



Agreement on the Conservation of Gorillas and their Habitats

Distribution: General

UNEP/GA/MOP2/REPORT

Original: English

SECOND MEETING OF THE PARTIES
Bergen, Norway, 26-27 November 2011

REPORT OF THE SECOND MEETING OF THE PARTIES*

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

1. The Meeting was opened by Mr. Bert Lenten, Deputy Executive Secretary of CMS. He introduced Ms. Melanie Virtue, Acting Agreements Officer of the CMS Secretariat, and Ms. Andrea Pauly, who had been assisting with the Gorilla Agreement since July as a result of financial support received from the Government of Germany.
2. Mr. Lenten conveyed the greetings of the Executive Secretary, Ms. Elizabeth Mrema, who was currently attending the AEWAs Standing Committee Meeting elsewhere in Bergen.
3. He said that the gorilla, although not a regular long-distance migrant, was an emblematic species that was of great importance to CMS as a whole, and that the more attention the species received, the greater the awareness of and support for CMS would be.
4. There were now six Parties to the Agreement, with the potential for this to become ten. It was important for all gorilla Range States to be involved, and he encouraged Parties to encourage the remaining countries to join the Agreement as soon as possible.
5. Financial support for implementation of the Agreement had been received from France, Germany and Monaco. At the Donors' meeting held during CMS COP10, Germany had pledged to fund a P2 position until the end of 2014, which would enable the Gorilla Agreement to move forward more quickly.
6. The Technical Committee of the Agreement had met during 2011 in Rwanda, hosted by the Government of Rwanda, to whom thanks were expressed.
7. Recalling that most of the public focus to date had been on Mountain Gorilla, Mr. Lenten said there was a need to raise awareness of the fact that there were several sub-species and that all were endangered. The population of Cross River Gorilla along the Nigeria-Cameroon border, for example, was down to just 200 individuals, and a combination of habitat loss, disease and illegal hunting for bushmeat and illegal trade were among the most severe threats facing populations across the range.

* Note: The Meeting ran from 0900-1900 on 26 November and from 0900 to 1630 on 27 November. Agenda Items 1 to 13 were considered on 26 November and Agenda Items 14 to 22 on 27 November.

8. Success in protecting gorillas meant that progress could also be made in the protection of other species that used the same ecosystems. The Gorilla Agreement was still young and needed time to take off – but once it did, it would fly.

9. Mr. Lenten closed by wishing MOP2 fruitful discussions. Though countries were facing hard times financially, money was still being pledged for implementation of the Gorilla Agreement.

10. Ms. Virtue reported that all ten gorilla Range States had been planning to attend MOP2, but that the representatives of Angola (two delegates), Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and Rwanda (Chair of the Agreement's Technical Committee) had unfortunately been unable to obtain visas for Norway in time.

11. The Parties represented at the Meeting were Congo (Brazzaville), Gabon and Nigeria, and non-Party Range States present were Cameroon, Equatorial Guinea and Uganda.

12. Ms. Virtue also welcomed observers from the following intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and other bodies to the meeting:

- UN Great Apes Survival Partnership (GRASP)
- IUCN Species Survival Commission Primate Specialist Group
- Lusaka Agreement Task Force
- Humane Society International (HSI)
- Migratory Wildlife Network (MWN), also representing Pro Wildlife
- Mountain Gorilla Veterinary Project
- Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) Gorilla Programme
- WWF African Great Apes Programme
- Zoological Society of London (Africa Programme)
- International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) Earth Negotiations Bulletin

2. ADOPTION OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE

13. Mr. Lenten referred to document UNEP/GA/MOP2/Doc.2/Rev.1: *Provisional Rules of Procedure for the Second Meeting of Parties to the Gorilla Agreement* and invited the Meeting to adopt the Rules of Procedure for this Meeting and for future MOPs under the Gorilla Agreement.

14. The representative of Nigeria drew attention to paragraph 2 of Rule 5 of the Rules of Procedure which referred to the election of a Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson at the “inaugural” session of the MOP.

15. Mr. Lenten agreed that the Rule needed to be more general. Accordingly, it was agreed to replace paragraphs 1 and 2 of Rule 5 with a single paragraph, to read: “The Meeting of Parties at each session shall elect a Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson”. The Rules of Procedure was adopted with amendments and is attached to this Report as Annex 1.

3. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

16. Following agreement on the amendment to Rule 5 of the Rules of Procedure, Mr. Lenten invited nominations for Chair and Vice-Chair of MOP2.

17. The representative of Cameroon proposed Mr. John Mshelbwala (Nigeria) as Chair. The representative of Congo (Brazzaville) seconded the proposal and Mr. Mshelbwala was duly elected.

18. The representative of Uganda proposed Mr. Florent Ikoli, Congo (Brazzaville), as Vice-Chair. The representative of Nigeria seconded the proposal and Mr. Ikoli was duly elected.

19. Taking the Chair, Mr. Mshelbwala expressed his hope that the Meeting would produce some useful results, and invited participants to introduce themselves.

4. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

20. Ms. Melanie Virtue (Interim Secretariat) introduced documents UNEP/GA/MOP2/Doc.4.1/Rev.1: *Provisional Agenda* and UNEP/GA/MOP2/Doc.4.2: *Provisional Annotated Agenda and Meeting Schedule*.

21. One additional document, draft Resolution 2.4: *Concerning an approach towards developing a specific strategy for the survival of gorillas*, proposed by the Republic of Congo, had been submitted to the Interim Secretariat shortly before CMS COP10.

22. The Chair suggested that this be considered under Agenda Item 15. There being no comments, the Agenda as amended, was adopted by consensus (attached as Annex 2 to the present report).

5. REPORT ON CREDENTIALS

23. Mr. Robert Vagg (Interim Secretariat) reported that impeccable credentials had been received from the Republic of Congo (as a Party to the Agreement); a nomination letter had been received from the Democratic Republic of Congo (non-Party Range State) but the delegate had not been able to travel; a copy of a letter of credentials had been received from Equatorial Guinea (non-Party Range State); and a joint letter of credentials for COP10 and the Gorilla Agreement MOP had been received from Uganda (non-Party Range State).

24. Ms. Virtue explained that with three of the six Parties present at the MOP, and credentials received from only one Party, under the Rules of Procedure there was no quorum for the Meeting. The Interim Secretariat had sought legal advice, which had suggested that the Meeting continue and that Gabon and Nigeria be asked to secure the appropriate credentials and send them to the Interim Secretariat as soon as possible. Any decisions and/or Resolutions made by MOP2 would be adopted provisionally and then confirmed once acceptable credentials had been received from Gabon and Nigeria.

25. This approach was agreed by consensus.

6. REPORTS AND STATEMENTS FROM PARTIES AND RANGE STATES

26. The Chair invited Parties, followed by non-Party Range States to present reports or statements.

27. The representative of Uganda sought clarification over the distinction between Agenda Item 6: *Reports and Statements from Parties and Range States* and Agenda item 10: *Reports from Observers*.

28. The Chair explained that Item 6 was to receive reports/statements on gorilla conservation activities from Parties and Range States, while Item 10 offered the opportunity for observers, including inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations, to make reports on their activities.

29. The representative of Gabon said that Gabon had submitted a written report, though somewhat late, and hoped that participants had received it via the Interim Secretariat.

30. The representative of Congo (Brazzaville) said that his country had sent a written report to the Interim Secretariat, but had not prepared an oral statement. He noted that Congo (Brazzaville) had also tabled a draft Resolution.

31. The Chair asked the Interim Secretariat to confirm the status of written reports received.

32. Ms. Virtue listed the following reports as having been received:

- UNEP/GA/MOP2/Inf.1.1: *National Report from the Republic of the Congo* (French only)
- UNEP/GA/MOP2/Inf.1.2: *National Report from the Republic of Rwanda* (English only)
- UNEP/GA/MOP2/Inf.1.3: *National Report from Equatorial Guinea* (Spanish only)
- UNEP/GA/MOP2/Inf.1.4: *National Report from Gabon*

33. She advised that although English and French were the official languages of the Agreement, there had not been an opportunity to translate the reports.

34. The Chair invited each Party and non-Party Range State to present brief comments on the situation of gorillas in their respective countries.

35. The representative of Nigeria said that his country report was in preparation and would be forwarded to the Interim Secretariat as soon as it was ready. To date, Cross River National Park and WCS remained the main bodies working in the field in efforts to conserve gorillas in Nigeria. The US Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the Arcus Foundation had provided support for monitoring of gorillas through deployment of cyber-trackers. Other activities included support for livelihoods and outreach to schools in the range. Surveys of markets to test whether there were losses through poaching had indicated some poaching had been carried out, but the exact locations were not clear and the quantity of poaching seemed small.

36. The representative of Congo (Brazzaville) introduced his country's written report and summarized the wide-ranging conservation-related activities undertaken for gorilla populations in different parts of the country. This had led to the preparation and submission of

draft Resolution 2.4 on monitoring of areas not currently under protection, for consideration by MOP2.

37. He further mentioned high concentration of western lowland gorillas in common areas. He made particular reference to the recent discovery of populations in the Ntokou-Pikounda region which is in the process of being designated as a national park. He highlighted the work of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) concerning the conservation of gorillas and their habitats.

38. He concluded by referring to the persistence of illegal traffic of apes which has spurred Congo to launch the initiative of Reintroduction of orphaned gorillas into their natural environment. He said that of the 18 orphan gorillas which have been reintroduced into their natural habitat, 15 have survived. These have given birth to 15 young, 11 of which were born alive.

39. Mr. Ian Redmond, CMS Ambassador, in the absence of colleagues from the Democratic Republic of Congo, noted a small correction to the mention of the occurrence of gorillas in the Réserve forestière de Luki; these were in fact chimpanzees rather than gorillas.

40. The representative of Gabon reported that in 2005 poaching had been a major threat to gorillas. The government had responded with a capacity-building and law-enforcement programme. Disease and forest exploitation continued to be major problems. Recruitment and training of rangers was ongoing and MIST (a database management system designed to service protected area and park management needs) had been introduced. Gabon had also adopted and was applying the IUCN best practice guidelines on survey design, field implementation, training and standardized reporting. Training sessions had been held, for example at Lopé National Park. A care programme for orphaned gorillas had been started. A National Park Agency with responsibility for gorilla habitats had been formed in 2007, with an increase in funding for its activities since 2009. The number of park rangers had grown from 140 to 320. There had been a slight decrease in illegal logging, but more work on this was needed, for example in cooperation with WCS. A research project using photo-traps had shown gorillas to be losing their fur, a problem which seemed to be affecting a growing number of gorillas, and for which a detailed study was needed.

41. The representative of Uganda reported on populations of Mountain Gorilla, of which only 820 remained, 52 per cent habituated for tourism and only 48 per cent fully wild. Sixty-seven per cent of the population was in one National Park, Bwindi. The situation was not that bleak and numbers seemed to be rising. The results of a 2010 census undertaken in Bwindi were not yet available but would confirm the situation. A 2010 census in Virunga National Park had revealed 480 individuals – a 26 per cent increase since 2003. The habituated population was growing faster than the wild population, and there was a need to find out why. From the policy and legislation viewpoint, things were in good shape, but under review to see if they could be made more effective. Virunga National Park was shared with DRC and Rwanda. Transboundary cooperation between the three countries to further protect the Virunga ecosystem had started at the level of Protected Area authorities and was being taken to the next level through the Greater Virunga Transboundary Collaboration Treaty, which was now at the first draft stage. Uganda was conscious that tourism might have far-reaching conservation implications for primate conservation. However, gorilla tourism was bringing in important financial resources, 100 per cent of which was being ploughed back into gorilla conservation. The income from gorilla tourism also accounted for 27 per cent of total

protected area revenues for Uganda, enabling a number of spin-off benefits. A full-time research and monitoring programme had been set up, using the MIST system. This had enabled the mapping of ranges, food and incidents such as the illegal setting of traps. A community conservation programme had also been established, run by local authorities working jointly with central government. This included a revenue sharing programme worth 800 million Ugandan shillings (approximately USD 300,000), a portion of which went towards livelihood support. This had brought about a tremendous change in the attitude of local people towards conservation. Under a reinforcement programme, a ranger force had been integrated into the Ugandan army, enabling the establishment of a unit to support prosecutions and carry out protection activities related to gorillas.

42. The observer from the Mountain Gorilla Veterinary Project reported the establishment of a field laboratory in Bwindi National Park, jointly with Conservation Through Public Health (CTPH), a Ugandan NGO that promoted conservation alongside public health by improving primary health services for people and animals around protected areas. Among the challenges was the problem of habituated gorillas entering community areas to raid crops, high expectations of revenue among local communities, and continued mild poaching, mostly of antelopes but sometimes resulting in the killing of gorillas. Gorillas were also suffering from outbreaks of disease arising from stress associated with habituation. A high human population plus poverty plus habituation of gorillas was a difficult mix.

43. Mr. Redmond commended Uganda for its clear and systematic report and for their activities. He cited the exemplary transboundary cooperation with Virunga NP and asked if there was any similar cooperation with Bwindi NP, which extended a little into DRC.

44. The representative of Uganda replied that gorilla populations in Bwindi did sometimes cross into DRC, and that the Greater Virunga Transboundary Collaboration, a treaty in the final stages of negotiation between DRC, Rwanda and Uganda, would cover this issue.

45. On the subject of finances for the Gorilla Agreement, Mr. Lenten recalled that the CMS core budget had to cover a number of instruments, including the Gorilla Agreement. Of the six Parties, only one (Rwanda) had paid its dues. This was not a good signal for donors. The CMS Secretariat had some difficult decisions to make on which of the MoUs and Agreements to support from the funds available, and it was important that all Parties played their part.

