



# Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS)

*Secretariat provided by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)*

## Report of the 22nd meeting of the CMS Standing Committee

*Bonn, 21-22 September 2000*

### Agenda Item 1: Opening Remarks

1. Mr. C. Custodio (Philippines) in the Chair opened the meeting. He highlighted some of the problems relating to the utilisation of migratory species. He then invited all the participants to introduce themselves briefly and invited Mr. Adams (Germany) to make a welcoming address on behalf of the host government.
2. Mr. Adams (Germany) reminded the meeting of the significance that the City of Bonn had had in the history of the Convention, since it had been signed there and had hosted the Permanent Secretariat since its formation. The twentieth anniversary celebrations had also taken place in Bonn in 1999. The city was also becoming increasingly significant for the CMS Agreements, with AEWA joining ASCOBANS and EUROBATS. The German Government looked forward to welcoming the AEWA Technical Committee in October 2000 and the joint CMS COP7/AEWA MOP2 in September 2002.
3. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht (CMS Secretariat) thanked the German Government for making the arrangements for the Standing Committee and for providing such excellent facilities. He welcomed the representatives of BirdLife International and Wetlands International who were attending the Standing Committee for the first time as observers, and commented that both organisations had been particularly active in their support of CMS. He also extended a special welcome to the Nigerian Minister of State for Environment when he joined the meeting on 22 September. He passed on the apologies of Dr. Colin Galbraith, Chairman of the Scientific Council, who had had to cancel his participation at short notice. Delegates from Kenya and Pakistan had been unable to attend because of difficulties encountered by the travel agents in issuing their tickets.
4. Mr. Hepworth (UNEP) forwarded the good wishes of the Executive Director, Dr. Töpfer, who took a keen interest in the activities of CMS. Mr. Hepworth, with his long association with the Convention, was particularly pleased to have witnessed the success of COP6, which had attracted participants from nearly 100 countries. Steady progress had been achieved since COP6, with the two Memoranda of Understanding on marine turtles and the negotiations for an albatross agreement. He warned against complacency and reminded the meeting that there was strong competition for limited amounts of political attention and financial resources. He promised that he would be as supportive as possible in his new role at UNEP. UNEP/CMS's initiatives to be in the forefront of finding synergies had been noted. Obvious partners for CMS and its Agreements were the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the UNEP Regional Seas Agreements. Financial resources remained scarce, but he could try to mobilise other forms of assistance, such as involving the Geneva-based Information Unit and helping efforts to recruit more Parties, especially amongst those countries from regions other than Europe and Africa. In conclusion, he quoted from the Malmö Declaration of the Environment Ministers in May 2000, which stressed the importance of a coordinated implementation of national and international instruments in the field of environmental law and the need to engage civil society in conservation activities.

## **Agenda Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda, Work Schedule and Rules of Procedure**

5. The meeting was invited to consider the proposed agenda and to suggest items to be considered under “any other business” (see agenda item 12). The provisional agenda (document CMS/Stc22/Doc 1) was adopted without amendment.
6. The schedule (CMS/Stc22/Doc 3) was also considered and adopted without amendment.
7. Mr. Hykle (CMS Secretariat) introduced the Rules of Procedure (CMS/Stc22/Inf 1) which had been amended to reflect the changes to the composition of the Standing Committee agreed at COP6. The revised rules were adopted subject only to the deletion of the explanatory note in parenthesis in Rule 6, as Mr. O’Sullivan (United Kingdom) pointed out that there were British Overseas Territories in the North America and Caribbean Region.

## **Agenda Item 3: Report of the Secretariat**

8. The Secretariat referred to CMS Bulletin editions 10 and 11 which had been produced since COP6. Agenda Item 7 (the Strategic Report) would also present an opportunity to discuss the work of the Secretariat and the Convention in detail.
9. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht (CMS Secretariat) took the opportunity to introduce new members of the Secretariat staff: Ms Jasmin Kanza, the new Administrative and Fund Management Officer, had been appointed in succession to Bothena Bendahmane. She had experience in project management from previous postings with UNICEF. Her post too would be funded from the 13% overhead charges. Mr. Marco Barbieri was the new Technical Officer, with prime responsibility for servicing the Scientific Council and managing CMS projects. He had previously worked at RAC/SPA in Tunis, a UNEP-affiliated office. Ms Beatriz Torres was the new Information Officer and Capacity Building Officer. She was a biologist and had previously worked for the CBD Clearing House Mechanism. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht also noted the departure of Mr. Suhel Al-Janabi, the German Liaison Officer. He had contributed greatly to the 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary celebrations and had produced maps, graphics and other materials. Finally, Mr. Bert Lenten was introduced as the new Executive Secretary of the African-Eurasian Waterbird Agreement (AEWA).
10. Mr. Hykle (CMS Secretariat) provided an update concerning the two Memoranda of Understanding (MoU) relating to Marine Turtles. The French Government had expressed a willingness to fund projects in support of the Memorandum for the Atlantic Coast of Africa. The related draft Conservation Plan was nearly ready for circulation. Good progress had been achieved in Malaysia for the MoU for the Indian Ocean and SE Asia. Interim secretariat facilities would be provided by the CMS Secretariat, and the search was now on for a host for a second Range State meeting and permanent arrangements for the MoU secretariat. Mr. O’Sullivan (United Kingdom) pointed out that the UK was a Range State to the Indian Ocean/SE Asian MoU and would therefore have an interest to be invited to the meeting. Mr. Hykle noted that unlike the first meeting, hosted by Malaysia, the CMS Secretariat would be involved in the issuing of invitations, and would ensure that the UK was invited to future meetings.
11. Mr. Vagg (CMS Secretariat) reported on further progress on the MoU for the middle-European population of the Great Bustard (*Otis tarda*). The MoU was now ready for signature and the authorities of Range States had been invited to issue appropriate credentials to their delegations attending the IUCN Congress in Amman. It had proved impossible to find a suitable time and venue for a signing ceremony. Mr. Adams (Germany) after welcoming the progress achieved for this important species, explained that Germany would not be able to sign the MoU immediately as a full ratification procedure was required.

12. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht (CMS Secretariat) reported on the stalled progress on the Houbara Bustard Agreement. Recapping events so far, he explained that the Saudi Arabian Scientific Councillor had agreed to take the lead in 1993. The COP and other international organisations such as IUCN and CITES had passed resolutions calling for urgent action. The Secretariat had assisted the lead country to develop a draft Agreement and Action Plan, and only four relatively minor points remained to be cleared when all contact was inexplicably broken off. The Secretariat sought guidance from the Committee about how to proceed, as it seemed counter-productive for the Secretariat to try to intervene further with the Saudi authorities. Mr. John O'Sullivan (BLI) recalled that at COP6 a number of other Arabic countries expressed concern at the sudden halt in progress and he suggested that they might be approached to make discreet enquiries. It was important to keep Saudi Arabia involved, because it was an important Range State. The forthcoming IUCN World Conservation Congress was to debate a motion on the African Houbara Bustard, and it could not be ruled out that the discussion would broaden to the Asian sub-species, and CMS might be asked to give an update. It was agreed that the Secretariat should re-assess the situation after the IUCN Congress and contact the Chair and members of the Standing Committee.

#### **Agenda Item 4: Reports from Committee Members and Observers**

13. Dr. Calvar (Uruguay) reported on progress from the Americas arising from the regional meeting at Punta del Este. Information had been distributed to all focal points, but to date, only Chile had replied. Further information regarding the status of flamingoes had been obtained and a range of species of interest to CMS were found in the Americas. Political and personnel changes had caused some loss of momentum, but both Argentina and Bolivia had been brought on board. Dr. Calvar had brought the latest draft of the albatross report with him but it was in need of updating.

14. Mr. Kasulu (Democratic Republic of the Congo) had e-mailed all other Focal Points in his region but had received no replies before his departure to Europe. Zambia had been urged to accede to CMS and there were possibilities for an agreement on antelopes with Angola and Namibia.

15. Mr. de Smet (Belgium) reported that the action plans of AEWA and EUROBATS had been circulated to Focal Points in the region to encourage further efforts to implement them. Similarly it was proposed to circulate the Strategic Plan to enlist further active support. Regarding ungulates, captive-bred stock in a number of zoos was being made available to Range States and the representatives of zoos in Europe and North America had promised to show extra commitment to the implementation of the Antelope Action Plan beyond providing surplus breeding stock. However, help was also needed in establishing protected areas into which captive stock could be safely released. A useful workshop had been held in May in the UK. France was leading a broad range of projects in an effort to implement the Action Plan.

16. Ms Herrenschmidt (France) reported that in cooperation with Belgian experts of the IRSNB, the French Ministry of the Environment and the National Institute for Hunting (ONC) were working on a proposal for submission to the *Fonds Français pour l'Environnement Mondial*. Coordinating all the countries party to the Djerba Declaration was proving difficult. It was hoped that the project would receive €1.3 million (ca. FF9.5 million) towards its total budget of €3.575 million if successful. It was being designed to meet the eligibility criteria requiring innovation and identifying specific environmental benefits. With UNEP's approval, it was hoped to use CMS as the coordinating body. With regard to the follow-up to the Abidjan meeting on marine turtles, France was also hopeful of further progress.

17. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht welcomed the efforts of Belgium and France on behalf of ungulates and particularly the proposed use of French funding for a project closely associated with CMS, which he hoped might set a precedent. He had not yet had time to examine the project proposal in great detail, but it seemed very innovative and he hoped that it would prove possible for CMS to participate fully. It was agreed that France would further elaborate in writing its thoughts on the

CMS Secretariat's role in the implementation of the project which would then examine the matter in consultation with Headquarters.

18. Mr. Domashlinets (Ukraine) reported on progress on the national action plan for the Great Bustard involving artificial breeding and releases and cooperation with the Russian Federation. Moldova, Armenia, Georgia and Kazakhstan had all taken steps towards acceding to CMS and the related Agreements. Ukraine had undertaken trans-frontier actions with Poland and Moldova, including a bat bio-reserve in the Carpathians. Ukraine had participated in European Bat Night, and research into cetaceans in the Black Sea and Sea of Asov had been carried out, including aerial surveys in co-operation with the Russian Federation. WWF (Russia) was coordinating a project across the former Soviet Union regarding the implementation of biodiversity conventions which would also include CMS issues. An European Union funded project was being developed for biodiversity in the Carpathians, jointly with Romania and likely to be relevant for CMS species.

19. Mr. Custodio (Philippines) reported on the progress since COP6 on the albatross agreement. The Range States, distant water fishing nations and NGOs had met in Hobart, and a consensus on the fundamental aims of the proposed Agreement had been reached. Threats had been identified, the need for data collection and dissemination agreed, and the conservation status of the species estimated. Australia had agreed to take the lead in the further development and negotiation of the Agreement in partnership with other countries of the region.

20. Mr. O'Sullivan (United Kingdom) reminded the meeting of the UK's interest in the albatross issue - its overseas territories making it the second or third most important Range State - and mentioned the catastrophic mortality rates resulting from long-line fisheries (250,000 birds per annum). He stressed the importance of concluding the first formal non-European Agreement under CMS to counteract the often heard, but unjustified, accusation that CMS was primarily a European instrument. He too had felt that the Hobart meeting had been entirely positive and that most outstanding issues had been solved with just a few remaining. The next meeting would take place in South Africa in January or February 2001 and the UK and Australian Governments had promised funding.

21. Mr. Adams (Germany) stressed that CMS was a global instrument and that a Southern Hemisphere Agreement for albatrosses and petrels would underpin this. He said that Germany was taking great interest in further developments. There was already a precedent for international environmental fora to tackle successfully long-line fisheries issues in CCAMLR, the Antarctic Agreement. Mr. Custodio (Philippines) informed the meeting that to address fisheries' impact on conservation, a joint committee had been set up in the Philippines between the Environment and Fisheries ministries.

22. Dr. Boere (Wetlands International) explained that the Netherlands was a partner in the Antarctic Treaty and was involved in research projects of interest to CMS. With regard to the Slender-billed Curlew (*Numenius tenuirostris*), it was still feared to be on the brink of extinction. Two expeditions to Iran had failed to make any sightings, but still some good data were gathered. The proposed workshop on the central Asian Flyway had yet to take place. The Dutch Embassy in Moscow had some funding available for such events, and the GEF AEWA project could also provide a framework for this meeting. Wetlands International was proposing a project to the Dutch government concerning broader issues relating to the flyway. The Dutch and Russian governments were cooperating and the central Asian Flyway was a priority for the Russian authorities. Dr. Boere had recently attended a Conservation of Arctic Fauna and Flora (CAFF) meeting where the conservation of migratory arctic birds outside the Arctic region was discussed. This was of great relevance to AEWA. Dr. Boere had encountered some resistance to entering multi-lateral agreements - including CMS and AEWA - amongst the Arctic nations on the grounds of costs, preferring bilateral agreements. He felt that bilateral agreements were even more costly because of the duplication of effort which they entailed.

