



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

Secretariat provided by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

Report of the Twelfth Meeting of the CMS Scientific Council

Glasgow, Scotland, United Kingdom, 31 March - 3 April 2004

1. Opening remarks

1. The Chair, Colin Galbraith (United Kingdom), opened the meeting and introduced Ms Isabel Glasgow, Chair of the West Areas Board of Scottish Natural Heritage. Ms Glasgow welcomed the participants to Scotland and briefly reviewed the main historical and natural characteristics of the Clyde area, including the establishment in 2002 of Scotland's first National Park covering Loch Lomond and the Trossachs. She underlined the key role of the CMS and its Scientific Council as global mechanisms for the conservation of migratory species of wild animals. She emphasized the importance of adopting an evidence-based approach, founded on a solid scientific basis, when providing information to the public and proffering advice to decision-makers on issues related to the conservation of the natural heritage. By analysing data clearly and reporting on it concisely, the Scientific Council could make a major contribution to the formation of perceptions and therefore to forwarding the global agenda for the conservation of biological diversity.

2. Ms Hilary Neal (United Kingdom), speaking as Chair of the CMS Standing Committee, emphasized that the Scientific Council was one of the principal engines of the effectiveness of the CMS in conserving migratory species of wild animals. She added that the programme of the meeting had been arranged so as to allow as many members of the Council as possible to attend the conference on Waterbirds around the World, to be held in Edinburgh the following week.

3. Mr John Mshelbwala (Nigeria), Vice-Chair of the Scientific Council, recalled that African countries faced many challenges in taking effective action for the conservation of migratory species. If the measures adopted in African countries fell short of expectations, the practical difficulties involved should be taken into consideration and the necessary support provided to the respective councillors and focal points so that they were able to fulfil their functions more effectively. He hoped that this situation would be discussed during the meeting with a view to identifying ways forward.

4. Mr Marco Barbieri (CMS Technical Officer) welcomed the participants on behalf of the Secretariat and conveyed the regrets of Mr Arnulf Müller-Helmbrecht, Executive Secretary of the CMS, that he could not be present at the meeting. He gave warm thanks to Scottish Natural Heritage for hosting the meeting just three years after it had hosted the Tenth Meeting in Edinburgh. He also thanked the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs of the United Kingdom for the logistical and technical support provided. He added that the CMS was in a dynamic phase, as illustrated by the growth in its membership. It now had 85 Parties, with several others being fairly near to joining in the near future. Significantly, the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP) had entered into force since the last meeting of the Scientific Council. A secretariat had also been established for the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on the Indian Ocean and South-East Asia, which would act as a regional conduit for the Bonn office, thereby reflecting the extension of the CMS' influence. A number of Memoranda of Cooperation (MoCs)

had been concluded with other organizations. There had also been changes in the Secretariat, with the departure of Douglas Hykle to Bangkok, and others were anticipated in the near future. All of this was occurring at a time when the CMS was having to adapt to a rapidly changing context, as reflected in the dynamic surrounding the holding of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in Johannesburg in 2002. The CMS would therefore need to take up the challenge of remaining relevant in this changing context without losing its basic *modus operandi*, namely the close link that it had always maintained between science and practical conservation work.

5. The Chair emphasized that there was much to do and a very long way to go. It should always be recalled that more could be achieved for the protection of globally threatened species by working together than by acting separately. Science had a very important role to play in furthering the impact of the CMS. The present meeting was of particular importance as it was called upon to take strategic decisions, the effect of which could be to take the action of the Scientific Council to a higher level, particularly by reinforcing its collaboration with other Convention and Agreement scientific bodies, secretariats, the representatives of local communities and national decision-makers. The key question was therefore how the Scientific Council could become more effective and efficient. For this purpose, the expertise and enthusiasm of all the councillors would be required. It was in this context that he welcomed particularly the new members of the Scientific Council.

