approving its submission to COP. The report would contribute to the reporting to COP on the implementation of the Convention and inform a range of COP decisions such as identification of priorities for conservation action, designation of species for Concerted Actions and amendments to the Appendices.

166. The Chair said that this issue was likely to be a standing item for consideration by the Scientific Council for the next few years and he expressed his thanks to the Swiss Government for the voluntary contribution.

167. Mr Williams (UK) suggested that the report could contribute to improve the Range States lists, that should make a clear distinction between those countries where animals were normally found and those that occasionally hosted vagrants. This would help Parties understand their responsibilities better. The situation was particularly complicated for the United Kingdom and its overseas territories.

168. Mr Galbraith (COP-appointed Councillor for Climate Change) said that it should be possible to provide an overview to COP on the conservation status of migratory taxa including the main threats impacting on them such as climate change and barriers to migration. Resources were clearly an issue, and CMS and other MEAs had historically not been well funded. If there was no allocation in the core budget and voluntary contributions were not forthcoming, the work should be carried out in-house, as this was a task too important to neglect.

169. Mr Hogan (COP-appointed Councillor for Fish) agreed with Mr. Galbraith on the importance of the task. Concerning fish, there were probably 50 fish species that should be assessed.

This could appear intimidating, however there was working going on for instance on North American sturgeons and the task t could be doable when broken down into more manageable component parts.

170. Ms Crockford (BirdLife International) supported the initiative and indicated the willingness of her organization to contribute to it. She suggested that the report could be framed as an important contribution towards the assessment of the achievement of the Aichi Targets thus contributing to integrate the work of CMS into wider biodiversity activities.

8.2 Development of an Atlas on Animal Migration (Activity 32)

171. The Chair introduced this item by saying that COP11 had agreed to pursue this ambitious project through a modular approach, starting with the African Eurasian region migratory bird atlas. The project could take advantage of the largest dataset of ringed birds in the world managed by EURING, the coordinating organisation for European bird ringing schemes. He introduced Franz Bairlein, Director of the Institute of Avian Research and President of EURING, who had been invited to give a presentation on a proposal for the development of the avian element of the Atlas on Animal Migration for the African-Eurasian region.

172. Mr Bairlein congratulated CMS on its decision to undertake the atlas project on a global scale. This was quite a challenge but the 12 million records maintained by EURING were being made available.

173. Spatial linkages between species and localities were often quite clear, but what was less evident and more commonly overlooked were functional links. For instance, the population of the Redstart rose and fell in conjunction with rainfall in the birds' sub-Saharan wintering grounds, similarly with Sedge warblers. The Normalized Difference Vegetation Index in the Redstart's stop-over sites in the Maghreb was an indicator of the population status of the species.

174. Advances in technology were being made but the equipment was expensive and in many cases too heavy for use with smaller species. The geographic coverage was also patchy, with some populations well covered while others had very limited historical data. Bird ringing provided an immediate tool, with 4,000 species covered including many migratory ones. EURING brought together 45 national schemes across Europe and had connections to Africa too. It used the labour of 10,000 volunteers and ringed 5 million birds a year.

175. There were already 10 national atlases in existence and EURING would be ready to start further work as soon as the green light was given by CMS.

176. The Chair thanked Mr Bairlein for his presentation. Working with EURING would be a positive first step in creating the Atlas using good quality data and models for species accounts that could be applied to other taxa.

177. Mr Medellín (COP-Appointed Councillor for Neotropical Fauna) said that it was a fascinating project with great potential which was pooling the efforts of various organizations involved in migratory species. He asked how all the inputs would be integrated and whether it could be estimated how many species would be covered.

178. Mr Ankara (Congo) said that the atlas could be very useful for Environmental Impact Assessment studies for the deployment of infrastructure such as electricity cables. He said that there were three main regions in Congo where birds came in winter and he recommended to involve experts in the field with the knowledge of the situation on the ground as they would know when the birds arrived, where they stayed and when they moved on.

179. Ms Crockford (BirdLife International) strongly endorsed the concept behind the atlas and asked to what extent there were scope for the project to use tracking data in addition to ringing data.

180. Mr Bairlein said that the plan was to compile individual species accounts. That could seem a huge task, however tools were available to compile information for about 400 species. The aim was to master the basic principles with birds and then expand to other taxa. EURING could provide the backbone upon which to build. Liaison with experts on site was a fundamental element and tracking data were an important part of the initiative.
181. Mr Siblet (France) mentioned that the European atlas of nesting birds was under revision, and suggested that it could be interesting to establish a link between the two atlas projects.
182. Mr Hogan (COP-appointed Councillor for Fish) wondered whether, in addition to a detailed part on birds, the atlas could include a part including more general information concerning migration of all taxa considered by CMS. In that regard, he mentioned an initiative by the Nature Conservancy, WWF and IUCN to develop a fish migration poster for World Fish Migration Day (21 May).
183. Mr Clay (COP-appointed Councillor for Birds) drew the attention to work was being undertaken in the Americas in particular by the Smithsonian's Migratory Bird Center, drawing on a large body of research, and recommended that linkages be established. Mr Bairlein confirmed that he was aware of this work and he would be collaborating with the Center. Mr Clay stressed that the emphasis should be placed on the important austral system where there was less ringing information and activity.
184. Mr Taylor (New Zealand) mentioned a project to develop an atlas on seabird movements in the Pacific from which a large amount of tracking data was now available. The full report would be published in a year's time.
185. Roman Baigún (Argentina) asked what was the foreseen timeline for producing the atlas for the different regions and whether there were resources to analyse raw data.
186. Mr Williams (UK) raised a concern about prioritization and the use of limited resources. He noted that there were many handbooks, factsheets and the coffee-table book *Survival* on the market. He asked what existing material could be drawn together at what cost and in what time-scale.
187. The Chair saw a need for the information that the atlas would contain for the whole range of members of the CMS Family. The atlas project seemed to be flexible and could be developed in stages as funds became available and it was being built on existing datasets.
188. Mr Bairlein said that the atlas would need some modest funding but something substantial could be produced in time for COP12 and a final product could be ready before COP13.
189. Mr Barbieri (CMS Secretariat) described the possible role for the Sessional Committee and the whole Scientific Council in overseeing the project and steering it to some extent. The Secretariat could play a role mainly in the identification of donors and the Convention's endorsement of the project might help attract contributions. In that regard, he expected the atlas project to be addressed to donors different from those supporting other CMS initiatives, so that competition for funding could be limited. COP13 seemed to be the more realistic final deadline but some progress could hopefully be achieved by COP12.

9. This item was deleted from the Agenda

10. Conservation Issues

10.1 Avian Species

190. The Chair invited the head of the Secretariat's avian team, Borja Heredia, to introduce and lead this agenda item.

10.1.1 Programme of Work on Migratory Birds and Flyways

191. Mr Heredia (CMS Secretariat) reported that some initiatives were under way that affected the entire CMS Family. Unfortunately, the Chair of the Flyway Working Group, Taej Mundkur, was not able to attend the present meeting. The Avian Working Group would look more closely at the details the next day.

192. Mr Dereliev (AEWA) raised the issue of the sensitivity mapping tool which featured on the POW of the AEWA Technical Committee. Because of its relevance to regions beyond the area covered by AEWA, it was more appropriate for CMS to take the lead.

10.1.1.1 Endorsement of the Action Plan for the Baer's Pochard

193. Referring to document ScC-SC1/Doc.10.1.1, Mr Heredia said that developing an Action Plan for Baer's Pochard (*Aythya baeri*) was included in the POW on Migratory Birds and Flyways. This was urgent because it was estimated that there were only 200 of them left in the wild and a start had already been made on implementing some of the components of the Plan. The Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust and BirdLife International had produced an action plan as a contribution to CMS and the East Asian-Australasian Flyways Partnership. The latter had already approved the action plan, which was now being submitted to the Sessional Committee for provisional approval with a view to its submission to COP12 for adoption. The Action Plan set out what could be done to protect the species, much of the range of which was in China.

194. The Chair agreed that action was needed and the work being carried out opened the door to further contact with the Chinese authorities.

195. Mr Clay (COP-appointed Councillor for Birds) said that he and his fellow COP-appointed Councillor for Birds, Stephen Garnett, thought that the Action Plan was good. He had two observations: one was how success was to be measured. He noted that the term "significant" was used throughout the Plan however without defining what had to be considered "significant". In the circumstance of there being only 200 individuals left, any gains or losses would be important. The threats included hybridization with the Ferruginous Duck (*Aythya nyroca*) whose population was increasing and probably competing in the same habitats with the Baer's pochard. This raised the question why one species was thriving and the other was increasing.

196. In the absence of further comments, the Chair concluded that the action plan was endorsed by the Sessional Committee and expressed the hope that action would be urgently undertaken.

10.1.1.2 Development of a Multi-Species Action Plan for African-Eurasian vultures

197. The Chair mentioned that his institute had hosted a meeting on the Egyptian Vulture the previous week and then invited Mr Nick Williams (CMS Secretariat) to make a presentation on the plans towards the development of a multi-species action plan for African-Eurasian vultures.

198. Mr. Williams gave a brief oral report on progress towards the development of the plan. He invited participants to refer to document UNEP/CMS/ScC-SC1/Inf.2 for more details.

199. Mr Vié (IUCN) asked whether any estimates had been made regarding the costs of developing the Action Plan. Having acknowledged the valuable support provided by the IUCN SSG, Mr Williams said that it had been calculated to cost US\$500,000 of which approximately \$300,000 had been secured. Progress would depend on whether and how quickly the remaining funds were found.
200. Mr Ankara (Congo) said that vulture conservation was a major issue in Central Africa as these birds were possibly locally extinct in Congo, DRC, Gabon and Cameroon, having been relatively common in the 1970s before the populations declined rapidly. He asked whether assessments had been made on the status of vultures in Africa and whether the Multi-Species Action Plan included breeding species in captivity for reintroduction.
201. Mr Williams said that much was known about the declines and distribution of some of the species, but there were few data from Africa. All Range States would be contacted and asked to provide all available information. He felt that captive breeding release schemes were almost an admission of failure and would not work if the underlying problems on the ground were not addressed as the released birds would suffer the same fate.
202. Mr Siblet (France) thanked Mr Williams for all his efforts and the authorities from Abu Dhabi and Switzerland for their financial support. He noted that, while there were still gaps in knowledge on the status of vulture species, there were no doubts about the dramatic declines in vulture populations and therefore action was urgently needed.
203. The Chair concluded the discussion by confirming the support of the Sessional Committee to the initiative and its urgency. He reminded the meeting that species that had once been common had almost disappeared having suffered losses of 99 per cent as a result of diclofenac poisoning.

10.1.1.3 Development of an Action Plan for the America's Flyways

204. Mr Heredia (CMS Secretariat) said that the development of the Action Plan had followed from Resolution 11.14 which had adopted the "Americas Flyway Framework", and the initiative had been taken by the Ecuadorian Scientific Councillor, Ana Elizabeth Agreda de la Paz, who was the main instigator. Mr Heredia was pleased to report that Ms Agreda and her colleagues were unharmed in the recent earthquake that had struck their country.
205. The draft Action Plan, which was submitted to the Sessional Committee in document UNEP/CMS/ScC-SC1/Doc.10.1.1.3, adhered to the familiar model for such instruments, covering the usual themes such as threats and conservation measures. The draft would continue to be elaborated and consideration be given regarding how this Action Plan would align with other initiatives in the region. The Sessional Committee was expected to take note of progress.
206. Mr Clay (COP-appointed Councillor for Birds) who had been a member of the Working Group congratulated Ecuador on the progress achieved. He stressed the importance of a stronger involvement of Parties from the Americas noting that Ecuador had been contacting other countries but with little success so far. There were something like 38 different migratory bird initiatives in the Americas covering the Atlantic and Pacific flyways and the Arctic migratory bird initiative. Bringing them all together would be complicated but synergies were needed to avoid wasteful duplication.
207. The Chair stressed the strategic importance of the Americas and said that ways had to be found to overcome the resistance of some countries to join CMS.

208. Bert Lenten (Deputy Executive Secretary, CMS Secretariat) said that he had attended a workshop in Jamaica in March 2014 where CMS had tried to raise its profile. The Convention had to be more active in the Western Hemisphere and to show that it had something to offer. CMS participated in the Western Hemisphere Migratory Species Initiative, which could offer opportunities for initiatives by the Convention.
209. Mr Taylor (New Zealand) said that the plan covered several species shared between New Zealand and South America such as albatrosses and petrels, so there was scope for cooperation from countries outside the Americas. A report on the migratory movements of the black petrel was being prepared, which was likely to suggest further linkages with the action plan for the Americas.
210. Mr Baker (COP-appointed Councillor for Bycatch) pointed out that the annex to the document incorrectly referred to some species being covered by ACAP. As far as he was aware there were no plans for ACAP to add any of the species mentioned.
211. Mr Williams (UK) noted that paragraph 1.1.6 of the Action Plan related to the prevention of illegal bird killing, taking and trade and asked if this would be linked to the International Consortium on combatting wildlife trade.
212. Mr Baigún (Argentina) said that in section 2.1.1 reference should be made to the MOU between Argentina and Chile for the Ruddy-headed Goose. He also suggested the development of a section on the assessment of the implementation of the Action Plan with appropriate indicators of achievement.
213. Having thanked all those that had made comments, which would be forwarded to the authors, Mr Heredia said that the Action Plan would contribute to the Americas Flyways Framework, for which there were plans to establish a Task Force.