23. On behalf of the Secretariat, Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht welcomed the reports, the considerable amount of progress which was being achieved, unilaterally, bilaterally and multilaterally and the synergising taking place in the integrated implementation of CMS, AEWA, Ramsar and, finally, CBD.

## **Agenda Item 5: Institutional Matters**

### **Item 5.1: Participation of Observers in the Standing Committee**

24. Mr. Hykle (CMS Secretariat) introduced the discussion on the participation of observers from NGOs by referring the Committee to the report of the 20<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Steering Committee (CMS/Stg22/Inf 8.2, paragraphs 26 and 27), in which the Committee decided to defer consideration of this question until the 22<sup>nd</sup> Meeting. CMS could follow the example of Ramsar by giving formal recognition to partner organisations or build on the existing procedures whereby observers could be invited routinely or on an *ad hoc* basis at the discretion of the Chairman.

25. Mr. O'Sullivan (United Kingdom) said that he was following developments closely. The issue was arising frequently in other fora, both national and international, and he was anxious that no firm precedent be set until the implications of NGO participation were clear.

26. Mr. Custodio (Philippines) asked the Committee members whether they wanted the NGO observers to withdraw from the meeting room while their participation was discussed, but all members who expressed an opinion felt that it was not necessary for them to leave.

27. Mr. Pritchard (BirdLife International) recalled his statement at the opening ceremony of COP6 in which he mentioned CMS's openness towards NGOs, when he had requested that BLI be granted access to the Standing Committee. He pointed out that the papers prepared for the meeting showed how closely BLI was involved in CMS affairs and that it could help find further synergies with the other Conventions with which it had dealings. National BLI partner organisations like the Wild Bird Society of Japan were also mentioned as key actors in CMS initiatives. From his experience of attending Ramsar Standing Committee meetings, he suggested that closed sessions could be kept to a minimum and on the question of who to invite, he felt CMS would be of interest to a limited number of NGOs anyway, so there was no need to be too restrictive.

28. Dr. Boere (Wetlands International) expressed pleasure to be attending the Standing Committee in his new capacity on behalf of Wetlands International, with whom CMS had a long history of co-operation, formalised through a Memorandum of Agreement and a Letter of Agreement with the Asia-Pacific Office, to promote CMS in the Far East. He explained that he was being seconded by the Dutch Government to WI to work on international issues, which would maintain his interest in CMS. The Dutch Government continued its commitment to international flyway work and had approved an annual budget of US\$ 8 million for the next five years. As he would remain a civil servant, he would continue his work in the CAFF, as Chairman of the Bern Convention Standing Committee and with the Slender-billed Curlew Working Group. He also called upon the Committee to be flexible in its approach to the participation of NGOs.

29. Mr. de Smet (Belgium) identified a number of points which arose from NGO participation. He explained that he had no mandate either from his Government or other members of his region to take a formal position, and he too shared the concerns expressed by the UK about setting precedents. The issues which needed to be decided were: which organisations should be invited; how they should be invited; cost implications of their participation and their right to vote and speak.

30. Mr. Adams (Germany) agreed that identifying the key organisations was important. Leaving the invitation to the discretion of the Chair was a flexible and pragmatic approach, which could adapt to the agenda of the meeting. Continuing on the present basis was advisable during the test phase of the

experiment. He stressed that NGO participants were observers and should therefore not enjoy voting rights. Personnel and budgetary matters should be discussion without the observers being present.

31. Mr. Kasulu (Democratic Republic of the Congo) said that he welcomed the presence of the NGOs in an advisory role, but agreed that they should not be granted the right to vote.

32. Mr. O'Sullivan (United Kingdom) felt that Belgium had identified key issues, and advocated that the Committee should adopt only provisional rather than permanent rules at this stage.

33. Mr. Hykle responding for the Secretariat pointed out that the current rules of procedure were flexible and achieved everything that the committee wanted to do. On the question of the costs of participation, he stressed that the NGOs had to pay for their own travel and accommodation. The COP had abolished the US\$100 charge for NGOs to participate at the Conference, so there seemed little justification in levying a charge to cover document production and postage for the Committee. The Scientific Council had identified the international NGOs which it would invite to participate at its meetings. These were probably, although not necessarily, the organisations most appropriate for the Standing Committee to invite too. The Secretariat needed some guidance from the Committee on this point. The Committee discussed the type of NGO most likely to provide useful input to the Committee. "Campaigning" NGOs were thought to be less suitable than BLI and WI, who were being included in the Scientific Council's deliberations because of the expert input that they could make.

34. In the experimental phase, it was agreed to restrict the organisations to be invited to BLI, WI, WWF and the IUCN. It was also agreed that there should be no standing invitation to the Secretariats of the other Biodiversity-related Conventions to attend the Standing Committee. If the need arose, an invitation could be issued to another Convention Secretariat or NGO on a case-by-case basis at the Chairman's discretion. It was agreed that for the current meeting, the NGO observers should be excluded from the agenda items 5.3 (the Agreements Unit), 5.4 (UNEP Administrative issues) and 6 (the Budget).

### **Item 5.2: Headquarters Agreement**

35. Mr. Adams (Germany) reported that unfortunately despite the best efforts of the Secretariat and the Federal Environment Ministry, there was little prospect of an immediate conclusion to the negotiations over the Headquarters Agreement, which had begun in 1996. The German Government's offer made in April 1998 went unanswered until October 1999. Legal discussions within the German Government had led to another eight month hiatus, with still some ground to be cleared on both sides. The German Government was aware of CMS's willingness to progress matters further and a meeting would be convened within the next four weeks or so to clear up the open questions. Mr. Adams sought to reassure the meeting that the absence of a Headquarters Agreement was not impairing the ability of CMS to operate since the old exchange of letters remained valid.

36. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht thanked the German representative for his explanation and confirmed that the German authorities were applying basic UN privileges to the Convention Secretariat and the newly integrated Agreement Secretariats as though the agreement had been signed. However, from the Secretariat's side, a few matters of concern for members of staff needed to be resolved. He also felt that it would be desirable to have the Agreement in place before COP7, to ensure that delegates participating at the next Conference in Bonn enjoyed the same rights as delegates attending similar events held under the auspices of other Bonn-based UN bodies.