46. Mr. Fernando Spina, Chair of the CMS Scientific Council, asked Uganda how it was managing the problem of increased tourism and the habituation of gorillas.

47. The representative of Uganda replied that 67 percent of the remaining unhabituated Mountain Gorillas were in Uganda, and that the country was applying the precautionary principle in keeping habituated groups of gorillas to below 30 percent of the population. Uganda's National Great Apes Action Plan laid down strict controls on the numbers of tourists permitted to visit gorilla sites, the amount of time spent with gorillas (up to eight people for a maximum of one hour per day) and the distance to be kept from gorillas.

48. The representative of Cameroon said that his country, as a Range State, was working very hard so that it could attend the next MOP as a full Party. He reported on conservation work in two newly created gorilla sanctuaries and in National Parks. Cameroon was also negotiating with Nigeria in relation to transboundary cooperation for the Cross River region.

There had been an increase in the budget for management of protected areas, and management plans were being developed for three areas. GIS mapping work was underway. Poaching remained a problem, and four ecoguards had lost their lives. A series of seminars had been organized on better understanding of wildlife law. A comprehensive report would be sent to the Interim Secretariat.

49. The representative of Equatorial Guinea said that earlier studies suggested that the number of gorillas in his country had declined from some 5,000 individuals in the 1960s to an estimated 1,000 in the 1990s. The results of a National Great Apes & Elephant Survey initiated in June 2011 and supported by IUCN, were expected in December 2011. The main pressures on gorillas were road construction, poaching for bushmeat, trafficking and agricultural expansion. There was an urgent need for the development and effective implementation of protected area management plans and an awareness campaign, especially in the continental part of the country where poaching was a serious problem and where law enforcement was poor.

50. The Chair asked for comments from the floor on the six reports received from Parties and Range States.

51. The observer from WCS drew attention to three useful reference documents: IUCN's *Best Practice Guidelines for Great Ape Tourism* (Occasional Paper No. 38 of the IUCN Species Survival Commission); a paper on human metapneumovirus (hMPV – a respiratory viral pathogen that causes a spectrum of illnesses) by the Mountain Gorilla Veterinary Project; and *Extreme Conservation Leads to Recovery of the Virunga Mountain Gorillas*, a research paper by M.M. Robbins *et al.* 2011 (available at www.plosone.org). It would be useful to upload these to the Gorilla Agreement website.

52. The observer from GRASP mentioned the availability of several GRASP publications, including *The Last Stand of the Gorilla*, prepared in conjunction with Range States and NGOs as a contribution to the UN International Year of the Gorilla, as well as the use of REDD+ as a tool for preserving forests for great apes. He also noted that since the establishment of the Gorilla Agreement, two new sanctuaries had been created in eastern DRC.

53. Mr. Redmond was pleased to hear about new protected areas being designated by Range States, but since the bulk of the Western Lowland Gorilla population was outside protected areas, asked how Range States were dealing with this, in particular in relation to the operations of timber companies.

54. The Chair said that Cameroon and Nigeria were working together on this issue.

55. Nigeria further mentioned the national Community-Based Sustainable Forest Management Initiative under development by the Nigerian Forestry Department, which included management plans.

56. The representative of Uganda reminded participants that CMS COP10 had adopted Resolution 10.3 on ecological networks, and that it was important that Gorilla Agreement Parties implemented this Resolution to protect gorillas throughout their range, within and outside protected areas and national parks.

57. Mr. Lenten noted that it would be important to include mention of the Meeting's support for the concept of ecological network in the Report of MOP2, especially since CMS Resolution 10.3 had given the Secretariat a mandate to support and promote the conservation and management of ecological networks. He noted that Norway, in particular, was providing funds for activities related to ecological networks.

58. The representative of Congo (Brazzaville) mentioned corridor protection activities and the involvement of forestry concessions. Two protocols, one with Cameroon and one with Angola and DRC, had been signed. Management plans had been adopted and companies were becoming involved with management in their concession areas. There was value in looking at the experience of Rwanda in the management of cross-border areas and in sharing know-how. Corridors between Congo and the Central African Republic and between Congo and Gabon and Cameroon needed more attention.

59. The representative of Cameroon said that timber companies had an obligation to protect gorillas, and wildlife in general, in their concession zones, particularly close to protected areas.

60. Ms. Virtue said that a new publication on ecological networks was available in English, with summaries also in French and Spanish.

7. REPORT OF THE INTERIM SECRETARIAT

61. Ms. Andrea Pauly (Interim Secretariat) introduced document UNEP/GA/MOP2/Doc.7: *Report of the Interim Secretariat*, presenting the background to the Gorilla Agreement and describing the services provided by the CMS Secretariat, which was acting as the Interim Secretariat for the Agreement.

62. Key elements included:

62.1 Meetings:

- First Meeting of the Parties, held in Rome, Italy, December 2008 (see UNEP/GA/MOP2/Inf.9)
- Ad hoc Meeting held in Frankfurt, Germany, June 2009
- First Meeting of the Technical Committee, held in Kigali, Rwanda, March 2011, attended by nine Range States (see UNEP/GA/MOP2/Doc.9)

62.2 Adoption of four Action Plans (see UNEP/GA/MOP2/Inf.7.1-7.4)

62.3 Discussions of a Monitoring and Reporting system

62.4 Year of the Gorilla 2009 in cooperation with GRASP and the World Association of Zoos and Aquaria (WAZA) (see UNEP/GA/MOP2/Inf.4)

62.5 Finances: MOP1 had agreed annual financial contributions of EUR 3,000 per Party, but to date contributions had been received from only one Party. This meant that the Agreement was funded from the CMS core budget and voluntary contributions from donor countries. The 37th Meeting of the Standing

Committee had expressed concern at this situation, which might deter donors from supporting the Gorilla Agreement

- 62.6 Recruitment of new Parties: Uganda and other Range States had indicated their interest in becoming Parties
63. The Chair invited comments or questions from the floor.
64. Mr. Lenten said that there had been no appreciable expression of commitment to the Agreement since MOP1. He asked that the MOP2 report should show that Parties had been urged to pay their annual contributions, including arrears, by 1 January 2012, and that they had also been requested to pay their annual contributions for the 2012-2014 triennium promptly.
65. The representative of Nigeria requested the Interim Secretariat to send a further reminder for outstanding contributions, and to give Parties another chance to commence actions that he believed would lead to payment. He had no doubt that Parties were willing to pay.
66. Ms. Virtue explained that invoices had been re-sent two weeks previously and that copies were available for representatives of Parties to take back with them.
67. The Chair emphasized that there had been no real expression of financial support from the Parties and suggested that a strong covering letter might be sent with the copies of previously sent invoices.

8. REPORT OF THE DEPOSITARY

68. Mr. Lenten introduced document UNEP/GA/MOP2/Doc.8: *Report of the Depositary*. As of 31 October 2011, six Parties had joined the Agreement: Central African Republic, Congo (Brazzaville), Democratic Republic of Congo, Gabon, Nigeria and Rwanda. He expressed the hope that all ten Range State countries would have joined by the time of MOP3.
69. Ms. Virtue recalled that the CMS Secretariat was the legal depositary for the Gorilla Agreement and was currently also acting as the Interim Secretariat. It was hoped that an alternative host for the Secretariat, preferably one of the Parties to the Agreement, would be found in the near future.
70. The Chair pointed out that all accessions by current Parties had taken place in 2008; three years had therefore elapsed with no new Parties joining the Agreement. He encouraged Range States to complete their procedures for acceding to the Gorilla Agreement as soon as possible.

9. REPORT OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

71. Ms. Virtue informed the Meeting that the Chair of the Technical Committee (TC), Dr. Antoine Mudakikwa, Rwanda, had been unable to attend MOP2 and that Nigeria, as Vice-Chair of the TC, had agreed to present the Committee's report on his behalf.

72. The representative of Nigeria introduced document UNEP/GA/MOP2/Doc.9: *Report of the Technical Committee*.
73. The First Meeting of the Technical Committee, sponsored by Germany and Monaco, had been held in Kigali, Rwanda on 29 March 2011. Key elements included:
- 73.1 Attendance by nine of the ten Range States
 - 73.2 Summaries of activities to implement Action Plans
 - 73.3 A presentation on transboundary cooperation between DRC, Rwanda and Uganda concerning Mountain Gorilla conservation
 - 73.4 The process for nomination of three expert positions on the Technical Committee, covering the fields of disease, law enforcement and forestry
 - 73.5 Development of a Monitoring and Reporting system, to be reviewed and agreed at MOP2
 - 73.6 Developments on wildlife law enforcement in the region
 - 73.7 Funding matters, including acknowledgement to France, Germany and Monaco for their support of meetings and projects
74. The Chair invited comments or questions from the floor but none was forthcoming.

10. REPORTS FROM OBSERVERS

75. The Chair invited representatives of international organizations and observers from non-governmental organizations to give brief synopses of their gorilla-related activities.

76. The observer from Humane Society International (HSI) reported that their involvement with gorilla conservation had started in 2007 when, through Flora & Fauna International (FFI), they committed to a three-year AU\$66,000 programme that contributed to the work of the International Gorilla Conservation Programme, a joint initiative of FFI, WWF and the African Wildlife Foundation, partnered with relevant government agencies. The programme protected Mountain Gorillas in DRC, Rwanda and Uganda. The programme had been very successful, with gorilla numbers increasing 26 percent since 2003. With the help of the Born Free Foundation, HSI had developed a new three-year AU\$60,000 contract, to protect Eastern Lowland Gorillas in Kahuzi-Biega National Park, in Eastern DRC. A ranger post had been established in a remote area in the west of the Park, an area previously too dangerous to work in. HSI (Washington) had committed US\$5,000 to help run the Gorilla Rehabilitation and Conservation Education Centre in the DRC, run by the Dian Fossey Gorilla Fund International.

77. The representative of the Lusaka Agreement on Co-operative Enforcement Operations Directed at Illegal Trade in Wild Fauna and Flora presented an overview the Lusaka Agreement and its activities. A multilateral institution with seven member states, its principal role was to assist and advise on enforcement of wildlife legislation across African countries. Formal agreements had been concluded with CITES, the Organization of Conservation of

African Wild Fauna, INTERPOL, World Customs Organization, and the Central African Commission, and MOUs had been signed with universities that conducted research on law enforcement. The Lusaka Agreement Task Force had been involved with the development of inter-agency cooperation to increase anti-poaching activities and awareness raising.

78. The observer from the Zoological Society of London (ZSL) outlined the work carried out by the Zoo's Africa Programme on Western Lowland Gorilla, especially in Cameroon, Equatorial Guinea and Gabon. Funding had been provided by the UK Darwin Initiative, USFWS and the Arcus Foundation. Timber certification was being used in south-east Cameroon to try and improve management of two timber concessions covering 7,000 square kilometres. ZSL was also looking at the use of REDD+ and the European Union's Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT) Action Plan. Work was also ongoing with partners in Gabon to survey apes and develop conservation action plans, as well as to replicate the work carried out in Cameroon with two timber companies in Gabon. In Equatorial Guinea the focus was on the development of a strategy to combat the bushmeat trade, in partnership with local communities and with funding from USFWS.

79. The observer from Migratory Wildlife Network (MWN) offered some thoughts based on MWN's experiences with ACCOBAMS, ASCOBANS and the Pacific Cetaceans Agreement. Successful CMS agreements had a well-developed understanding of their role as a platform for political discussion, coordination and ultimately decisions. The Agreement was a useful forum for Parties to take political-level decisions in common, including those emanating from on-the-ground work that then flowed into national legislative and political processes. Agreements also provided a useful forum for reporting on national progress and making adjustments to programmes, giving confidence to partners and donors to maintain their support. Lastly, when appropriately focused, Agreements could have a powerful influence on the mother Convention, one that could be reflected by CMS Parties within other MEAs, such as CITES, CBD and UNFCCC, and indeed the Lusaka Agreement. Making the political connections, especially between civil society and government processes, was what the Migratory Wildlife Network had been established to facilitate, and the MWN hoped that Parties to the Gorilla Agreement would accept an offer of support in this capacity.

80. The observer from the Mountain Gorilla Veterinary Project (MGVP) said that the Project, which had been running for 27 years, had started as one vet with a mandate to treat sick gorillas or those with injuries from human-induced activities. There were now 12 vets working in DRC, Rwanda and Uganda, treating snare injuries and respiratory disease, looking at genetic issues and also carrying out post-mortems to establish cause of death in gorillas. Between 12 and 15 gorillas were treated each year. Human metapneumovirus had recently been discovered in gorillas and caused the deaths of two animals during a respiratory outbreak. Four Mountain Gorillas and eight Eastern Lowland Gorillas had been raised by MGVP and the Dian Fossey Gorilla Fund International (DFGFI) for possible release into the wild pending the decision of a technical steering group. MGVP had commenced an employee health programme for all conservation personnel to reduce the risk of disease transmission. Close collaboration was maintained with the Wildlife Animal Resources Management (WARM) unit at Makerere University in Uganda, and MGVP had also been instrumental in setting up national wildlife-sample storage and testing facilities for DRC, Rwanda and Uganda.