10.1.2 Preventing poisoning of migratory birds

214. The Chair said that this issue was high on the agenda and correspondingly a large number of related activities were taking place.
215. Mr Heredia (CMS Secretariat) said that it was a broad topic. The guidelines adopted at COP had actually had positive impacts. A meeting had been held in South Africa and the Chair of CMS Scientific Council and the AEWA Secretariat had been collaborating. An Action Plan was being finalized regarding the application of the guidelines across Southern Africa.
216. A meeting of the Poisoning Working Group was being prepared. This would take place in Spain after the summer. Possible ideas for activities to be considered for inclusion in the PoW of the Sessional Committee included the investigation of further sources of poisoning as well as looking at the effects of neonicotinoid pesticides.
217. Mr Dereliev (AEWA Secretariat) said that one message from the AEWA Technical Committee which had met the previous month was the importance of agrichemicals and lead shot for migratory waterbirds. Given that these problems were not confined to the area covered by AEWA, it fell to CMS to take the lead. He asked how CMS proposed to take things forward as the Technical Committee had sought clarification of the mechanisms involved.
218. Mr Heredia said that coordination of this work was a top priority for CMS and the coordinator would be recruited as soon as possible. The Raptors MOU had provided some funds but further potential donors such as BirdLife International were being approached.

219. Mr Taylor (New Zealand) reported on the positive use of poisons to eradicate invasive alien species from small islands. New Zealand had successfully eliminated rodents from important breeding sites of migratory birds. Any document being produced should not prevent the possibility of a controlled use of poisons for purposes that would benefit wildlife.

220. Mr Baker (COP-appointed Councillor for Bycatch) said that on Macquarie Island rabbits which had destroyed habitat had been poisoned. The project had taken into account the likely secondary poisoning of petrels.

221. Ms Crockford (BirdLife International) while noting the significant progress on several issues in the avian agenda after COP12 was concerned that progress was slow in respect to bird poisoning. It would be important to have the coordinator in place in time for the IUCN World Congress being held in Hawaii in September 2016, where three motions linked to CMS resolution on bird poisoning were on the agenda as well as two side events.

10.1.3 Progress in the implementation of the Action Plan for Migratory Landbirds in the African-Eurasian Region

222. In introducing this item, the Chair noticed that there had been many positive developments since Mr Bairlein's address to COP9 in Rome which had set the process in motion.

223. Oliver Biber (Chair of the Working Group on Migratory Landbirds in the African Eurasian Region) said that this Action Plan complemented AEWA and the Raptors MOU providing comprehensive coverage of avian species for the region. The second meeting of the Working Group had taken place in Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire. The coordinator, Alex Ngari who was present at the meeting, had been appointed thanks to funding from BirdLife International.

10.1.3.1 Programme of Work for Migratory Landbirds in the African-Eurasian Region

224. Mr Biber presented the draft Programme of Work by highlighting some of its key aspects. The draft was included in document UNEP/CMS/SCC-SC1/Doc.10.1.3.1. It was important to establish a presence on the ground in the countryside where birds landed and fed. A workshop was being planned to take place in West Africa on the subject of land use and land use change. The Swiss Government was ready to fund it. Three species had been identified for special attention – the Turtle Dove *Streptopelia turtur turtur*, for which the RSPB was developing an Action Plan, the Yellow-breasted Bunting *Emberiza aureola* and the European roller *Coracias garrulus*. Prime actors had already been lined up for all three species.

225. The development of the atlas on migration was to be welcomed and synergies should be sought with AEWA, the Raptors MOU and the Bern Convention which had organized a workshop recently hosted by Albania. The first meeting of the task force on illegal killing taking place in Cairo in July would also be relevant.

226. Mr Biber hoped that COP12 would endorse the POW and at the request of Mr Clay undertook to add to the table details of costings and the desired outcomes. He added that the Steering Group responsible for overseeing the Landbirds Action Plan would be meeting shortly.

10.1.4 Progress in the implementation of the Saker Falcon Global Action Plan (SakerGAP)

227. Mr Nick Williams (CMS Secretariat) reported on the SakerGAP stressing that accepting sustainable use was a major contribution to the solution and not part of the problem as some people perceived it. Colin Galbraith, the Chair of the Working Group, had managed to reconcile the various conflicting viewpoints behind a common programme. COP Resolution 11.18 included a 10-year plan and had given the Task Force a fresh mandate to oversee implementation of the SakerGAP.

228. The SakerGAP had also been endorsed at the second Meeting of the Signatories to the Raptors MOU and it was translated into Arabic and Russian. A coordinator was being recruited to drive forward implementation of the SakerGAP in order to allow the Coordinating Unit to focus on other species.
229. The Chair recalled having chaired a polarized session at COP9 in Rome on the listing of the Saker Falcon and was relieved that a satisfactory solution had been found.
230. Ms Qwathekana (South Africa) asked whether Range States were expected to develop national action plans based on the SakerGAP or integrate relevant elements of the SakerGAP into NBSAPs, and whether CMS Parties and Signatories to the Raptor MOU were expected to report on the implementation of the SakerGAP within their national report obligations under those instruments. Mr Williams replied that Signatories to the Raptors MOU had agreed to develop national strategies for species listed under the MOU and some countries, even non-signatories to the MOU, had incorporated plans for the Saker Falcon in their National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs).

10.2 Aquatic Species

10.2.1 Live captures of cetaceans from the wild for commercial purposes

231. Ms Frisch (CMS Secretariat) referred the Committee to document UNEP/CMS/ScC-SC1/Inf.4 explaining that a consultation exercise had been conducted in 2015, seeking information from the Parties on the implementation of two important provisions of Resolution 11.22, one concerning the development and implementation of national legislation prohibiting the live capture of cetaceans from the wild for commercial purposes, the other soliciting stricter measures in line with CITES Article XIV with regard to the import and international transit of live cetaceans for commercial purposes that have been captured in the wild. Forty-five responses had been received with the response of one Party, the EU, covering legislation enacted in 28 Member State.
232. Monaco had provided a voluntary contribution for the production of a tool kit to support Parties in the development of legislation addressing live capture of cetaceans from the wild. Resolution 11.22 requested the Scientific Council and the Secretariat to seek to enhance cooperation with CITES and the IWC on small cetacean species targeted by live captures from the wild. The CMS Secretariat was in regular contact with the CITES and IWC secretariats and attended relevant meetings when possible. Suggestions were sought on how the Sessional Committee could contribute to further develop collaboration with those conventions.
233. The Chair asked how many Parties responding to the questionnaire had legislation banning live capture in their waters but allowed transit and import of live animals. The Sessional Committee could consider calling upon countries to consider prohibiting all import and transit.
234. Ms Frisch said that nine countries replied that they had no legislation on the statute book but five of these were landlocked. Two countries had plans to introduce legislation. The situation was less clear regarding imports.
235. Mr Panigada (ACCOBAMS) said that the ACCOBAMS Scientific Committee had drafted a resolution to be submitted to CITES COP on the identification of the origin of cetaceans kept in captivity and was seeking a CITES Party to sponsor it.
236. Ms Wood (WDC) expressed support to the initiative suggested by the Chair and the willingness of her organization to help.
237. Mr Baker (COP-appointed Councillor for Bycatch) sought clarification that the issues being addressed were related to conservation rather than animal welfare. The occasional capture of a specimen was not likely to have a great impact on the conservation status of a species.

238. Mr Notarbartolo di Sciara (COP-appointed Councillor for Aquatic Mammals) said that the issue was not clear-cut and there were some populations for which any taking from the wild could adversely affect their conservation. He agreed that the inconsistencies of policies should be brought to Parties' attention.
239. Mr Williams (UK) recalled that at the last meeting of the Scientific Council there had been discussion about relevant activities undertaken under CITES, notably non-detriment findings (NDF) and how these applied to the issue of live capture of cetaceans. Given also that CITES had a project on national legislation, it would be worth liaising with the CITES Secretariat.
240. Ms. Frisch said that Resolution 11.22 had tried to address the issue by soliciting stricter measures in line with CITES Article XIV, thus encouraging Parties to use their degree of latitude not to make their decision dependent on the NDF mechanism.
241. Mr Vié (IUCN) urged caution about use of the term "ban" to which some countries often had strong adverse reactions.
242. Mr Simmonds (HSI) thought that some progress had been made with the consultation, however there was still room for further research to identify gaps and inconsistencies in the establishment and implementation of legislation.
243. Ms Frisch said that the information gathered through the consultation could be further processed to provide a clearer picture of the situation for each respondent concerning capture in their waters, import and transit. That could be used in conjunction with the tool kit to approach countries and solicit implementation of Resolution 11.22. Endorsement by the Sessional Committee of a call for further action might serve as a prompt to Parties.
244. Mr Størkersen (CMS Standing Committee) reminded the meeting that CITES only dealt with import and export and had no mandate covering domestic trade. CMS could add a species to Appendix I (most of those affected were on Appendix II of both CMS and CITES). The failure to provide an NDF had led to trade with the Solomon Islands being suspended.
245. The Chair concluded that collaboration with CITES was to be pursued. He welcomed the offer of the Secretariat to further analyse the information obtained through the consultation to get an overview of the situation to be shared within the Sessional Committee and the Scientific Council. Investigation of the issues should continue and further measures should be considered if appropriate.

10.2.2 Marine bushmeat

246. The Chair opened this item by referring to document UNEP/CMS/ScC-SC1/Doc.10.2.2, which described the alarming scope of this problem which covered many species and a number of geographic regions.
247. Mr Notarbartolo di Sciara (COP-appointed Councillor for Aquatic Mammals) said that the issue of terrestrial bushmeat was well documented but in the aquatic environment the problem existed on a similar scale but it was far less well researched. Aquatic species affected included cetaceans, sirenians, crocodiles, turtles and seabirds. The regions mentioned in the document as having the highest incidence were West and Central Africa, South and South-east Asia and Latin America. A definition of aquatic bushmeat was provided and the growth in demand across the world was described. Part of the problem was that non-targeted animals taken as bycatch were being utilized leading to directed catch. There was also a correlation between the price of fish in markets and declining fish stocks on one hand and the prevalence of consumption of marine bushmeat on the other. A large number of turtles were being taken to satisfy domestic demand and for export.

248. In West and Central Africa, four species of cetacean were particularly frequently consumed in Ghana, but aquatic bushmeat was also in demand in Togo, Benin, Cameroon and Nigeria. Smoked bushmeat was also traded and available in some landlocked countries. Trade in manatee meat was recorded in 20 countries.
249. There were also 12 countries in Latin America where aquatic bushmeat was consumed and the species affected included river dolphins. There was directed taking of manatees in eight countries.
250. In South and South-east Asia turtles, dugongs, baleen whales and salt water crocodiles were taken, experimental nets being responsible for catching thousands of cetaceans, including baleen whales. There were also serious threats to salt water crocodiles.
251. The bushmeat issue had been raised at the level of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). The Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management had launched a bushmeat sourcebook, however that initiative did not cover aquatic bushmeat and this needed to be changed.
252. Mr Notarbartolo di Sciara concluded his presentation by referring to the main recommendation of the document to develop a specific CMS Resolution for CMS COP12 on aquatic bushmeat, that would aim at: establishing a CMS Family Aquatic Bushmeat Working Group, to coordinate an approach to the aquatic bushmeat issue; mandating the CMS Secretariat to represent the aquatic bushmeat issue at forthcoming meetings of CBD, CITES and IWC and promote the discussion of the aquatic bushmeat issue within the Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management.
253. Ms Frisch (CMS Secretariat) acknowledged that the document had been prepared by the Aquatic Mammal Working Group, under the lead of Sigrid Lüber of the NGO OceanCare. Input had been received from Narelle Montgomery and colleagues, Lindsay Porter leading on this issue in IWC, Koen van Waerebeek, Tim Dodman, Mel Cosentino, Nicola Hodgins and other colleagues from WDC and Margi Prideaux.
254. The Chair noted with concern the shift from bycatch to targeted taking, which led in many cases to unsustainable harvesting of species listed on CMS, in particular sirenians.
255. Mr Baker (COP-appointed Councillor for Bycatch) said that despite being a member of the Working Group he had been unable to contribute as much as he would have liked to the discussion. He added that he was not in favour of the term “aquatic bushmeat” which had connotations of organisms coming from the land and of harvest of wildlife in a developing country. The essential question revolved around the illegal harvest of listed species. With sharks, there were no quotas, and where regulation existed fisheries management organizations were responsible for them. There was also controversy over the practice of finning. Mr Baker gave two examples of bycaught birds that were consumed: shearwaters were also known in some circles as “mutton birds” and off the Galapagos Islands, albatrosses were targeted if the fish catch was poor. He thought that the paper needed further work before being submitted to COP and he was ready to contribute.
256. Ms Frisch stressed that the document was the first briefing paper that had been prepared and it reported on progress achieved so far. Further input was welcome. Day3 Track3 till1:03:03.
257. Mr Baigún (Argentina) suggested that the effects on public health of the consumption of aquatic bushmeat, in particular zoonoses and lead poisoning, not covered in this version of the paper, could be considered in its further development. He referred to the relevant work of Dr. Marcela Uhart in this respect.