37. Mr. Hepworth (UNEP) thanked the Secretariat and the German authorities for their efforts to conclude the Agreement. He stressed as a matter of principle, that it was important that CMS staff should not be disadvantaged compared with other UN colleagues in Bonn. He suggested that

UNEP/CMS and the German Government set a target of the end of the current year to try to clear up the outstanding issues.

38. Mr. Adams informed the meeting that formal ratification of the Agreement might take some further months or even years depending on what legislation was necessary. He acknowledged that other matters to be resolved included work permits for spouses and relatives; issuing visas at borders for delegates and extending the HQ Agreement to CMS Agreements operating within the Agreements Unit.

39. Mr. Custodio (Philippines) asked whether there was anything that the Standing Committee should do. Mr. Hepworth thought that the Committee should press the parties concerned for a speedy conclusion of the Agreement in the interests of the Convention. The Standing Committee decided, through its Chair, to appeal to both parties concerned -- UNON/UNEP as the focal point for the responsible offices of the United Nations, and the German authorities -- in order to expedite conclusion of a headquarters agreement with provisions comparable to those already in place for all other Bonn-based UN agencies. (The Secretariat is preparing a draft letter for consideration by the Standing Committee Chair, with a view to having it sent out under his signature in October).

### **Item 5.3: Developments Concerning the Establishment of the Agreements Unit**

40. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht called upon Bert Lenten (AEWA) and Andreas Streit (EUROBATS) to introduce themselves to the Committee, and presented apologies on behalf of Rüdiger Strempele (ASCOBANS).

41. Mr. Lenten (AEWA) explained that he had entered on duty in Bonn in July as the Executive Secretary of AEWA, having previously headed the Interim Secretariat at the Dutch Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Protection and Fisheries in the Hague. He thanked his colleagues in the CMS Secretariat for their assistance since his arrival. He hoped soon to be in a position to recruit an assistant.

42. Andreas Streit informed the meeting that the Parties to EUROBATS had adopted a resolution endorsing the decision to integrate the EUROBATS Secretariat into the CMS Agreements Unit. He looked forward to continuing his close co-operation with CMS. EUROBATS continued to grow with two new Parties recently and more expected soon. The year 2001 had been declared "International Year of the Bat", with global rather than just European coverage.

43. Mr. O'Sullivan (United Kingdom) noted from the report of the ASCOBANS MOP that the budget implications for integration had made the decision controversial, and asked how the concerns raised were to be addressed. In response, Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht pointed out that moving the Agreements Secretariats from national bodies to the UN had been agreed in principle some time before, and that the full implications of the change would only become evident after the event. At the MOP, three delegations raised fundamental concerns about the budget and proposed downgrading the two posts to part-time, with considerable detrimental effects on the effectiveness of the ASCOBANS Secretariat. It was neither possible nor desirable for the CMS Secretariat to provide additional staff time available to compensate for the shortfall, other than in a range of administrative tasks, which lay within the range of administrative support CMS and UNON had to provide. In addition, a considerable number of fields of co-operation and mutual support arose already before the Agreements Unit was fully operational.

44. Mr. O'Sullivan suggested that a management consultant should be engaged to assess the benefits of joining the Agreements Unit, to help inform any future similar decisions to integrate agreements Secretariats. In the absence of support from other members he did not press the point, although he felt it was the business of the Committee to assess the financial implications for CMS of decisions taken by the Agreements.

#### **Item 5.4: UNEP/UNON Administrative issues**

45. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht introduced this item by explaining that UNEP provided the CMS Secretariat and the administrative and regulatory basis for its operations, which included audit and legal services and support for conferences.

46. Mr. Hepworth (UNEP) welcomed the decisions by the ASCOBANS and EUROBATS Parties to integrate their Secretariats into the Agreements Unit, stressing that the Agreements would remain answerable to their Parties on matters of substantial policy. In view of the debate about the budgetary consequences, the new Unit would have to prove itself. Mr. Hepworth reported that a routine audit carried out earlier in the year had resulted in a very favourable report on the effectiveness and efficiency of the CMS Secretariat, with only minor and easily remedied criticisms. UNEP would soon be acting upon the CMS COP6 decision to write-off US\$10,500 in unpaid pledges. He noted the recent appointment of three new professional staff improving the regional and gender balance of the Secretariat, and apologised for the length of time that finalising the appointments took. He noted that CMS was considering national reporting within its information management plan and stressed the importance of harmonising reporting requirements for all biodiversity-related and regional seas conventions. Ideas needed to be explored and pilot projects launched. To this end, a workshop was being arranged in Cambridge in October 2000. It was recognised that filing reports was widely regarded as a time-consuming chore and a distraction from carrying out work in the field.

47. Mr. de Smet (Belgium), referring to the organisation chart (CMS/Stc 22/Inf 6), asked how many of the posts identified there were yet to be filled. All were now occupied with the exception of the Agreements Development Officer, the associated general staff post to be shared with the Technical Officer, and the JPO posts which depended on external rather than core funding.

#### **Item 5.5: Collaboration with other Organisations**

48. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht introduced CMS/Stc 22/Doc 7 and the four annexes, which covered CMS's collaboration with CBD, the IWC, Wetlands International and the IUCN.

#### **Convention on Biological Diversity**

49. With regard to collaboration with CBD, Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht pointed out that at the Rio summit in 1992, 156 Heads of State and Government had signed up to the Convention on Biodiversity, which set new frontiers for integrated conservation, sustainable use and economic development policy. CMS was only just developing itself at this time with 38 Parties and neither EUROBATS nor ASCOBANS was in force. There had been some danger of CMS being overshadowed by CBD and the funding available to it through GEF. The CMS-CBD study, published in May 2000, which received helpful support from UNEP set out to illustrate how CMS and CBD could go hand-in-hand by highlighting their complementarities. The four page covering paper showed how CMS wished to proceed by operating in a complementary manner to CBD and with the aim of also tapping into GEF resources for national and transboundary projects which feature migratory species as indicators for wider biodiversity issues. Unfortunately, GEF criteria favoured national rather than international projects and its country-driven ecosystem approach opened doors to Ramsar while essentially keeping them closed to CMS and CITES. The CBD COP noted the study and referred it to its Scientific Body for recommendations to the COP on how migratory species could be integrated into CBD's eight thematic areas. The Secretariat needed assistance in drawing up a paper outlining the case for including migratory species in the CBD themes. Studies on two, or preferably three, of the eight thematic CBD areas, the inclusion of migratory species and the special role which CMS and related Agreements should play would be important to convince in particular the authorities responsible for biodiversity in developed countries.