2. Adoption of the agenda

6. The meeting had before it a provisional agenda (ScC12/Doc.1), an annotated provisional agenda (ScC12/Doc.2) and a provisional schedule (ScC12/Doc.2.1 rev.1). There being no comments, the agenda and schedule were adopted as presented. The Agenda is attached to this report as Annex 2.

7. Mr Barbieri (CMS Technical Officer) explained that, as decided at the 11th meeting of the Scientific Council, as many of the pre-session documents as possible had been distributed in electronic form on CD-ROM, although the most recent documents were being distributed in hard copy. He believed that this would be the way forward for the future and noted that it would result in major savings for the Secretariat in mailing costs. He also observed that as many of the documents as possible had been translated into CMS' three working languages. However, due to budgetary restrictions the Secretariat could not afford to have all the documents translated and he therefore hoped that it had made the right choices in selecting the documents for translation.

3. Developing a strategy for the work of the Scientific Council

3.1 *Suggested structure for the Strategy (from the November 2003 Edinburgh workshop)*

8. Introducing Document ScC12/Doc.3, the Chair recalled that the 7th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the CMS (COP7) had adopted a strong resolution instructing the Scientific Council “*to produce a strategy on its scientific and conservation work, taking into account the ecology of species listed in the CMS Appendices as well as the factors which may threaten or endanger migratory species, leading to clear priorities for action and including appropriate considerations of monitoring the implementation of such a strategy*” (Res. 7.12). He emphasized that the adoption of such a strategy would be a major step forward in the work of the Scientific Council. The document submitted on this subject tried to be forward-looking and had been prepared by Michael Moser, who was not able to attend the present meeting, but who had facilitated a workshop held in Edinburgh in November 2003, consisting of a small number of

councillors, which had reviewed and amended the proposals for the strategy and its implementation. He recalled that a strategy was needed for a number of reasons. Firstly, the numbers of species on the Appendices to the CMS, which demanded the attention of the Scientific Council, were increasing. It was therefore necessary to attain an improved understanding of the threats facing migratory species. Moreover, the funding available for conservation actions was inadequate, leading to the need to make hard decisions on prioritization. The number of members of the CMS, and therefore of the Scientific Council, was increasing and there was a greater need to coordinate more closely and effectively with other Conventions. This all meant that it was now necessary to work in a different way. As a result, an overall plan was being developed for the implementation of the CMS and it was necessary to see where the work of the Scientific Council fitted into this plan. In other words, it was important to take a step back and assess how well the Scientific Council had been working, where improvements could be made and whether it was necessary to adopt different working practices as the overall situation changed.

9. Mr Barbieri added that the councillors should indicate whether they were comfortable with the approach outlined by the Edinburgh workshop, which was to endeavour to ensure that the proposed Strategic Implementation Plan for the Scientific Council remained within the general framework of the CMS Strategic Plan for 2006-2011. In particular, to make the linkage between the two documents explicit, the activities proposed in the Implementation Plan had been structured under the relevant Goals and Operational Objectives included in the draft CMS Strategic Plan for 2006-2011. The processes for the elaboration of the two documents were however somewhat separate from each other, with input to them being provided by different actors. The partial independence of the two processes was the origin of some discrepancies between the Goals and Operational Objectives as enumerated in Annex 1 of Document ScC12/Doc.3, which incorporated the relevant proposals made by the Edinburgh workshop, and those appearing in the draft CMS Strategic Plan for 2006-2011 tabled as document ScC12/Doc.4. A revised version of the draft CMS Strategic Plan for 2006-2011 had been prepared by the Chair of the Working Group in charge of the elaboration of the Strategic Plan, which incorporated several suggestions from the Workshop in Edinburgh but also input from other actors. The document was tabled as ScC12/Doc.22. If the proposed approach for the elaboration of the Scientific Council Strategy was maintained, plans existed to undertake periodic reconciliations of the Scientific Council Strategy Implementation Plan and the CMS Strategic Plan in order to keep the two documents in harmony.