258. Mr. Oteng-Yeboah (COP-appointed Councillor for African Fauna) expressed general support to the paper, which was touching important aspects of the broader issue of sustainable use. He recommended to liaise with CBD in the discussion concerning the terminology to be used.
259. Ms Sharma (Fiji) welcomed the paper. She noted that the three regions highlighted did not include the Pacific Island region, where aquatic bushmeat was also an issue. With regard to sea turtles and their eggs, five of the ten worst offending countries were found in her region. She also agreed with Mr Baker's reservations about the term "bushmeat" when applied to the aquatic environment and would also prefer to refer to "harvest".
260. Mr Medellín (COP-appointed Councillor for Neotropical Fauna) agreed that a Working Group should be established the tasks of which would include bringing together all the sources of information to determine the extent to which the different species were being affected. On terminology, he concurred that the term "aquatic bushmeat" could not be the most appropriate, and suggested to consider the Spanish terminology used within CITES "*carne de animales acuaticos silvestres*".
261. Mr Ankara (Congo) added a francophone perspective to the discussion on terminology saying that the French rendition of bushmeat *viande de brousse* also did not work well in the aquatic context. As an alternative he suggested *viande sauvage aquatique*. On the question of harvesting, CMS could call on its Parties to create MPAs as some had designated such sites while others had not. MPAs were not the whole solution as many aquatic species were wide ranging and did not confine their movements to within protected areas.
262. The Chair agreed that it would be good to have more MPAs but they were unlikely to account for more than a small percentage of the sea and enforcing the regulations that applied in them was a challenge.
263. Mr Williams (UK) said that the document contained much interesting material, but some of the recommendations were confusing and CMS needed to ensure that the development of its thinking was conducted in parallel with that in CBD and CITES. Any Working Group established needed to have clear terms of reference and it was not entirely obvious how the existing structures would fit together with the Sessional Committee. There had previously been a number of Working Groups and it should be made clear whether these were to continue or whether their work would be taken over by the Sessional Committee. CMS was already a member of the Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management, which was chaired by CBD, and existing mandates did not need to be reviewed.
264. Mr Simmonds (HSI) recalled that the IWC had also tried to resolve the terminology issue and after hours of discussion the experts had not found a consensus. The term "aquatic bushmeat" had however seemed to have established itself. Mr Simmonds agreed with the incongruence of referring to bushmeat in the marine context but also felt that "harvesting" did not reflect the opportunistic nature of the practices involved. He also mentioned that a workshop was to be held later in the year in South-east Asia and synergies should be sought with the organizers.
265. Ms Frisch clarified that the three regions highlighted in the document were those specifically mentioned in Resolution 10.15 which did not include a reference to the Pacific. However, it was expected to expand the geographic scope of the document in its further development. On terminology, the document referred to aquatic bushmeat rather than marine because a number of river-dwelling species were being taken. Concerning the relation of the proposed Working Group with the Sessional Committee, the idea was to establish a CMS Family Working Group, not one internal only to the Scientific Council. The Aquatic Mammal working Group had initiated the process, however the scope of the document went beyond aquatic mammals and required expert input for all other aquatic taxa.

Work ahead included the further development of the paper to make it more comprehensive and balanced, and the development of a draft resolution for which input concerning all aquatic taxa was sought.

266. Mr Barbieri (CMS Secretariat) said that the relationships between the Sessional Committee and existing Working Groups was complicated. Some Working Groups of the Scientific Council had been created under mandate from the COP, whereas the Working Groups of the Sessional Committee were a means of dividing tasks. In the understanding that the Sessional Committee was responsible of delivering advice to the COP on behalf of the entire Scientific Council, it was expected that any existing Working Group would report on its work to the Sessional Committee. How the different entities interrelated would evolve over time, with some Working Groups possibly reaching a natural end and there was no formula that the Secretariat could prescribe during the transitional period.

10.2.3 Underwater noise

267. The Chair introduced this item by noting that underwater noise was an issue, on which various members of the CMS Family cooperated.

268. Ms. Frisch (CMS Secretariat) presented document 10.2.3/Rev.1, that had been jointly prepared by the Secretariat and Wild Migration, which was hired as consultant to develop CMS Family Environmental Impact Assessment Guidelines for Noise-generating Offshore Industries. Many resolutions had been adopted over the years by CMS, ACCOBAMS and ASCOBANS, all calling for a better assessment of the impact of noise on migratory species in the ocean environment. There were some national and regional operational guidelines but not for all sectors, and for some regions and taxa there were no guidance at all. Progress on this issue had been made possible by a contribution by Monaco under the CMS Family Champions Programme. The guidelines were expected to cover all CMS, ACCOBAMS and ASCOBANS listed species potentially affected and their preys, and all potentially harmful noise-generating activities.

269. Underwater noise would be on the agenda of the Meetings of Parties to ACCOBAMS and ASCOBANS, both of which would be taking place later in 2016. The deadline for responses to be taken into account for documents prepared for the ASCOBANS MOP was therefore tight. Members of the Sessional Committee and observers were invited to provide comments on the draft guidelines by the set deadline. The aim was to have the same guidelines adopted under the three treaties, and specific provisions for each treaty could be developed in the resolutions through which the guidelines should be adopted.

270. Mr Størkersen (Chair, CMS Standing Committee) commented that two questionnaires had been issued at about the same time, one from CBD and the other from CMS, and asked for clarification on how the two related to each other. Ms Frisch explained that each contained a cross-reference to the other as it had not been possible to produce a single questionnaire. CMS was liaising closely with CBD to ensure that information was shared where appropriate.

271. Mr Ankara (Congo) said that underwater noise was an important issue for Africa where exploration for oil was taking place. Clear guidelines were needed and it would be particularly useful to have them in French.

272. Mr Williams (UK) asked whether representatives of industry were being consulted. He added that the JNCC (UK conservation agency) had funding from the UK Oil and Gas Regulator for a project on noise risk assessment for geophysical surveys. The project will look at information level of detail that would be appropriate and proportionate according to the type and scale of activity, the aim being to make sure that EIAs would gather the information that would actually be needed.

273. Ms Frisch confirmed that the final documentation would be produced in French, but the working drafts were being prepared in English only and that representatives of industry had been invited to join the Working Group. She thanked the Committee for its positive feedback.

10.3 Terrestrial species

10.3.1 The Central Asian Mammal Initiative

274. Ms Orlinskiy (CMS Secretariat) described the Range States and species covered by the Central Asian Mammal Initiative (CAMI), which acted as an umbrella initiative for a range of CMS work, including the Saiga Antelope MOU, Action Plans and Concerted Actions. She further described the principal threats such as mining and linear infrastructure and the activities being undertaken such as capacity-building and organizing meetings, some of which was done in partnership with the German Federal Environment Ministry (BMUB), the German Nature Conservation Agency (BfN) and the development agency, GIZ.

275. In its first 1½ years, CAMI had made a good start and had raised awareness of Central Asia as a biodiversity hotspot and the threats the species faced. However, there was a lack of data on problems such as overgrazing, overhunting, climate change and linear infrastructure.

276. The Chair said that CAMI covered some iconic species and interesting habitats in the steppes. It would be necessary to work with industry to find solutions through compromise.

277. Ms Qwathekana (South Africa) said an important element of conservation work was developing policy guidelines but it was essential that such documents were read and understood. She asked what was being done to facilitate the implementation for the recommendations and policies contained in them.

278. Ms Orlinskiy said that included in the POW was a series of focused workshops for policy-makers, one of the aims of which was making products such as policy guidelines more readable and relevant.

279. Mr Lenten (CMS Secretariat) reported that a recent workshop in Mongolia had brought a wide range of stakeholders together. On the field trip participants had gone to see the railway fences, and a promise had been secured from the railway company to remove some of the barriers. Attempts were being made to make contact with industry and other stakeholders and positive responses were being made in return.

280. Mr Badamjav (Mongolia) said that the guidelines on linear infrastructure had been the basis for the country's new policy, which meant that they were both practical and useful.

281. Mr Størkersen (Chair, Standing Committee, Norway) described CAMI as a very interesting emerging initiative and welcomed the fact that funding had been obtained for the Secretariat posts through voluntary contributions. Another issue was the extension of the electricity grid across Africa. He accepted that it was necessary to fulfil human aspirations for a better quality of life but this could be done in ways with less impact on nature. Billions of dollars were being provided by investment institutions and they should impose more demanding environmental conditions. While Mongolia had transposed the CMS guidelines into national regulations, many countries were not Party to the Convention (e.g. China and the Russian Federation) and they too had to implement them.

282. Mr Vié (IUCN) asked whether there was any prospect of CAMI developing into a larger scale project such as the one for Sahelo-Saharan antelopes or the Dugong. The IUCN often worked on projects of this scale and was an implementing agency under GEF.

283. Mr Lenten said that CMS was looking to develop similar arrangements to CAMI in other regions, with Africa a likely target for the period after COP12, but this would require large donors.
284. Mr Ankara (Congo) noting that poaching was a problem across the globe asked whether there were many conflicts between local herdsman and conservationists.
285. Ms Orlinskiy conceded that there were conflicts with herders and livestock, affecting Snow leopards and Argali sheep, as livestock was being taken to ever higher ground for grazing and climate change impinged on the natural habitat of wild animals.
286. By phone Ms Beudels (Belgium) referred to the Sahelo-Sharan Antelope project mentioned by Mr Vié as in a way a precursor to CAMI but located in Africa, in a region facing major security issues. She also referred to a publication issued in 2015 on fencing policies for dryland ecosystems which should also be taken into account.

Mongolian Gazelles

287. In his introductory remarks, the Chair said that gradual drops in population were commonplace but there were occasionally catastrophic incidents, one of which befell Mongolian gazelles.
288. Mr Badamjav was sorry to be the bearer of bad news but the harsh winter the previous year had led to a mass mortality event, which was illustrated through a presentation. The main recommendations were that CMS should urge the Mongolian Government and the railway authorities to remove fences and to follow the national standard and the CMS guidelines on the removal of barriers affecting migratory species.
289. The Chair commented that some of the species of the steppe had a huge range and travelled long distances to avoid harsh conditions. Problems arose when the animals reached bottlenecks as they tried to escape extreme weather. CAMI had a vital role in calling for local policies to be adapted.
290. Mr Baker (COP-appointed councillor for Bycatch) asked if any modelling had been done for the possible recovery of the population which would in part depend on the fecundity of the species. Recovery could take between five and ten years.
291. Mr Badamjav said that the last assessment made in 2009 indicated that there were about 1 million individuals but some populations were small and isolated having been cut off by the railway. There were fears that a similar occurrence might happen under similar weather conditions.
292. Mr Kasiki (Kenya) suggested that properly enforced EIAs could play a role in preventing disasters but it was difficult to foresee extreme circumstances. However, there were many linear projects being built or in the planning stage and many involved long fences.
293. Mr Badamjav said that there was legislation and regulation requiring EIA but much of the problem centred on the railway itself, which had been built in the 1950s to link Russia with China. It was owned 50-50 by Mongolia and Russia. The Mongolian side of the management was aware of the concerns surrounding migratory species but no action was being taken, on the ground that there were no resources to undertake even pilot studies.
294. Mr Baigún (Argentina) reported on similar situations in Argentina where fences were erected to keep wild animals away from roads.
295. Mr Galbraith (COP-appointed Councillor for Climate Change) pointed out that the Saker falcon was also affected by power lines, another linear feature of the landscape. He suggested

that a dossier of key factors should be compiled for presentation at COP12. He was sure that solutions were available but they needed to be presented in a methodical manner.

296. Ms Qwathekana (South Africa) recalled the case of the Amur falcon where international outcry had led to action being taken by the Indian authorities to stop the unsustainable harvesting of that species.

297. Mr Ankara (Congo) said that the Government usually prioritized industry over nature conservation. He asked how wildlife was protected under Mongolian law. As the railway was a source of revenue and employment it would take precedence over migratory species. He suggested that a letter be sent to the Mongolian Government.

298. Mr Vié (IUCN) asked that all the information in the presentation was sent to David Mallon of the IUCN Species Specialist Group, as the latest Red List status did not take account of the threats.

299. Mr Lenten said that approaches had been made to the Mongolian railway and this had resulted in parts of the railway fences being dismantled. The German Government and its agencies were raising environmental concerns with the mining companies. The Secretariat would take advice from Mr Badamjav on the best way for approaching the Mongolian authorities.

Saiga Antelopes

300. Ms Orlinskiy provided an update on the saiga die-off which had occurred in May 2015 in calving areas meaning that most of the dead animals were females and young. The expert team which had visited the affected areas had issued a report. Two opportunistic bacteria, *Pasteurella multocida* serotype B and *Clostridium perfringens*, had contributed to the rapid die-off and loss of the entire population of saiga in each birth site in May. However, the infection was thought not to have been transmitted from one animal to the next, because it independently occurred across 13 calving sites spread over 250,000 square kilometres in central Kazakhstan. This almost synchronous die-off was believed to be due to underlying environmental triggers and drivers acting simultaneously at each individual site across the landscape. However, the precise factors and mechanisms remain unclear.

301. Mr Medellín (COP-appointed Councillor for Neotropical Fauna) asked what insights the experts had had into the alarming collapse, whether there were any precedents, what likelihood there was of a repetition and whether any other ungulate species were vulnerable to such events.

302. Ms. Orlinskiy said that there had been previous die-offs but never with near 100 per cent mortality. Other species were also affected with reports of small numbers of dead cattle nearby.

303. Mr Badamjav (Mongolia) said that *Pasteurella* had previously led to a large die off in Mongolian gazelles.

10.3.2 African lion

304. The Chair reminded the Committee that at COP11 there had been a discussion about the possible listing of lions because of the heavy declines they had suffered.

