Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals
Secretariat provided by the United Nations Environment Programme

44th Meeting of the Standing Committee
Bonn, Germany, 14 - 15 October 2015

UNEP/CMS/StC44/4.1

DRAFT REPORT OF THE 42ND MEETING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE

Quito, Ecuador, 2 November 2014

1. Opening remarks and introduction

1. The Chair of the Standing Committee, Mr Alfred Oteng-Yeboah (Ghana) opened the meeting.

2. The Executive Secretary, Mr Bradnee Chambers welcomed all participants to the meeting and to Quito and congratulated the local organizers on the quality of their preparations, the warmth of their welcome and the beauty of their country. He observed that all logistics and documents had been well prepared and that everything was in place for a successful COP.

2. Adoption of the Agenda and Meeting schedule

2.1 Provisional Agenda and Documents
2.2. Annotated Agenda and Meeting Schedule

3. The Chair introduced documents UNEP/CMS/StC42/Doc.2.1/Rev.1 *Provisional Agenda and Documents* and asked whether any members wished to propose amendments.

4. The representative of Chile, in her role as Chair of the Finance and Budget Committee, asked for item 9, the Report of the Finance and Budget Sub-Committee, to be considered before item 8, the Report on the Implementation of the CMS Budget during the Triennium 2012-2014.

5. The Agenda was adopted, subject to inclusion of the amendment tabled by Chile.

3. Adoption of the Report of the 41st Meeting of the CMS Standing Committee

6. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/StC42/Doc.3 *Draft Report of the 41st Meeting of the CMS Standing Committee, Bonn (Germany), 27-28 November 2013* noting that it had previously been circulated to the members of the Standing Committee and that written comments had been incorporated into the present version of the draft report.

7. The representative of New Zealand drew attention to item 14, paragraph 78 of the document, which stated incorrectly that the online reporting system was not working (instead of now working). This error should be corrected.

8. There being no other comments, the Standing Committee approved the Report of the 41st Meeting, subject to inclusion of the minor correction tabled by New Zealand.

4. Progress Report on activities since the 41st Meeting of the CMS Standing Committee

9. The Executive Secretary noted that this item would be covered in depth during the COP. Nevertheless there was one item he wished to report to the Standing Committee regarding the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Standing Committee and UNEP. Following the 41st Meeting of the Standing Committee in November 2013, a draft MOU had been circulated among Committee members between May 29 and August 2014, and a number of comments had been received. At the same time, IPSAS, a new accounting system was being adopted by the UN, and some aspects of this were expected to have a significant influence on the MOU. For this and other reasons, UNEP had indicated a preference for postponing conclusion of the MOU.

10. The representative of UNEP confirmed the information presented by the Executive Secretary report, noting that the IPSAS accounting system was UN-wide and beyond the control of UNEP. In February 2014 the Executive Director of UNEP had established a Task Team composed of the MEA Secretariats administered by UNEP to examine the effectiveness of the administrative arrangements in place. There were two Working Groups covering administrative arrangements and programmatic cooperation, chaired respectively by the CITES and CBD Secretariats. The Working Groups will report to UNEP in January 2015 and it will be important to incorporate their findings into the revised draft MOU. Resolution 1.12 of the United Nations Environment Assembly at its first session on 27 June 2014 also dealt with the relationship between UNEP and MEAs and it would be important to take that Resolution into account in a revised draft MOU. For these reasons it was hoped that negotiations on the draft MOU would resume in the first quarter of 2015.

11. The Standing Committee noted the comments of the Executive Secretary and the representative of UNEP.

5. Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023

12. The Secretariat introduced two documents: UNEP/CMS/StC42/Doc.5 *Final Draft Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023* and Document UNEP/CMS/StC42/Inf.2 *The Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023: 3rd and Final Draft.* The Chair of the Working Group on the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023 had not yet arrived in Quito, and Ms Anne Sutton (Secretariat) made a presentation on behalf of the Working Group.

