



CONVENTION ON MIGRATORY SPECIES

Distr: General

UNEP/CMS/AW-2/Report

Original: English

SECOND MEETING OF THE SIGNATORIES TO
THE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
CONCERNING CONSERVATION MEASURES FOR
THE AQUATIC WARBLER (*Acrocephalus paludicola*)
Biebrza National Park, Poland, 13-15 May 2010

REPORT OF THE SECOND MEETING OF THE SIGNATORIES

Agenda Item 1.0: Welcoming Remarks

1. Mr. Marco Barbieri, Agreements Officer, CMS Secretariat opened the Meeting and introduced Ms. Anna Liro from the Polish Ministry of Environment. Ms. Liro welcomed participants on behalf of Mr. Michał Kięlsznia, Head of General Directorate for Environment Protection, and announced the decision of the Ministry to organize, within the General Directorate, a special National Secretariat for the Aquatic Warbler to enhance implementation of the Species Action Plan in Poland.

2. Mr. Barbieri then introduced Mr. Norbert Schaffer, Head of European Programmes and International Biodiversity Policy, RSPB, who also welcomed the delegates on behalf of BirdLife International (BLI) and the national BirdLife partners. Mr. Schaffer underlined that BLI initiated the signing of the MoU and helped with its implementation: The BirdLife Aquatic Warbler Conservation Team had been created; the position of BirdLife/CMS Aquatic Warbler Conservation Officer (AWCO) was hosted by APB-BirdLife Belarus). He also thanked the Government of Poland for hosting the Meeting and OTOP-BirdLife Poland and Biebrza National Park for making all the arrangements.

3. Mr. Barbieri transmitted the greetings of Ms. Elizabeth Mrema, Executive Secretary of CMS to delegates. He thanked the Government of Poland for hosting the Meeting; BLI and its national partners for the technical and logistical support of the Meeting and for contributing to the implementation of the MoU; and the Government of France for providing financial support. Mr. Barbieri also described the history, progress and importance of the Aquatic Warbler MoU in terms of the general CMS contribution to reducing loss of biodiversity.

Agenda Item 2.0: Election of Meeting officers

4. The Meeting elected Mr. Jaroslaw Krogulec, OTOP-BirdLife Poland, as Chair and Mr. Torsten Langgemach, head of Brandenburg State Bird Conservation Centre, Germany, as a Vice-Chair.



Agenda Item 3.0: Adoption of the Agenda and Meeting Schedule

5. The Chairman asked participants to make proposals for amendment to the Agenda presented in documents UNEP/CMS/AW-2/Doc.1, UNEP/CMS/AW-2/Doc.2 and UNEP/CMS/AW-2/Doc.3.

6. Mr. Barbieri (CMS) asked for suggestions of issues to be taken under Agenda Item 11.0 (Any other business). Mr. Schaffer suggested a resolution thanking the host country for arranging the Meeting as well as congratulating them with the results of the EU LIFE Project.

7. Mr. Barbieri introduced the Meeting's formal procedure. Decisions would be adopted by consensus basis, English would be the only official language of the MoU, all the Meeting documents would also be in English, but simultaneous translation in English and French during the Meeting would be provided to facilitate communication.

8. The formal procedure, agenda and schedule were adopted with the amendment proposed by Mr. Schaffer. The adopted Agenda is reproduced as Annex 1 to the present report.

Agenda Item 4.0: Opening statements

9. The Chair invited opening statements from the Signatories.

10. Mr. Uladzimir Malashevich, BirdLife/CMS International Aquatic Warbler Conservation Officer (AWCO), made an opening statement on behalf of Ms. Natalia Minchenko, Head of the State Administration for the Biological and Landscape Diversity of the Ministry for Natural Resources and Environmental Protection of Belarus, confirming that Aquatic Warbler conservation was one of the priorities of nature conservation work in Belarus.

11. In his opening statement, Mr. Schaffer (RSPB/BLI UK) underlined the importance of the MoU as a tool that helped to improve the conservation of the species. He mentioned that in the implementation report 2008 it was stated that one medium-term aim of the MoU was to stop the rapid decline of the species. Now the medium-term aim to extend the area of occupancy needed to be achieved.