305. Clara Nobbe (CMS Secretariat) gave a report on the implementation of Resolution 11.32 after summarizing its main provisions. She said that regional studies into the conservation status of lions in Africa had been undertaken by the IUCN and that another proposal was likely to be made at COP12 for Appendix II listing.

306. The Wildlife Conservation Research Unit (WildCRU) based in Oxford had assessed the degree to which the IUCN regional strategies had been and were being implemented and to what extent they were still valid. The assessment was carried out on the basis of the replies received from CMS Party Range States to a questionnaire.
307. The results had been posted on line on World Wildlife Day (3 March) and the principal findings were that the IUCN strategies were considered important. Five of the six respondent Range States that had adopted national action plans had based them on the IUCN strategies. Some countries had stable lion populations but overall the decline was continuing and all the threats remained. The main threats were hunting, habitat degradation, loss of prey and human-wildlife conflict. Other problems were the low political priority and controversy surrounding trophy hunting. There was some trade in bones connected to traditional medicine.
308. Resolution 11.32 would continue to be implemented and CMS was working closely with CITES, for which lions were also of interest. Details of how the two Conventions would collaborate were being elaborated. The Range States had been approached and Uganda had agreed to host a meeting at the end of May 2016 to which all Range States would be invited. Funding had been secured from Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. Lions would also be on the agenda of the CITES COP at the end of the year.
309. There was a role for the Scientific Council as the Resolution called for it to be represented at any meeting. Mr Kasiki (Kenya) was closely involved in the work on lions of both CMS and CITES and was a suitable candidate to fulfill this role.
310. The Chair said that the lion was an iconic species and was likely to attract media attention and be of interest to the general public.
311. Mr Medellín (COP-appointed Councillor for Neotropical Fauna) said that the report made disturbing reading and asked whether approaches had been made to CBD which might be in a position to contribute through its access and benefit-sharing (ABS) protocol. Ms Nobbe undertook to make enquiries.
312. Mr Ankara (Congo) said that this could be an important project for Africa. Lions had disappeared from Congo for reasons that were not entirely clear, although there were still some left in Gabon and Cameroon. Action was needed to ensure the lion's survival before they disappeared completely. Hunting, poaching and conflicts with livestock owners were the main problems, and tuberculosis also affected lions.
313. Ms Qwathekana (South Africa) asked how human-wildlife conflicts could be resolved. Normally the interests of people took precedence over wildlife. The consistency between Aichi Targets and SPMS Targets presented an opportunity to work in tandem with CBD, and CMS should seek to ensure that lion conservation in particular, and migratory species in general, was discussed at the forthcoming CBD SBSTTA meeting and at the CBD COP in December.
314. Ms Crockford (BirdLife International) pointed out the overlap between lions and vultures and potential synergies. A multispecies Action Plan had been developed and poisoning was one of the main issues addressed. The forthcoming IUCN Congress would have a motion on poisoning with a focus on Africa.
315. Mr Lenten (CMS Secretariat) announced that the German Government had provided funding for a meeting to be held in Bonn regarding the African Wild Ass, only 200 of which survived in the wild in Ethiopia and Eritrea.
316. Mr Barbieri (CMS Secretariat) noted that there were several activities relating to terrestrial mammals in the POW regarding lions and CAMI. He invited suggestions for specific tasks for the Sessional Committee.

317. The Chair suggested that the Sessional Committee should consider issuing a statement or declaration concerning the declines of populations of terrestrial mammals resulting from the construction of linear infrastructure.
318. Mr Simmonds (HSI) noted that there was a significant gap between the next CITES and CMS COPs. It might therefore be advisable for the Sessional Committee to provide an update to the next CMS COP on developments following the meeting in Uganda and the CITES COP. Ms Nobbe (CMS) added that the Resolution required that a report be made on progress to the 45th meeting of the Standing Committee.
319. Speaking remotely, Ms Beudels-Jamar (Belgium) raised the issue of the Addax and the catastrophe that this species was facing. Niger had the bulk of the population and had established a protected area in 2012. Now the country was suffering from civil unrest and oil exploration was putting the protected area at risk. A meeting was planned for May 2016 and a press release was in the offing which would report that a recent extensive aerial survey had found only three animals.
320. Mr Vié (IUCN) said that his organization had funded the survey. He confirmed that IUCN was working with the Sahara Conservation Fund and would willingly cooperate with CMS on issues on common concern. The status of the Addax was of grave concern and the species was possibly facing imminent extinction in the wild if the low numbers sighted were an accurate indication.
321. The Executive Secretary confirmed his willingness to collaborate with the IUCN and would welcome more information. CMS had been aware of incidents of poaching and of a deterioration of conditions on the ground.
322. Ms Qwathekana saw an opportunity of synergies with a variety of international organizations through UNEP and with other partners. The Executive Secretary undertook to raise this issue with the Biodiversity Liaison Group.
323. Mr Sibley (France) asked whether there were many addaxes held in captivity. Ms Beudels-Jamar confirmed that there was a well-established stud book for the species. When circumstances were favourable, restocking the wild from captive stocks might be viable.
324. Mr Barbieri said that the comments were noted and additional tasks would be assigned to the Sessional Committee in the POW regarding lions and possible collaboration with IUCN and the scientific bodies of other BLG members on the Addax. Some of the points raised had a general application and were not confined to terrestrial species.

10.4 Crosscutting conservation issues

10.4.1 Conservation implications of non-human culture

325. In introducing the item, the Chair said that by broaching this issue, CMS was entering uncharted territory and COP Resolution 11.23 was groundbreaking.
326. Mr Notarbartolo di Sciara (COP-appointed Councillor for Aquatic Mammals) presented document UNEP/CMS/ScC-SC1/Doc.10.4.1, which provided a progress report on the activities of the intersessional expert working group to address the conservation implications of culture and social complexity (the Culture Expert Group), established within the Scientific Council at the request of Resolution 10.23. Efforts had focused on extending the expertise of the group to taxa other than cetaceans, and an invitation to join the group was again extended to Scientific Council members and observers. By June 2015 44 experts had been nominated with specialisms covering cetaceans, birds, elephants, primates and other species. The discussion within the Group demonstrated that integration of data on social behaviour for the conservation of some species listed on the CMS Appendices was profoundly multifaceted. The

challenge, amid all that complexity, was to determine how best to use all this new knowledge for the benefit of conservation and to distil this into clear management advice. The group was working towards making some practical recommendations and in particular was working on some case studies for CMS relevant species.

327. Mr Siblet (France) acknowledged the pioneering character of the work on this issue. He raised the question of compensation measures for negative effects when they could not be avoided.

328. Mr Williams (UK) agreed that the issues were interesting but was slightly concerned about how to apply them, and in order to convince policy-makers solid evidence was needed. Seeing patterns in behaviour did not necessarily prove the existence of a culture.

10.4.2 Advancing ecological networks to address the needs of migratory species

329. The Chair reported on the proceedings and outcomes of a Workshop on connectivity held in September 2015 in the Po Delta in Italy attracting 17 participants. A follow-up meeting was being planned for early 2017 with a view to developing a draft resolution to be presented to COP12.

330. Mr Badamjav (Mongolia) said that the UNDP office in Mongolia had organized a similar thematic workshop to introduce the concept of connectivity.

331. Mr Panigada (ACCOBAMS) reported that the Mediterranean Science Commission (CIESM) had also organized a seminar in Spain on marine connectivity, migratory routes, stepping stones and larval dispersal. The resulting publication in the form of monographs was due to appear in the next few months.

332. Ms Qwathekana (South Africa) said that Parties had many opportunities to take action to meet Aichi Target 11, for instance by expanding marine and terrestrial protected areas. In South Africa transfrontier conservation areas were being identified, however criteria other than migratory species were used. More awareness about migratory species could possibly help to correct that.

333. The Chair emphasized the potential for the issue of connectivity to be a hallmark of CMS.

10.4.2.1 Important Marine Mammal Areas (IMMAs)

334. Mr Notarbartolo di Sciara (COP-appointed Councillor for Aquatic Mammals) introduced the item by highlighting key elements of document 10.4.2.1. He explained that Important Marine Mammal Areas (IMMAs) were a scientific flagging tool of the IUCN Joint SSC/WCPA Marine Mammal Protected Areas Task Force, modelled on the Important Bird Areas (IBAs) concept. IMMAs did not include management elements. There was collaboration with CBD to streamlining the criteria for IMMAs and Ecologically or Biologically Significant Areas (EBSAs) and Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs). A series of regional workshops was planned to identify IMMAs in various regions.

335. Ms Qwathekana (South Africa) sought clarification on whether IMMAs were being considered within CBD processes for identifying Marine Protected Areas. Some recommendations in that respect could be made at the forthcoming CBD SBSTTA meeting. Mr Notarbartolo di Sciara expressed interest to explore this further with Ms. Qwathekana. He was in touch with CBD over linkages between IMMAs and EBSAs.

336. Mr Siblet (France) pointed out that IBAs and IMMAs differed in that most IBAs were located on land and so could be subject to national jurisdiction, whereas some IMMAs were expected to be in international waters. The question was what type of management and monitoring could be applicable for IMMAs in international waters. Mr Notarbartolo di Sciara said that there was no management regime for IMMAs and some marine IBAs were also beyond national jurisdiction.

337. Mr Galbraith (COP-appointed Councillor for Climate Change) said that the initiative was important in relation to climate change, because the resilience of species and habitats depended on the size and location of sites. The question of resilience in relation climate change was worth to be raised in a possible submission to SBSTTA.
338. Mr Williams (UK) said it was difficult to make a judgement without knowing the criteria for IMMAs and EBSAs. Mr Notarbartolo di Sciara undertook to produce a table comparing the two sets of criteria.
339. Mr Panigada (ACCOBAMS) said that a workshop to identify IMMAs in the Mediterranean was planned, of which ACCOBAMS was one of the organizers.
340. Mr Vié (IUCN) said that standards had now been adopted by the IUCN Council for Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs).
341. On the question of seeking the endorsement of IMMAs within the CBD Strategy to expand marine protected areas, Mr Oteng-Yeboah felt that it was appropriate for the Sessional Committee to give its opinion and advise CMS Parties that were also Parties to CBD.
342. The Chair requested that Mr Notarbartolo di Sciara and Ms Qwathekana liaise to agree the wording of a recommendation.

10.4.3 Programme of work on climate change and migratory species

343. Mr Galbraith (COP-appointed Councillor for Climate Change) introduced the item by reminding participants that COP11 through Resolution 11.26 had adopted a thematic programme of work on climate change and migratory species. This entailed several stages including an assessment of the steps to be taken to allow migratory species to cope with climate change; addressing key information and knowledge gaps; looking at best practices, and sharing them between the CMS Family; strengthening capacity; framing actions within the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species; looking for funding for the WG to continue and report to COP on implementation of the programme of work.
344. The discussion at COP11 had stressed the need to focus efforts and that priorities would vary in different regions. CMS would also have to work with other fora such as the Bern Convention, which similarly to the Scientific Council had established a Working Group on Climate Change. This Working Group had met in Rome the previous year and was expected to meet again soon in Bosnia-Herzegovina.
345. In concluding his introduction, Mr Galbraith propose three areas for action by the Climate Change Working Group with support from the Sessional Committee in the period between the meeting and COP12, including (i) an assess of the survival need of particular species; (ii) getting a better understanding of key information gaps; (iii) compiling a list of key examples of best practices to help migratory species to cope with climate change.
346. Mr Siblet (France) agreed that it was necessary to collect more data on the consequences of climate change on migratory species. However, there was already a good idea of the impact on some species, notably birds, in terms of changes in phenology, migration routes and stopover sites. There was consensus that one of the best adaptation measures consisted in the significant increase of the surface and density of protected areas, with a view to giving species on the move the best chance to find suitable habitats. In this regard, the objective of 17% of protected areas stated in Aichi Target 11 was seen as insufficient by many. CMS should find its position in the ongoing debate. Other fora were dealing with protected areas, and the data that they were gathering should be used.

347. Referring to the Atlas project discussed under item 8.2, the Chair stressed the interest of overlaying migration routes with maps of habitats and land use and their projected changes in the light of climate change, to assess the effectiveness of the current network of protected areas to satisfy the future needs of migratory species.
348. Ms Crockford (BirdLife International) said that some research from the Netherlands to be published the following month in Science would show that the Red knot (*Calidris canutus*) and Sanderling (*Calidris alba*) had been shrinking in size because of nutritional mistiming at their breeding grounds. Their bills in particular were becoming smaller. This meant in turn that they were not able to reach their normal food at their wintering grounds in Banc d'Arguin, and they were eating seagrass roots instead of bivalves. The changes had been noticed over a very short period of just 20 years.
349. Mr Simmonds (HSI) said that mismatching was affecting also some migrating whales, with evidence from the thickness of blubber and reproductive effort. He agreed that a paper was needed on how to improve resilience, as Governments seemed to be at a loss and needed advice on what to do. He suggested looking through the Appendices and identifying those species most at risk of climate change related effects, notably those with restricted habitats.
350. Mr Galbraith pointed out that Defra had produced a review of the impact of climate change on migratory species about ten years before, that study deserved to be updated in the light of new information. He concluded requesting participants to provide examples of best practices to populate the proposed compilation.

