



# CONVENTION ON MIGRATORY SPECIES

Distribution: General

UNEP/CMS/ScC18/4.4/Addendum  
2 July 2014

Original: English

---

18<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF THE SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL  
Bonn, Germany, 1-3 July 2014  
Agenda Item 4.4

## **OPTIONS FOR A NEW STRUCTURE OF THE SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL**

### **Compilation of Comments from Parties**

#### Summary

Under this cover is reproduced a synthesis of the comments received from Parties on the options for a new structure of the Scientific Council.



## OPTIONS FOR A NEW STRUCTURE OF THE SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL

### Compilation of Comments from Parties

#### Czech Republic

The Czech Republic prefers **scenario C with a small modification**. We miss NGOs in this scenario. On the basis of the long term experience we consider the role of NGOs as a very essential and beneficial in the work of the SC so we support an integration of NGOs into proposed structure of the new SC in scenario C. Especially IUCN and BirdLife International and also IPBES and marine NGOs offer a large and useful expertise and deep knowledge so we would welcome continued cooperation with them in future too.

#### Ecuador

Based on the review of the three scenarios, the Scientific Councillor of Ecuador assessed that Scenario A is the most appropriate structure for the next Scientific Council. This scenario foresees 11 regional representatives of which 3 from Africa, 3 from Europe, 2 from South America, 2 from Asia and 1 from Oceania. Each region will elect their representatives to the meetings of the Scientific Council. The remaining members of the Scientific Council are representatives for taxa (6) and cross-cutting themes (6). These councillors for specific taxa and topics may be appointed by the Parties. An important issue here is that the themes may change depending on changing situations of the Convention. A representative for each of the following taxa will be appointed: birds, marine mammals, terrestrial mammals, fish, reptiles and invertebrates, i.e. all taxa represented in Appendices I / II of CMS. Similarly a representative will be appointed for each of the following themes: climate change, bycatch, invasive species, sustainable use, ecology and migration of wildlife diseases. The total number of representatives of the Scientific Council is of 23 members.

#### *Original submission in Spanish:*

En base a la revisión de los tres escenarios el Consejero Científico de Ecuador evaluó que el *Escenario A* es el más idóneo para la próxima estructura del Consejo Científico. Dicho escenario contiene 11 representantes regionales 3 de Africa, 3 de Europa, 2 de America del Sur, 2 de Asia y 1 de Oceania. Cada región deberá elegir a sus representantes para las reuniones del Consejo Científico. Los restantes miembros del Consejo Científico son representantes por taxones (6) y temas transversales (6). Estos consejeros específicos para taxones y temas pueden ser nombrados por las Partes. Un tema importante aquí es que los temas pueden sufrir modificaciones dependiendo de las situaciones cambiantes de la Convención. Entre los taxones se elegirá un representante para cada una de las siguientes taxa: aves, mamíferos acuáticos, mamíferos terrestres, peces, reptiles e invertebrados, es decir están representados todas las taxa de los Apendices I/II de CMS. De la misma forma se designará un representante por tema, los temas designados son: cambio climático, captura incidental, especies invasivas, uso sostenible, ecología migratoria y enfermedades de fauna silvestre. En total el número de representantes del Consejo Científico es de 23 miembros.

#### Germany

- Germany welcomes the Secretariat's Paper "Options for a new Structure of the Scientific Council". It is fully in line with the discussion process in the Standing Committee and the need to keep the Council's efficient, effective structure.

- Germany feels that the principle of regional representation is urgently needed, useful and the right step to reach a higher efficiency. This is in line with the thinking behind the future shape of CMS.
- Currently, CMS has 120 member states and is constantly growing. The Standing Committee composition of a regional representation has already proved to guarantee a sufficient regional coordination. Overall, this structure should also be appropriate for the Scientific Council. At the COP every Contracting Party will keep its influence on decisions by one vote. That should allow the expression of every Party's view; also on issues the Scientific Council has given its advice on.
- Germany shares the view that certain taxa are not yet well represented by experts in the Council. We have a considerable number of migrating invertebrates but no expert on this huge, species-rich taxa group. Marine fish species might be underrepresented, too. In principle, we share the view of the Secretariat that "the analysis shows a clear in-balance in the Scientific Council and points to existing gaps" (Figure 1-3 & page 4 of the Secretariats report). However, it is important to recognize that long-range migrating bird species are much more abundant as such reptile species (and long range migratory amphibians will not exist). Therefore, the number of experts has to be seen in relation to the migratory species in each vertebrate class. The same caution in evaluation appears necessary for habitats: Tropical woodlands show much more richness of species than arid areas. Thus, it is logical to have more experts on forests than on deserts.
- In our view, Scenarios A and C appear more favorable than solution B, while solution A is presumably the model reaching the greatest variety of different aspects, which might be useful for CMS.
- Furthermore, we think that each region should be represented by at least 2 Persons, including North-America – even if none of the 3 NA states is a member yet. 2 – 3 representatives for each region would diminish the risk that a regional representative might speak only on behalf of its Contracting Party.