12. Mr. Torsten Langgemach, on behalf of the German delegation, thanked the Polish partners for organizing the scientific conference and for the impressive excursion. He congratulated the EU LIFE Project staff for the results achieved in Eastern Poland and noted the critical situation on the Western edge of the species' range. He also mentioned progress in scientific knowledge about Aquatic Warblers obtained since the last meeting and also thanked the International Aquatic Warbler Conservation Team chaired by Mr. Martin Flade.

13. Mr. Bourama Niagate (Mali) thanked the Polish Government for hosting the Meeting and the CMS Secretariat for the invitation.

14. Mr. Lars Lachmann (RSPB-BirdLife, UK) gave a summary of the Scientific Conference in his opening statement. The Conference had a double function, on one hand it was a Final Conference of the EU LIFE Project “Conserving Aquatic Warblers in Poland and Germany”, on the other hand it served as a Scientific Meeting for the MoU Meeting of Signatories. The Scientific Meeting summarized the knowledge about the Aquatic Warbler, its ecology, numbers and distribution as well as experience in implementation of conservation measures. Mr. Lachmann also noted that, in 2008, a review of the implementation of the Species Action Plan showed very good progress in achieving short-term aims. The rapid decline in the species’ population had been stopped. Extension of the area occupied by the Aquatic Warbler to at least 1,500 km² was a medium-term aim. Achieving this aim would allow the Aquatic Warbler to be removed from the list of globally threatened species. Work in this direction had already been started in Germany, Poland and Belarus.

Agenda Item 5.0: Report of the CMS Secretariat

15. Mr. Sebastian Flinkerbusch (CMS) was asked by Mr. Barbieri to present the Report of the Secretariat. Mr. Flinkerbusch also explained that the report of the Secretariat was composed of sub-Agenda Items: 5.1 (Status of signatures); 5.2 (List of designated national contact points); and 5.3 (Any other matters). The report of the Secretariat was presented as document UNEP/CMS/AW-2/Doc.4.

Agenda Item 5.1: Status of Signatures

16. Mr. Flinkerbusch (CMS) presented the Secretariat’s brief report concerning the status of signatures and recruitment efforts. He noted that CMS acted as Secretariat for the MoU, kept track of the status of the MoU, kept the original version of the file and notified all Signatories when new signatures had been added to the MoU. As at 7 May 2010, 12 out of 15 Range States had signed the MoU. The most recent signature had been that of the Government of Belgium in 2006. CMS regularly invited the three remaining Range States: the Netherlands, France and the Russian Federation to sign the MoU. The last attempt had been made in March 2009.

17. With the purpose to facilitate communication, the MoU and the proposed new Species Action Plan (SAP) had been translated into French. In preparation of the Meeting, new potential Range States had been contacted. Mali had come to the Meeting.

18. The Meeting took note of the report of the Secretariat.

Agenda Item 5.2: List of designated national contact points

19. Mr. Flinkerbusch (CMS) announced that the CMS Secretariat was maintaining the list of designated National Contact Points for the MoU. Of the 12 Signatories, 11 had nominated their Contact Points. Mr. Flinkerbusch asked delegates to review the list and to provide the Secretariat with updates.

20. The Meeting took note of the list of officially designated National Contact Points.

Agenda Item 5.3: Any other matters

21. Mr. Marco Barbieri (CMS) stressed the importance of names and details of the Contact Points being updated. He also asked Signatories to notify the Secretariat about organizational changes in Ministries.

Agenda Item 6.0: Review of MoU and Action Plan Implementation

22. Mr. Barbieri (CMS) explained that the review of the MoU and Action Plan Implementation was composed of sub-Agenda Items: 6.1 (Aquatic Warbler conservation status within the agreement area); 6.2 (Status of implementation); and 6.3 (Any other matters). He also suggested considering submission of National Reports under Agenda Item 6.3.