10. Several councillors welcomed the proposed Scientific Council Strategy Implementation Plan. Mr. Devillers (European Communities) suggested that, in view of the detailed list of work to be carried out, a strong statement would be required under each Operational objective indicating the most urgent priorities. Otherwise, the impression might be given that all the review work already undertaken would have to be recommenced, which would clearly be a serious retrograde step. In this respect, the right-hand column, which was currently fairly empty, should be used to further specify the priorities for the action to be taken. Mr. Muembo (Democratic Republic of the Congo) said that the Plan should adopt more of an overview of the situation of all migratory species, rather than focusing mainly on species listed on Appendix I. Moreover, rather than laying emphasis on future protected areas, he thought that priorities should be set, especially in relation to the current measures that were being taken for the protection of species, particularly in the protected areas that currently existed. Finally, he said that the indicators should include mention of the persons and organizations responsible for carrying out the actions identified. Mr. Heredia (Spain) pointed to a number of inconsistencies in the Spanish version of the document and the difficulties involved in developing an implementation plan for a strategy, which had not yet been finalized. Nevertheless, he believed that Document 3 was a very focussed and worthy contribution to the process.

11. The meeting proceeded to examine each of the goals set out in Annex 1 to Document 3.

Goal 1: All endangered migratory species are protected and benefit from conservation actions to return them to favourable conservation status (Appendix I species (Art. III))

12. The Chair recalled that this was a very important goal and that most of the species involved were globally threatened and facing extinction. Ms Neal (CMS Standing Committee Chair), noting that Operational Objective 1.2 called upon the Scientific Council to review the legal protection status of species listed in Appendix I and provide recommendations to Contracting Parties in this field, expressed the belief that such legal matters should be left to others and that the Scientific Council should focus on scientific matters. Mr Devillers (European Communities) agreed that less emphasis should be placed on legal matters than on the importance of conservation measures for the species involved.

Goal 2: All migratory species with an unfavourable conservation status benefit from appropriate conservation and management measures (Appendix II species (Art. IV))

13. The Chair emphasized in this respect that it was necessary to give priority to the development of Agreements to protect species that were not adequately covered by other international or regional initiatives and to develop and improve coordination with the secretariats of the relevant agreements.

Goal 3: Major threats to migratory species and obstacles to animal migration are identified and assessed, and measures are taken to control, remove or mitigate them

14. Mr Storkersen (Norway) welcomed the goal, but emphasized the need to be clear and succinct concerning the type of action to be taken, particularly in view of the political unwillingness to accept all the measures proposed by scientists, for example to prevent harm to birds from wind turbines and electrical power lines. Ms Neal (CMS Standing Committee Chair) recalled her comment concerning Goal No. 1 that the Scientific Council should not be involved with legal aspects of the protection of migratory species, as proposed in Operational objective 3.2.2. She added that two months ago at its meeting in Kuala Lumpur, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity had adopted a resolution on protected ecological areas and noted that any action by the CMS should be seen in the context of that resolution.

15. Mr Oteng-Yeboah (Convention on Biological Diversity, Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice – CBD SBSTTA) said that it was the intention of the Secretariat of the CBD to coordinate closely with the CMS. Ms Nickson (World Wide Fund for Nature - WWF International) expressed support for the proposed work, but believed that reference should also be made of the problem of by-catch, especially in relation to marine turtles and cetaceans. Mr Simmonds (Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society - WDCS) informed the Scientific Council that the WDCS was undertaking regular reviews of some of the threats to cetaceans under the auspices of ASCOBANS and ACCOBAMS. In particular, it had recently considered the issue of marine wind farms as a threat to marine animals, and had prepared a website addressing marine protected areas in relation to cetacean conservation.