13. The draft Strategic Plan had been developed with financial contributions from Germany, South Africa, Switzerland and UNEP. An extensive consultation process had generated strong support for building the draft Strategic Plan around the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and for broadened applicability to the whole international community. The draft Strategic Plan included five Strategic Goals and 16 Targets, which were more specific than the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and had an end date consistent with the CMS COP cycle. How to implement the plan had not been part of the current Working Group mandate, so it was proposed that a Companion Volume should be produced detailing delivery mechanisms and associated activities. The content of such a Companion Volume was scoped in Annex III to StC42/Doc 5.

14. The Chair invited comments from the floor.

15. The representative of Poland, a member of the Working Group on the Strategic Plan, thanked the Group for the quality of its work. For Poland, the most important point was that for each Strategic Goal the starting point should be described very clearly so that progress could be tracked effectively.

16. The Standing Committee noted the report of the Working Group. The Chair invited members to review the draft COP11 Resolution contained in Annex I of StC42/Doc.5 and hoped that members would join him in commending the draft Strategic Plan to the COP for adoption.

6. Cooperation with other MEA Secretariats

17. The Executive Secretary reported that the CMS Secretariat had held discussions with the CBD and Ramsar Secretariats, with a view to establishing Joint Work Plans with each of them. It had been agreed that more time was needed to prepare draft Joint Work Plans but that this stage should be completed in time for consideration by StC44.

6.1 Joint Work Plan with CITES

18. Ms Melanie Virtue (Secretariat) introduced document UNEP/CMS/StC42/Doc.6.1 *Cooperation between CMS and CITES*. She recalled that the CITES and CMS Secretariats had been implementing Joint Work Plans since 2008. Annex 1 to the document contained a progress report on implementation of the 2nd Joint Work Plan 2012-2014. Annex II contained the draft 3rd Joint Work Plan 2015-2020. This took into account, *inter alia*, the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, the CITES Strategic Vision and the proposed CMS Strategic Plan. The Joint Work Plan did not have cost implications for the CMS budget, but additional external funding would be sought for certain elements. Cooperative working by CITES and CMS could lead to efficiencies and synergies in fundraising efforts.

19. The Chair invited the Standing Committee to take note of the report on implementation of the Joint Work Plan 2012-2014 and to approve the draft Joint Work Plan for 2015-2020. He opened the floor for comments.

20. The CITES Secretariat thanked the CMS Secretariat for the document that had been tabled and for the work done over the last few years. The CITES Secretariat was pleased with the progress described in Annex I. There was a need to bear in mind that not all CITES Parties were Party to CMS. Some 63 States were Party to CITES but not to CMS and some CITES Parties attached higher priority than others to engaging with CMS. Nevertheless, the draft 3rd Joint Work Plan had already been endorsed by the CITES Standing Committee and it was to be hoped that the CMS Standing Committee would do likewise. A side event on 4 November, organized jointly by both Secretariats, would look in more detail at prospects for synergy and cooperation, at regional and national levels, as well as at global level.

21. In response to a question from the representative of Chile, the Executive Secretary noted the close cooperation between CMS and INFORMEA. Discussions were continuing with a view to strengthening collaboration further.

22. The representative of South Africa thanked the various Secretariats for their efforts to enhance synergies between MEAs, but noted the need for mechanisms that could help cascade the good work being done at global level to regional and national levels.

23. There being no further interventions, the Chair concluded that the Standing Committee had taken note of the work accomplished by the two Secretariats under the Joint Work Plan 2012-2014 and had approved the draft Joint Work Plan 2015-2020. He called on Standing Committee Members and other Parties to give strong support to the side event on 4 November.

7. Process for Election of the new Members of the Standing Committee for next triennium (and Budget Sub-Committee) in accordance with Res 9.15

24. Referring to document UNEP/CMS/Resolution 9.15 *Composition and Organization of the Standing Committee*, the Executive Secretary remarked that effective regional coordination would be

a central element of COP11, given the very full agenda. Rooms had been made available for regional meetings and the times for the first such meetings notified to all delegates. One of the most important tasks would be the nomination of candidates for election as Regional Representatives and Alternate Representatives in the new Standing Committee. He recalled that Parties having already served two consecutive terms as Regional Representative would not be eligible for re-election. Parties that had served only one term would be eligible for re-election, while there were no restrictions on the number of terms that could be served by Alternate Representatives. Africa and Europe were entitled to three Regional Representatives each, Americas and Asia two Regional Representatives, and Oceania one. The regional groupings were invited to advise the Secretariat as soon as possible of their nominations; these would then be put before Plenary for adoption on the final day of the COP.