Agenda Item 6.1: Aquatic Warbler Conservation Status within the Agreement Area

23. Mr. Barbieri (CMS) explained that the information provided in the Secretariat's Overview Report had been collected prior to the Meeting and was based in part, on information available to the BirdLife International Aquatic Warbler Conservation Team, as well as national reports available before 6 May. He underlined that before the Meeting, five National Reports had been received from Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Germany and the Ukraine. Mr. Barbieri mentioned that submission of the National Reports would still be worthwhile after the Meeting and invited Signatories to submit them before the end of June 2010. Reports prepared in 2008, within the context of revision of SAP implementation, could also be submitted as National Reports even if they did not follow the format agreed during the First Meeting of Signatories.

24. The Chair asked Signatories to inform the Secretariat about their intention to produce National Reports.

25. Ms. Anna Liro (Poland) said that the Polish National Report was under internal discussion; it would be submitted taking into account the new reporting format and suggested deadline.

26. The Chair invited Mr. Malashevich, acting on behalf of the Secretariat, to present a review of the conservation status of the Aquatic Warbler within the agreement area. Participants were invited to comment further on this part of the Overview Report.

27. Mr. Barbieri asked delegates if the level of detail in the Status report was adequate.

28. Mr. Torsten Langgemach (Germany) agreed with the level of detail, but suggested making population estimates using data from 2009, but not from last seven years.

29. Mr. Martin Flade (BLI Germany), Chair of the International Aquatic Warbler Conservation Team, made a comment that annual data on Aquatic Warbler numbers were available; however, weather conditions in single years had considerable influence on the population and there was a problem with interpretation of data from only 1-2 single years. It was agreed to provide in the report population estimates based on the information from the last seven years as well as data from 2009 and 2010.

30. Mr. Arnaud Le Neve (France) suggested to include in the Report a small educational remark explaining the importance of the species and making parallels with well-known problematic species such as the African elephant. Such remarks would improve understanding of the species' problems by the general public as well as by decision-makers.

Agenda Item 6.2: Status of Implementation

31. The Chair invited Mr. Malashevich (AWCO) to present a status report of the MoU and Action Plan implementation within the agreement area and at national levels. The Chair then invited the Signatories and the Collaborating Organization to provide comments on this part of the Overview Report and share additional information and any problems or gaps in their implementation of the Action Plan.

32. Mr. Lachmann (RSPB-BirdLife, UK) noted that very good progress had been made against the short-term aim, but it was not fully achieved yet.

33. Mr. Niagate (Mali) asked for clarification of units used in giving population figures: singing males and individuals, as well as for global population number. He also mentioned a conflict between habitat conservation and agriculture in wintering areas. Mr. Niagate asked other Range States to share their experience in solving such conflicts.

34. Mr. Flade (BLI Germany) gave his comments on the numbers given for the Aquatic Warbler population: only singing males were counted at breeding sites, while at wintering grounds, as well as estimating the global population, females were also taken into account. From genetic studies it was known that there were 54-55% of males in the population. He also noted that agriculture was a main threat both for breeding and wintering sites. Intensification as well as abandonment could be a threat. Mr. Flade underlined that in the wintering grounds outside of protected areas decisions were often taken in favour of agriculture. The situation in Mali had to be assessed and a compromise had to be found in order to save the most important, core areas.

35. Mr. Ibrahima Diop (Senegal) mentioned the following problems with Aquatic Warbler conservation in wintering areas in Senegal: (a) the absence of an action plan; (b) management of aquatic habitats was very time-consuming and costly; and (c) overgrazing of habitats was another aspect of the conflict with agriculture. The expert mentioned that to solve these problems, international support was needed.

36. Mr. Michel Ledard (France) mentioned the difficulties in protection of dispersed migratory stopover sites. The Aquatic Warbler was registered at 60 per cent of SPAs in France, but there were no more concrete data. At this moment no active habitat management was being implemented in France, but the adoption of a new five-year national action plan would change the situation.

37. Ms. Liro (Poland) informed the Meeting that the most important Aquatic Warbler sites in Poland were included in the Natura 2000 network and management plans for them would be elaborated in 3-4 years' time. Agri-environmental planning in this area would be simplified to ensure wider use of agri-environmental practices beneficial for biodiversity.

38. The Meeting provided further input into the report. The revised Overview Report is attached as Annex 2 to the present report.

Agenda Item 7.0: Proposed amendments to the Memorandum of Understanding and its associated Action Plan

39. The Chair invited Mr. Barbieri to present proposed amendments to the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU).