10.4.4 Future CMS activities related to Invasive Alien Species

351. Mr Heredia (CMS Secretariat) said that unfortunately the Secretariat had lacked the resources to dedicate to the issue since the last COP. With some assistance, some progress could be made before COP12. Possible ideas to be considered by the Working Groups scheduled for the next day concerning the possible role of the Sessional Committee included: furthering the analysis of the interactions between migratory species and invasive alien species; identifying priorities for action; improve cooperation with other organizations working on invasive alien species; assessing the impact of invasive alien species at the level entire migratory systems such as flyways.
352. Mr Vié (IUCN) said that the IUCN had a specialist group on invasive alien species that was in good contact with CMS, however concrete action was impeded by a lack of funding. A project on the impact of invasive alien species on freshwater ecosystems involving CMS and the Ramsar Convention was at the stage of concept note, wait for some concrete perspective of funding to develop it further.
353. Mr Siblet (France) endorsed the idea of setting priorities and suggested concentrating on invasive alien species' effects on islands.

11. Progress on other matters requiring Scientific Council advice

354. On bycatch, Mr Baker (COP-appointed Councillor for Bycatch) said that he had looked through all the past Resolutions of which there were six. He suggested drafting a consolidated text in a new Resolution and retiring the old ones.
355. Regarding touristic activities with impacts on wildlife, laypeople that professed a love for animals could unwittingly cause harm through taking part in poorly managed boat-based wildlife watching. Ms Frisch (CMS Secretariat) provided an update on the implementation of Resolution 11.29 saying that Monaco had provided funds for the compilation of guidelines based on those already developed for whale watching to apply to other taxa.

356. On “swim-with-dolphins” activities, Mr Notarbartolo di Sciara (COP-appointed Councillor for Aquatic Mammals) projected the Dolphin Watch website on screen. This was a new phenomenon, answering people’s desire to be close to wildlife and providing a business opportunity. It was known that there were operations active on Australia, Egypt, Indonesia, Kenya, the United Republic of Tanzania, part of the South Pacific and the USA. Some were well regulated and some not regulated at all. The website had a video of boats off the coast of Egypt moving through what was supposedly a resting area for dolphins. A possibility was to cover this phenomenon in the previously mentioned guidelines on wildlife watching, however it was developing so quickly that it probably deserved to be treated separately to get proper attention. A shadow Working Group already existed with experts identified and it could operate without funding. Mr Notarbartolo di Sciara stressed that there were some very good “swim-with” schemes but there were some that needed to be reined in.
357. Mr Panigada (ACCOBAMS) said that in the Pelagos sanctuary examples existed of swim with whale practices, and expressed the interest of being involved in a possible working group.
358. Ms Wood (Whale and Dolphin Conservation) supported the creation of a Working Group as the activities were engaged in poor practices, turning an excellent opportunity to inform the public about wildlife and conservation into a threat to humans and animals alike.
359. The Chair said that the product of the shadow Working Group could be recognized by the Sessional Committee and Mr Baker suggested subsuming it within the Marine Mammals Working Group.
360. Ms Frisch (CMS Secretariat) reported that the COP in Quito had adopted Resolution 11.30 on marine debris, that requested the Scientific Council to liaise with other relevant organizations within and outside the CMS Family to ensure synergies and avoid duplication of efforts. The problem was affecting all taxa and not just marine mammals, and all working groups should integrate it in their work where relevant. It was suggested that the Australian Government which had submitted the Resolution be asked what follow-up actions were foreseen.

Concluding items

12. Time and venue of the 2nd Meeting of the Sessional Committee of the Scientific Council (ScC-SC2)

361. Mr. Barbieri (CMS Secretariat) said that the dates of the 2nd meeting of the Sessional Committee were to be determined largely by the deadlines for the submission of documents to COP12. Considering that COP12 would be held at the end of October 2017, and that listing proposals and other documents with a scientific component were to be submitted 150 days in advance and had to be reviewed by the Sessional Committee, the likely date for the next meeting would be in July 2017.

13. Any other business

362. The Chair said that one issue had been raised under this agenda item relating to the Central Asian Mammals Initiative. A presentation had been given by Mr Badamjav (Mongolia) on the effects of linear infrastructure on the Mongolian Gazelle. A statement had been drafted in conjunction with Mr Bajamdav who had had to leave the meeting early. Copies of the draft statement had been circulated and it was being presented to the meeting for endorsement.
363. After some discussion, it was agreed that the declaration could be issued after the language had been polished and the aspects of a political rather than scientific nature had been removed. The final text would be submitted to Mr Badamjav to ensure that he was content.

14. Closure of the Meeting

364. The Chair said that at this stage of meeting he felt contrasting emotions – relief that the business had been concluded and sadness to be leaving. He thanked all the staff at the Secretariat, the technicians from the UN premises, the Host Government and the interpreters, as well as the members of the Committee and the observers for contributing to an interesting and fruitful meeting.

365. The Executive Secretary added his thanks to all those mentioned above and to the Chair for having guided the meeting so skillfully. The Convention could look forward to the immediate future with confidence. Having completed the drafting of the POW, the next task was to start delivering results on the ground, on issues such as the conservation of Mongolian Gazelles. He also looked forward to welcoming the Chair back to Bonn the following month along with the Bologna Choir for the annual World Migratory Bird Day Benefit Concert.

Programme of Work for the Sessional Committee of the Scientific Council for 2016-2017

Thematic Work Area: **Institutional and Legal matters (Working Group 1)**

WG1 lead(s) and participants: Alfred Oteng-Yeboah / Fernando Spina, Malta Qwathekana, James Williams, Olivier Biber

Secretariat Focal Point: Marco Barbieri

Mandate	Progress till ScC-SC1	Description of SC intersessional actions (ScC-SC1 – ScC-SC2)	Expected Output	Lead / Contributors	Priority	Funding needed	Comments/Notes
Scientific Council, with advice from the Secretariat, to develop and establish a revision of its Rules of Procedure, as well as elements of its <i>modus operandi</i> in accordance with Res. 11.4 (Res. 11.4 , para. 12)	Analysis of sections of the Rules of Procedure requiring revision pursuant to Res. 11.4 prepared by the Secretariat.	Sessional Committee to produce a revised version of the Rules of Procedure. Secretariat to develop options for key points to be reviewed by chairs of Standing Committee and Scientific Council before review by the working group. Working Group to create draft consolidated RoP by end of June. Sessional Committee and Scientific Council to respond to consultation by end of July.	Revised RoP	Secretariat / WG	Core	No	Deadline for submitting documents to StC45 approximately set at 9 Sep. 2016
Scientific Council to submit a report on the implementation of Res. 11.4 to COP12 (Res. 11.4 , para. 12)		Sessional Committee to produce a report on the implementation of Res.11.4 provisions relevant to the establishment and operationalization of the Sessional Committee, to be submitted to cOP12	Report	ScC Chair / Secretariat	Core	No	
Scientific Council and Secretariat to update Res.1.5 by developing a new template and guidelines for the drafting of listing proposals in line with the Annex of this Resolution, for adoption by the Standing Committee in time for its use for proposals to be submitted to the Conference of the Parties at its 12 th Meeting (Res.11.33 para.5)	Draft revised template and guidelines for proposals to amend CMS Appendices prepared by the Secretariat. Submitted to ScC-SC1 for consideration (Doc.7.1.1)	Template revised by SC, reviewed following SCSC1. Revised template and guidelines for proposals to amend CMS Appendices submitted to StC45 for review and approval	Revised template	Secretariat / WG	Core	No	Deadline for submitting documents to StC45 approximately set at 9 Sep. 2016

Mandate	Progress till ScC-SC1	Description of SC intersessional actions (ScC-SC1 – ScC-SC2)	Expected Output	Lead / Contributors	Priority	Funding needed	Comments/Notes
		Sessional Committee to develop a couple of model proposals for amendment, using the revised template to be adopted by StC45, with a view to assisting Parties in developing sound proposals for amendment	Model proposals		High	No	
Scientific Council to clarify the meaning of the phrase “significant proportion” in Article I, paragraph 1 (a) of the Convention Text, and report back to the COP (Res.11.33 para.6)	None before ScC-SC1	Needs consideration of practicality of making definition. May need to have a part in the listing template that asks for why this is a significant proportion. Possible checklist of issues to be considered.	Output of SC to explain complexity of the matter. Aim for amendment to template for listing proposals.	ScC Chair / WG Initial approach to SC, may thereafter place out as request for help to scientific community.	Core	No	Does this need legal as well as scientific input? Numbers <i>per se</i> may not be the answer – changing circumstances with respect to impacts may affect. Need practical approach. Issue of how deal with partial migrants. Possible cross reference to CITES listing process.

Thematic Work Area: **Strategic issues (Working Group 2)**

WG2 lead(s) and participants: Fernando Spina / Malta Qwathekana, Zeb Hogan, Vincent Hilomen, James Williams, Olivier Biber, Sergey

Dereliev, Kelly Malsch (WCMC)

Secretariat Focal Point: Marco Barbieri

Mandate	Progress till ScC-SC1	Description of SC intersessional actions (ScC-SC1-ScC-SC2)	Expected Output	Lead / Contributors	Priority	Funding needed	Comments/Notes
Preparation of a report on the conservation status of species included in CMS Appendices (Res. 11.1 , Annex V, Activity 30)	Funding obtained for a scoping workshop with key partners to develop a concept note and Terms of Reference. Workshop currently being planned	SC Chair to participate in scoping workshop. SC to review and approve a costed concept for the report, to be prepared by the Secretariat. Depending on successful fundraising, SC to oversee production of the report, including review and endorsement in time for its submission to COP12. SC to provide focus on questions to be addressed by the workshop.	Concept initially followed by plan for report.	Secretariat /Chair / input from IUCN SSC-SGs / WCMC (Species+)	High	Yes	The concept is expected to include a few options, with different resource needs and timeframe for completion. Report also to cover input to Range State List. Pick up on aquatic mammals work previously done by Bill Perrin. Aim for report for CoP12, based on resources available following scoping workshop. Aim to improve over time. Synthesise existing assessments & focus on CMS listed species.
Development of Atlas on Animal Migration - Starting with the African Eurasian region migratory birds atlas and taking into consideration already existent ones (Res. 11.1 , Annex V, Activity 32)	Discussion at first technical workshop on connectivity mediated by migratory species (Albarella, September 2015)	SC to consider proposal based on presentation by Franz Bairlein at ScC-SC1. SC to oversee preparation of the Atlas when work will start subject to successful fundraising	Progress in the implementation of the preparation of the atlas to be submitted to COP12	Franz Bairlein / Chair SC. EURING input wrt birds part. World Fish Migration Platform for fish poster. Need to identify other input for other taxa.	High – need to avoid fundraising competition with status assessment work above.	Yes	Need to fundraise for specific parts and plan development over a longer timeframe. Time frame of this initiative would go beyond COP12. First phase on birds with aim to stimulate for other taxa. Bring in different types of tagging from different taxa. First step to establish partnerships with different organizations working on different taxa. Several volumes over time? Much information on web rather than physical volumes. Link with critical site network tool & connectivity. Looking for highest quality individual movement data where possible.

Mandate	Progress till ScC-SC1	Description of SC intersessional actions (ScC-SC1-ScC-SC2)	Expected Output	Lead / Contributors	Priority	Funding needed	Comments/Notes
<p>CMS Strategic Plan Working Group (SPWG) to consult the Scientific Council as appropriate, including on the scientific evidence underpinning relevant indicators Res. 11.2, Annex 2, para. 8)</p>	<p>Zero draft of the Indicator Factsheets for the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species being developed by the SPWG. To be ready for consultation before ScC-SC1</p>	<p>Input individually to drafts of indicator factsheets and Companion volume Review at Sessional Committee in mid 2017.</p>	<p>Comments provided to consultant in advance of deadlines set by SPWG.</p>	<p>All members of SC to contribute to SPWG</p>	<p>Core</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Important to get information on availability of information for indicators in different parts of the world. May need to input further following discussion at Standing Committee 45 and follow on from discussion at CoP12.</p>

Thematic Work Area: **Aquatic species conservation issues (Working Group 3)**

WG3 lead(s) and participants: Giuseppe Notarbartolo di Sciara / Barry Baker, Zeb Hogan, Graeme Taylor, Malta Qwathekana, Saras Sharma, Vincent Hilomen, Simone Panigada (ACCOBAMS), Heidrun Frisch (ASCOBANS), Mark Simmonds (H.S.I.), Alison Wood (WDC), Kelly Malsch (WCMC)

Secretariat Focal Point: Melanie Virtue

Mandate	Progress till ScC-SC1	Description of SC intersessional actions (ScC-SC1 – ScC-SC2)	Expected Output	<u>Lead</u> / Contributors	Priority	Funding needed	Comments/Notes
Scientific Council to nominate, for each species and/or taxonomic group listed for concerted or cooperative action, a member of the Council or a designated alternative expert to be responsible for providing a concise written report to each meeting of the Council on progress in the implementation of actions for the species or taxonomic group concerned. Confirm at each subsequent meeting of the Scientific Council that these nominations remain valid or agree alternative nominations as necessary. (Res. 10.23 , para. 6)	ScC members or alternative experts identified as focal points for most aquatic mammal species designated for Concerted or Cooperative Actions	Confirm availability of already identified focal points and identify focal points for remaining species.	Focal points identified	Secretariat	Medium	No	In the present transition phase, it might be premature to undertake an important reporting effort.
Scientific Council to identify candidate species for designation for Concerted Action, and action to take in response to Concerted Action listing, taking fully into account the recommendations summarized in Annex 3 to Res. 11.13. (Res. 11.13 , para. 5)		ScC members to promote, and assist with the development of proposals for Concerted Actions following the guidance provided in Annex 3 to Res. 11.13, for species already designated or for candidate species for designation	Proposals for designation of species for concerted Actions	Individual members	High	No	