50. Mr. Adams (Germany) agreed that this was a vitally important topic, since it presented an opportunity for accessing funding without which projects could not be undertaken. He offered to help draft one of the papers. Mr. O'Sullivan (United Kingdom) offered the support of the Performance Working Group in identifying performance indicators and suggested that the Scientific Council might be well placed to offer advice. Mr. de Smet (Belgium) also offered to help and suggested that writing to other Parties might reveal that suitable papers were already in existence. BLI also volunteered to contribute material from studies already undertaken for other purposes.

51. Following an intervention from Ms Herrenschmidt (France), Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht explained that he thought that the French proposal to its environmental fund might serve as a model for others, but pointed out that the situation was confused since overseas aid was the responsibility of different national ministries. As to the CBD studies, CMS needed the input of scientific experts who were familiar with the implementation of CBD and who could advise on integrating migratory species issues into the CBD themes. A further difficulty was CMS's relationship to GEF, which was itself not directly linked to CBD but operated through an MOU. Although the CBD COP decision placed the onus on the CBD Secretariat to take action, experience showed that it was not advisable for CMS to wait for CBD to respond, and that a pro-active approach by CMS was required.

## **CITES**

52. At the CITES COP, it was agreed that CITES and CMS should adopt an MoU given that there were areas of common concern such as elephants and sturgeons. CITES promised to produce a first draft of the MoU but this had not yet been prepared. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht hoped that relations with CITES could be developed more now that the three professional staff were in place.

53. Mr. Adams (Germany) reported that an initiative to establish an Agreement on sturgeons including CITES had been put on the back burner after CITES wrote requesting that action be delayed because of serious doubts about whether the venture would serve CITES' aims.

## **IWC**

54. As reported in the Bulletin, the IWC Meeting in Adelaide approved the draft MoU which was then signed in the margins of the ASCOBANS MOP in Bristol on 26 July.

## **UNESCO (WHC and MAB)**

55. The World Heritage Convention and the Man and Biosphere Programme were two key partners for CMS, both under the aegis of UNESCO in Paris. The Director of MAB, Dr. Peter Bridgewater, a former CMS Standing Committee Chair, was keen to identify areas for cooperation and had suggested Sahara-Sahelo ungulates, which would complement the French FFEM proposals, action plans relevant to AEWA, and marine turtles. No concrete common action plan had been identified for WHC yet.

## **IUCN**

56. The IUCN Director Ms von Bieberstein Koch-Weser had agreed that there should be an "umbrella" agreement with CMS, given IUCN's role in drafting the convention text and developing the Agreements. The MoU with the IUCN-Environmental Law Centre in Bonn, negotiated in 1996, had now expired. A first draft of a broader MoU had been prepared, but considerable work was needed for it to be a useful tool.

57. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht, introducing annex IV, referred to the IUCN's Quadrennial Programme "*Stepping into the New Millennium*" and drew the Committee's attention to the fact that CMS's potential role as a partner for IUCN appeared to have gone unrecognised, which was in the interests of neither IUCN nor CMS. Members of the Committee agreed that CMS's role past, present and future should be properly recognised and authorised the Secretariat to write to all Focal Points urging that they contact their national delegations to press for amendments. Many members of the Committee thought that the Secretariat's paper should be amended to be more assertive. Mr. Hepworth (UNEP) also offered to assist promote CMS in his role of UNEP coordinator for the IUCN World Conservation Congress.

### **MoUs**

58. Mr. O'Sullivan (United Kingdom) asked whether the Secretariat could let the next Standing Committee have an assessment of the value of the series of administrative MoUs in force and under negotiation. Mr. de Smet (Belgium) did not think MOUs were necessary to underpin every instance of cooperation, although Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht felt that they were important sometimes, when statements of intent failed to materialise into corresponding actions.

### **BirdLife International**

59. Mr. John O'Sullivan gave a brief summary of recent work where BLI and CMS were collaborating, including action plans on the Aquatic warbler, the Corncrake and the Lesser kestrel. Mr. Pritchard stressed that BLI could help CMS with many species and by acting as a link with other Conventions, providing linkages to CBD themes and through the ecosystem approach to Ramsar. BLI's paper on eco-corridors for the Bern Convention would be of particular interest to CMS. BLI also had close links with the European Environment Agency and its work on environmental indicators.

### **Wetlands International/International Crane Foundation**

60. Dr. Boere stated that his new post seconded to WI presented lots of scope to promote CMS. WI had initiatives in South America and Asia. Mr. Hykle pointed to the LoA with the Asia-Pacific Office of WI, where staff undertook to promote CMS in that region. He also mentioned the International Crane Foundation, with whom the Secretariat was working on Siberian Cranes, as another organisation with whom an extension of cooperation on other crane species was possible.

### **Item 5.6: Any Other Institutional Matters**

61. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht spoke on the issue of the different official language versions of the Convention and the earlier decision of the Standing Committee that the Secretariat should assume responsibility for updating the Appendices, in all languages including Arabic, Chinese and Russian. The Secretariat had asked the Depositary for electronic versions of the Russian, Arabic and Chinese texts and would engage a language service company under contract to store, update and maintain these texts. Unfortunately, as not all of these were available in electronic form, the Secretariat would have to start the work from the beginning.

### **Agenda Item 6: Review of Current Status of Contributions to the CMS Trust Fund, Budget and Resources**

62. Introducing Document CMS/Stc 22/Doc 8, Mr. Hykle reported that Saudi Arabia was now among the Parties having paid their contributions for 2000. Referring to paragraph 6 of the paper, Mr. Hykle pointed out that a large percentage of the outstanding contributions could be attributed to a small number of countries, to whom reminders would be sent. A new account number had been

allocated to the CMS Trust Fund after the Meeting documentation had been prepared: the correct account number was 485-000326. The meeting noted Annex V, listing all Parties eligible for financial support to attend CMS meetings.

63. Dr. Okopido (Nigeria) requested that reminders be sent to the Nigerian Finance Ministry, since the national budget had been passed late this year. Mr. Kasulu (Democratic Republic of the Congo) stated that his country's contributions up to the year 2002 (a total of US\$ 1370) had been paid, excluding an amount to be written off in keeping with the decision of COP6.