81. The Vice-Chair asked about the process of returning adult gorillas to the wild.

82. MGVP said that experience had shown that gorillas placed back into the wild too early did not survive. The project had changed from quick return to providing care for gorillas till they reached an age of 8-9 years. Between the time of confiscation until 3 years of age the gorillas were cared for 24 hours a day by caregivers who then start to reduce time with the animal to promote normal behaviour. At eight to nine years, gorillas were capable of looking after themselves and would have a much better chance of surviving in the wild. Semi-wild sites were now being used for returning Western gorillas to the wild as this reduced the likelihood of interactions with people and large populations of wild great apes. There was still a question of whether the mountain gorillas would fully integrate into the wild. It was unlikely that such a project would be as viable for smaller habitat areas such as the Virungas as it is in western gorillas' releases.

83. The Vice-Chair said that there was a need to strengthen cooperation between scientific programmes in the different countries, especially in relation to animal health issues.

84. Mr. Lenten said that COP10 Resolution 10.22: *Wildlife Disease and Migratory Species* would lead to the setting up of a Task Force, with which gorilla Range States could liaise.

85. Ms. Virtue said that Ebola was important for the human-wildlife nexus, and that, through the Gorilla Agreement and CMS, efforts would be made to keep this on the agenda.

86. The representative of Gabon said that better coordination was needed at international level. Administrative processes in relation to an alert concerning Sitatunga (*Tragelaphus spekkii*) death in Gabon had failed to function. While there were guidelines for the Gorilla Agreement at an international and political level, there were still shortcomings at field level. There was a need to look carefully at issues of communication and enforcement.

87. The representative of Equatorial Guinea expressed the need to improve cooperation between his country and other Range States.

11. OVERVIEW OF THE CONSERVATION STATUS OF GORILLAS AND THEIR HABITATS ACROSS THEIR RANGE

88. The observer from Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), speaking also on behalf of WWF and IUCN-SSC, gave an overview of the distribution, population, key threats and conservation measures for the four sub-species of gorillas: Cross River (*Gorilla gorilla diehli*), Western Lowland (*G. g. gorilla*), Eastern Lowland (*G. beringei graueri*) and Mountain Gorilla (*G. b. beringei*). Remote sensing was helping to prioritize areas for surveys by identifying likely habitats for Cross River Gorillas, and sniffer dogs were being used to detect Cross River Gorilla faeces. Western Lowland Gorillas were threatened by trade in bushmeat, so actions were being taken with regard to surveillance and law enforcement, providing economically viable alternatives, promoting applied conservation research, and strengthening transboundary cooperation. Threats to the Eastern Lowland Gorilla included lack of security, displacement of people, difficult or sometimes impossible law enforcement, deforestation for charcoal production, and artisanal mining. Some of the problems facing Mountain Gorillas – such as weak institutional structures, insufficient funds and lack of regional collaboration – had been almost completely addressed. Ongoing problems were human population density, land conversion, land-tenure issues, poaching, mining, conflict and

insecurity, and disease. With regard to the status of the four Action Plans, WCS hoped CMS would continue to adopt these as they had been developed with inputs from many stakeholders in the Range States.

89. Mr. Lenten asked what was expected of the Interim Secretariat in 2012.

90. WCS asked for input to action-planning processes for all four sub-species of gorilla. It also recommended that focus should shift from Mountain Gorilla to the other three sub-species. A Cross River Gorilla Action Planning Workshop would be held early in 2012.

91. Mr. Lenten said that the Interim Secretariat could facilitate contacts with governments.

92. WCS said that the Cross River team would like to know what the Government of Norway had intended when it pledged support to gorillas at the CMS COP10 donors' meeting.

93. Mr. Lenten replied that the detailed allocation of funds had been left to the discretion of the Interim Secretariat, and that, in principle, it could be used to support any gorilla-related conservation activities.

94. The representative of Cameroon noted that the WCS presentation had indicated new sites for Cross River Gorillas. He asked if this meant the population was higher than previously thought.

95. WCS said that the results of genetic analysis of dung samples were awaited. These would help to ensure that there was no double counting of individuals.

96. Mr. Redmond said that FFI had been appealing for funds for the Western Lowland Gorilla, citing a population of 2,000. He thought the figure was more like 3,000-5,000 but from the WCS report the total could possibly be as high as 5,000-10,000. He asked for further clarification on this point. The list of threats should have mentioned climate change, for which Mountain Gorillas were one of the FAO case studies.

97. The observer from IUCN said that estimating the Western Lowland Gorilla population at 5,000-10,000 was pure speculation at the moment and that a proper assessment of the population size would be forthcoming in due course.

98. The observer from GRASP said that a key issue was economic development and that GRASP was trying hard to find direct examples of where the provision of economic alternatives had proven successful in reducing bushmeat commerce.

99. The observer from WWF agreed that conservation organizations had not done a very good job in this area. Without proper law enforcement, any other interventions were likely to fail.

100. The observer from WCS said that there had been a huge effort in community engagement around Bwindi Impenetrable National Park but that the presence of rangers and law enforcement were still key.

101. The representative of Nigeria said there were three approaches that must be sustained: support for livelihoods, awareness raising and law enforcement.

12. OVERVIEW OF THE INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF THE GORILLA 2009

102. Mr. Redmond (using slides from UNEP/CMS/Conf.10.23: *'Year of...'* *Species Campaigns*) gave an overview of activities undertaken during the 2009 International Year of the Gorilla (YoG) campaign, for which he had been appointed Ambassador.

103. The objectives for the year – as part of the UN Decade of Education for Sustainable Development – had been to support implementation and generate publicity for the Gorilla Agreement, to support projects addressing threats to gorillas, to educate and raise awareness among the public and stakeholders, to support conservation cooperation, and to promote sustainable cultural attitudes. Partners in the YoG had been CMS, GRASP and WAZA, although there had been some 90 full and supporting partners overall. During a 'State of the Gorilla Journey' in August and September 2009, Mr. Redmond, as Ambassador for the Gorilla Agreement, had visited seven of the ten Range States, giving interviews, writing a blog and making short video documentaries (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LramufCBDPk>). A two-day YoG symposium entitled 'Gentle Giants in Need', held in Frankfurt in June 2009, had been attended by 160 governments, experts, corporate bodies and conservationists from 20 countries, and had resulted in the Frankfurt Declaration on Gorilla Conservation. Information on the campaign had been available through a dedicated YoG website. Funds raised by the campaign supported a monitoring project, law enforcement activities and the purchase of fuel-efficient stoves to mitigate forest loss.

104. Ms. Virtue reported that the YoG website had received 55,000 unique visitors from 183 countries, while the YoG blog had received 57,000 unique visitors.

105. Ms. Virtue introduced new arrival Mr. Neville Ash, UNEP Chief of Biodiversity and Ecosystems Branch, to the meeting.

13. ELECTION OF SUPPLEMENTARY EXPERTS TO THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

106. Ms. Virtue introduced document UNEP/GA/MOP2/Doc.13: *Supplementary Experts to the Technical Committee*.

107. MOP1 had agreed that the TC should be composed of one representative from each of the ten Range States, one representative from GRASP, and experts representing each of the following fields: (i) forest management and conservation, (ii) environmental law, and (iii) animal health.

108. TC1, held on 29 March 2011, had considered in detail the criteria for selecting each of the three experts, and had agreed that nominations should be sent to the Interim Secretariat for presentation and final decision at MOP2.

109. The Interim Secretariat had sent out the nomination forms with a deadline for receipt of 120 days prior to MOP2. A total of 17 nominations had been received, from CAR, Congo (Brazzaville), DRC, Uganda and GRASP. As agreed by TC1, the Interim Secretariat had consulted with the IUCN Primate Specialist Group, which had provided the analysis shown in the last column of Annex 1 to MOP2/Doc.13.

110. Seven nominations had been received for the expert in forest management and conservation expert.

111. The Vice-Chair suggested that, given his area of expertise, Mr. Bonaventure Ebayi should be listed under Environmental Law, and after some discussion, this was agreed.

112. After further discussion, and confirmation from IUCN that the candidates were listed in order of the degree to which their qualifications and experience matched the criteria set by the TC, and that all candidates were aware they had been nominated, it was agreed that the position of forest management and conservation expert be offered to the top-ranked candidate (Dr. Conrad Aveling). Should Dr. Aveling decline the invitation, the position would be offered to the candidate ranked second (Dr. Marc Languy), and in the event that he too declined, it would be offered to the third-ranked candidate (Dr. Jaap Schoorl).

113. Five nominations had been received for the expert in environmental law, six with the addition of Mr. Ebayi.

114. The observer from IUCN advised that Mr. Ebayi's name should be placed second in terms of matching the TC criteria.

115. After some discussion it was agreed to offer the position of law enforcement expert to the Manager of INTERPOL's Environmental Crime Programme. In the event that the post-holder declined, the position would be offered to the candidate ranked second (Mr. Bonaventure Ebayi), and in the event that he too declined, it would be offered to the third-ranked candidate (Dr. Emmanuel Kasimbazi).

116. Five nominations had been received for the expert in wild animal health.

117. The Meeting agreed to adopt the same procedure as for the two previous expert posts, and accordingly the position of expert in wild animal health would be offered to Dr. Patricia Reed, with Dr. John Bosco Nizeyi as second choice.

118. The representative of Congo Brazzaville commended the selection of Dr. Reed as expert in wild animal health.

14. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE AGREEMENT

119. Ms. Virtue (Interim Secretariat) introduced document UNEP/GA/MOP2/Doc.14: *Institutional Arrangements for the Agreement: Draft Resolution 2.3* and briefed the meeting on the following points:

- a) The meeting to negotiate the Gorilla Agreement in Paris, 22-24 October 2007, had asked CMS to provide the Interim Secretariat for the Agreement in cooperation with GRASP. This had fallen to the CMS Secretariat.
- b) MOP1 had recommended to the COP that the CMS Secretariat continued to act as the Secretariat for the Agreement.
- c) There was little capacity for this within the CMS Secretariat, with the Agreements Officer taking care of the Gorilla Agreement plus 14 other CMS instruments. Ms. Virtue was spending approximately 10 percent of her time on the Gorilla Agreement.
- d) Earlier in 2011 the Government of Germany had provided funding to CMS for a P2 position for 3.5 years, with 40 percent of the officer's time available for the Gorilla Agreement.
- e) All of the other seven legally binding Agreements under CMS had a mix of donor and developing countries. All of the gorilla Range States were developing countries, which made funding for the Secretariat tenuous.
- f) MOP1 had agreed an annual contribution of EUR 3,000 from Parties to the Agreement. If all ten Range States were Parties and if contributions were paid by all Parties, this would provide EUR 30,000 per year, but so far only one Party (Rwanda) had paid two annual contributions (totalling EUR 6,000).

120. Ms. Virtue said that the CMS Secretariat would look into options for the way forward. This could include other relevant institutions that might be willing and able to host the Gorilla Agreement Secretariat. One possibility was GRASP, which was hosted by UNEP, held a seat on the Technical Committee, and had a close working relationship with CMS. Another possibility was for the Agreement Secretariat to be hosted by a Party, other Range State or an institution.

121. The Chair invited comments on how to proceed.

122. Mr. Neville Ash (UNEP) thanked both CMS for the services provided to date to the Gorilla Agreement and the Government of Germany for financial support. He recognized that the current situation was not enough to support the Agreement. UNEP believed that draft Resolution 2.3 was a good one and was ready to see if UNEP, through GRASP, could play a role. He recommended not to narrow the options as they currently stood, but to agree the process in line with the draft Resolution.

123. The Chair asked if any of the Parties present was ready to host the Secretariat.

124. The observer from GRASP asked if the Secretariat could lay out a timeline in terms of what it could continue to do within existing capacity.

125. Ms. Virtue said that, with the addition of the 40% P2, the CMS Secretariat could continue to provide services to the Gorilla Agreement up to MOP3.

126. After initial discussion, a small, informal working group, led by Nigeria and Cameroon, was established to prepare amendments to draft Resolution 2.3, including recognition of the COP10 decision directing the CMS Secretariat to continue to provide Interim Secretariat services to the Gorilla Agreement. The amended text was reviewed by the MOP and adopted by consensus, subject to the inclusion of a further minor amendment tabled by the observer from the Migratory Wildlife Network (attached as Annex 3 to this report).

15. COOPERATION ON LAW ENFORCEMENT

127. Ms. Virtue introduced document UNEP/GA/MOP2/Doc.15: *Law Enforcement Cooperation: Draft Resolution 2.1* and gave the background to the development of the draft Resolution:

- i. TC1 had been attended by representatives from INTERPOL and TRAFFIC and by the CITES Secretariat Law Enforcement Officer.
- ii. TC1 had been introduced to the International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICWC) – a collaborative effort by five intergovernmental organizations working to bring coordinated support to the national wildlife law enforcement agencies and to sub-regional and regional networks.
- iii. TC1 felt it would be useful for MOP2 to endorse a Resolution on the issue of law enforcement.

128. The representative of Congo (Brazzaville) asked if the representative of the Lusaka Agreement could throw some light that organization's relations with INTERPOL and others in the field of law enforcement.

129. The representative of the Lusaka Agreement (LA) read a statement on behalf of the Lusaka Agreement, its Secretariat and its Task Force – the latter being the operational arm of the LA – to which seven countries were Party. The LA had been adopted under the auspices of UNEP and deposited with UN Secretary General. Law enforcement was essential for successful conservation at national and regional levels. The Yaoundé Declaration had recognized the LA and the LA Task Force and the need for law enforcement to be taken into account. Article 9 of the Gorilla Agreement referred to the LA alongside CITES, INTERPOL, the World Customs Organization, COMIFAC (Commission des Forêts d'Afrique Centrale) and other multilateral agreements contributing to law enforcement. The LA Task Force worked in synergy with conservation and law-enforcement agencies at national, regional and international levels, with annual expenditure of US\$800,000. The LA representative concluded with a request that mention of the LA be made in draft Resolution 2.1 on law enforcement cooperation.