Mandate	Progress till ScC-SC1	Description of SC intersessional actions (ScC-SC1 – ScC-SC2)	Expected Output	Lead / Contributors	Priority	Funding needed	Comments/Notes
<p>Species previously listed for cooperative action, but for which no activity has yet begun, would be automatically transferred into a new unified Concerted Actions list. The list would be subject to review by the Scientific Council and the COP, to determine whether each such species should remain listed or be deleted. (Res. 11.13, Annex 3, para. 3)</p> <p>Projects and initiatives already begun as Cooperative Actions under earlier COP decisions would continue unaffected. These too would be subject to review by the Scientific Council and the COP. Such reviews may conclude, <i>inter alia</i>, that the objectives of a given action have been achieved and it has been completed, or that it should continue within the terms of the unified Concerted Actions mechanism (and be re-named accordingly). (Res. 11.13, Annex 3, para. 4)</p>		<p>Secretariat to produce unified concerted Actions list for ScC-SC2 review</p> <p>Secretariat to compile information on implementation of Concerted and Cooperative Actions from national reports to assist ScC review</p>	<p>Recommendation to COP on species designated for Cooperative Actions to be maintained in the unified Concerted Actions mechanism</p>	Secretariat	High	No	Res. 11.13 is not fully explicit as regards the timing for the review
<p>Scientific Council to seek to enhance cooperation and collaboration with CITES and the IWC on small cetacean species targeted by live captures from the wild (Res. 11.22 para. 3)</p>		<p>Develop cooperation, e.g. through ScC Members or observers present in relevant CITES or IWC fora to provide link. Mutual observers IWC-ASCOBANS to assist</p>	<p>Options for cooperation identified</p>	Mark Simmonds/ (Sec FP: Frisch)	High	No	
<p>Resolution on live captures of cetaceans from the wild for commercial purposes (Res. 11.22)</p>	<p>Questionnaire sent and responses compiled</p>	<p>Perform further analysis of survey responses, including possible legal inconsistencies, and consider the situation in non-Parties</p>	<p>Gaps and inconsistencies identified</p>	Alison Wood / (Sec FP: Frisch)	High	No	
<p>Action to address the impact on CMS-listed species that are likely to be subject to utilization as aquatic bushmeat (Res. 10.15)</p>	<p>Discussion paper drafted by the Aquatic Mammal WG. Submitted to ScC-SC1 for consideration (Doc. 10.2.2)</p>	<p>Develop cooperation with CPW and IWC, e.g. through ScC Members or observers present in these fora, assisted by IWC-ASCOBANS observers</p> <p>Further develop briefing paper</p> <p>Develop draft resolution for COP12</p>	<p>Enhanced version of briefing paper; Draft resolution</p>	Sigrid Lueber / (Sec FP: Virtue & Frisch)	High	No	

Mandate	Progress till ScC-SC1	Description of SC intersessional actions (ScC-SC1 – ScC-SC2)	Expected Output	Lead / Contributors	Priority	Funding needed	Comments/Notes
Development of CMS Family Environmental Impact Assessment Guidelines for Noise-generating Offshore Industries (Res. 9.19 para. 3)	Development of guidelines contracted out by the Secretariat in consultation with the Joint CMS / ASCOBANS/ ACCOBAMS Noise Working Group. Progress report submitted to ScC-SC1 (Doc. 10.2.3)	Participate in consultation process on draft guidelines to be concluded by 5 July 2016 Develop draft resolution for COP12	Agreed guidelines Draft resolution	Notarbartolo di Sciara / (Sec FP: Frisch)	High	No further funding required	NZ draft Code of Conduct to be shared
Scientific Council to identify candidate species for listing on, or delisting from the CMS Appendices, and assist in the preparation of proposals for amendment as appropriate (Art.VIII para. 5.c of the Convention)		Consult ScC taxonomic WGs and CMS Family advisory bodies on species to be considered for listing Assist in development of listing proposals Consider: whale shark, golden dorado, Danube salmon, Japanese eel	Draft listing proposals	COP-App. Councillors for Aquatic Mammals, Turtles and Fish WGs / (Sec FP: Virtue)	High	No	Ongoing update of Freshwater Fish Review, will identify candidate species for COP13 IUCN Freshwater Fish SG to fundraise jointly with CMS
Scientific Council to assess the potential impact of dolphin swim-with programmes on CMS-listed species and advise CMS COP accordingly (Art. VIII para. 5.e of the Convention)		Provide briefing paper to ScC-SC2 Develop draft resolution and guidelines	Briefing paper Draft guidelines Draft resolution	Notarbartolo di Sciara / (Sec FP: Frisch)	High	No	ACCOBAMS WG on whale watching also to address this, opportunity to liaise

Thematic Work Area: **Terrestrial species conservation issues (Working Group 4)**

WG4 lead(s) and participants: Lkhagvasuren Badamjav / Rodrigo Medellin, Samuel Kasiki, Jean-Christophe Vié, Kelly Malsch (WCMC)

Secretariat Focal Point: Bert Lenten

Mandate	Progress till ScC-SC1	Description of SC intersessional actions (ScC-SC1 – ScC-SC2)	Expected Output	Lead / Contributors	Priority	Funding needed	Comments/Notes
<p>Scientific Council to nominate, for each species and/or taxonomic group listed for concerted or cooperative action, a member of the Council or a designated alternative expert to be responsible for providing a concise written report to each meeting of the Council on progress in the implementation of actions for the species or taxonomic group concerned. Confirm at each subsequent meeting of the Scientific Council that these nominations remain valid or agree alternative nominations as necessary. (Res. 10.23, para. 6)</p>	<p>Species Focal Points identified for all species except wild Yak</p>	<p>Confirm availability of already identified focal points</p> <p>Wild Yak –Lkhagva to suggest expert</p>	<p>Focal points identified</p>	<p>Secretariat</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>In the present transition phase, it might be premature to undertake an important reporting effort.</p>
<p>Scientific Council to identify candidate species for designation for Concerted or Cooperative Action, and action to take in response to Concerted or Cooperative Action listing, taking fully into account the recommendations summarized in Annex 3 to Res. 11.13. (Res. 11.13, para. 5)</p>		<p>ScC members to promote, and assist with the development of proposals for Concerted Actions following the guidance provided in Annex 3 to Res. 11.13, for species already designated or for candidate species for designation</p>	<p>Proposals for designation of species for Concerted Actions</p>	<p>Individual members</p>	<p>high</p>	<p>No</p>	

Mandate	Progress till ScC-SC1	Description of SC intersessional actions (ScC-SC1 – ScC-SC2)	Expected Output	Lead / Contributors	Priority	Funding needed	Comments/Notes
<p>Species previously listed for cooperative action, but for which no activity has yet begun, would be automatically transferred into a new unified Concerted Actions list. The list would be subject to review by the Scientific Council and the COP, to determine whether each such species should remain listed or be deleted. (Res. 11.13, Annex 3, para. 3)</p> <p>Projects and initiatives already begun as Cooperative Actions under earlier COP decisions would continue unaffected. These too would be subject to review by the Scientific Council and the COP. Such reviews may conclude, <i>inter alia</i>, that the objectives of a given action have been achieved and it has been completed, or that it should continue within the terms of the unified Concerted Actions mechanism (and be re-named accordingly). (Res. 11.13, Annex 3, para. 4)</p>		See point above	Recommendation to COP on species designated for Cooperative Actions to be maintained in the unified Concerted Actions mechanism	Secretariat	High	No	Res. 11.13 is not fully explicit as regards the timing for the review
<p>Scientific Council and the Secretariat to continue and strengthen efforts to collaborate with other relevant international fora with a view to strengthening synergies and implementation of CMS and the CAMI in these fora. (Res. 11.24 para. 7)</p>	Progress report on CAMI implementation submitted to ScC-SC1	Similar reports should be done on progress under CAMI, Sahelo-Saharan Antelopes, Bats and other species groups Effort should be made to promote the abovementioned species initiatives at relevant international fora,	Reports at next meeting on progress made and on promotion of the initiatives in international fora	Scientific councillors	high	No	

Mandate	Progress till ScC-SC1	Description of SC intersessional actions (ScC-SC1 – ScC-SC2)	Expected Output	Lead / Contributors	Priority	Funding needed	Comments/Notes
Scientific Council to identify candidate species for listing on, or delisting from the CMS Appendices, and assist in the preparation of proposals for amendment as appropriate (Art.VIII para. 5.c of the Convention)		Verify interest of Parties in submitting listing proposals for species such as Chinkara and Lion, and assist them in the development of the proposals as appropriate. Consider the case of species which are not migrating anymore (e.g. Oryx, Przewalski's horse), listing lions at next COP (a review may be coming out of the upcoming Range states meeting (organized by CITES/CMS	Listing proposals submitted to COP12 for consideration	Scientific councillors	high	No	A review may be coming out of the upcoming Range states meeting (jointly convened by CITES and CMS)
Establishing Central Asian Scientific Initiative (Resolution 11.24 CAMI)	Already being done in Mongolia, UNDP workshop further actions requested to make the programme for all universities to teach about landscape permeability issues and migrations	Approach scientists in Central Asia with the help of the Secretariat to coordinate research efforts, collect data, use uniform methodology and cooperate with each other First task to compile distribution/migration data for CAMI species. To incorporate migratory species and threats into university curricula	Start the activity by next meeting, contact scientists	Lkhagva/ CMS Secretariat (CAMI)	high	No, at a later stage to conduct meetings	
Dry land fencing problems		Include this issue for drylands in Africa and Central Asia under the topic of Ecological networks	Address this issue in next meeting	Scientific Councillors	high	Yes?	For future workshops to address this issue funding is needed
African carnivores		Develop a regional initiative to conserve African carnivores, consider including wild dog, lions, cheetah, leopards	Report on the next meeting	Scientific Councillors/ secretariat	high	Yes, meeting to discuss and set up the initiative	Consider existing expert review "Bigger than the Elephant" , Something similar may be discussed for Jaguar (cooperation with Africa to exchange best practices)

Thematic Work Area: **Avian species conservation issues (Working Group 5)**

WG5 lead(s) and participants: Rob Clay, Stephen Garnett / Barry Baker, Graeme Taylor, Samuel Kasiki, Roman Baigún, Sergey Dereliev (AEWA), Nick P. Williams (CMS/Raptors MoU), Alex Ngari (BirdLife Int.), Kelly Malsch (WCMC)

Secretariat Focal Point: Borja Heredia

Mandate	Progress till ScC-SC1	Description of SC intersessional actions (ScC-SC1 – ScC-SC2)	Expected Output	Lead / Contributors	Priority	Funding needed	Comments/Notes
<p>Scientific Council to nominate, for each species and/or taxonomic group listed for concerted or cooperative action, a member of the Council or a designated alternative expert to be responsible for providing a concise written report to each meeting of the Council on progress in the implementation of actions for the species or taxonomic group concerned. Confirm at each subsequent meeting of the Scientific Council that these nominations remain valid or agree alternative nominations as necessary. (Res. 10.23, para. 6)</p>		<p>Confirm availability of already identified focal points and identify focal points for remaining species.</p>	<p>Reports for each species. Identify actions required.</p>	Secretariat	Medium	No	<p>In the present transition phase, it might be premature to undertake an important reporting effort.</p>
<p>Scientific Council to identify candidate species for designation for Concerted or Cooperative Action, and action to take in response to Concerted or Cooperative Action listing, taking fully into account the recommendations summarized in Annex 3 to Res. 11.13. (Res. 11.13, para. 5)</p>		<p>ScC members to promote, and assist with the development of proposals for Concerted Actions following the guidance provided in Annex 3 to Res. 11.13, for species already designated or for candidate species for designation</p>	<p>Proposals for designation of species for Concerted Actions</p>	Individual members	High	No	

Mandate	Progress till ScC-SC1	Description of SC intersessional actions (ScC-SC1 – ScC-SC2)	Expected Output	Lead / Contributors	Priority	Funding needed	Comments/Notes
<p>Species previously listed for cooperative action, but for which no activity has yet begun, would be automatically transferred into a new unified Concerted Actions list. The list would be subject to review by the Scientific Council and the COP, to determine whether each such species should remain listed or be deleted. (Res. 11.13, Annex 3, para. 3)</p> <p>Projects and initiatives already begun as Cooperative Actions under earlier COP decisions would continue unaffected. These too would be subject to review by the Scientific Council and the COP. Such reviews may conclude, <i>inter alia</i>, that the objectives of a given action have been achieved and it has been completed, or that it should continue within the terms of the unified Concerted Actions mechanism (and be re-named accordingly). (Res. 11.13, Annex 3, para. 4)</p>		<p>Secretariat to produce unified concerted Actions list for ScC-SC2 review</p> <p>Secretariat to compile information on implementation of Concerted and Cooperative Actions from national reports to assist ScC review</p>	<p>Recommendation to COP on species designated for Cooperative Actions to be maintained in the unified Concerted Actions mechanism</p>	<p>Secretariat</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Res. 11.13 is not fully explicit as regards the timing for the review</p>
<p>Continuation of the open-ended Flyways Working Group to (a) monitor the implementation of the POW and the Americas Flyways Framework, (b) review relevant scientific and technical issues, international initiatives and processes, (c) provide guidance on and input into the conservation and management of flyways at global and flyway level during the intersessional period until COP12 and (d) review and update the POW, as a basis for the continued prioritization of the CMS activities on flyways (Res. 11.14 para. 7)</p>		<p>The Flyways Programme of work will be analyzed to check specific mandates for the scientific council.</p>	<p>A specific list of actions will be identified.</p>	<p>Avian Working Group</p>	<p>Core</p>	<p>No</p>	