16. The Chair acknowledged the importance of addressing the issues of wind turbines, power lines and by-catch. He noted that the relations between the CMS and the CBD were already good, but that joint work between the Conventions would become even more important in the future and that closer coordination would be required in scientific matters in the years to come. While Goal No. 3 was not especially concerned with site protection, the assessment of threats was a major part of the strategy. He re-emphasized the need for a scientific basis for action and, in this respect, noted the importance of taking into account the data sets maintained by other bodies.

Goal 4: To improve the availability of information for conserving migratory species through strategic research and monitoring, and to use this to develop capacity and awareness.

17. Mr Fragoso (UNEP WCMC) noted the proposals related to information with great interest and suggested that linkages were identified between the proposed activities of the Strategy Implementation Plan and the CMS Information Management Plan adopted by COP6. Mr Camara (Gambia) agreed that the gathering and dissemination of information were of the greatest importance in improving awareness, and therefore in increasing the membership of the Convention and promoting action for its implementation. He expressed the belief that greater emphasis should be placed on field programmes so that the real benefits of the action taken could be seen in practice, and particularly the benefits for the livelihoods of local communities. Mr Schlatter (Appointed Councillor), while welcoming the important work that had been carried out in relation to the strategy, expressed concern that its implementation depended on action at the national level. It would therefore be important to develop sound national implementation strategies. For this purpose, it would be very important to hold regional meetings to convey the necessary information and to decide on a common strategy in relation to protected areas and species. When all the information was made available, it would be possible to develop national strategies based on scientific information. Mr Limpus (Appointed Councillor) requested a correction in the present text in relation to reptiles, under which the sole reference was to marine turtles. However, there were also migrant freshwater reptiles, and the correct term would be "*reptilia*". With regard to all the goals, he noted that their implementation would to a large extent involve other Agreements and MoUs. A clearer linkage should therefore be established in the document calling for the provision of information by the institutions concerned, not just to the CMS, but also to the Scientific Council itself.

3.2 *Links to the CMS Strategic Plan and the role of the Scientific Council*

18. Mr Biber (Switzerland) explained that the next meeting of the COP of the CMS had to adopt a CMS Strategic Plan 2006-2011. The process had been initiated at the previous meeting of the COP (COP7), which had created an intersessional working group, of which he was the Chair, to push the process forward. The working group had finalized a first draft of the Strategy, which was contained in Document ScC12/Doc.4 and which had been circulated for comments at the end of 2003 to the Parties to the CMS, the members of the Scientific Council and the secretariats of the Agreements and MoUs concluded under the CMS. The draft Strategy had provided a basis for the Edinburgh workshop in November 2003 to formulate a draft Implementation Plan for the Scientific Council, which had just been discussed (ScC12/Doc.3). The linkage between the two documents was based on the concept that the CMS Strategic Plan formed the skeleton which then needed to be filled in with implementation plans and programmes, as was being done by the Scientific Council. Clearly, the Scientific Council would only address part of the goals, with the others having to be dealt with by the Standing Committee and the Secretariat.

19. The Council briefly reviewed each of the Operational objectives of the proposed Implementation Plan, taking into account the modifications proposed by the Edinburgh workshop, which had been incorporated in document ScC12/Doc.22. The Chair noted that Operational objective 1.1 (*To ensure that migratory species, which are endangered, are listed in Appendix I*) was a rolling programme, for which it was important that the Scientific Council had the necessary mechanisms in place. Operational objective 1.3 (*To prioritise Appendix I species for concerted action, and to identify priority conservation activities in collaboration with relevant stakeholders*) was self-explanatory. Operational objective 1.5 (*To review the success of conservation activities*) was a key area that should be examined by the working group. It was of great importance for the Scientific Council to ensure that it improved the manner in which it reviewed the successes and failures of its action, with a view to identifying areas in which it could do better.