25. It had previously been decided by the Standing Committee that nominations for the Sub-Committee on Finance & Budget should be drawn from among the new Standing Committee members. This would avoid the significant additional travel costs incurred if Sub-Committee members were elected from outside the Standing Committee, as had been the case during the 2012-2014 triennium.

26. There being no questions from the floor, the Chair concluded that the points made by the Executive Secretary had been duly noted by the Standing Committee.

9. Report of the Finance and Budget Sub-Committee

27. At the request of the Chair of the Finance & Budget Sub-Committee, this item was taken before item 8 *Financial and Human Resources*.

28. Ms Nancy Céspedes (Chile), Chair of the Finance & Budget Sub-Committee recalled two decisions taken by StC41:

(a) Financial reports should be produced by the Secretariat every six months for consideration of the Finance & Budget Sub-Committee;

(b) Members of the Sub-Committee, should, in future, be elected from among the members of the Standing Committee.

29. In conformity with decision (a), the Sub-Committee received the Secretariat's financial report for 1 January to 31 July 2014 in August 2014. This information had also been used in preparing document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.14.1 *Execution of the CMS Budget during the 2012-2014 Triennium*. The Chair of the Sub-Committee had received an email from the Secretariat questioning if it would be necessary to hold a meeting of the Sub-Committee prior to COP11, since detailed budgetary discussions would be taking place at the COP. She had circulated that email to members of the Sub-Committee and received only two comments; one from a Sub-Committee member and one from an observer.

30. Ms Céspedes noted that although it had been agreed at StC41 that the draft budget for 2015-2017 should be drawn up with the support of the Sub-Committee, the Sub-Committee had not, in fact, received any request from the Secretariat to support the development of the draft budget for the forthcoming triennium.

31. There being no questions or comments, the Chair of the Standing Committee concluded that the Committee had taken due note of the comments made by the Chair of the Finance & Budget Sub-Committee.

8. Financial and Human Resources

32. At the request of the Chair of the Finance & Budget Sub-Committee, this item was taken after item 9 *Report of the Finance & Budget Sub-Committee*.

8.1 Report on the Implementation of the CMS Budget during the Triennium 2012-2014

33. Mr Bruce Noronha (Secretariat) introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.14.1 *Execution of the CMS Budget during the 2012-2014 Triennium*. This represented the situation as of 31 July 2014. It contained three elements:

- Status of the Trust Fund for Assessed Contributions as at 31 December 2013
- Status of Contributions (income)
- Status of budget implementation for staff and operations (expenditure)

34. As of 31 December 2013, the balance of the Trust Fund was €867,393. Of that amount, approximately €650,000 was committed for the 2014 budget. Therefore the uncommitted Fund balance was €217,685. It was important to consider that the Fund balance contained unpaid pledges – an amount that had been rising, as shown in Table 3 of the document, standing at €345,981 as of 31 December 2013. Liquidity of the Fund therefore relied on unspent carry-overs and operating reserves. To address this trend the Secretariat has redoubled its efforts to urge Parties to pay their outstanding contributions for 2013 and prior years, and all corresponding invoices had been reissued. In response to these measures the balance of unpaid pledges for 2013 and prior years had fallen to €204,000 by 31 July 2014, and to €174,000 by 31 October 2014. Annex I provided an overview of the contributions status for each Party.

35. With regard to the 2014 budget, the total of unpaid contributions stood at €578,000 on 31 July 2014. However, as of 31 October 2014, this had fallen to approximately €550,000, of which €425,000 was at an advanced stage of processing. The 2014 year-end balance of unpaid pledges was expected to be slightly lower than for 2013.

36. With regard to expenditures, all the resources allocated for staff and operations costs in 2014 would be fully allocated. The information presented in the document had been reviewed in the light of expenditure during the period August to October 2014 and projections remained effectively unchanged.