Mandate	Progress till ScC-SC1	Description of SC intersessional actions (ScC-SC1 – ScC-SC2)	Expected Output	Lead / Contributors	Priority	Funding needed	Comments/Notes
Flyways Working Group to support the establishment of a Task Force, in conjunction with WHMSI, to coordinate the development and implementation of an action plan to achieve the global Programme of Work and Americas Flyways Framework including provisions for concerted conservation action for priority species, and to report to COP12 onwards and WHMSI (Res. 11.14 para. 3)	Draft Action Plan for the Americas Flyway developed under the lead of the Scientific Councillor for Ecuador in consultation with the CMS Americas Regional Group. Submitted to ScC-SC1 for consideration (Doc.10.1.1.3)	Provide technical support and review draft of the action plan.	Action plan endorsed.	Avian Working Group	Core	No	
Development and adoption of a Species Action Plan (SAP) for Baer's Pochard in Asia (Res. 11.14 , Annex 1)	Action Plan developed by WWT. Submitted to ScC-SC1 for provisional endorsement (Doc.10.1.1.1)	Provide technical support and review draft of the action plan.	Action plan endorsed.	WWT/ EAAFP	Core	No	
Development and adoption of a multi-species action plan for all African-Eurasian Vultures (except Palm-nut Vulture (<i>Gypohierax angolensis</i>)) via the CMS Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation of Migratory Birds of Prey (Raptors MoU) (Res. 11.14 , Annex 1)	Coordinating Unit for the Raptors MOU developed a Project Charter for the Vulture MsAP and circulated it to all Range States, partners and interested parties, with a call for nominations to the Vulture WG and for financial or in-kind support to ensure the development of the MsAP. Substantial funds and in-kind support already secured (ScC-SC1/Inf.2)	Review and provide guidance as it develops. Offering a review and endorsement by the Council before the COP. Evaluate any proposals for listing resulting from the draft action plan. Evaluate the action plan and evaluate documents submitted by respective parties prior to COP.	Action plan endorsed.	Raptors MOU / IUCN SSC Vulture SG; BirdLife Int.	Core	No	

Mandate	Progress till ScC-SC1	Description of SC intersessional actions (ScC-SC1 – ScC-SC2)	Expected Output	Lead / Contributors	Priority	Funding needed	Comments/Notes
Continuation of the open-ended Preventing Poisoning Working Group until COP12 under the Terms of Reference annexed to Res. 11.15, renewing its membership to incorporate expertise from geographical regions currently absent as well as representatives of industry and governments, to address the impact of other sources of poisoning, and geographic gaps, and to monitor the implementation of the Guidelines (Res.11.15 para.15)		Providing recommendations as requested regarding working group membership. Reviewing the outputs from working group prior to COP.	Recommendations for the next COP.	Avian working group.	Core	No	
Scientific Council and the Working Group on African-Eurasian Migratory Landbirds, in liaison with the Migrant Landbirds Study Group to promote work to address key gaps in knowledge and future research directions, in particular through the analysis of existing long-term and large-scale datasets, the European Atlas of Bird Migration, the use of new and emerging tracking technologies, field studies of migrant birds in Sub-Saharan Africa, use of survey and demographic data from the Eurasian breeding grounds and use of remote sensing earth observation data of land cover change in sub-Saharan Africa (Res. 11.17 para. 6)	Draft Programme of Work for the implementation of the African-Eurasian Migratory Landbirds Action Plan for the period 2016-2020 developed by the Working Group. Submitted to ScC-SC1 for consideration (Doc.10.1.3.1)	Providing guidance as requested and reviewing any outputs from the working group.	Recommendations for the next COP.	Avian working group	Core	No	
Working Group on African-Eurasian Migratory Landbirds and the CMS Scientific Council, in liaison with the Migrant Landbirds Study Group and the Friends of the Landbirds Action Plan, with the support of the CMS Secretariat, to develop as an emerging issue Action Plans for a first set of species including the Yellow-breasted Bunting <i>Emberiza aureola</i> , Turtle Dove <i>Streptopelia turtur</i> and European Roller <i>Coracias garrulous</i> (Res. 11.17 para. 11)	Draft Programme of Work for the implementation of the African-Eurasian Migratory Landbirds Action Plan for the period 2016-2020 developed by the Working Group. Submitted to ScC-SC1 for consideration (Doc.10.1.3.1)	Reviewing the action plans. Offer guidance and advice if requested.	Recommendations for the next COP.	Avian working group	Core	No	
Saker Falcon Task Force to report on progress in the implementation of its mandate to the intersessional meeting of the Scientific Council (Res. 11.18 para. 6)	Progress report submitted to ScC-SC1 (ScC-SC1/Inf.3)	Take note of the report and offer advice where appropriate.	Endorse the report.	Scientific sessional committee avian working group	Core	No	

Mandate	Progress till ScC-SC1	Description of SC intersessional actions (ScC-SC1 – ScC-SC2)	Expected Output	Lead / Contributors	Priority	Funding needed	Comments/Notes
<p>Scientific Council to consider the implications of adopting in future as a standard reference for Passerine bird taxonomy and nomenclature the Handbook of the Birds of the World/BirdLife International Illustrated Checklist of the Birds of the World, Volume 2: Passerines (Res. 11.19 para.3)</p>		<p>Provide a review and consult with partners.</p>	<p>A technical review document and a recommendation to COP.</p>	<p>Robert Clay and Stephen Garnett.</p>	<p>Core</p>	<p>No</p>	
<p>Scientific Council to identify candidate species for listing on, or delisting from the CMS Appendices, and assist in the preparation of proposals for amendment as appropriate (Art.VIII para. 5.c of the Convention)</p>		<p>Provide a review aligned with the taxonomic review. To continuously review any proposals that Parties submit.</p>	<p>Recommendations regarding species to be added based on the proposals that are received. Recommendation of species that parties could consider.</p>	<p>Avian working group</p>	<p>Core</p>	<p>No</p>	

Thematic Work Area: **Cross-cutting conservation issues (Working Group 6)**

WG6 lead(s) and participants: Barry Baker, Giuseppe Notarbartolo di Sciara, Zeb Hogan, Colin Galbraith, Fernando Spina / Rodrigo Medellin, Graeme Taylor, Malta Qwathekana, Saras Sharma, Vincent Hilomen, Simone Panigada (ACCOBAMS), Heidrun Frisch (ASCOBANS), Mark Simmonds (H.S.I.), Alison Wood (WDC), Kelly Malsch (WCMC), Alex Ngari (BirdLife Int.)

Secretariat Focal Points: Melanie Virtue, Heidrun Frisch, Borja Heredia, Marco Barbieri

Mandate	Progress till ScC-SC1	Description of SC intersessional actions (ScC-SC1 – ScC-SC2)	Expected Output	Lead / Contributors	Priority	Funding needed	Comments/Notes
Culture and Social Complexity							
Scientific Council to establish an intersessional expert working group dealing with the conservation implications of culture and social complexity, with a focus on, but not limited to cetaceans (Res.11.23 para. 6)	Expert Group established. Progress report submitted to ScC-SC1 (Doc.10.4.1)	Convene second workshop Develop draft resolution for COP12?	Draft resolution	Notarbartolo di Sciara (Sec FP: Virtue & Frisch) Culture Expert Group	High	€50,000	
Encourages Parties and other stakeholders to gather and publish pertinent data for advancing the conservation management of these populations and discrete social groups (Res.11.23 para. 5)		Development and compilation of papers	Completion of papers Draft resolution	Notarbartolo di Sciara / Baker (Sec FP: Virtue & Frisch) Culture Expert Group	High	none	
Invites relevant CMS Scientific Councillors for taxa other than cetaceans to review the findings of the workshop and engage in this expert group. (Res.11.23 para. 7)		SC Councillors invited to contribute toward the work of the Expert Group, particularly with respect to other taxa.	Comments in relation to other taxa considered and incorporated in relevant paper and draft resolution	Notarbartolo di Sciara / Baker (Sec FP: Virtue & Frisch)	High	none	

Mandate	Progress till ScC-SC1	Description of SC intersessional actions (ScC-SC1 – ScC-SC2)	Expected Output	Lead / Contributors	Priority	Funding needed	Comments/Notes
<u>Ecological Networks & Connectivity</u>							
Scientific Council to support Parties, as appropriate, to promote ecological networks and connectivity through, for example, the development of further site networks within the CMS Family or other fora and processes, that use scientifically robust criteria to describe and identify important sites for migratory species and promote their internationally coordinated conservation and management (Res.11.25 para.7)	1st technical workshop on connectivity mediated by migratory species organized under the auspices of the Scientific Council	2nd technical workshop on connectivity mediated by migratory species organized under the auspices of the Scientific Council (Feb/March 2017)	Draft resolution for COP12	Fernando Spina / (Sec FP: Barbieri)	High	€10,000 (other funds likely to be provided locally)	
<u>Important Marine Mammal Areas</u>							
Scientific Council to assess the relevance of the concept of Important Marine Mammal Areas (IMMAs) to CMS and advise CMS COP accordingly (Res.11.25)	Report on the development of the concept, criteria for identifying IMMAs and an IMMA Toolkit submitted to ScC-SC1 by the AMWG (Doc.10.4.2.1)	Review process, criteria and toolkit and make recommendation to COP12	Recommendation to COP12	Notarbartolo di Sciarra (Sec FP: Virtue & Frisch)	High	none	
<u>Climate Change</u>							
Scientific Council and the Working Group on Climate Change to promote work to address key gaps in knowledge and future research directions, in particular through the analysis of existing long-term and large-scale datasets (Res. 11.26 para.3)		Assess survival needs of migratory species impacted by climate change Identify gaps in knowledge Develop a list of successful examples of action taken to improve resilience of species impacted by climate change	Report to MOP12 Draft resolution focusing on adaptation to assist the resilience of migratory species to climate change	Colin Galbraith (Sec FP: Barbieri) Climate Change WG	High	None (for now)	

Mandate	Progress till ScC-SC1	Description of SC intersessional actions (ScC-SC1 – ScC-SC2)	Expected Output	Lead / Contributors	Priority	Funding needed	Comments/Notes
<p>Parties and the Scientific Council to report progress in implementing the POW on Climate Change and Migratory Species, including monitoring and the efficacy of measures taken, to COP12 in 2017</p> <p>(Res. 11.26 para.11; Res.11.1, Annex V, Activity 33)</p>		<p>Convene a meeting of the Climate Change Working Group</p>	<p>Report to COP12</p> <p>Draft resolution focusing on adaptation to assist the resilience of migratory species to climate change.</p>	<p>Colin Galbraith (Sec FP: Barbieri) Climate Change WG</p>	High	USD 30,000	
<p>Scientific Council and the Working Group on Climate Change to promote work to address key gaps in knowledge and future research directions, in particular through the analysis of existing long-term and large-scale datasets</p> <p>(Res. 11.26 para.3)</p>		<p>Start process to revise and update the review of climate change vulnerability of migratory species</p> <p>Taxonomic WGs to review whether updates are required</p>	Updated review	<p>Colin Galbraith (Sec FP: Barbieri) Climate Change WG</p>		None (for now)	
<u>Boat-Based Wildlife Watching</u>							
<p>Scientific Council, subject to availability of resources, to review existing agreed guidelines, existing good practice and underpinning scientific evidence of the issues of concern, and based on this review develop guidelines as appropriate on marine boat-based wildlife watching for different taxonomic groups, differentiated if necessary by geographic areas</p> <p>(Res.11.29 para.9)</p>		<p>Development of guidelines for first taxonomic group (cetaceans) and simultaneously a template for the further modules (to follow later)</p>	<p>Guidelines developed and adopted by COP12 for cetaceans</p> <p>Draft guidelines developed for sharks/rays; seabirds/ turtles prepared</p>	<p>Notarbartolo di Sciara (Sec FP: Frisch)</p> <p>Barry Baker (Sec FP: Frisch)</p>		<p>Provided by Monaco</p> <p>Yes \$10,000</p>	

Mandate	Progress till ScC-SC1	Description of SC intersessional actions (ScC-SC1 – ScC-SC2)	Expected Output	Lead / Contributors	Priority	Funding needed	Comments/Notes
Marine Debris							
Scientific Council, with support from the Secretariat, to further the Convention's work on the marine debris issue and investigate the feasibility of close cooperation with other biodiversity-related agreements by means of a multilateral working group (Res. 11.30 para.11)		Develop cooperation with CBD and IWC, as well as ACCOBAMS and ASCOBANS	??	To be identified (Sec FP: Virtue & Frisch)	High	None	Secretariat to liaise with other MEAs
Working groups established under the Scientific Council incorporate the issue of marine debris where relevant, drawing on the work already undertaken by the Convention (Res. 11.30 para.11)		Remind WG Chairs of this requirement	??	To be identified (Sec FP: Virtue & Frisch)	High	None	
Scientific Council, with support from the Secretariat, to promote the prioritization of research into the effects of microplastics on the species ingesting them, and support research on the significance of colour, shape or plastic type on the likelihood of causing harm, in order to be able to focus management strategies in future; (Res. 11.30)		Produce a review of the micro plastics threat to migratory species	Document for SC2	Simmonds (Sec FP: Virtue & Frisch)	High	None	