130. The observer from WWF made a joint statement on behalf of WWF and TRAFFIC. WWF and TRAFFIC warmly welcomed the strong focus on law enforcement cooperation at MOP2. Poaching and domestic and international trade in great apes were among the biggest threats to gorilla conservation. As long as laws were poorly enforced, resources for enforcement were inadequate and poachers and illegal traders were not prosecuted, gorilla populations would continue to decline. WWF/TRAFFIC therefore fully supported draft Resolution 2.1 and called for Parties to identify law enforcement issues as a priority and for non-Party Range States and other stakeholders to give law enforcement the priority attention it deserved. WWF/TRAFFIC welcomed improved law enforcement cooperation and information-sharing which international law enforcement organizations such as World Customs Organization, INTERPOL and the CITES Secretariat provided. The potentially significant role that could be played by ICWC was also recognized, and mention was also made of the COMIFAC Regional Action Plan for Strengthening National Wildlife Law Implementation, to which WWF/TRAFFIC hoped MOP1 would lend its support.

131. Following lengthy discussion of draft Resolution 2.1, including its consideration by a small, informal drafting group, an amended text was adopted by consensus (attached as

Annex 3 to this report), reflecting contributions from the representatives of Cameroon, Congo (Brazzaville), Gabon and Nigeria, the observers from the Lusaka Agreement and WWF, and Gorilla Ambassador Mr. Ian Redmond.

15.1 DRAFT RESOLUTION 2.4 CONCERNING AN APPROACH TOWARDS DEVELOPING A SPECIFIC STRATEGY FOR THE SURVIVAL OF GORILLAS

132. The representative of Congo (Brazzaville) presented draft Resolution 2.4: *Concerning an approach towards developing a specific strategy for the survival of gorillas*. He said that the different ministries and agencies responsible for different aspects of gorilla conservation within each Range State made it difficult to coordinate activities. The idea behind the draft Resolution was to set up a small coordinating group in each Party with the task of overseeing monitoring of both gorilla populations and law enforcement actions, and to establish a database on the status of gorillas across the whole of their range, along with a standard methodology for data collection of data.

133. Following some discussion, which included concerns that the draft Resolution covered aspects already adopted under an earlier Resolution, and risked also duplicating the Technical Committee's ongoing development of a standardized reporting system, it was agreed that a small group, led by the Vice-Chair, should get together to work on redrafting the text.

134. Later during the Meeting, and after considerable further discussion, the Vice-Chair concluded that the redrafted Resolution, now entitled *Elements of Information Management for Gorilla Conservation*, reflected both the original intent and the ideas discussed during the MOP. Accordingly, draft Resolution 2.4, with extensive amendments, reflecting the work of the drafting group and additional inputs from the representatives of Cameroon, Congo (Brazzaville), Nigeria, Uganda, the observers from GRASP, IUCN, Lusaka Agreement, WMN, WCS and WWF, Gorilla Ambassador Ian Redmond, and the Interim Secretariat, was adopted by consensus (attached as Annex 3 to this report).

16. REVIEW OF THE AGREEMENT'S ACTION PLANS

135. Ms. Andrea Pauly (Interim Secretariat) introduced document UNEP/GA/MOP2/Doc.16: *Review of the Agreement's Action Plans* and briefed the Meeting on the following points:

- i. MOP1 had adopted four Action Plans drafted by the Royal Belgian Institute for Natural Sciences, based on existing IUCN/SSC Primate Specialist Group regional Action Plans
- ii. Article VIII of the Gorilla Agreement required Action Plans to be reviewed at each MOP
- iii. IUCN and other organizations were updating their Action Plans as follows:
 - *G. g. gorilla*: IUCN Action Plan workshop, October 2012
 - *G. g. diehle*: IUCN workshop, February 2012
 - *G. b. graueri*: Plan in preparation based on workshop in 2011
 - *G. b. beringei*: part of the 10-year Transboundary Strategic Plan
- iv. The Interim Secretariat suggested that:
 - Focal Points should participate in the process of updating Action Plans

- Organizers were encouraged to include Focal Points
- The Secretariat would liaise with organizers, ensuring applicability of revised Action Plans to the Gorilla Agreement
- Adoption of newly developed Action Plans should be considered at MOP3
- Range States could provisionally adopt the Action Plans, with their finalization to come during the interim period

136. The Chair invited updates from participants on the Action Plan revision processes.

137. The observer from WCS said that the Action Planning Workshop for Cross River Gorilla was expected in the week of 20 February 2012, for which formal invitations should go out the following week. USFWS were thanked for providing funding for the workshop.

138. The representative of Uganda said that his country currently had a National Great Apes Action Plan and that as Uganda was preparing to become a Party to the Gorilla Agreement, a review of what was already being done would be carried out, along with consideration of what the Gorilla Agreement could add.

139. Ms. Virtue asked whether there was either an existing or planned means of linkage, such as an overarching Action Plan, of activities carried out in the three Range States of the Mountain Gorilla.

140. The representative of Uganda replied that there was no specific unifying Action Plan for gorillas, but that Uganda was pursuing transboundary cooperation for the Albertine Rift, which bordered five countries. Regional level efforts were being made to harmonize databases for planning gorilla conservation across Uganda, Rwanda and DRC (MIST was already being used in Rwanda and Uganda), and the forthcoming tripartite treaty between the three countries would be another big step forward.

141. The observer from GRASP said that if the Virunga Action Plan, which had a large gorilla component, were used as an overarching Plan, there would probably be no need for a separate document. He suggested waiting for the genetic results of recent surveys before deciding anything further.

142. Ms. Virtue said it was not the intention of the Gorilla Agreement to duplicate existing efforts, but that it was the responsibility of the MOP to review Action Plans and decide a way forward.

143. The observer from WCS said that WCS supported the transboundary plan, within which there were gorilla-specific agreements.

144. The representative from the Lusaka Agreement Task Force suggested focusing on the international dimension by reviewing all Action Plans that involve gorillas and coming up with a global strategy that reflected the status of the Gorilla Agreement. It was time for the Agreement to take a lead on this.

145. The Chair pointed out that the key problem for the Gorilla Agreement was a lack of resources.

146. The representative of Uganda suggested that since different Action Plans existed at different levels, what was needed was to integrate objectives, targets and milestones of the existing Plans into one overarching Action Plan for the Gorilla Agreement. This would help with obtaining resources. The programme and staff were already in place.

147. Mr. Lenten reported that a similar discussion had taken place within AEWA. By combining Action Plans under a single international ‘umbrella’ Action Plan for gorillas, with sub-plans for different sub-species, this would heighten attention for the Gorilla Agreement and increase its strength.

148. Mr. Redmond agreed with Uganda and Mr. Lenten and with GRASP’s approach of adopting gorilla components of existing Action Plans that had already been agreed by governments.

149. The observer from IUCN said that Range States were not facing the same problems when dealing with the different gorilla sub-species, and that as a result different action plans were needed in different countries. Actions to conserve gorillas could be diluted by bringing the existing sub-specific Action Plans together into one big Plan. IUCN recommended sticking with the tried-and-tested five to ten-year programme of updating sub-regional action plans for the different sub-species.

150. The observer from MGVP said that Action Plans come and go and that clarity was needed if governments were to adopt one overarching Action Plan. It would be better to develop regional Action Plans for adoption by Range States.

151. The observer from WCS supported IUCN’s stance on maintaining the sub-regional Action Plans.

152. Mr. Lenten re-emphasized that bringing together the different Action Plans into one overarching Plan – “bringing all the logos together” – would create greater impact.

153. The observer from IUCN pointed out that there was no IUCN action plan for Mountain Gorillas as numerous other bodies were already working on this sub-species.

154. The observer from GRASP recommended sticking to the current structure, citing the difficulty of getting partners together in eastern DRC.

155. Following discussion on the revised draft Resolution 2.4, it was agreed that the Interim Secretariat would engage with the various regional processes to update the different sub-species Action Plans. It was further agreed that national focal points would endeavour to be part of such processes.

17. REPORTING FORMAT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AGREEMENT’S ACTION PLANS

156. Ms. Pauly introduced document UNEP/GA/MOP2/Doc.17/Rev.1: *Draft Reporting Format for the Implementation of the Agreement’s Action Plans*, noting that TC1 had asked the Interim Secretariat to develop a new reporting format for presentation to MOP2. The

proposed format was deliberately general so that all four sub-species Action Plans, which are quite different in format, could use the same template.

157. Following a wide-ranging discussion, the Meeting decided to adopt the new reporting format, subject to the inclusion of a proposal by the observer from WWF that the first bullet under the reporting table for *I Law enforcement* be amended to read: “Law enforcement activities in general (including arrests, confiscations, prosecutions and surveillance efforts)”. The Meeting adopted the Reporting Format with amendments which is attached as Annex 4 to this report.

158. The Chair emphasized that the Reporting Format should be used by Parties as a guide. Different Action Plans had different reporting requirements and when reporting under the Agreement, Parties would be free to select the fields relevant to them.

18. FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

159. Ms. Virtue introduced document UNEP/GA/MOP2/Doc.18: *Financial and Administrative Matters: Draft Resolution 2.2*.

160. She briefly outlined the summary of expenditures for the past triennium, contained in Annex 1, and the proposed budget for the coming triennium in Annex 2. Referring to Annex 3, Status of Party Contributions (as at 31 October 2011), Ms. Virtue said that only Rwanda had so far paid any contributions, and this for two years only. This meant that every Party was now in arrears. Payment of contributions would send a very strong signal to interested donors that Parties to the Gorilla Agreement were committed in their own modest way.

161. The representative of Germany pointed out that the date of COP9 in Rome in the third preambular paragraph of draft Resolution 2.2 should be 2008, not 2009, and suggested placing donor country names in alphabetical order in the sixth preambular paragraph.

162. The representative of Cameroon suggested replacing “*Reconfirms*” in operational paragraph 3 with “*Reiterates*”.

163. The representative of Nigeria suggested inserting “Parties,” after “*Invites*” in operational paragraph 6, since Parties to the Agreement could also make voluntary contributions.

164. The meeting adopted draft Resolution 2.2, subject to inclusion of the above-mentioned amendments, by consensus (attached as Annex 3 to this report).

19. DATE AND VENUE OF NEXT MEETING

165. Mr. Lenten said that it was not sensible from a logistical and cost point of view to hold MOP3 back-to-back with CMS COP11, which was currently anticipated to be convened in Paraguay, and suggested holding it towards the end of the first half of 2014, preferably in a gorilla Range State country.

166. The Chair asked if any Party or Range State would be willing host MOP3, and indeed the Agreement Secretariat.

167. The representative of Uganda said that would be very happy if the Gorilla Agreement was hosted by one of the Range States. He asked the Interim Secretariat to come up with criteria for possible hosting, clearly identifying what was required of countries for hosting the MOP and also the Secretariat.

168. The representative of Congo (Brazzaville) said that the Interim Secretariat had sent information on hosting meetings to the Government of Congo, and asked if it could be resent. He pointed out that Congo had offered to host the First Meeting of the Technical Committee, but a change of date had meant there had no longer been a budget available for the rescheduled meeting.

169. The observer from GRASP said that, in the absence of an offer from a Range State, GRASP could examine the possibilities of hosting MOP3 in Nairobi.

170. The MOP requested the Interim Secretariat to follow up on the date and venue of MOP3, including the circulation of the criteria that any host would need to meet.

20. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

171. Mr. Redmond pointed out that conservation education was part of the Gorilla Agreement but had not been mentioned during the meeting. He reminded participants that many education and awareness materials were being developed and were available for use in and by Parties and Range States. He urged that Focal Points should be tasked to talk to national TV stations.

172. There was no other business.

21. ADOPTION OF THE DECISIONS AND ACTION POINTS

173. The following Resolutions were adopted and attached as Annex 3 to the present report:

Resolution 2.1: **Law Enforcement Cooperation**

Resolution 2.2: **Financial & Administrative Matters**

Resolution 2.3: **Institutional Arrangements for the Agreement**

Resolution 2.4: **Elements of Information Management for Gorilla Conservation**

174. The reporting format for the Gorilla Agreement had been agreed (see Annex 4).

175. The Meeting had elected three new experts to the Technical Committee.

176. The date and venue of MOP3 would depend on offers received, but the timescale should be towards the end of the first half of 2014 to fit in with the timetable for CMS COP11 towards the end of 2014.

177. The Interim Secretariat would place all the technical information and reports mentioned at MOP2 on the CMS website.

178. The Interim Secretariat would circulate the criteria for hosting MOP3 and for hosting the Gorilla Agreement Secretariat.

179. The Secretariat would provide copies of all outstanding invoices for annual contributions; indeed copies had already been provided for representatives of those Parties present at MOP2 to take back with them.

22. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

180. The Chair invited Mr. Lenten to make a closing statement on behalf of the Interim Secretariat.

181. Mr. Lenten thanked the Parties, other Range States, partner agencies and NGOs, interpreters and report writers for their contribution to the Meeting and looked forward to Uganda and the other Range States becoming Parties to the Gorilla Agreement by MOP3. He also recorded a vote of thanks to the Chair and Vice-Chair. The List of Participants is attached as Annex 5 to the present report.

182. The Chair, acknowledging the tremendous spirit in which the Meeting had taken place and the passion and determination of all concerned to give the best possible protection to Africa's gorillas, closed the Meeting at 1620 hrs. on 27 November 2011.