## **Agenda Item 7: Implementation of the Strategic Plan 2000-2005 and the Performance Working Group**

### **Performance Working Group**

64. Mark O'Sullivan (United Kingdom) introduced CMS/Stc 22/Doc 9.1, the report of the Performance Working Group. He explained that the Group had been established at COP6, as part of a range of initiatives concerning reporting processes. It was important to address presentational as well as scientific and administrative issues in order to mobilise civil society in support of conservation and sustainable development. Many of the species covered by CMS were charismatic and likely to excite public interest. The work of the Convention needed to be made accessible and understandable to a wider audience. The idea of performance indicators was familiar to many public administrations over the past ten/fifteen years, as they needed to be sure that their work was effective and to know how they could work better. In assessing performance, three aspects could be measured: activities, outputs and outcomes. Of these, outcomes were the most important but often the most difficult to measure. It also needed to be accepted that not all key factors were within the control of governments and their agencies, so that measurement of outcomes did not necessarily reflect the performance of Parties. Thus, perfection was not obtainable; progress however was.

65. In addition to assisting assessment of implementation of the Convention itself, performance indicators could usefully support progress in the Secretariat, Standing Committee, Scientific Council and Conference of the Parties, though this would need to be on a consensual basis; such an approach could not be imposed on institutions which did not accept its utility in their current circumstances.

66. Mr. Adams (Germany) asked how the performance of the Convention could be assessed when scientific knowledge was imperfect, as measurement of biological indicators was often based on incomplete data. Mr. O'Sullivan suggested that the Convention should use the best information available, and with appropriate caveats, use this as 'proxy' information. Where gaps in knowledge were identified, research effort should be directed to address this.

67. The Standing Committee approved the paper and invited the PWG to continue its work as proposed.

### **Strategic Plan**

68. Mr. Hykle introduced document CMS/Stc 22/Doc 9. The Secretariat had systematically reviewed the implementation of the Strategic Plan adopted at COP6 and the table presented to the Committee reflected the structure of the CMS Strategy. The Review was a dynamic document which would be in need of periodic updating and the input of the Scientific Council would be necessary for certain elements. The Secretariat sought the confirmation of the Committee that the format of the Review was appropriate and input regarding how to fill in some of the sections on future actions. One omission was activities being undertaken at the national level within and outside CMS but still

relevant to migratory species conservation, and it was hoped that the WCMC review of national reports might help address this information gap (see Agenda Item 8: Information Management Plan).

69. Mr. de Smet (Belgium) and Mr. O'Sullivan (United Kingdom) both felt that the format of the document was good and Mr. O'Sullivan added that its succinctness was also a virtue which should be retained. He suggested that brief references to activities undertaken nationally, under the EU or the Bern Convention would suffice. Dr. Martens (Belgium) agreed, suggesting a "matrix" system for cross references would help keep the document to a manageable size.

70. Dr. Boere (WI) thought that the strategy should remain a "rolling" document and should be designed to facilitate the addition of new information. He spoke about his experience with the Ramsar Convention, which had an electronic implementation document, which took some time to establish initially but which was very easy to update thereafter. AEWa wanted to follow the Ramsar model. Progress and action could be recorded with a simple tick box or ☺/☹ system. Consideration should also be given to activities undertaken by non-Parties; the North American governments were particularly active, although outside the CMS framework.

71. Mr. Pritchard (BLI) suggested that the Strategic Plan should remain a *strategic* document within a hierarchical reporting system, and should be used as a sign post to other reporting instruments dealing with *tactical* issues.

***Objective 1: to promote the conservation of migratory species***

72. Issues raised under Objective 1 were primarily the concern of the Scientific Council and it was agreed not to examine this section in excessive detail. Some input from the Committee was however desirable, particularly with regard to further specific actions to be undertaken.

73. Mr. Adams (Germany) mentioned the German initiative to list sturgeons under Appendix II of CMS in parallel with similar measures under CITES. The proposed MoU under CMS would have provided a medium for information exchange for the Range States. The Black Sea/Caspian Sea Action Plan tabled at CITES COP met with a positive response from delegates, and it was regrettable that CITES, having decided to initiate its own "Significant Trade Review", had expressed reservations about the joint venture with CMS. Given this background, the German Government felt that it was best to let the CITES procedures take their course and return to the CMS MoU if appropriate after the effect of the CITES regulations became clear.

74. Dr. Okopido (Nigeria) reported that Nigeria had signed the African marine turtle MOU in November 1999 and had undertaken to assume the lead. At a GEF workshop in July 2000, Nigeria had lobbied for support for turtle projects, in particular along the Nigerian-Cameroon coast. He expressed his willingness to organise a turtle workshop in Nigeria next year.

75. Mr. Kasulu (Democratic Republic of the Congo) reported that there were problems coordinating the Range States of the Mountain Gorilla impeding progress of any Agreement.

76. Dr. Beudels (Scientific Council, Belgium) commented that the entry concerning Sahara-Sahelo ungulates referred to the Scientific Council giving consideration to allocating funds to these species. The Scientific Council had already considered the matter and had agreed to allocate US\$100,000 for the 1998-2000 triennium, which would serve as useful matching funding for the project application to the French FFEM. However, as these funds had not been claimed, some of it had been reallocated and US\$58,000 remained earmarked for these purposes. This did not rule out the possibility of the full amount being restored from other sources in a further reallocation exercise. As the precise state of affairs concerning the ungulate funding was not clear at the time of the meeting, the Secretariat undertook to investigate the matter and inform Dr. Beudels of the outcome in time for the end of September deadline for the FFEM.

77. This discussion preempted the question of the proper procedures for allocating project funding, given the advisory role of the Scientific Council and the decision-making role of the Standing Committee. It was suggested that the Scientific Council should draw up a list of projects within broader categories covering types of species and geographic range, and having secured approval from the Standing Committee or the COP, be left a degree of discretion to adjust the details of the budget within these broad parameters. The Standing Committee did not need to examine the project proposals in great detail (duplicating the role of the Council), but merely to approve the general shape, balance and direction of the whole package. This question also highlighted the need to synchronise the cycle of meetings.

78. Mr. de Smet (Belgium) asked what was proposed for the items in the Plan with the entry “no specific actions known to have undertaken to date”. He felt that either action should be identified or the item be deleted. He was also concerned to read in the budget papers that some projects for 2000 had not yet spent any of their allocation at the end of the third quarter. With the Scientific Council not due to meet until spring 2001, it was too late to seek advice on redistributing the 2000 allocations. He also recalled that the sum of US\$200,000 had been agreed at COP5 in Geneva, so was puzzled to find the amount of US\$239,000 mentioned in the budget documents.