Agenda Item 7.1: Extension of the Geographic Scope of the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)

40. Mr. Barbieri (CMS) explained that the MoU did not define a precise geographic area of application. At this time it applied to 15 countries, but was still open to cover more of the Range States. It had already been suggested during the First Meeting to invite a few additional countries to sign the MoU. The proposal of this Meeting was to have an amendment that would consider the extension to additional countries.

41. The Chair asked Mr. Flade (BLI Germany) to introduce the rationale of extension of the geographical scope to seven further countries: Luxembourg, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Portugal, Slovakia and Switzerland. Mr. Flade stated that all available bird records had been checked. The conclusion was made that there were at least seven countries with regular confirmed records.

42. Mr. Oskars Keiss (Latvia), informed the Meeting about records from Croatia dating from 1996-1999.

43. Mr. Barbieri pointed out that if the Meeting considered the justification was sufficient, Croatia could be included into the list of Range States.

44. Mr. Lachmann (RSPB-BirdLife, UK) suggested that, in preparing the next Meeting, consideration should be given to including more countries and to checking records with special attention paid to those relating to Croatia.

45. Mr. Niagate (Mali) informed the Meeting about the availability of biotopes in Chad and Burkina Faso similar to those in Mali. He suggested contact be made with these countries in order to join conservation efforts.

46. Mr. Flade noted the smaller possibility to find more Aquatic Warbler migratory stopover sites in Sahelian Africa away from the coast. Stable isotope analysis also indicated a low chance of finding many Aquatic Warblers east of Mali. For instance in Chad, Aquatic Warblers had never been netted in spite of good efforts at the ringing station.

47. Mr. Langgemach (Germany) suggested this issue to be discussed under the Priority Projects List.

48. Mr. Le Neve (France) mentioned geographical locations in Italy to be potentially suitable for the Aquatic Warbler's spring migration.

49. Mr. Zsolt Végyvári (Hungary) suggested waiting for more data to be obtained within the geolocators project that could give a good list of potential Range States.

50. The Meeting agreed by consensus to extend the geographic scope of the MoU to cover seven new Range States. The delegates also agreed to consider more countries to be included in the list in future and that BLI would prepare suggestion on further extension of the geographic scope up to half a year before the next Range State Meeting.

Agenda Item: 7.2: Discussion and adoption of an updated International Species Action Plan for the Aquatic Warbler as part of the MoU

51. The Chair asked Mr. Barbieri (CMS) to introduce this Agenda Item.

52. Mr. Lachmann (RSPB-BirdLife, UK) gave a brief presentation of the new Action Plan, focusing on the main changes with respect to the Action Plan adopted in 2003. He especially underlined that in the proposed MoU Action Plan content was nearly the same as in the EU Action Plan, while the activities were exactly the same, with only population figures having been updated. Adoption of this Action Plan would not create any difficulties in reporting.

53. Mr. Flade (BLI, Germany) suggested including a definition to the Area of Occupancy in the Action Plan. The total area of the occupied mire tracts except Siberia had been measured.

54. Mr. Anatoliy Poluda (Ukraine) noted that more updated information concerning the conservation status of the Aquatic Warbler in Ukraine was available and should be included in the Action Plan.

55. The updates from Belgium were received after the Action Plan had been placed at the web-site. They would also be taken into consideration.

56. Mr. Le Neve (France) informed the Meeting about the availability of updates for France.

57. The Meeting adopted the revised Action Plan by consensus taking into account updated country figures that would be sent to Mr. Lachmann before 24 May 2010.

58. Revised International Species Action Plan is attached as Annex 3 to the present report.

Agenda Item 8.0: Future Implementation and Further Development of the MoU and Action Plan

59. The Secretariat introduced Agenda Item 8 which was composed of three sub-Agenda Items: 8.1 (National report format), 8.2 (Future MoU coordination), 8.3 (Priority projects for funding).

Agenda Item 8.1: National Report Format

60. Mr. Barbieri (CMS) gave arguments in favour of introducing the new format submitted to the Meeting for consideration as document UNEP/CMS/AW-2/Doc.6.