Agreement on the Conservation of Gorillas and their Habitats

Distribution: General

UNEP/GA/MOP2/REPORT
Annex 1

Original: English

SECOND MEETING OF THE PARTIES
Bergen, Norway, 26-27 November 2011

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE SECOND MEETING OF PARTIES TO THE GORILLA AGREEMENT

Part I

Delegates, Observers, Secretariat

Rule 1 - Delegates

- (1) A Party to the Agreement (hereafter referred to as a "Party")¹ shall be entitled to be represented at the meeting by a delegation consisting of a Representative and such Alternative Representatives and Advisers as the Party may deem necessary.
- (2) Without prejudice to the provisions of Rule 14, paragraph 2, the Representative of a Party shall exercise the voting rights of that Party. In their absence, an Alternative Representative of that Party shall act in their place over the full range of their functions.
- (3) Logistic and other limitations may require that no more than four delegates of any Party be present at a plenary session. The Secretariat shall notify Parties, observers and other participants of any such limitations in advance of the meeting.

Rule 2 - Observers

- (1) The United Nations, its Specialized Agencies, the International Atomic Energy Agency and any State not a Party to the Agreement may be represented at the meeting by observers who shall have the right to participate but not to vote.²
- (2) Any body or agency technically qualified in protection, conservation and management of gorillas which is either:
 - (a) an international agency or body, either governmental or non-governmental, or a national governmental agency or body; or

¹ See Articles I, paragraph 2 (e), of the Agreement. Deadline for the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession is on or before 30 September 2008, in order for the Agreement to be in effect for a Party at the First Meeting of Parties.

² See Convention, Article VII, paragraph 8.

- (b) a national non-governmental agency or body which has been approved for this purpose by the State in which it is located;

and which has informed the Secretariat of the Agreement of its desire to be represented at the meeting by observers, shall be permitted to be represented unless at least one-third of the Parties present object. Once admitted, these observers shall have the right to participate but not to vote.³

- (3) Bodies and agencies desiring to be represented at the meeting by observers shall submit the names of their representatives (and in the case of bodies and agencies referred to in paragraph (2) (b) of this Rule, evidence of the approval of the State in which they are located) to the Secretariat of the Convention prior to the opening of the meeting.

- (4) Logistic and other limitations may require that no more than two observers from any non-Party State, body or agency be present at a plenary session of the meeting. The Secretariat shall notify Parties, observers and other participants of any such limitations in advance of the meeting.

- (5) No standard participation fee for non-governmental organisations shall be levied. Nonetheless contributions are appreciated.

Rule 3 - Credentials

- (1) The Representative or any Alternative Representative of a Party shall, before exercising the voting rights of the Party, have been granted powers by, or on behalf of, a proper authority, such as the Head of State, the Head of Government or the Minister of Foreign Affairs or the head of an executive body of any regional economic organisation or as mentioned in footnote 1 above enabling them to represent the Party at the meeting and to vote.

- (2) Such credentials shall be submitted to the Secretariat of the Convention.

- (3) A Credentials Committee of not more than five Representatives shall examine the credentials and shall report thereon to the meeting. Pending a decision on their credentials, delegates may participate provisionally in the meeting.

Rule 4 - Secretariat

The Secretariat of the Convention shall service and act as secretariat for the meeting.⁴

Part II

Officers

Rule 5 - Chairpersons

- (1) The Chairperson of the Meeting to Negotiate an Agreement on the Conservation of Gorillas and Their Habitats (Paris, France, 22-24 October 2007) shall act as temporary

³ See Convention, Article VII, paragraph 9.

⁴ See Agreement, Article V, paragraph 2, and Article VII, sub-paragraph (a).

Chairperson of the meeting until the meeting elects a Chairperson in accordance with Rule 5, paragraph 2.

(2) The Meeting of Parties in its inaugural session shall elect a Chairperson and a Vice-Chairperson of the Meeting.

Rule 6 - Presiding Officer

(1) The Chairperson shall preside at all plenary sessions of the meeting.

(2) If the Chairperson is absent or is unable to discharge the duties of Presiding Officer, the Vice-Chairperson shall deputize.

(3) The Presiding Officer shall not vote but may designate an Alternative Representative from the same delegation.

Rule 7 - Bureau

(1) The Presiding Officer, the Vice-Chairperson, the Chairperson of the Technical Committee, and the Secretariat shall constitute the Bureau of the Meeting with the general duty of forwarding the business of the meeting including, where appropriate, altering the timetable and structure of the meeting and specifying time limits for debates.

(2) The Presiding Officer shall preside over the Bureau.

Part III

Rules of Order and Debate

Rule 8 - Powers of Presiding Officer

(1) In addition to exercising powers conferred elsewhere in these Rules, the Presiding Officer shall at plenary sessions of the meeting:

- (a) open and close the session;
- (b) direct the discussions;
- (c) ensure the observance of these Rules;
- (d) accord the right to speak;
- (e) put questions to the vote and announce decisions;
- (f) rule on points of order; and
- (g) subject to these Rules, have complete control of the proceedings of the meeting and the maintenance of order.

(2) The Presiding Officer may, in the course of discussion at a plenary session of the meeting, propose to the Conference:

- (a) time limits for speakers;
- (b) limitation of the number of times the members of a delegation or the observers from a State not a Party, body or agency may speak on any question;

- (c) the closure of the list of speakers;
- (d) the adjournment or the closure of the debate on the particular subject or question under discussion; and
- (e) the suspensions or adjournment of the session.

Rule 9 - Seating, Quorum

- (1) Delegations shall be seated in accordance with the alphabetical order of the names of the Parties in the English language.
- (2) A quorum for plenary sessions of the meeting shall consist of one-half of the Parties having delegations at the meeting. No plenary session shall take place in the absence of a quorum.

Rule 10 - Right to Speak

- (1) The Presiding Officer shall call upon speakers in the order in which they signify their desire to speak, with precedence given to the delegates.
- (2) A delegate or observer may speak only if called upon by the Presiding Officer, who may call a speaker to order if the remarks are not relevant to the subject under discussion.
- (3) A speaker shall not be interrupted except on a point of order. The speaker may, however, with the permission of the Presiding Officer, give way during their speech to allow any delegate or observer to request elucidation on a particular point in that speech.
- (4) The Chairperson of a committee or working group may be accorded precedence for the purpose of explaining the conclusions arrived at by that committee or working group.

Rule 11 - Submission of Proposals for Amendment of the Agreement and its Annex

- (1) As a general rule proposals shall, subject to any provisions of the Agreement itself, have been communicated at least 150 days before the meeting to the Secretariat, which shall have circulated them to all Parties in the working languages of the meeting. Proposals arising out of discussion of the foregoing may be discussed at any plenary session of the meeting provided copies of them have been circulated to all delegations not later than the day preceding the session. The Presiding Officer may also permit the discussion and consideration of urgent proposals arising after the period prescribed above in the first sentence of this Rule provided that they relate to proposed amendments which have been circulated in accordance with the second sentence of this Rule and that their consideration will not unduly inhibit the proceedings of the Meeting. The Presiding Officer may, in addition, permit the discussion of motions as to procedures, even though such motions have not been circulated previously.
- (2) After a proposal has been adopted or rejected by the Conference it shall not be reconsidered unless a two-thirds majority of the Representatives participating in the meeting so decide. Permission to speak on a motion to reconsider a proposal shall be accorded only to a delegate from each of two Parties wishing to speak against the motion, after which the motion shall immediately be put to the vote.

Rule 12 - Submission of Resolutions or Recommendations

As a general rule Resolutions or Recommendations shall have been communicated at least 60 days before the meeting to the Secretariat who shall circulate them to all Parties in the working languages in the meeting. The remaining provisions of Rule 11 shall also apply *mutatis mutandis* to the treatment of Resolutions and Recommendations.

Rule 13 - Procedural Motions

(1) During the discussion of any matter, a delegate may rise to make a point of order, and the point of order shall be immediately decided by the Presiding Officer in accordance with these Rules. A delegate may appeal against any ruling of the Presiding Officer. The appeal shall immediately be put to the vote, and the Presiding Officer's ruling shall stand unless a majority of the Representatives present and voting otherwise decide. A delegate rising to a point of order may not speak on the substance of the matter under discussion.

(2) The following motions shall have precedence in the following order over all other proposals or motions before the Meeting:

- (a) to suspend the session;
- (b) to adjourn the session;
- (c) to adjourn the debate on the particular subject or question under discussion; and
- (d) to close the debate on the particular subject or question under discussion.

Rule 14 - Arrangements for Debate

(1) The Meeting may, on a proposal by the Presiding Officer or by a delegate, limit the time to be allowed to each speaker and the number of times delegates or observers may speak on any question. When the debate is subject to such limits, and a speaker has spoken for the allotted time, the Presiding Officer shall call the speaker to order without delay.

(2) During the course of a debate the Presiding Officer may announce the list of speakers and, with the consent of the meeting, declare the list closed. The Presiding Officer may, however, accord the right of reply to any delegate if a speech delivered after the list has been declared closed makes this desirable.

(3) During the discussion of any matter, a delegate may move the adjournment of the debate on the particular subject or question under discussion. In addition to the proposer of the motion, a delegate may speak in favour of, and a delegate of each of two Parties may speak against the motion, after which the motion shall immediately be put to the vote. The Presiding Officer may limit the time to be allowed to speakers under this Rule.

(4) A delegate may at any time move the closure of the debate on the particular subject or question under discussion, whether or not any other delegate has signified the wish to speak. Permission to speak on the motion for closure of the debate shall be accorded only to a delegate from each of two Parties wishing to speak against the motion, after which the motion shall immediately be put to the vote. The Presiding Officer may limit the time to be allowed to speakers under this Rule.

(5) During the discussion of any matter a delegate may move the suspension or the adjournment of the session. Such motions shall not be debated but shall immediately be put to the vote. The Presiding Officer may limit the time allowed to the speaker moving the suspension or adjournment of the session.

Part IV

Voting

Rule 15 - Methods of Voting

(1) Without prejudice to the provisions of Rule 1, paragraph 2, each representative duly accredited according to Rule 3 shall have one vote. Regional economic integration organizations, in matters within their competence, shall exercise their right to vote with the number of votes equal to the number of their member States which are Parties. In such case, the member States of such organizations shall not exercise their right individually.⁵

(2) The Meeting shall normally vote by show of hands, but any Representative may request a roll-call vote. The roll-call vote shall be taken in the seating order of the delegations. The Presiding Officer may require a roll-call vote on the advice of the tellers where they are in doubt as to the actual number of votes cast and this is likely to be critical to the outcome.

(3) All votes in respect of the election of officers or of prospective host countries shall be by secret ballot and, although it shall not normally be used, any Representative may request a secret ballot for other matters. If seconded, the question of whether a secret ballot should be held shall immediately be voted upon. The motion for a secret ballot may not be conducted by secret ballot.

(4) Voting by roll-call or by secret ballot shall be expressed by "Yes", "No" or "Abstain". Only affirmative and negative votes shall be counted in calculating the number of votes cast.

(5) If votes are equal, the motion or amendment shall not be carried.

(6) The Presiding Officer shall be responsible for the counting of the votes and shall announce the result. The Presiding Officer may be assisted by tellers appointed by the Secretariat.

(7) After the Presiding Officer has announced the beginning of the vote, it shall not be interrupted except by a Representative on a point of order in connection with the actual conduct of the voting. The Presiding Officer may permit Representatives to explain their votes either before or after the voting, and may limit the time to be allowed for such explanations.

Rule 16 - Majority

Except where otherwise provided for under the provisions of the Agreement, these Rules or the Terms of Reference for the Administration of the Trust Fund, all votes on procedural

⁵ See Agreement, Article V, paragraph 5.

matters relating to the forwarding of the business of the meeting shall be decided by a simple majority of votes cast, while all other decisions shall be taken by a two-thirds majority of votes cast.

Rule 17 - Procedure for Voting on Motions and Amendments

(1) A delegate may move that parts of a proposal or of an amendment be voted on separately. If objection is made to the request for such division, the motion for division shall be voted upon first. Permission to speak on the motion for division shall be accorded only to a delegate from each of two Parties wishing to speak in favour of and a delegate from each of two Parties wishing to speak against the motion. If the motion for division is carried, those parts of the proposal or amendment which are subsequently approved shall be put to the vote as a whole. If all operative parts of the proposal or the amendment have been rejected, the proposal or the amendment shall be considered to have been rejected as a whole.

(2) When an amendment is moved to a proposal, the amendment shall be voted on first. When two or more amendments are moved to a proposal, the Meeting shall vote first on the amendment furthest removed in substance from the original proposal and then on the amendment next furthest removed therefrom, and so on until all amendments have been put to the vote. When, however, the adoption of one amendment necessarily implies the rejection of another amendment, the latter amendment shall not be put to the vote. If one or more amendments are adopted, the amended proposal shall then be voted upon. A motion is considered an amendment to a proposal if it merely adds to, deletes or revises part of that proposal.

(3) If two or more proposals relate to the same question, the Meeting shall, unless it decides otherwise, vote on the proposals in the order in which they have been submitted. The Meeting may, after voting on a proposal, decide whether to vote on the next proposal.

Rule 18 - Elections

(1) If in an election to fill one place no candidate obtains the required majority in the first ballot, a second ballot shall be taken restricted to the two candidates obtaining the largest number of votes. If in the second ballot the votes are equally divided, the Presiding Officer shall decide between the candidates by drawing lots.

(2) If in the first ballot there is a tie amongst candidates obtaining the second largest number of votes, a special ballot shall be held amongst them to reduce the number of candidates to two.