Mandate	Progress till ScC-SC1	Description of SC intersessional actions (ScC-SC1 – ScC-SC2)	Expected Output	Lead / Contributors	Priority	Funding needed	Comments/Notes
<u>Bycatch</u>							
Scientific Council to assess the progress made in addressing bycatch of migratory species and advise CMS COP accordingly (Res.10.14, Res.9.18, Res.8.14; 7.2, 6.2)	Bycatch WG established at previous ScC meetings	Review existing bycatch resolutions and develop a draft revised resolution for COP12, that reaffirms necessary actions relevant to the conservation of migratory species	Draft resolution	Barry Baker (Sec FP: Virtue & Frisch) Bycatch WG	High	No	
Work Program 2014-2017 for Bycatch Councillor and Bycatch Working Group		Maintain a small informal group of interested parties and technical experts on the workspace to assist the Scientific Councillor, Bycatch	Review of relevant bycatch issues, as required	Barry Baker (Sec FP: Virtue & Frisch)	ongoing	No	
As above	Workshop with CMS & daughter agreements to explore synergies for working with RFMOs	Work closely with other international competent bodies such as FAO and relevant RFMOs, to ensure bycatch management approaches are promulgated in working fisheries	Attendance at RFMO meetings Coordination of activities with daughter agreements	Barry Baker (Sec FP: Virtue & Frisch) Bycatch Working Group, relevant taxonomic WGs ACAP, ACCOBAMS, ASCOBANS, Wadden sea Seals, Marine Turtles Africa, Marine Turtles IOSEA, Pacific Islands Cetaceans, Sharks, IWC Bycatch Group		US\$ 30,000 pa	
As above		Continuously review and utilise available information on the at-sea distribution of migratory species to assess overlap with fishing operations and hence the risk of bycatch in fishing regions	Advice to Scientific Council on emerging issues, as appropriate	Barry Baker (Sec FP: Virtue & Frisch) Bycatch Working Group	ongoing	None	

1st Meeting of the Sessional Committee of the CMS Scientific Council (ScC-SC1)

Bonn, Germany, 18 – 21 April 2016

UNEP/CMS/ScC-SC1/Report/Annex 2

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

SESSIONAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS

COP-APPOINTED MEMBERS

Mr. Barry G. **BAKER**
114 Watsons Road, Kettering
Tasmania 7155
AUSTRALIA
Tel.: (+61 3) 6267 4079
Email: barry.baker@latitude42.com.au

Dr. Rob P. **CLAY**
Director of the Executive Office, Western
Hemisphere Shorebird Reserve Network
Manomet Center for Conservation Sciences
Gaetano Martino 215 esq. Teniente Ross,
Asunción
PARAGUAY
Tel: (+ 595) 21 223567 ext. 109
Email: rclay@manomet.org

Dr. Zeb S. **HOGAN**
2355 Camelot Way Reno
NV 89509
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Tel: (+1 530) 219 0942
Email: zebhogan@hotmail.com

Prof. Dr. Colin A. **GALBRAITH**
45 Mounthooly Loan
Edinburgh EH10 7JD, Scotland
UNITED KINGDOM
Email: colingalbraith3@gmail.com

Dr. Rodrigo A. **MEDELLIN**
President of the Society for Conservation Biology
Instituto de Ecología, UNAM
Ap. Postal 70-275, 04510 Ciudad Universitaria, D.
F.
MEXICO
Tel.: 52-55-5622-9042
Email: medellin@miranda.ecologia.unam.mx

Dr. Guiseppe **NOTARBARTOLO DI SCIARA**
Via Benedetto Marcello 43
20124 Milano
ITALY
Tel: +39 02 2940.2867
Email: disciara@tethys.org

Prof. Alfred **OTENG-YEBOAH**
Council for Scientific and Industrial Research
CSIR-Ghana
C/o Wildlife Division, Forestry Commission of
Ghana
Accra
GHANA
Tel: (+233 24) 477 2256
Email: alfred.otengyeboah@gmail.com

PARTY-APPOINTED MEMBERS

Africa

Dr. Samuel M. **KASIKI**
Deputy Director Biodiversity Research &
Monitoring
Kenya Wildlife Service
P.O. Box 40241 – 00100
Nairobi
KENYA
Tel.: (+254) 721 446729
Fax: (+254 20) 603792
E-mail: skasiki@kws.go.ke

Ms. Nopasika Malta **QWATHEKANA**
Senior Policy Adviser
International Advisory Services
Department of Environmental Affairs
Private Bag x447, Pretoria 0001
South Africa
Tel: (+27) 780936266
Email: mqwathekana@environment.gov.za

Asia

Dr. Lkhagvasuren **BADAMJAV**
Leading Scientist of the Mammalian Ecology
Laboratory
Institute of Biology, Mongolian Academy of
Sciences
Jukov Avenue 77
Ulaanbaatar 51
MONGOLIA
Tel.: (+976 11) 453583
E-mail: lkhagvazeer@gmail.com

Europe

Dr. Jean-Philippe **SIBLET**
Directeur du Service du Patrimoine Naturel
Muséum National d'Histoire naturelle (MNHN)
36 rue Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, CP 41
75231 Paris Cedex 05
FRANCE
Tel: (+33 1) 4079 3266
E-mail: jean-philippe.siblet@mnhn.fr

Dr. Fernando **SPINA**
Head of Science, Bird Migration Branch, Italian
Ringing Centre, ISPRA
CMS Scientific Council
Ispra, Area Avifauna Migratrice,
Via Ca Fornacetta 9
40064 Ozzano Emilia (Bo)
Italy
Tel: (+39 347) 3507032
Email: fernando.spina@isprambiente.it

Oceania

Dr. Vincent **HILOMEN**
Project Manager
Marine Key Biodiversity Areas Project
Biodiversity Management Bureau
Department of Environment and Natural
Resources (DENR)
North Avenue
Quezon City
PHILIPPINES
Tel.: (+63 2) 924 6031 to 35
Fax: (+63 2) 924-0109
Mobile phone: (+63 908) 8114304
E-mail: vvhilomen@up.edu.ph

Ms. Saras **SHARMA**
Fisheries Technical Officer – Species
Ministry of Fisheries and Forests
P.O.Box 3165
Draunibota
Lami
FIJI ISLAND
Tel.: +679 9290902
Fax: +679 3363500
E-mail: saras.sharma0205@gmail.com

Mr. Graeme **TAYLOR**
Principal Science Advisor
Science and Capability Group
Department of Conservation - Te Papa Atawhai
PO Box 10420, Wellington 6143
NEW ZEALAND
DDI: +64 4 4713294
Email: gtaylor@doc.govt.nz

South & Central America and the Caribbean

Sr. Román Javier **BAIGÚN**
Dirección de Fauna Silvestre
Secretaría de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sustentable
Jefatura de Gabinete de Ministros
San Martín 451
Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires (1004)
ARGENTINA
Tel: (+54 11) 4384 8547
E-mail: rbaigun@ambiente.gob.ar

OBSERVERS

SCIENTIFIC COUNCILLORS

Mr. Dieudonne **ANKARA**
 Directeur de la Conservation des Ecosystèmes
 Direction Générale de l'Environnement (MODEFE)
 B.P. 958, 54, rue Bordeaux Oeunzé
 Brazzaville
 CONGO
 Tel.: (+242) 551 67 50 ou (+242) 51 67 50
 Fax: (+242) 551 67 50
 Email: graspcongo@yahoo.fr

Dr. Peter **PUCHALA**
 Zoologist
 State Nature Conservancy of the Slovak Republic
 Administrative of Malé Karpaty Protected
 Landscape Area
 Štúrova 115
 900 01 Modra
 SLOVAKIA
 Tel/Fax: (+421 33) 6474002
 Email: peter.puchala@sopsr.sk

Mr. Øystein **STØRKERSEN**
 Principal Advisor
 Directorate for Nature Management (DN)
 Tungasletta 2
 N-7485 Trondheim
 Norway
 Tel: (+47 735) 80500
 Fax: (+47 735) 80501
 Email: oystein.storkersen@miljodir.no

Mr. James **WILLIAM**
 Indicators & Reporting Manager
 Joint Nature Conservation Committee
 Monkstone House
 City Road
 Peterborough PE1 1JY
 UNITED KINGDOM
 Tel: (+44 1733) 866868
 Fax: (+44 1733) 555948
 Email: james.williams@jncc.gov.uk

PARTY OBSERVERS

Gambia

Mr. Abdoulie **SAWO**
Department of Parks and Wildlife
Management
Abuko Nature Reserve
Abuko Gambia
Tel. (+220) 6530860 / 4376937
Email: Abdoulie_80@yahoo.com;

Belgium

Ms. Ines **VERLEYE**
Biodiversity Expert,
Federal Public Service for the Environment,
Place Victor Horta 40,
1060 Brussels, Belgium
Email: inesverleye@gmail.com

IGO/NGO

BirdLife International

RSPB, The Lodge, Sandy
Bedfordshire, SG19 2DL
United Kingdom
Tel: (+44) 7718116994

Ms. Nicola **CROCKFORD**
Principal Policy Officer
Email: nicola.crockford@rspb.org.uk
Tel: (+44) 7718116994

Ms. Vicky **JONES**
Global Flyways Officer
Email: vicky.jones@birdlife.org
Tel: +44 1223 279862

BirdLife Africa Regional Office

Mr. Alex **NGARI**
Volkers Garden on Terrace Close, Off Rhapta
Road, Westlands. KENYA
Tel: (+254) 020 8068314
Email: Alex.Ngari@birdlife.org

Humane Society International

Mr. Mark **SIMMONDS**
5 Underwood Street, London N1 7LY, UK
Email: mark.simmonds@sciencegyre.co.uk

IUCN

Dr. Jean-Christophe **VIE**
Deputy Director, IUCN Species Programme and
Director, Save Our Species Initiative
Rue Mauverney 28
1196 Gland
Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 9990000
Email: press@iucn.org

Institut für Vogelforschung - Vogelwarte

Mr. Franz **BAIRLEIN**
Helgoland
An der Vogelwarte 21
26386 Wilhelmshaven
Tel: (+49 4421) 968911
Email: franz.bairlein@ifv-vogelwarte.de

UNEP/WCMC

Ms. Frances **DAVIS**
UN Environment World Conservation Monitoring
Centre
219 Huntingdon Road
Cambridge
CB3 0DL
United Kingdom
Tel: +44 (0)1223 277314
Email: birdlife-africa@birdlife.org

Whale and Dolphin Conservation

Ms. Alison **WOOD**
7 Nelson Street, Plymouth, MA 02360
Tel: +44 888.699.4253
Email: contact@whales.org

CMS INSTRUMENTS

AEWA

Mr Sergey **DERELIEV**
 Technical Officer
 UNEP/AEWA Secretariat
 Platz der Vereinten Nationen 1
 53113 Bonn, Germany
 Tel: (+49 228) 815 2415
 Email: sergey.dereliev@unep-awea.org

African-Eurasian Migratory Landbirds Action Plan (AEMLAP)

Mr. Olivier **BIBER**
 Biodiversity Policy Advisor
 FOEN (via Gruner AG)
 Postfach 197, 3000 Bern 7
 Switzerland
 Tel.: +441 31 311 17 40
 Email: Olivier biber@bafu.admin.ch

ACCOBAMS

Mr. Simone **PANIGADA**
 98000 Monaco, Monaco
 Tel: (+377 98) 988010
 Email: spanigada@accobams.net

UNEP/CMS Secretariat

UNEP/CMS Secretariat
 Platz der Vereinten Nationen 1
 53113 Bonn, Germany
 Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2401
 Fax: (+49 228) 815 2449
 Email: cms.secretariat@cms.int

Mr. Bradnee **CHAMBERS**
 Executive Secretary
 Email: bradnee.chambers@cms.int

Mr. Bert **LENTEN**
 Deputy Executive Secretary
 Acting Head of Terrestrial Species team
 Email: Bert.lenten@cms.int

Mr. Marco **BARBIERI**
 Scientific Adviser
 Email: marco.barbieri@cms.int

Ms. Heidrun **FRISCH**
 Marine Mammals Officer
 Email: heidrun.frisch@cms.int

Mr. Borja **HEREDIA**
 Head of Avian Species team
 Email: borja.heredia@cms.int

Ms. Clara **NOBBE**
 Joint CITES-CMS Programme Officer
 Email: clara.nobbe@cms.int

Ms. Polina **ORLINSKIY**
 Terrestrial Species Team
 Email: polina.orlinskiy@cms.int

Mr. Francisco **RILLA**
 Capacity Building Officer
 Email: francisco.rilla@cms.int

Ms. Siri **QUADE**
 Scientific Advisory Services
 Email: siri.quade@cms.int

Mr. Robert **VAGG**
 Report Writer
 Email: Robert.vagg@cms.int

Ms. Melanie **VIRTUE**
 Head of Aquatic Species team
 Email: melanie.virtue@cms.int

CMS Abu Dhabi Office
 c/o Environment Agency
 Al Mamoura, PO Box 45553
 45553 Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates
 Tel: (+971 2) 6934 437

Mr. Nick **WILLIAMS**
 Programme Officer – Birds of Prey
 Email: nick.williams@cms.int

External Consultants

Mr. Dave **PRITCHARD**
 20 Burswell Avenue, Hexham, NE46 3JL
 United Kingdom
 Tel: (+44 1434) 608842
 Email: davepritchard@care4free.net