20. Turning to Goal 2, the Chair observed that Operational objective 2.1 (*To ensure that Appendix II reflects accurately those migratory species with an unfavourable conservation status and which require international agreements for their conservation and management, as well as those which have a conservation status which would significantly benefit from international cooperation*) appeared to assume that Agreements would be more common in future, and therefore implied the need for greater collaboration between the Scientific Council and the secretariats of such Agreements. Operational objective 2.2 (*To prioritise the elaboration of agreements for species not adequately covered by other international or regional initiatives and to seek for that purpose collaboration with the relevant organisations*) constituted a strong recommendation for the Scientific Council to examine the manner in which it interacted with the CMS's daughter Agreements. Operational objective 2.3 (*To promote the conservation and management of Appendix II species throughout their migratory range through Agreements or cooperative actions*) raised the question of whether the Scientific Council had identified all the Agreements and MoUs that were practicable, or whether other new ones were needed.

21. With regard to Goal 3, the Chair wondered whether the Scientific Council could really claim that it assessed threats at specific levels, including the local level. The Goal was an invitation for the Scientific Council to adopt a more holistic approach in terms of threat control, based on an examination of the potential impact of specific threats. He added that Operational objective 3.1 (*To identify and assess the major threats to migratory species, and provide guidelines on their control, removal or mitigation*) would need to be a major part of the work of the Scientific Council over the years to come. Operational objective 3.2 (*To ensure the establishment of networks of protected areas and required species-specific habitats along migratory routes through/including ecosystem management and habitat restoration*) raised the question of the role of the CMS in relation to protected areas and the need to work with other bodies, based on a scientific assessment of whether the measures taken were successful, without dabbling in the legal aspects of such issues. Work on Operational objective 3.3 (*To address threats to migratory species and include conclusions in impact assessment procedures where possible*) would assist in reporting on the measures adopted. Operational objective 3.4 (*To remove or mitigate the impediments of obstacles to animal migrations*) constituted an exciting but challenging work programme, in which emphasis needed to be placed on delivery, based on a practical assessment of the available time and resources. The Scientific Council should ensure that its proposals in this respect consisted of a realistic "shopping list" that could be resourced over the next triennium, with the COP performing the function of links to the overall objectives of the Convention.

22. On the subject of Goal 3, Mr Limpus (Appointed Councillor) said that it had a very terrestrial flavour with its concentration on protected areas. In the marine environment, solutions other than protected areas would need to be found for the conservation of species, particularly in view of the issue of protection in international waters.

23. The Chair explained that Goal 4 had originated from the Edinburgh workshop, which had seen an improvement in the availability of information for conserving migratory species based on strategic research and monitoring, and the use of this information to develop capacity and awareness, as an important input from the Scientific Council. Operational objective 4.1 (*To undertake or promote scientific/strategic research to address the major issues affecting migratory species*) was a plea for the Scientific Council to be able to carry on its work with assistance from other bodies and parties. Operational objective 4.2 (*To monitor systematically migratory species as a basis for decision-making and to provide capacity building for monitoring*) reflected the need for reliable information on species, which gave rise to concern. Operational objective 4.3 (*To disseminate information on migratory species so as to enhance their conservation, through improved decision-making and greater public awareness*) was concerned with the need to use the information collected in a proactive manner. Mr Glowka (CMS Agreements Officer) added that

Operational objective 4.3 could provide a link with the CMS Information Management Plan. Finally, the Chair noted that Operational objective 4.4 (*To review the progress made in research, monitoring (coverage and quality), as well as in the degree of awareness of conservation enhancement and in monitoring capacity*) was of great importance.

24. The Chair noted with regard to Goal 5 (*The global membership in CMS reflects the full range of states of migratory species listed in Appendices I and II*) that the membership of CMS was progressing well, with 85 Contracting Parties at present and the expectation of more in the near future. Mr Devillers commented in relation to Operational objective 5.1 (*To increase membership to the Convention by proactive initiatives*) that the promotion of successful field activities would attract new members to the Convention.