79. Mr. Hykle explained that although funds had been allocated for specific purposes, concrete project proposals had not been presented in all cases. In a couple of instances, projects were awaiting the entry on duty of responsible programme officers. Bringing greater transparency to these procedures for allocating funds was one of the issues which the Scientific Council needed to address.

### *Objective 2: to focus and prioritise actions for migratory species*

80. Mr. Hykle noted that the fisheries sector was of increasing importance to CMS with interest in sea-birds, cetaceans and turtles. The Secretariat had not however had much contact to date with fisheries organisations. Mr. O’Sullivan (United Kingdom) felt that the CMS Parties had a role to play in speaking up for CMS rather than expecting the Secretariat to intervene directly. The Governments of Parties attended international fora and many Parties had a track record of promoting conservation issues, including the UK which had tabled the by-catch resolution at COP6. Mr. Hykle identified two key areas: representing CMS’s views in international fisheries fora and CMS accessing national fisheries authorities. He reminded the meeting that Parties had been invited to nominate additional Focal Points responsible for marine or agricultural issues, if Parties thought that this was appropriate. Many Parties to the Ramsar Convention had established national committees drawing together all interested sectors. Mr. Adams (Germany) did not think that there was a simple model which would suit all Parties, which should be left to find their own solutions for bringing interest groups together. Ms Herrenschmidt (France) commented that fisheries was a broad term with lots of potential impacts, on feeding grounds, breeding grounds and through by-catch. There were already efforts in hand to monitor some activities (such as tuna fishing in the Mediterranean) and she asked how one could best bring all these issues together. Dr. Okopido (Nigeria) spoke about the problems caused in coastal waters from off-shore mineral extraction, both for fisheries and conservation activities. Mr. Domashlinets (Ukraine) suggested that hunting interests were potential partners in conservation activities. Mr. O’Sullivan (United Kingdom) warned against casting the net too wide and overburdening CMS Focal Points with coordination duties. Mr. de Smet (Belgium) offered to write to all regional Focal Points to obtain their views on how best to engage other sectors more actively in CMS concerns.

81. Dr. Okopido (Nigeria) spoke about the problems caused by the Nypa palm, a plant similar to the coconut which had been introduced to Africa from South America in 1906 to stabilise the coastline. It was now proving highly invasive and damaging to fish spawning grounds and a hazard to propeller driven boats. In response to Nigeria’s appeal for assistance, Mr. Adams (Germany) suggested that the matter should be raised at the IUCN Congress where invasive and alien species would be discussed. The case might also be of interest to CBD and the German Economic

Cooperation Ministry. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht suggested that the Nigerian representative on the Scientific Council should raise the issue in that forum because of the potential effects on turtles and cetaceans.

82. Turning to another point, Mr. Hykle reminded the Committee that the Convention contained very few specific binding obligations, but one exception was the requirement to address obstacles to migration, which had been the subject of a paper submitted to the Scientific Council in 1994. Mr. O'Sullivan (United Kingdom) suggested that when the issue was next considered in detail, that the effects of climate change should be added.

83. The accuracy and appropriateness of the species listed on Appendix I was primarily an issue for the Scientific Council. However, Appendix I listing often led to concerted action being drawn up for a species. Mr. Adams (Germany) felt that those species which were receiving attention in other fora, such as the Council of Europe or the EU, did not need CMS intervention as well, citing the Great Bustard and Aquatic Warbler as examples. CMS resources would be better deployed dealing with Appendix I species not subject to existing plans, even if these were not perfect or completely comprehensive. A further issue arose with the entry into force of AEWA, namely whether CMS or AEWA should take the lead on species listed on the annexes of both. Different versions of Action Plans being issued in the name of different fora also added to confusion and could be counter-productive, giving the impression of poor coordination and inadequate prioritisation.

84. Mr. John O'Sullivan (BLI) agreed that it would be wasteful to duplicate effort, but it was often appropriate to revisit action plans as knowledge improved and, equally, involving different fora was appropriate to ensure that the full range of a species was covered. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht supported this view. He also pointed out that the Slender-billed Curlew MoU might be superseded by AEWA, but a problem arose because not all AEWA Parties has signed the MoU and not all signatories of the MoU had acceded to AEWA.

85. The advice of the Scientific Council was only one element in drawing up a prioritised list of actions to be implemented. Availability of funds and political input were also important factors. The development of Agreements depended apparently on a measure of luck and the willingness of a Party to make the running, rather than following a pre-established plan.

86. Mr. Adams (Germany) pointed out that Parties were called upon to develop Agreements, but some Parties had not done so. He suggested that a small working group might consider this question and report to COP7. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht reminded the Meeting of Parties' legal, moral and political duty to develop Agreements and quoted Resolution 4.4 which urged developed countries to provide support to developing countries to set up Agreements regardless of whether the developed country was a Range State. Mr. Adams volunteered to chair the Working Group and sought volunteers, preferably with a broad geographic range. A decision about whether the group would meet or conduct its business through correspondence was deferred. France, the UK, Nigeria and the Democratic Republic of the Congo expressed an interest. Committee members undertook to contact Parties in their regions to seek further participants.

87. The question of the collection and use of data for informing the decision-making process was more appropriate for consideration under the Information Management Plan (Agenda Item 8).

88. The use of satellite telemetry in monitoring migratory species had been subject of papers prepared by BLI and others. The Scientific Council would be best placed to review this issue, providing a further reason for the Council to meet as soon as possible.

***Objective 3: to enhance global membership in CMS through targeted promotion of the Convention's aims***

89. The Strategic Plan set a goal of 85 Parties by 2002. The current total was 70, so the plan had an ambitious target. Mr. Hykle noted that the Letter of Agreement with WIAP would help efforts to recruit in Asia; however, North America remained a problem, and there was little prospect of the USA acceding in the near future for political reasons. The Standing Committee was urged to continue its recruitment effort, and BLI and WI would also lobby on the Convention's behalf. Nigeria offered to lobby through various African fora, AMCEN, ACOPS, G77 and China. Mr. O'Sullivan (United Kingdom) congratulated the Secretariat and others for the successful recruitment effort since 1995. It was agreed that ensuring the Convention was seen to be successful was the best means of attracting further Parties.

***Objective 4: to facilitate and improve implementation of the Convention***

90. CMS's profile in other fora and linkages with other Conventions and conservation organisations had been discussed at length under Agenda Item 5.5. A record of achievement rather than promotional materials would probably be the most effective means of enhancing the Convention's membership and global coverage.