37. Referring to the last two tables presented in Annex II, it was important to take into account that most activities with no or low expenditure when the document was compiled related to COP activities. It was expected that all such funds would be be fully allocated.

38. The Chair opened the floor for comment.

39. The representative of South Africa noted that Table 6 (Savings as of 31 December 2013 rephased into 2014) appeared to indicate that savings from the core budget had been used to fund JPO positions. It was her understanding that such positions were sponsored by Parties and should not be funded from the core budget.

40. Mr Noronha (Secretariat) recalled that StC41 had approved utilization of core budget savings to support the fourth year of a JPO position.

41. The representative of South Africa responded that it was a standard principle that Parties sponsor JPO positions. It was undesirable to set a precedent of such a position being funded from the core budget, even if such rephasing had been endorsed by the Standing Committee. It would have been preferable to see how the savings could have been utilized for other purposes.

42. The Executive Secretary stressed that the positions supported by the rephasing were temporary positions, not permanent core budget positions. The core budget savings enabled two positions to be extended exceptionally.

43. Several members, including the representatives of Chile, South Africa and Uganda, supported by the representatives of France and Poland, sought clarification with regard to paragraph 14 of UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc 14.1, which referred to the Associate Programme Officer position based in Washington DC. Points raised included: the basis for including the position in the core budget at COP10; the degree to which the position had been successful in mobilising funds; the extent to which the position was realising tangible benefits within the Americas region; and the over-expenditures incurred in relation to this position.

44. The Executive Secretary recalled that the position was shared with and 50% funded by UNEP. He noted that the position was not dedicated solely to fundraising; a comprehensive report had been submitted to StC41and the Officer had been available at that meeting to answer questions. A further report had been submitted ahead of COP11, under Agenda item 12.2.

45. Mr Noronha (Secretariat) explained the specific provisions of the UN system that treats taxation of US citizens differently from those of citizens of other countries, and which meant in the case of the Associate Programme Officer, those costs had to be covered through the budget line for that position.

46. Following further discussion, it was agreed that this matter should be taken up by the COP11 Budget Committee, bringing together the relevant COP Agenda items, namely item 12.2 *Report on CMS Activities in North America* and 14.1 *Execution of CMS Budget 2012-2014*. The Committee would be tasked with finding a way forward to resolve remaining concerns over this issue.

47. Subject to the reservations expressed in relation to paragraph 14, document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.14.1 was endorsed by the Standing Committee.

10. Status of Preparations for CMS COP11/ 11. Briefing on key Documents for COP

48. The Standing Committee accepted a proposal by the Executive Secretary that items 10 and 11 should be considered together.

10.1 Summary of Preparatory Work
10.2 Logistical Arrangements and Procedures
10.2.2 Conference Timetable including High Level Ministerial Panel, Champions night, side events and other meetings

49. Mr Johannes Stahl (Secretariat) summarized the logistical arrangements that had been made for the COP. The Government of Ecuador was generously providing transportation from three hubs in the city within reach of all hotels, to the Conference Centre, and had subsidized the cost of the excursions on November 8th. Arrangements for the High Level Panel on November 3rd, Champions Night/35th Anniversary celebrations, and two receptions were also presented.

50. The Executive Secretary drew attention to the COP website, and in particular the new COP11 'splash' page and the 'In-Session' page where in-session documents would be uploaded for the convenience of delegates as the meeting progressed.

51. The representative of Norway, supported by the representative of France, expressed concern about the time implications of the relatively complex transportation logistics. He suggested that in

the interests of saving time, consideration should be given to establishing additional working groups and that every effort should be made to move through the Agenda as efficiently as possible.

52. The Executive Secretary responded that every effort had been made by the Host Country to put together a flexible transport schedule that was as convenient as possible.

53. The representative of New Zealand suggested that Working Groups could begin earlier than 20.00, as currently scheduled.

10.2.1 Meeting Structure: Committees, Working Groups and Election of Chairs/Vice Chairs

54. The Executive Secretary made a short presentation proposing arrangements to maximise the efficiency of the COP. In view of the very full Agenda, he proposed that a Drafting Group could work in parallel with the COW. The Drafting Group would focus mainly on institutional and governance issues, while the COW concentrated on implementation matters, supported as required by short-term working/contact groups for specific draft Resolutions and other key documents. The Budget Committee would operate as normal. Regional coordination meetings would be an important means of ensuring that the views and priorities of Parties were communicated to the appropriate forum, especially in the case of Parties with small delegations that needed to engage with parallel sessions.