(3) In the case of tie amongst three or more candidates obtaining the largest number of votes in the first ballot, a special ballot shall be held amongst them to reduce the number of candidates to two. If a tie then results amongst two or more candidates, the Presiding Officer shall reduce the number to two by drawing lots, and a further ballot shall be held in accordance with paragraph 1 of this Rule.

Part V

Languages and Records

Rule 19 - Official and Working Languages

- (1) English and French shall be the official and working languages of the meeting.
- (2) Speeches made in any of the working languages shall be interpreted into the other working language.
- (3) The official documents of the meeting shall be distributed in the working languages.

Rule 20 - Other Languages

- (1) A delegate may speak in a language other than a working language. They shall be responsible for providing interpretation into a working language, and interpretation by the Secretariat into the other working language may be based upon that interpretation.
- (2) Any document submitted to the Secretariat in any language other than a working language shall be accompanied by a translation into one of the working languages.

Rule 21 - Summary Records

- (1) Summary records of the meeting shall be circulated to all Parties in the official languages of the meeting.
- (2) Committees and working groups shall decide upon the form in which their records shall be prepared.

Part VI

Publicity of Debates

Rule 22 - Plenary Sessions

All plenary sessions of the meeting shall be open to the public, except that in exceptional circumstances the Meeting may decide, by a two-thirds majority of Representatives present and voting, that any single session be closed to the public.

Rule 23 - Sessions of Committees and Working Groups

As a general rule, sessions of committees and working groups shall be limited to the delegates and to observers invited by the Chairpersons of the committees or working groups.

Part VII

Committees and Working Groups

Rule 24 - Establishment of Committees and Working Groups

- (1) In addition to the Credentials Committee, the Meeting may establish such working groups as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions. It shall define the terms of reference and composition of each working group, the size of which shall be limited according to the number of places available in assembly rooms.
- (2) The Credentials Committee and each working group shall elect their own officers.

Rule 25 - Procedure

Insofar as they are applicable, these Rules shall apply *mutatis mutandis* to the proceedings of committees and working groups; however, interpretation may not be provided in sessions of the committees and working groups.

Part VIII

Amendment

Rule 26

These rules may be amended as required by decision of the Meeting.



Agreement on the Conservation of Gorillas and their Habitats

Distribution: General

UNEP/GA/MOP2/REPORT
Annex 2

Original: English

SECOND MEETING OF THE PARTIES
Bergen, Norway, 26-27 November 2011

AGENDA OF THE MEETING

1. Opening of the Meeting
2. Adoption of the Rules of Procedure
3. Election of Officers
4. Adoption of the Agenda
5. Report on Credentials
6. Reports and Statements from Parties and Range States
7. Report of the Interim Secretariat
8. Report of the Depositary
9. Report of the Technical Committee
10. Reports from Observers
11. Overview of the Conservation Status of Gorillas and their Habitats across their range
12. Overview of the International Year of the Gorilla 2009
13. Election of supplementary experts to the Technical Committee
14. Institutional Arrangements for the Agreement
15. Cooperation on Law Enforcement
 - 15.1 Draft Resolution 2.4 Elements of Information Management for Gorilla Conservation
16. Review of the Agreement's Action Plans

17. Reporting Format on the Implementation of the Agreement's Action Plans
18. Financial and Administrative Matters
19. Date and Venue of next Meeting
20. Any other business
21. Adoption of the Decisions and Action Points
22. Closure of the Meeting



Agreement on the Conservation of Gorillas and their Habitats

Distribution: General

UNEP/GA/MOP2/REPORT
Annex 3

Original: English

SECOND MEETING OF THE PARTIES
Bergen, Norway, 26-27 November 2011

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES AT ITS SECOND MEETING

LIST OF RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY MOP2

- | | |
|----------------|--|
| Resolution 2.1 | Cooperaton and Information Sharing for Improved Wildlife Law Enforcement |
| Resolution 2.2 | Financial Matters |
| Resolution 2.3 | Institutional Arrangements for the Agreement |
| Resolution 2.4 | Elements of Information Management for Gorilla Conservation |



Agreement on the Conservation of Gorillas and their Habitats

Distribution: General

UNEP/GA/Resolution 2.1

Original: English

COOPERATION AND INFORMATION SHARING FOR IMPROVED WILDLIFE LAW ENFORCEMENT

Adopted by the Meeting of the Parties at its Second Meeting (Bergen, 26-27 November 2011)

Recognizing that the lack of enforcement of existing wildlife laws plays a major role in the decline of gorilla populations;

Aware that the issue of wildlife law enforcement is being addressed by governments supported by a number of international organizations, together embodying significant knowledge and experience concerning the relevant issues;

Acknowledging that the sharing of information among countries and with relevant international law enforcement organizations is key to gaining an overview of trends and hotspots in illegal trade in live gorillas and gorilla body parts;

Considering the need for all Range States to accede to the Gorilla Agreement so as to cooperate in the cross-border law enforcement measures for the management of gorilla populations;

Recalling that the Gorilla Agreement has been supporting several projects aimed at improving the enforcement of relevant national laws;

Appreciating the role played by the International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICCWC), comprised of the CITES Secretariat, INTERPOL, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), the World Bank and the World Customs Organization (WCO), and *noting* that the CITES Secretariat chairs the Consortium;

Recalling that the First Meeting of the Technical Committee of the Gorilla Agreement requested the Interim Secretariat to seek and implement improved coordination with existing law enforcement organizations and other relevant programmes, including ICCWC;

Further appreciating the experience of the Lusaka Agreement Task Force on Cooperative Enforcement Operations Directed at Illegal Trade in Wild Fauna and Flora and the role played by its implementing organs in building capacity for law enforcement in Africa;

Noting the need to enhance multilateral cooperation in law enforcement and the implementation of Multilateral Environment Agreements; and

Further noting the development of an Action Plan to reinforce the implementation of wildlife legislation by the COMIFAC states under their Convergence Plan;

*The Meeting of the Parties to the
Agreement on the Conservation of Gorillas and their Habitats*

1. *Urges* all Range States that are not yet Parties to the Agreement to accede in order to effectively carry out cooperative law enforcement measures for gorilla conservation;
2. *Requests* Parties to identify law enforcement issues as a priority in their gorilla conservation plans and activities;
3. *Urges* non-Party Range States as well as other stakeholders to consider according law enforcement issues related to the conservation of gorilla populations, the priority attention they deserve;
4. *Calls upon* the Parties to submit to the INTERPOL General Secretariat, via their INTERPOL National Central Bureaux and using the *Ecomessage* system, information relating to the poaching of and illegal trade in gorillas. The resulting up-to-date and international database can lead to more efficient and targeted law enforcement activities;
5. *Recommends* non-Party Range States equally to submit to the INTERPOL General Secretariat, via their INTERPOL National Central Bureaux and using the *Ecomessage* system, information relating to the poaching of and illegal trade in gorillas;
6. *Calls upon* the National Customs Authorities of Range States to use the World Customs Organization's Central Enforcement Network (CEN) to submit data on seizures of gorilla contraband and live animals;
7. *Encourages* all Range States to make use of existing law enforcement capacity-building materials, such as the Controlled Delivery manual, the Wildlife Smuggling Concealment handbook and the Questioning of Wildlife Smugglers manual published by CITES and INTERPOL for their law enforcement activities;
8. *Encourages* the International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICCWC) to recognize the seriousness of illegal international trade in gorillas, and to provide support to the implementation of the Gorilla Agreement;
9. *Further encourages* the ICCWC to share information, provide information material and tools, as well as invite Range States to participate in the capacity building activities for customs and law enforcement officers and prosecutors;
10. *Instructs* the Interim Secretariat to keep abreast of planned ICCWC activities and to ensure that Agreement Focal Points and Technical Committee Members are, where appropriate, involved;
11. *Calls upon* the Interim Secretariat to share relevant information to be incorporated into ICCWC work plans, as and when appropriate;

12. *Further calls upon* the Parties, other Range States and the Interim Secretariat to cooperate with law enforcement bodies and regional enforcement networks, such as the Lusaka Agreement on cooperative enforcement operations directed at illegal trade in wild fauna and flora and its operational arm, the Lusaka Agreement Task Force where appropriate; and

13. *Urges* the Gorilla Range States to consider acceding to the Lusaka Agreement on Cooperative Enforcement Operations Directed at Illegal Trade in Wild Fauna and Flora.

FINANCIAL MATTERS

Adopted by the Meeting of the Parties at its Second Meeting (Bergen, 26-27 November 2011)

Recalling Article IV 2.a of the Agreement on the Conservation of Gorillas and their Habitats which states that each Party should contribute towards the budget of the Agreement according to the decision taken by the Meeting of the Parties as provided in Article VII 4 of the Convention;

Further recalling Article IV 2.b which states that decisions relating to the budget and contribution by the Parties shall be adopted by the Meeting of the Parties by consensus;

Noting that at its 1st session in December 2008 in Rome, the Meeting of the Parties to the Agreement decided upon an annual contribution of €3,000 towards the cost of implementing the Agreement and that it was emphasized that Parties and Range States could make additional voluntary contributions;

Further noting that the CMS Secretariat has been acting as the Interim Secretariat to the Gorilla Agreement, as agreed at the 32nd CMS Standing Committee in November 2007 and following a decision of the 1st Meeting of the Parties;

Further noting that as no additional funds had been budgeted by either the CMS COP or the Gorilla Agreement MOP, coordination of the Agreement continues to be done by existing UNEP/CMS staff in addition to their regular duties; and

Acknowledging with appreciation the substantial financial and in-kind contribution provided by the donor governments, particularly France, Germany and Monaco, the CMS Secretariat and other organizations to implement the Gorilla Agreement;

*The Meeting of the Parties to the
Agreement on the Conservation of Gorillas and their Habitats*

1. *Approves* the Financial Report for 2009-2011 attached as Annexes 1a and 1b to this Resolution;
2. *Adopts* the budget for 2012-2014 attached as Annexes 2a and 2b to this Resolution;

3. *Reiterates* that the annual contribution, for the execution of activities for the implementation of the Agreement during the 2012-2014 triennium, shall be €3000;
4. *Requests* Parties to take note of the status of Party contributions attached as Annex 3 and *urges* those countries with payment in arrears to pay their dues before the end of 2011;
5. *Further requests* Parties to pay their contributions for the coming triennium promptly, but in any case not later than the end of June of the year to which they relate and to consider, if feasible, paying for the whole triennium in one installment; and
6. *Invites* Parties, Non-Party Range States, donor governments, other organizations and the private sector to make voluntarily contributions to the Agreement, either financially or in-kind, towards activities to implement the Agreement.

Annex 1a

Financial report of the Interim Secretariat for the triennium 2009-2011 (in EUR) - Expenditures

Budget line	Budget estimate at MOP 1			Actual Expenditures			Source of funding
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	
1.0 Personnel							
1.1 Executive Secretary CMS - 2% ¹	3,337	3,404	3,471	6,680	6,800	6,920	CMS core budget
1.2 Deputy Executive Secretary CMS 2% ¹	2,800	2,856	2,913	5,600	5,720	5,800	CMS core budget
1.3 Programme Officer CMS P4 -10% ²	12,800	13,056	13,317	25,600	13,000	13,300	CMS core budget
1.4 Associate Programme Officer CMS P2/P3 - 50% ³	45,000	45,900	46,818	0	0	14,667	Pledge from Germany
1.5 Programme Officer GRASP P4 10% ⁴	12,800	13,056	13,317				GRASP not reported
1.6 Support Staff CMS GS ⁵	17,500	18,375	19,294	18,000	5,600	5,600	CMS core budget
1.7 Consultants ⁶	100,000	70,000	70,000	28,800	28,800	24,000	VC Germany CMS core budget
Personnel sub-total	194,237	166,647	169,130	84,680	59,920	70,287	
2.0 2nd Meeting of the Parties							
2.1 Delegate travel	0	0	21,000	0	0	26,900	CMS core budget
2.2 Venue, logistics (incl. Translation)	0	0	5,000	0	0	8,400	CMS core budget
2.3 Staff travel ⁷	0	0	0	0	0	1,548	CMS core budget
2nd Meeting of the Parties sub-total	0	0	26,000	0	0	36,848	
3.0 1st Technical Committee Meeting							
3.1 Delegate travel	0	27,300	8,800	0	0	16,900	VC Monaco VC Germany
3.2 Venue, logistics (incl. Translation)	0	8,000	5,000	0	0	8,000	VC Germany CMS core budget
3.3 Staff travel	0	0	0	0	0	5,100	CMS core budget
3.4 Miscellaneous	0	0	0	0	0	3,000	CMS core budget
1st Technical Committee Meeting sub-total	0	35,300	13,800	0	0	33,000	

Budget line	Budget estimate at MOP 1			Actual Expenditures			Source of funding
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	
4.0 Miscellaneous							
4.1 Travel/expenses for YoG 2009 campaign, patron, ambassadors	12,600	0	0	3,000	0	0	CMS core budget
4.2 Travel/mission staff	2,100	2,100	2,100	10,000	0	0	CMS core budget
4.3 Office supplies/IT equipment	1,350	612	625	1,350	612	625	CMS core budget
4.4 Postage/communication	400	410	420	400	410	420	CMS core budget
4.5 Printing	0	1,730	1,765	0	1,730	1,765	CMS core budget
4.6 Outreach and Fundraising	0	967	967	0	0	5,310	PC Rwanda
Miscellaneous sub-total	16,450	5,819	5,877	14,750	2,752	8,120	
5.0 Conservation Fund							
5.1 Selected projects	150,000	150,000	150,000	0	0	0	
5.2 PALF - Wildlife Law Enforcement (Co-funding)	0	0	0	13,274	0	0	VC Monaco
5.3 Conservation Justice - Wildlife Law Enforcement	0	0	0	0	23,400	0	VC Germany
Conservation Fund sub-total	150,000	150,000	150,000	13,274	23,400	0	
6.0 Year of the Gorilla							
6.1 Materials, dissemination	0	0	0	42,000	0	0	VC France CMS core budget
6.2 Website maintenance	0	0	0	1,000	1,000	1,000	CMS core budget
Year of the Gorilla sub-total	0	0	0	43,000	1,000	1,000	
Sub-total	360,687	357,766	338,807	155,704	87,072	149,255	
Programme Support Costs (13%)	46,889	46,510	44,045	20,242	11,319	19,403	
Total	407,576	404,276	382,852	175,946	98,391	168,658	
Total for the triennium 2009-11			1,194,704			442,995	