25. On the subject of Goal 6 (*The Convention is fulfilling its leadership role concerning migratory species issues*), the Chair emphasized the importance of the Goal in terms of the outreach of the information produced. With regard to Operational objective 6.3 (*To help achieve by 2010 a significant reduction in the current rate of loss of migratory species diversity as a contribution to the WSSD 2010 target, notably through the joint work plan with CBD, and by using the global goals of CBD, through the development of appropriate indicators*), Ms Neal (CMS Standing Committee Chair) said that the 2010 target and the link with the CBD were essential aspects of the global action taken by the CMS. They should therefore be given a higher profile as overarching strategic objectives, which set the context for all the other goals, and operational objectives. Mr Glowka (CMS Agreements Officer) suggested that the reference to the 2010 target could be set out in a mission statement at the beginning of the Strategic Plan.

26. The Chair expressed some concern at the term “rationalise” in Operational objective 6.4 (*To rationalise arrangements for the institutions of the Convention*). However, Mr Davidson (Ramsar Convention) expressed the opinion that some of the current arrangements might indeed be irrational. All the action under Goals 1, 2 and 3 should logically be addressed under Goal 6. Moreover, there were some structural problems in Goal 6. Some of the operational objectives were related to institutional and financial matters, while others, such as Operational objective 6.2 (*To develop the CMS in a global network for conservation of migratory species*), were more strategic and tended to repeat Goals 1 and 2. Operational objectives 6.2 and 4.3 were also overlapping. Some further work could therefore be undertaken to distinguish more clearly between ways and means and more strategic objectives. The Chair invited Mr Davidson to join the working group.

27. In relation to Operational objective 6.5 (*To mobilise financial resources so as to meet the augmenting need for conservation measures*), the Chair observed that it was necessary to identify the resources necessary for the work of the Scientific Council and its projects, based on the development of a shopping list of institutional and action projects with a view to obtaining funding from different sources. In view of the hesitancy demonstrated by the Contracting Parties to increase the core funding for the CMS and other bodies, and in view of the urgency of taking action, it would be necessary to encourage governments to finance action directly. Mr Heredia (Spain) said that Operational objective 6.5 was crucial in view of the need to strengthen and enhance what was already being done. He hoped that the Strategic Plan would provide the opportunity for the CMS to consolidate the important work that it was doing.

28. Mr Biber (Switzerland) expressed some surprise that the Scientific Council had concentrated its comments on Goals 5 and 6, rather than Goals 1, 2 and 3, which covered the essence of its work. With regard to the issue of protected areas in the marine environment, he drew attention to the lengthy discussion of this subject at the COP of the Convention on Biological Diversity in Kuala Lumpur, where it had been recognized that areas beyond national jurisdictions played a crucial role in conservation and attention had been drawn to means of protection in the marine environment,

both on the surface and in deep waters. Some pessimism had been expressed concerning the possibility of taking action within the framework of the CBD in areas beyond national jurisdictions and emphasis had been placed on the need for action at the level of the Law of the Sea. With regard to the 2010 target, he noted that it had been referred to under the goal relating to the leadership role of the CMS in view of the responsibilities delegated to the CMS by the CDB through the joint programme of work. However, he agreed that the target covered everything that had to be done by the CMS and that emphasis should be placed on the target through its inclusion in a mission statement introducing the Strategic Plan. The Chair added that the interest shown by the Scientific Council in its working practice was undoubtedly due to the growth in the membership of the Convention.

29. The meeting endorsed the proposal by the Chair that a working group should be set up, facilitated by Mr Bagine (Kenya), to review all matters related to the Strategy and Implementation Plan, with particular reference to Annex 1 of Document ScC12/Doc.3, bearing in mind that work on the CMS Strategic Plan 2006-2011 was still ongoing and that comments could therefore still be made on the whole of the text, but focussing more particularly on the action to be taken by the Scientific Council, based on a forward-looking view of what needed to be achieved.