61. Mr. Niagate (Mali) raised a question concerning the legal protection of the species. He stated that it would take some time to include the Aquatic Warbler in the list of protected species in Mali and other African countries.

62. Mr. Barbieri informed the Meeting that there would be some time available before the next cycle of reporting for Focal Points to become familiar with reporting requirements as well as to add the species in national lists.
63. Mr. Malashevich (AWCO) was asked by the Chair to make a presentation on the new National Report Format.
64. Mr. Le Neve (France) stated that the proposed reporting format was not suitable for the Range States covering Aquatic Warbler migration. It was impossible in sites to estimate the effectiveness of conservation measures taken through population response and habitat availability. The number of birds could be given, but it would change year after year depending on weather conditions, not because of the state of the habitat.
65. Mr. Lachmann (RSPB-BirdLife, UK) explained that the form had been adopted to be used by countries with breeding, migratory stop-over and wintering sites. Estimates for number of birds affected by the action could be made on the assumption that altogether all migratory sites held 100% of the national population. Of course, it also needed some expert judgment.
66. Ms. Sarah Roggeman (Belgium) mentioned the absence of Belgium in the Site Protection section.
67. Mr. Lachmann suggested that the Aquatic Warbler Coordination Officer (AWCO) should create a list of sites in the Site Protection section with further request of Range States for updates.
68. Mr. Niagate made a remark that as the Aquatic Warbler did not consume grain, but only insects and did not exert any pressure on agricultural resources, they could be proposed for species protection.
69. Mr. Flade (BLI, Germany) gave an answer that there was a permanent conflict between Aquatic Warbler conservation and agriculture in breeding sites as well, but this problem could mostly be solved. In Africa, the Aquatic Warbler Conservation Team (AWCT) did not have such an experience, at least there was no such conflict in Djoudj National Park because of high nature value and protection status of the area. In Mali, Aquatic Warblers could influence local population in two directions:
- (i) Increase tourist attractiveness of region
 - (ii) could lead to a conflict if the habitat was drained or transformed into fresh water reservoirs or intensively grazed
70. One of the most important targets for Mali in case Aquatic Warblers were found there was to elaborate a management plan considering the interests of local people and agriculture as well as interests of nature conservation, by creating zones.
71. Mr. Lachmann mentioned that conflicts between nature conservation and agriculture were real for Europe as well. At the same time, he pointed out that it did not require any changes in the report format. Such conflicts could just be described under the “Habitat protection” section. No separate line for conflict was needed.

72. Mr. Diop (Senegal) noted that work with Aquatic Warbler had been implemented in Djoudj National Park, Senegal, since 2003. No reports of any harm caused by the species had been registered since then.

73. The Meeting agreed that a list of Aquatic Warbler sites would be created by AWCO in the site protection sheet of the reporting format. When reporting, the MOU national experts would only be asked for updates.

74. The Meeting adopted the new reporting format for future reporting on the MoU and Action Plan's implementation. The revised National Reporting Format is attached as Annex 4 to the present report.

Agenda Item 8.2: Future MoU Coordination

75. The Chair invited Mr. Barbieri to introduce this Agenda Item on behalf of the Secretariat.

76. Mr. Barbieri (CMS) introduced the position of the AWCO and a proposal to extend existing arrangements for MoU Coordination referring to documents UNEP/CMS/AW-2/Doc.7 (Future MoU Coordination) and UNEP/CMS/AW-2/Doc.7/Add.1 (Report on Interim Coordination).

77. As the number of MoUs had grown to 18, in order to better ensure that these instruments and their accompanying action plans were effectively implemented, the CMS Secretariat had been developing the theory and practice of outsourced "MOU coordinators" with many of the same collaborating partner organizations.

78. It was also mentioned that the first such Officer was employed within the Aquatic Warbler MoU. The AWCO was undertaking a wide range of activities to support implementation of the MoU. Among other things, he had (a) supported conservation work within a number of Range States; (b) assisted Range States in securing funds for conservation activities; (c) facilitated communication across the species' range, including maintaining the web site for the AWCT < www.aquaticwarbler.net > and servicing the GIS site database for the species; (d) provided technical advice to the CMS Secretariat in preparation of the Second Meeting of Signatories, including the development of a new draft Range State reporting template, drafting of a Priority Projects list, and production of the second issue of the Aquatic Warbler Flyway Newsletter; and (e) provided other supporting documentation to the MoU meeting. The AWCO would assist in producing the meeting report.