- 1: Actual working time was 4%.
- 2: Actual working time was 20% in 2009 and 10% in 2010 and 2011
- 3: Funding for this position has been provided since July 2011
- 4: GRASP provided 5% of a P4 officers working time in 2009; costs are not reported here
- 5: More working time than estimated was spent in 2010 and 2011
- 6: The consultant was partly paid from voluntary contributions from Germany for the YOG website in 2009
- 7: Staff travel costs were calculated on the basis of 2 DSAs (Daily Subsistence Allowance) for the two meeting days for three staff members

PC: Party Contribution

VC: Voluntary Contribution

GRASP: Great Apes Survival Partnership

YOG: Year of the Gorilla

Annex 1b

Financial report of the Interim Secretariat for the triennium 2009-2011 (in EUR) –Sources of funding

Source of funding	2009	2010	2011	Total
CMS core budget	91,988	63,672	110,428	266,088
Party contributions	0	0	5,310	5,310
Pledge from Germany (for personnel)	0	0	14,667	14,667
Voluntary contributions in general	63,717	23,400	18,850	105,966
Sub-total	155,704	87,072	149,255	392,031
Programme Support Costs (13%)	20,242	11,319	19,403	50,964
Total	175,946	98,391	168,658	442,995

Annex 2a

Draft budget for the triennium 2012-2014 (in EUR) - Proposed Expenditures

Budget line	2012	2013	2014	Total	Source
1.0 Personnel					
1.1 Executive Secretary (D1, part-time 4%)	6,400	6,500	6,700	19,600	CMS core budget
1.2 Deputy Executive Secretary (P5, part-time 4%)	5,900	6,000	6,200	18,100	CMS core budget
1.3 Agreement Officer (P4, part-time 10%)	13,500	13,800	14,000	41,300	CMS core budget
1.4 Associate Programme Officer (P2, part-time 40%)	35,000	35,000	35,000	105,000	Pledge from Germany
1.5 Administrative Assistant (G5, part-time 10%)	6,100	6,200	6,300	18,600	CMS core budget
1.6 Consultants	5,000	5,000	5,000	15,000	Voluntary contributions
2.0 Travel on official business					
2.1 Secretariat staff	3,000	6,000	6,000	15,000	CMS core budget
2.2 Experts on mission	2,000	2,000	2,000	6,000	Voluntary contributions
Personnel subtotal	76,900	80,500	81,200	238,600	
3.0 2nd Meeting of the Technical Committee					
3.1 Delegate Travel	0	27,000	0	27,000	Voluntary contributions
3.2 Venue, logistics, translation, interpretation	0	15,000	0	15,000	Voluntary contributions
3.3 Staff travel	0	6,000	0	6,000	CMS core budget
4.0 3rd Meeting of the Parties					
4.1 Delegate Travel*	0	0	27,000	27,000	Voluntary contributions
3.2 Venue, logistics, translation, interpretation	0	0	15,000	15,000	Voluntary contributions
4.3 Staff travel	0	0	6,000	6,000	CMS core budget
Meetings subtotal	0	48,000	48,000	96,000	

Budget line	2012	2013	2014	Total	Source
5.0 Office costs					
5.1 Expendable office equipment	500	500	500	1,500	CMS core budget
5.2 Non-expendable office equipment	1,000	1,000	1,000	3,000	CMS core budget
5.3 Maintenance of office equipment	1,000	1,000	1,000	3,000	CMS core budget
5.4 IT Service	3,500	3,600	3,700	10,800	CMS core budget
5.5 Communication	1,000	1,100	1,200	3,300	CMS core budget
Office costs subtotal	7,000	7,200	7,400	21,600	
6.0 Information Materials					
6.1 Flyers, Posters, Publications	5,000	5,000	5,000	15,000	Party contributions
6.2 Website maintenance and fees	300	300	300	900	Voluntary contributions
Information materials subtotal	5,300	5,300	5,300	15,900	
7.0 Projects	50,000	50,000	50,000	150,000	Party contributions Voluntary contributions
Budget sub-total	139,200	191,000	191,900	522,100	
Programme Support Costs (13 %)	18,096	24,830	24,947	67,873	
Budget total	157,296	215,830	216,847	589,973	

Annex 2b

Draft budget for the triennium 2012-2014 (in EUR) – Proposed sources of funding

Sources of funding	2012	2013	2014	Total
CMS core budget	41,900	51,700	52,600	146,200
Party contributions	15,929	15,929	15,929	47,788
Pledge from Germany (personnel)	35,000	35,000	35,000	105,000
Subtotal	92,829	102,629	103,529	298,988
Programme Support Costs (13 %)	12,068	13,342	13,459	38,868
Total	104,897	115,971	116,988	337,856
Amount required according to Annex 2a	157,296	215,830	216,847	589,973
Shortfall to be met from Voluntary contributions (net)	52,399	99,859	99,859	252,117
Programme Support Costs (13 %)	6,812	12,982	12,982	32,775
Shortfall to be met from Voluntary Contributions (gross)	59,211	112,841	112,841	284,892

Annex 3

Status of Party Contributions (as at 31 October 2011)

Parties	Pledges (in EUR)			Payments received (in EUR)			Amount in arrears as at 31 Oct 2011
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	
Central African Republic	3,000	3,000	3,000	0	0	0	9,000
Republic of Congo	3,000	3,000	3,000	0	0	0	9,000
Democratic Republic of Congo	3,000	3,000	3,000	0	0	0	9,000
Gabon	3,000	3,000	3,000	0	0	0	9,000
Nigeria	3,000	3,000	3,000	0	0	0	9,000
Rwanda	3,000	3,000	3,000	0	0	6,000	3,000
Total	18,000	18,000	18,000	0	0	6,000	48,000

INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE AGREEMENT

Adopted by the Meeting of the Parties at its Second Meeting (Bergen, 26-27 November 2011)

Recalling that the Meeting to negotiate the Gorilla Agreement in October 2007, requested the CMS Standing Committee to mandate the CMS Secretariat to provide interim secretariat services to the Agreement in close cooperation with the UNEP Great Apes Survival Partnership (GRASP) secretariat and other institutions of GRASP;

Further recalling that MOP1 considered the establishment of a Secretariat for the Agreement and agreed that the CMS Secretariat should continue to act as Interim Secretariat for the Agreement, and that the role of GRASP in providing secretariat services should be explicitly mentioned;

Welcoming the prominent role played by GRASP in supporting the Year of the Gorilla Campaign in 2009;

Appreciating the decision of CMS COP10 that the CMS Secretariat continue to provide interim secretariat services to the Gorilla Agreement for the next triennium;

Noting with concern that the Gorilla Agreement is unique among the CMS Agreements, in that it does not have its own independent Secretariat, and is not able to fund one from Party contributions alone; and

Realizing that this situation puts the Gorilla Agreement in a vulnerable position, where any reduction in funding to the CMS Secretariat, or increases in mandate, from new agreements, for example, could mean a reduction in resources available to be allocated to the Gorilla Agreement;

*The Meeting of the Parties of the
Agreement on the Conservation of Gorillas and their Habitats*

1. *Requests* the CMS Secretariat to act as the Interim Secretariat for the next triennium;
2. *Instructs* the Interim Secretariat to investigate future options for the administrative arrangements for the Gorilla Agreement Secretariat, including, but not limited to the following:

- a. A Party hosting the permanent Secretariat.
 - b. Another institution or organization, such as UNEP or GRASP taking on the role of permanent Secretariat.
 - c. The CMS Secretariat remaining as the Interim Secretariat, while seeking formal or informal arrangements with other institutions to provide support and secretariat services to the Agreement.
 - d. The CMS Secretariat acting as the permanent Secretariat, while looking for synergies with other institutions in the implementation of the Agreement's activities, for example, in holding joint meetings, or undertaking joint activities.
3. *Instructs* the Interim Secretariat to prepare a formal proposal for consideration and possible adoption at MOP3.



Agreement on the Conservation of Gorillas and their Habitats

Distribution: General

UNEP/GA/Resolution 2.4

Original: English

ELEMENTS OF INFORMATION MANAGEMENT FOR GORILLA CONSERVATION

Adopted by the Meeting of the Parties at its Second Meeting (Bergen, 26-27 November 2011)

Taking note of the proposal by the Republic of the Congo to develop a specific strategy for the survival of gorillas;

Considering the results achieved for the protection of gorillas and their habitats since the Paris (France) Declaration in October 2007, and the signing and entry into force of the Agreement;

Noting the development of an Action Plan to reinforce the implementation of wildlife legislation by the COMIFAC States, under their Convergence Plan;

Further noting the conservation and management measures taken with regard to gorillas both in protected areas and other gorilla habitats; and

Recognizing the ongoing process for the development of new and the revision of existing Action Plans for the four Sub-species of gorillas;

*The Meeting of the Parties to the
Agreement on the Conservation of Gorillas and their Habitats*

1. *Instructs* the Interim Secretariat to monitor the revision process of the Action Plans for the four Sub-species and to circulate them to all Parties, other Range States and interested stakeholders;
2. *Agrees* to adopt the methodology contained in the IUCN Best Practice Guidelines for the Surveys and Monitoring of Great Ape Populations with the uniform standards for the collection of data so that the data are quantitatively comparable both in space and time and *requests* that the Interim Secretariat circulates these guidelines to all Parties and other Range States;

3. *Requests* Parties and *urges* other Range States that have not done so already, to consider establishing small coordination units with the task of overseeing the monitoring of:
 - a. gorilla population dynamics; and
 - b. operations targeting illegal activities affecting gorillas and their habitats.
4. *Decides* to contribute to and liaise with the IUCN/SSC Ape Populations, Environments and Surveys (A.P.E.S.) database on the status of the gorillas, and other great apes across the whole of their range; and
5. *Instructs* the Interim Secretariat to work closely with GRASP and IUCN to investigate a way to utilize this information in an efficient manner.



Agreement on the Conservation of Gorillas and their Habitats

Distribution: General

UNEP/GA/MOP2/REPORT
Annex 4

Original: English

SECOND MEETING OF THE PARTIES
Bergen, Norway, 26-27 November 2011

REPORTING FORMAT FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AGREEMENT'S ACTION PLANS

Reporting Format for the Implementation of the Agreement's Action Plans

Convention on Migratory Species

Gorilla Agreement National Report

for

Cross River Gorilla (*Gorilla gorilla diehli*)

Western Lowland Gorilla (*Gorilla gorilla gorilla*)

Eastern Lowland Gorilla (*Gorilla beringei graueri*)

Mountain Gorilla (*Gorilla beringei beringei*)

I. Law enforcement

- **Enforcement activities in general including arrests, confiscations, prosecutions and surveillance efforts**
- **Training and Capacity building on law enforcement**
- **Education and Awareness raising on law enforcement**
- **Other aspects related to law enforcement**

Action point identified in Action Plan :	[Please see Annex 2 for an example how to allocate action points from the Action Plans to one of the fields of actions given in the reporting format.]
Area/Site of action:	
Date of action:	
Action undertaken:	
Results:	
Publications, reports, maps etc.:	
Difficulties encountered:	
Further action required:	
Contacts/Implementing organization:	

Each table refers to one action point implemented.

Please click here to add another table

If the new table does not show automatically, please copy and paste the above table.

II. [Species and habitat protection] / [Conservation management]

- Management plans, action plans, work plans
- Management of populations, protected areas
- Liaison with the timber industry
- Training and capacity building of staff such as eco-guards, park wardens etc.
- Other aspects related to [species and habitat protection] / [Conservation management]

Action point identified in Action Plan :	[Please see Annex 2 for an example how to allocate action points from the Action Plans to one of the fields of actions given in the reporting format.]
Area/Site of action:	
Date of action:	
Action undertaken:	
Results:	
Publications, reports, maps etc.:	
Difficulties encountered:	
Further action required:	
Contacts/Implementing organization:	

Each table refers to one action point implemented.

Please click here to add another table

If the new table does not show automatically, please copy and paste the above table.

III. Monitoring and related research

- Gorilla population monitoring
- Genetic monitoring, taxonomy
- Habitat monitoring
- Threat monitoring
- Monitoring with focus on other aspects
- Training on monitoring techniques and capacity building
- Other aspects related to monitoring
- Studies on the ecology of gorillas and habitats

Action point identified in Action Plan :	[Please see Annex 2 for an example how to allocate action points from the Action Plans to one of the fields of actions given in the reporting format.]
Area/Site of action:	
Date of action:	
Action undertaken:	
Results:	
Publications, reports, maps etc.:	
Difficulties encountered:	
Further action required:	
Contacts/Implementing organization:	

Each table refers to one action point implemented.

Please click here to add another table

If the new table does not show automatically, please copy and paste the above table.