55. The Chair invited the Standing Committee to support the proposals outlined by the Executive Secretary so that they could be put to the COP plenary for adoption.

56. Following responses to requests for clarification made by the representatives of New Zealand, South Africa and Uganda, the Standing Committee agreed to table the proposed arrangements for consideration by the COP.

57. The Executive Secretary noted that in response to concerns raised at COP10, the Secretariat had reached out to the regions seeking proposals for Chairs of the principal bodies of the COP. As a consequence of these consultations with Parties, the following nominations had been received:

Chair of the Committee of the Whole: Øystein Størkensen, Norway
Chair of the Drafting Group: Alfred Oteng-Yeboah, Ghana
Chair of the Budget Committee: Malta Qwathekana, South Africa

58. For short-term working/contact groups, Chairs would be proposed as the need arose.

59. The Standing Committee approved submitting the names of the proposed Chairs, for consideration by the COP.

12. Report by the Chair of the Scientific Council on the Outcomes of the 18th Meeting of the Council

60. The Secretariat introduced Document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Inf.8 *Report of the 18th Meeting of the Scientific Council of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (1-3 July 2014, Bonn, Germany).*

61. The Chair of the CMS Scientific Council, Mr Fernando Spina (Italy) made a presentation summarizing the activities of the Scientific Council between 2011 and 2014.

62. A number of Working Groups had been very active during the triennium and their work had been facilitated by promotion of the new online workspace for Scientific Councillors'. Much work

had been done on development of organizational changes in the *modus operandi* of the Scientific Council. Mr Spina drew attention to the work of the Saker Falcon Task Force, the Landbirds Action Plan, the Working Group on Minimizing Poisoning, and work on the conservation implications of cetaceans' culture. Contacts with other MEAs had been maintained and he, in his role as Chair of the Scientific Council, had represented CMS at meetings of IPBES and the Bern Convention. Mr Spina had secured funding from the Po Delta Regional Park for a restricted Scientific Council Meeting in Venice, in February or March 2015. The 18th Scientific Council meeting in Bonn, from 1-3 July 2014 had been very generously supported by the Government of Germany and outputs of that meeting would provide key contributions to COP11. Mr Spina concluded by inviting the Standing Committee to take note of his report, and to provide guidance concerning the Council's future activities.

63. The Chair thanked Mr Spina for an informative presentation and drew attention to the fact that many Scientific Councillors had been unable to attend COP11, since the Scientific Council meeting itself had been held some months prior to the COP.

64. The representative of Uganda thanked Mr Spina applauded the successful fundraising efforts made by the Chair of the Scientific Council, and sought clarification over the criteria used to select participants for the restricted Scientific Council meeting that had been held in Formia.

65. Mr Spina responded that only COP-Appointed Councillors had been invited, due to the resource limitations and the need for in-depth discussions within a small group. It had been decided not to invite national delegates because the self-funding requirement was felt to discriminate unfairly in favour of those countries with adequate financial resources.

66. The representative of Chile congratulated Mr Spina on the scale and efficiency of his work. She was struck by the lack of participation of Scientific Councillors at COP11, and drew attention to the importance of restructuring the Scientific Council.

67. The representative of South Africa thanked Mr Spina for his excellent work and for the support he made available despite budget constraints. She also expressed regret that in spite of its important role in guiding the activities of the Convention, the budget for the Scientific Council had been cut at COP10.

68. The Standing Committee took note of the presentation and of Document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Inf.8.

13. Date and Venue of the 43rd Meeting of the Standing Committee

69. The Executive Secretary confirmed that the 43rd meeting of the Standing Committee would take place in Quito immediately following the close of the final plenary session on 9 November.

14. Any other business

70. There was no other business

15. Closure of the Meeting

71. The Chair closed meeting at 17:14hrs underlining the need for regional groupings to select their candidates for election to the new Standing Committee as soon as possible during the course of the COP.