91. CMS had modest resources, with contributions augmented by voluntary donations and support for specific activities. It had nothing akin to the outside contributions enjoyed by Ramsar and UNEP imposed restrictions on the Secretariat regarding soliciting financial support. Mr. O'Sullivan (United Kingdom) commented that the imposition of 13% overhead charges on voluntary contributions was a disincentive, especially if the basis on which the charge was calculated was not apparent. Mr. de Smet (Belgium) commented that appeals for specific projects were usually more successful than appeals for general additional contributions.

92. COP6 had instigated some changes to the constitution of the Standing Committee. It would be advisable for the Scientific Council to consider structural reforms, as it had grown into a large body with national representatives, Conference-appointed experts and observers with many varied taxonomic interests represented.

**Agenda Item 8: Information Management Plan**

93. Mr. Hykle introduced CMS/Stc 22/Doc 10 on the Information Management Plan. There had been a long discussion on this subject at COP6 culminating in the adoption of Resolution 6.5. Many actions had been identified including the review of national reports and a project proposal had been received from WCMC, for which funding had been identified at COP6. Work would start in October with some pilot and sub-projects. The project would be completed in March 2001 and the subject would be discussed at the next Standing Committee.

94. Mr. O'Sullivan (United Kingdom) drew the meeting's attention to the Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF) sponsored by the OECD, as news of its existence had not filtered through to all in the environment field. The Secretariat was aware of BCIS, but not GBIF, and undertook to ensure that the WCMC took it into account when working on the Information Management Plan.

**Agenda Item 9: Arrangements for the Seventh Meeting of the Conference of the Parties**

95. Mr. Schmitz (Germany) said that Germany was delighted to be hosting CMS COP7/ AEWA MOP2 in September 2002. Members of the Committee had had the opportunity of briefly visiting the Hotel *Maritim* in Bonn to see the facilities. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht (CMS Secretariat)

acknowledged the work already done by the Federal Government to prepare the meeting and the Secretariat would cooperate to ensure that the meeting was a success. He agreed that a priority was the completion of a Host Government Agreement. He also called on all present to promote the Convention in the meantime to ensure that there were lots of successes to report.

#### **Agenda Item 10: Matters of the Scientific Council relating to the work of the Standing Committee**

96. Mr. Hykle extended the apologies of Dr. Colin Galbraith, Chair of the Scientific Council, who had had to cancel his participation at short notice. A fax had been received from Dr. Galbraith outlining some key issues:

97. The next meeting of the Scientific Council would hopefully take place in Edinburgh in April or May 2001, with the modest additional costs of holding the meeting away from Bonn not a great concern. He welcomed the election of John Mshelbwala as Vice-Chairman. He noted that the appointment of the Scientific Councillor for Asiatic Fauna remained outstanding and would be facilitated with the assistance of the Secretariat. He would consult fellow councillors regarding any nominations received and make the appointment in the light of comments received. A number of candidates were thought to be interested. Dr. Galbraith was involved in drawing up the Albatross Agreement and was keen to contribute to the Performance Working Group's deliberations by providing suggestions for measures to gauge the success of the Scientific Council.

#### **Agenda Item 11: Date of Next Meeting**

98. The Committee faced two options; either one meeting between now and the next COP (in December 2001 or January 2002) or two (June or September 2001 and January or February 2002). It was agreed that the Secretariat would liaise with the Chairman and the arrangements would be made through correspondence.

#### **Agenda Item 12: Any Other Business**

99. The meeting closed with the customary thanks to the hosts, organisers, participants and interpreters, and from Dr. Okopido (Nigeria) to the Secretariat for assisting with his visa application at short notice.

## 22nd meeting of the CMS Standing Committee

*Bonn, 21-22 September 2000*

### LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

**Chair:**

Philippines (Oceania)

Mr. Carlo Custodio

**Vice-Chair:**

Belgium (Europe)

Dr. Koen de Smet

Dr. Els Martens

**Members:**

Germany (Depositary)

Mr. Gerhard Adams

Mr. Joachim Schmitz

Democratic Republic of the Congo (Africa)

Mr. Seya Makonga Kasulu

Mr. Lhelo Boloto

Kenya (Alternate for Africa)

(not represented)

Ukraine (Alternate for Europe)

Mr. Volodymyr Domashlinets

Uruguay (Americas)

Dr. Marcel Calvar Agrelo

Pakistan (Asia)

(not represented)

**Observers:**

Burkina Faso

Mme. Mariam Nikiéma

France

Mme. Véronique Herrenscheidt

Nigeria

H.E. Dr. Imeh Okopido

United Kingdom

Mr. Mark O'Sullivan

UNEP/UNON - Nairobi

Mr. Robert Hepworth

Wetlands International

Dr. Gerard Boere

BirdLife International

Mr. John O'Sullivan

CMS Scientific Council

Mr. David E. Pritchard

Dr. R. Beudels-Jamar de Bolsee

**Secretariats of CMS Agreements:**

AEWA

Mr. Bert Lenten

EUROBATS

Mr. Andreas Streit

**UNEP/CMS Secretariat:**

Executive Secretary

Mr. Arnulf Müller-Helmbrecht

Deputy Executive Secretary

Mr. Douglas Hykle

Technical Officer

Mr. Marco Barbieri

Information Officer

Ms. Beatriz Torres

Administrative Officer

Ms. Jasmin Kanza

Special Projects Officer

Mr. Robert Vagg

**Meeting Secretariat:**

Administrative Assistant

Ms. Patricia Nolan-Moss

Finance Assistant

Mr. Thilo Schliebener

Secretary

Mr. Liam Addis

## **22nd meeting of the CMS Standing Committee**

*Bonn, 21-22 September 2000*

### PROVISIONAL AGENDA

1. Opening remarks
2. Adoption of the agenda, work schedule and rules of procedure
3. Secretariat report on inter-sessional activities
4. Reports from Committee members
5. Institutional matters
  - 5.1 Participation of observers in Standing committee
  - 5.2 CMS Headquarters Agreement
  - 5.3 Developments concerning establishment of an Agreements Unit
  - 5.4 UNEP/UNON administrative issues
  - 5.5 Collaboration with other organizations
  - 5.6 Any other institutional matters
6. Review of current status of contributions to the CMS Trust Fund, CMS budget and resources
7. Implementation of the Strategic Plan 2000-2005
8. Implementation of the Information Management Plan
9. Arrangements for the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP7)
10. Matters of the Scientific Council relating to the work of the Standing Committee
11. Date and venue of the next meeting of the Standing Committee
12. Any other business