79. The CMS Secretariat signed a Letter of Agreement with RSPB in December 2006, undertaking to finance this position for a further two years at equal shares. A one-year gap in the staffing of this position meant that the current funding arrangement lasted until March 2010. At present, the staff member was still employed courtesy of RSPB's agreement to continue funding 50 per cent of the costs of this position. The other 50 per cent was currently not covered.

80. The work of the AWCO had proved to be successful and cost effective. There was a suggestion of continuing the post. RSPB-BirdLife UK had offered to continue funding 50 per cent of the costs of the position for at least another two years, i.e. US\$10,000/year. The CMS Secretariat was confident of being able to secure resources for the first year. The possibility of providing resources for the second year would depend on the budgetary settlement to be approved

by the Tenth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP10) to take place in 2011. Pledges from the Signatory States were encouraged to reduce or eliminate such uncertainties.

81. Mr. Norbert Schaffer (RSPB/BLI UK) stated that Mr. Malashevich had provided excellent service and BirdLife International would be happy to continue, and he asked Signatories to express their opinions.

82. The Chair mentioned a fruitful cooperation with Mr. Malashevich (AWCO) in preparation of a transboundary EU Neighbourhood project application “Aquatic Warblers and biomass” that resulted in submission of the application to the donor.

83. The Meeting agreed that the mechanism of coordinating the MoU had proved to be efficient and cost-effective.

84. The Secretariat appealed to Signatories to consider supporting this position financially.

Agenda Item 8.3: Priority projects for funding

85. Mr. Barbieri (CMS) made a brief introduction of this Agenda Item (UNEP/CMS/AW-2/Doc.7).

86. Mr. Flade (BLI Germany) underlined the importance of the list as a tool helping to focus resources on key activities. All the recently implemented Aquatic Warbler conservation projects referred to the list and this reference served as a rationale for funding decisions.

87. Mr. Lachmann (RSPB-BirdLife, UK) was invited by the Chair to present the list. Mr. Lachmann explained criteria of including projects on the list and the difference between it and the list of actions recommended by the Action Plan: (a) only concrete project ideas were included; (b) the projects had an international importance, where cooperation and international funding were needed; and (c) the list was kept as short as possible, most of the projects had either essential or at least high priority. He also presented the structure and suggested not to modify the list between meetings.

88. Mr. Diop on behalf of Senegal asked to remove Senegal from the list of Range States involved in projects concerning Mauritania and Mali. Senegal had already dealt with Aquatic Warbler for seven years. Habitat distribution and numbers had already been estimated. Senegal would continue further research and monitoring work, but the need of habitat restoration and conservation and proper water management were more urgent. He asked to add a relevant project to the list. Senegal was not only relying on international investment, as there were some interested local donors in the country and part of Aquatic Warbler work was already being supported by them.

89. Mr. Flade noted that threats face by Aquatic Warblers and their habitats were currently being analyzed in Djoudj National Park in order to identify management needs, and if the need for management for wintering grounds was confirmed, such a project could be added to the list.

90. Mr. Keiss (Latvia) pointed out that only research projects were foreseen for Africa at the moment; sooner or later the need for such a management project would arise. Such projects could be included into the list during the next update.