### Israel

The report mentions that one of the problems with the current working groups is that they have no Terms of Reference. This is a major failing and makes me concerned about those scenarios that wish to appoint councilors based on the working group themes. Also, the themes chosen in the scenarios should be flexible to change, since pressing issues can arise and change over time.

Scenario B is not good since it includes IPBES, IUCN and a marine NGO as part of the Council. This is not appropriate and these bodies should continue to be honored observers and not members of the council.

If I had to vote for only one scenario of those offered, it would be A, but I would be happy to see other scenarios.

### Norway

We thank the Secretariat for the draft. We share the view that a revision of the composition of the ScC will be advantageous if these result in more alignment with the present focal areas of CMS. We also recognize the added benefit of cost savings and further enhancement of synergies.

We fully share the view that the core members of the ScC should be primarily appointed in their personal capacity as scientific experts. We are also of the opinion that participation from

the Parties at meetings of the ScC should be open to any participant nominated by the Parties. This composition would be a change from the present system where the Parties appoint permanent members of the ScC. In other words we question if it is necessary for the Parties to appoint their permanent representatives to the ScC. Guidelines for sponsoring of participation by the COP appointed councillors should therefore be limited to apply only to those and not to participation by Party observers. This would result in a significant cost saving, while still keeping meetings open for participation by Party observers.

For all three proposed scenarios we need to see a clarification on how the regional distribution is to be accomplished. Unless the idea is to ask Parties for nominations on each topic (birds, fish, climate change, wildlife disease) and then at the COP elect the best qualified on each. We therefore suggest that the Secretariat screen the proposed list and propose a list of candidates, and at the same time keep an eye on a balance in regional representation. On Regional Representatives, it should be clarified on what criteria these are to be elected (other than being from a specific region). We would support a focus of scientific merits for these candidates too. Scenario A seems to be most clear cut and we are supportive of the idea to strengthen topical focus as this will ease the selection of best qualified candidates.

### Philippines

Considering the scenarios outlined in the document, we believe that “Scenario C” would be a strategic approach for restructuring the Scientific Council. Such option would ensure a strong regional representation for bird, marine and terrestrial experts and at the same time avoid redundancy of expertise.

### Togo

After reviewing the document, we found that all scenarios contribute to the reduction of the size of the Scientific Council and therefore to the reduction of the cost of meetings.

From the analysis of the three scenarios, it is clear that scenario B seems the most suitable and practical. Indeed, this scenario shows that the experts cover all taxa and all topics. In addition, the representation of international institutions such as IUCN, IPBES and marine NGOs in the Council will have an added value in the analysis and making of harmonized and coherent scientific decisions.

However, the representation of the various regions in taxa and themes may be disproportionate. That said, this may not have a negative influence on the scientific decision of the Council as skills will be put to the service of all regions.

### *Original submission in French:*

Nous avons l'honneur de vous signifier qu'après avoir parcouru le document, nous avons constaté que tous les scénarios concourent à la réduction de la taille du Conseil Scientifique et par conséquent la réduction du coût des réunions.

De l'analyse des trois scénarios, il ressort que le scénario B semble le mieux adapté et le plus pratique. En effet, ce scénario montre que les experts couvrent tous les taxons et tous les thèmes. De plus, la représentation des institutions internationales telles que UICN, IPBES et ONG marine dans le Conseil aura une valeur ajoutée dans l'analyse et la prise des décisions scientifiques harmonisées et cohérentes.

Toutefois, la représentativité des différentes régions au niveau des taxons et des thèmes pourra être disproportionnée. Cependant, il ne peut pas avoir d'influence négative sur la prise de décisions scientifiques du Conseil car les compétences seront mises au service de toutes les régions.

### Uganda

1. Uganda agrees generally with the need, rationale, aims and objectives of the restructuring since this will not only improve efficiency of the Council but also cost effectiveness of managing the Council.
2. In order not to defeat the spirit of Party representation in the Council, Scenario A brings out clearly the principle of Party representation without comprising the technical ability of the Council. In Principle, Uganda supports Scenario A.
3. Even though the CoP may adopt any given scenario say A, Article VIII.2 of the Convention states that "Any Party may appoint a qualified expert as a member of the Scientific Council" is not amendable by such CoP decision without proper amendment of the Agreement Text. As such, any Party would still be entitled to send its appointed Councilor to the core Council by virtue of Article VIII (2). What the CoP may have limitations though, is funding of the Party Appointed Councilors. CoP would ordinarily have power to say that the COP will only fund delegates within the core "Council" without excluding formal recognition of all those parties who may wish to send Councilors at their expense as formal members of the Council with decision making powers. To change this would require amendment of the Agreement Text. As a long term solution, amendment of the Agreement Text is thus still recommended.