IV. Human and gorilla health

- **Human health (incl. education, programmes, funds)**
- **Gorilla health (incl. health monitoring)**
- **Training on monitoring techniques**
- **Research on Ebola or other diseases relevant to gorillas**
- **Other aspects related to gorilla health**

Action point identified in Action Plan :	[Please see Annex 2 for an example how to allocate action points from the Action Plans to one of the fields of actions given in the reporting format.]
Area/Site of action:	
Date of action:	
Action undertaken:	
Results:	
Publications, reports, maps etc.:	
Difficulties encountered:	
Further action required:	
Contacts/Implementing organization:	

Each table refers to one action point implemented.

Please click here to add another table

If the new table does not show automatically, please copy and paste the above table.

V. National Policy and legislation

Action point identified in Action Plan :	[Please see Annex 2 for an example how to allocate action points from the Action Plans to one of the fields of actions given in the reporting format.]
Area/Site of action:	
Date of action:	
Action undertaken:	
Results:	
Publications, reports, maps etc.:	
Difficulties encountered:	
Further action required:	
Contacts/Implementing organization:	

Each table refers to one action point implemented.

Please click here to add another table

If the new table does not show automatically, please copy and paste the above table.

VI. Institutions and funding

Action point identified in Action Plan :	[Please see Annex 2 for an example how to allocate action points from the Action Plans to one of the fields of actions given in the reporting format.]
Area/Site of action:	
Date of action:	
Action undertaken:	
Results:	
Publications, reports, maps etc.:	
Difficulties encountered:	
Further action required:	
Contacts/Implementing organization:	

Each table refers to one action point implemented.

Please click here to add another table

If the new table does not show automatically, please copy and paste the above table.

VII. Trans-boundary activities

- General activities
- Trans-boundary policy

Action point identified in Action Plan :	[Please see Annex 2 for an example how to allocate action points from the Action Plans to one of the fields of actions given in the reporting format.]
Area/Site of action:	
Date of action:	
Action undertaken:	
Results:	
Publications, reports, maps etc.:	
Difficulties encountered:	
Further action required:	
Contacts/Implementing organization:	

Each table refers to one action point implemented.

Please click here to add another table

If the new table does not show automatically, please copy and paste the above table.

VIII. Tourism

Action point identified in Action Plan :	[Please see Annex 2 for an example how to allocate action points from the Action Plans to one of the fields of actions given in the reporting format.]
Area/Site of action:	
Date of action:	
Action undertaken:	
Results:	
Publications, reports, maps etc.:	
Difficulties encountered:	
Further action required:	
Contacts/Implementing organization:	

Each table refers to one action point implemented.

Please click here to add another table

If the new table does not show automatically, please copy and paste the above table.

IX. Education and Awareness

Action point identified in Action Plan :	[Please see Annex 2 for an example how to allocate action points from the Action Plans to one of the fields of actions given in the reporting format.]
Area/Site of action:	
Date of action:	
Action undertaken:	
Results:	
Publications, reports, maps etc.:	
Difficulties encountered:	
Further action required:	
Contacts/Implementing organization:	

Each table refers to one action point implemented.

Please click here to add another table

If the new table does not show automatically, please copy and paste the above table.

X. Community based work

- **Generating alternative income**
- **Land use planning (incl. livestock, agriculture, agro-forestry, infrastructure planning)**
- **Community based conservation projects**
- **Socio-economic studies**
- **Other aspects related to community based work**

Action point identified in Action Plan :	[Please see Annex 2 for an example how to allocate action points from the Action Plans to one of the fields of actions given in the reporting format.]
Area/Site of action:	
Date of action:	
Action undertaken:	
Results:	
Publications, reports, maps etc.:	
Difficulties encountered:	
Further action required:	
Contacts/Implementing organization:	

Each table refers to one action point implemented.

Please click here to add another table

If the new table does not show automatically, please copy and paste the above table.

XI. Any other action undertaken

Action point identified in Action Plan :	[Please see Annex 2 for an example how to allocate action points from the Action Plans to one of the fields of actions given in the reporting format.]
Area/Site of action:	
Date of action:	
Action undertaken:	
Results:	
Publications, reports, maps etc.:	
Difficulties encountered:	
Further action required:	
Contacts/Implementing organization:	

Each table refers to one action point implemented.

Please click here to add another table

If the new table does not show automatically, please copy and paste the above table.



Agreement on the Conservation of Gorillas and their Habitats

Distribution: General

UNEP/GA/MOP2/REPORT
Annex 5

Original: English

SECOND MEETING OF THE PARTIES
Bergen, Norway, 26-27 November 2011

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS / LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS

CHAIR/PRESIDENT

Mr. John Mshelbwala
Assistant Director, Wildlife Management
Federal Ministry of Environment
Plot 393/394, Augustus-Alkhomeu Wa
Abuja-FCT
Nigeria
Tel: (+234) 8033287039
E-mail: johnmshelbwala2@yahoo.com

VICE-CHAIR/ VICE-PRESIDENT

M. Florent Ikoli
Conservateur de la Réserve Naturelle de
Gorilles de Lésio-Louna
Ministère de Développement Durable, de
l'Economie Forestière et de l'Environnement
70, Rue PK Rouge Mikalou B.P. 98
République du Congo
Tel: (+242) 066648543
E-mail: ikoli@hotmail.fr

PARTIES / PARTIES CONTRACTANTES

GABON

Ms. Natacha Ermence Ona Abiaga
Agence National des Parcs Nationaux
BP 20379
Batterie IV Libreville
Gabon
Tel: (+241) 07895711 / 06808444
E-mail: ermence2003@yahoo.fr

REPUBLIC OF CONGO / RÉPUBLIQUE DU CONGO

M. Jérôme Mokoko Ikonga
Directeur Adjoint de Wildlife Conservation
Society, Programme Congo
Ministère de l'Economie Forestière
53, rue de la Victorial
4537 Brazzaville
République du Congo
Tel: (+242 5) 551 1785
E-mail: jrmokoko@gmail.com

NIGERIA / NIGÉRIA

Mr. Fidelis Omeni
Assistant Director
Federal Ministry of Environment, Department
of Forestry
Augustus Aikhomu Way
PMB 468, Garki
Abuja-FCT
Nigeria
Tel: (+234) 8023 198394
E-mail: fedelodomeni@yahoo.com

**NON-PARTIES RANGE STATES
ETATS DE L'AIRE DE RÉPARTITION NON-CONTRACTANTES**

CAMEROON / CAMEROUN

Mr. Philip Tabi Tako-Eta
Director of Wildlife
Ministry of Forestry
May 20 Avenue
Yaoundé
Cameroun
Tel: (+237) 77605008 / 96573276
E-mail: tabitakoetap@gmail.com

Mr. Zang Mbarga Come
Conservateur
Sanctuaire à Gorille de Mengame
BP 717 Sangmélima
Cameroun
Tel: (+237) 97876161
E-mail: mbarga61@yahoo.fr

**EQUATORIAL GUINEA / GUINÉE
ÉQUATORIALE**

Dr. Longinos Ebang Ondo
Coordinador Administrativo
Dirección General de Medio Ambiente
Malabo 2
Malabo; Bioko Norte
Equatorial Guinea
Tel: (+240) 232278503
E-mail: ebang1960@yahoo.es

UGANDA/ OUGANDA

Mr. Akawasah Barirega
CMS Scientific Councillor for Uganda
Ministry of Tourism, Wildlife and Heritage
Parliamentary Avenue 7103
256 Kampala
Uganda
Tel: (+256) 772831348
E-mail: abarirega@mtti.go.ug

Mr. Aggrey Rwetsiba
Senior Monitoring and Research Coordinator
Uganda Wildlife Authority
Plot 7 Kira Road, Kamwokya
P.O. Box 3530
Kampala
Uganda
Tel: (+256) 772 499735 / 414 346291
E-mail: aggrey.rwetsiba@ugandawildlife.org

Mr. Charles Tumwesigye
Chief Conservation Area
Manager
Uganda Wildlife Authority
Plot 7 Kira Road, Kamwokya
P.O. Box 3530
Kampala
Uganda
Tel: (+256) 772 461 908 / 414 346 291
E-mail: charles.tumwesigye@ugandawildlife.org

OTHER OBSERVERS / AUTRES OBSERVATEURS**GOVERNMENTS / GOUVERNEMENTS****GERMANY / ALLEMAGNE**

Mr. Edward Ragusch
Desk Officer
Federal Ministry for the Environment,
Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety
Robert-Schuman-Platz 3
53175 Bonn
Germany
Tel: (+49 228) 99 3052663 / 99 3052684
E-mail: edwa.ragusch@bmu.bund.de

ITALY / ITALIE

Mr. Fernando Spina
ISPRA – Istituto Superiore per la Protezione e
la Ricerca Ambientale
Via Ca' Fornacetta 9
I-40064 Ozzano Emilia (BO)
Italy
Tel: (+39 51) 65 12 214 / 347 35 07 032
Fax: (+39 51) 79 66 28
E-mail: fernando.spina@isprambiente.it

**UNITED NATIONS AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS
NATIONS UNIES ET ORGANISATIONS INTERGOUVERNEMENTAL**

IUCN

Dr. Liz Williamson
Coordinator, GRASP Specialist Group
IUCN
University of Stirling
G414RL Glasgow
United Kingdom
Tel: (+44 7752) 077463
E-mail: caw1@stir.ac.uk

LUSAKA AGREEMENT TASK FORCE

Mr. Bonaventure Ebayi
Director
Lusaka Agreement Task Force
Langata KWS Headquarters
Off Lang'ata Road
Box 3533-00506
Nairobi
Kenya
Tel: (+254) 721999341
E-mail: bonaventure@lusakaagreement.org;
Bonaventure_ebayi@yahoo.fr

**UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT
PROGRAMME (UNEP)**

Mr. Ash Neville
Chief, Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services
Branch, DEPI
United Nations Environment Programme
P.O. Box 30552
00100 Nairobi
Kenya
Tel: (+254 20) 762 6106
E-mail: Neville.ash@unep.org

NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS / ORGANISATIONS NON-GOUVERNEMENT

HUMANE SOCIETY INTERNATIONAL

Ms. Alexia Wellbelove
Senior Program Manager
Humane Society International
439
2107 Avalon, NSW
Australia
Tel: (+61 4) 15954600
E-mail: alexia@hsi.org.au

UNEP/GRASP

Mr. Douglas Cress
GRASP Programme Coordinator
Great Apes Survival Partnership (GRASP)
United Nations Environment Programme
P.O.Box 30552
00100 Nairobi
Kenya
Tel: (+254) 20 762 6712 / 704 913 000
E-mail: Douglas.Cress@unep.org

Dr. Johannes Refisch
GRASP Programme Manager
Great Ape Survival Partnership (GRASP)
United Nations Environment Programme
P.O. Box 30552
00100 Nairobi
Kenya
Tel: (+254 20) 762 4517 / 762 4249
E-mail: Johannes.Refisch@unep.org

**MOUNTAIN GORILLA VETERINARY
PROJECT**

Dr. Michael Cranfield
1876 Mansion House Drive
21217 Baltimore
United States of America
Tel: (+1 410) 917 7666
E-mail: cranfield.mike@gmail.com

MIGRATORY WILDLIFE NETWORK

Dr. Margi Prideaux
Policy and Negotiations Director
Migratory Wildlife Network
Pennehsaw LPO641
5222 Dudley East
Australia
Tel: (+61 4)14555398
E-mail: margi@wildmigration.org

Mr. Nicolas Entrup
Policy Advisor, Migratory Wildlife Network
Scheidlstr.450
1180 Vienna
Austria
Tel: (+43) 6602119963
E-mail: n.entrup@shiftingvalues.com

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION SOCIETY

Dr. Elizabeth Macfie
Gorilla Coordinator, Species Program
Wildlife Conservation Society, 24747
502 Karen - Nairobi
Kenya
Tel.: (+254) 733 623872; (+44) 7810393740
E-mail: lmacfie@wcs.org

**WORLD WIDE FUND FOR NATURE -
WWF**

Mr. David Greer
Coordinator, African Great Apes Programme
WWF
6676 Yaoundé
Cameroon
Tel: (+237) 77117357
E-mail: dgreer@wwf.panda.org

ZOOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF LONDON

Mr. Paul De Ornellas
Projects Coordinator for the African
Programme
Zoological Society of London
Regent's Park
NW1 4RY London
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern
Ireland
Tel: (+44 207) 449 6559
E-mail: paul.deornellas@zsl.org

SECRETARIAT**UNEP/CMS Secretariat**

United Nations Campus
Hermann-Ehlers-Str. 10
53113 Bonn, Germany
Tel: (+49 228) 815-2401
Fax: (+49 228) 815-2449
E-mail: secretariat@cms.int

Mr. Bert Lenten
Deputy Executive Secretary
Tel. (+49 228) 815-2407
E-mail: blenten@cms.int

Ms. Melanie Virtue
Acting Agreements Officer
Tel. (+49 228) 815-2462
E-mail: mvirtue@cms.int

Ms. Andrea Pauly
Associate Programme Officer
Tel. (+49 228) 815-2477
E-mail: apauly@cms.int

Mr. Robert Vagg
Tel. (+49 228) 815-2476
E-mail: rvagg@cms.int

Ms. Stella Reschke
Tel. (+49 228) 815-2439
E-mail: sreschke@cms.int

Ms. Marie Mevellec
Tel. (+49 228) 815-2456
E-mail: mmevellec@cms.int

ENB

Ms. Alice Miller
IIOSD, Ca.
Tel.: +44 7969917883
E-Mail: alicem@iisd.org

Ms. Kate Louw
IISD, Ca.
Tel.: +27834509103
E-Mail: kate@iisd.or