91. Mr. Végvári (Hungary) underlined the need to take into consideration other species with different habitat needs.
92. Mr. Le Neve (France) suggested adding a project on the monitoring of suitable habitats.
93. Mr. Lachmann noted that as such monitoring was foreseen by the French Species Action Plan it should be implemented. The question was that the list included only the projects requiring international funding. In case of monitoring of suitable habitats, France could implement it using its own resources. However, it would only make sense to include such a project if it covered the whole migratory range.
94. Mr. Le Neve underlined that the question was not one of finance, but whether the project was of international importance.
95. Mr. Lachmann agreed to include the proposed project into the list and asked for the exact wording to be provided after the meeting.
96. Mr. Niagate (Mali) invited delegates to take into consideration priorities of each country. For Mali the priority was searching for wintering grounds. Senegal stated habitats restoration and conservation as its priority, rather than spending time on further research of aspects that were already known.
97. Mr. Flade clarified the proposal of Senegal. The idea was to mow 500 ha of habitat every year, at a cost of €2,000 and to estimate the effectiveness of conservation measures undertaken via monitoring. Burning was used in former times for maintaining the habitat, but this option was not acceptable any more. The wording for this project should be established.
98. Mr. Flade also made some explanations concerning the geolocators project. New 0.5 g geologgers had been developed. The fixing system had already been tested before, so the technology was proven. Only new weight devices would be tested within the planning project. Forty loggers would be available for the project.
99. The Meeting endorsed the priority projects list on condition that the following changes be made in the list: (a) correct the numbering; (b) distinguish status of projects as regards funding (funding secured or application for funding submitted); (c) include a project targeting active conservation in Djoudj. It should include mowing of 500 ha per year with biomass removal, and subsequent estimation of the effectiveness of conservation measures undertaken via monitoring; (d) include a project targeting monitoring the quality of available habitats, with help of satellite images; and (e) in point 12, change the target country from Senegal to Mauritania and Mali.
100. The revised priority project list is attached as Annex 5 to the present report. It was agreed that the list would be updated during the next meeting of signatories.
101. The Meeting also agreed to produce a separate resolution to facilitate obtaining of data from national ringing centres.

Agenda Item 9.0: Next Meeting of the Signatories

102. The Chair invited Mr. Barbieri to introduce this Agenda Item on behalf of the Secretariat.
103. Mr. Barbieri (CMS) invited the Meeting to consider the periodicity of the meetings as well as venue of the next meeting.
104. Mr. Lachmann (RSPB-BirdLife, UK) suggested two options: (a) in 2013 or 2014 in Lithuania in case of LIFE+ project approval; it would help to facilitate Lithuanian Government involvement; and (b) in Poland in the framework of the LIFE+ Project, but this option was less preferable in the context of rotation of countries.
105. The Meeting agreed to wait with this decision until the end of June 2010.

Agenda Item 10.0: Signing ceremony

106. Mr. Barbieri (CMS) familiarized the delegates with signing procedure and with the text of Amendment Protocol that according to the procedure is signed by Chairman and Secretariat.
107. The Meeting agreed to have a signing ceremony at 1930 hrs. at the beginning of the dinner hosted by the Polish Government.
108. The representatives of France and Mali signed the MoU and Action Plan on behalf of their countries.

Agenda Item 11.0: Any other business

Agenda Item 11.1: Agree to a resolution thanking the host country for arranging the Meeting as well as congratulating them with the results of the EU LIFE Project

109. The Chair introduced the delegates with the text of Meeting resolution, which the Meeting adopted.
110. The Chair invited participants to raise and discuss other issues not covered under the earlier agenda items.
111. Mr. Langgemach (Germany) raised a question of French becoming the second official language for the MoU.
112. Mr. Barbieri on behalf of the CMS Secretariat explained the consequences of such decision. Such a decision would lead to production of documents in two languages and need of simultaneous translation during the next meeting. It would increase related costs. Logically, national reports would have to be accepted in either of the two languages as well.

113. Mr. Lachmann (RSPB-BirdLife, UK) said that the experience of the meeting had proved the effectiveness of having simultaneous translation. He made a recommendation for future meetings to have a simultaneous English/French translation without making French an official language for the MoU.

114. The representative of France informed the Meeting that France has already translated the EU SAP into French and it could be used by other francophone countries in order to facilitate the understanding of this document.

115. Mr. Lachmann suggested that track versions be sent to the Secretariat in order to include changes into French version of SAP.

116. The Secretariat agreed to receive track changes made to the Action Plan during the meeting in order to reflect the changes in a French version as well.

Agenda Item 12.0: Closure of the Meeting

117. The Chair summarized the results of the Meeting, thanked all of the participants for their contribution and the Secretariat for its hard work on preparations for the Meeting, and declared the Meeting as closed at 1800 hrs. on Friday the 14 May 2010. List of Participants attached as Annex 6 to the present report.