30. Reporting back on the discussions of the working group, Mr Bagine (Kenya) indicated that it had concentrated on the activities of the Scientific Council set out in Annex 1 rather than on the goals and operational objectives of the CMS Strategic Plan, which were still evolving. In doing so, the working group had endeavoured to take into account the functions of the Scientific Council, as defined in the Convention. In addition to the more detailed modifications of individual action lines, the key changes proposed by the working group consisted of: the removal of all the activities of a legal nature proposed under Operational objective 1.2, which were more the responsibility of the CMS itself than of the Scientific Council; the transfer of the activities under Operational objective 1.5 to Goal No. 4; and the elimination from Operational objective 4.3 of any activities relating to the dissemination of information, which may not be within the competence of the Scientific Council. The amendments proposed by the Working Group had been incorporated in a revised version of the Strategy Implementation Plan for the Scientific Council, which was tabled as document ScC12/CRP.2. The document is attached to this report as Annex 3.

31. In reply to a comment by Mr Perrin (Appointed Councillor) emphasizing the importance of the dissemination of information, the Chair noted that the Scientific Council had a major role to play in the development and maintenance of information, but that its wider dissemination was primarily the responsibility of other organs of the Convention.

32. Several councillors welcomed the input from the working group and raised the question of the schedule for further consideration of the Implementation Plan, particularly as there had not yet been any time to discuss it at the national level. Mr El Mastour (Morocco) noted that the Plan raised several legal and institutional issues that would require further consideration. Moreover, to avoid confusion as to which elements of the Plan were the responsibility of the Scientific Council and which were taken from the CMS Strategy; the document should be provided with a more developed introduction.

33. Ms Benites (Peru) suggested the inclusion in Annex 5 on the proposed format for CMS Appendix II Agreements and MoUs of reference to: the Convention for the Conservation and Management of the Vicuna, the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific and the Plan of Action for the Conservation of the Marine Mammals in the South Pacific.

34. Mr Biber (Switzerland) noted that the activities proposed by the Scientific Council fitted very well with the overall CMS Strategic Plan. Indeed, it was for the Scientific Council to decide

how closely the CMS Strategy and the Implementation Plan should be interlinked. Although he had no major concerns with regard to the proposed goals and operational objectives, he believed that it would be necessary to provide the Plan with a clearer introduction. An added complication was that new suggestions were still being received for the goals and operational objectives of the CMS Strategic Plan, some of which might require further expert clarification by the Scientific Council. There also remained certain terms and passages which had been left in square brackets by the Edinburgh workshop. If there were no further comments on these, he proposed that the documents should be consolidated, translated and submitted to the Standing Committee at its meeting in June.

35. The Chair agreed that the important date was the meeting of the Standing Committee in June. The submission of a more finalized document to the Standing Committee, showing how the Scientific Council's Implementation Plan fitted in with the CMS Strategic Plan, would send a powerful message from the Scientific Council. He noted the agreement that a clearer introduction should be prepared for the document, outlining the schedule of work and the relationship between the Implementation Plan and the CMS Strategic Plan. He welcomed the very productive contribution by the working group, which should continue to be active under the leadership of Mr Bagine. A further period of one month would be accorded to the councillors to send in further comments, after which time the document should be finalized for submission to the Standing Committee. At the present time, only high-level comments should be considered, with the detail being left to the next meeting of the Scientific Council, which should allocate a reasonable amount of time for a more detailed discussion, once the views of the Standing Committee had been received. **Action**. The Chair requested the Secretariat to circulate a note to councillors after the meeting outlining this schedule.

3.3 Reporting needs and the requirement to focus on conservation priorities

36. Mr Barbieri (CMS Technical Officer) recalled that the draft Implementation Plan placed great emphasis on information tools, reporting needs and the necessity of compiling background information. The Edinburgh workshop had made a very specific recommendation concerning the development of new information documents (ScC12/Doc.3, page 3), and the annexes to the document contained proposals for the format and content of these information tools. It would be useful if the Council could agree upon the various information tools for the implementation of the Plan. An attempt had already been made, in collaboration with UNEP-WCMC, based on sources of information that were already easily available, to produce model documents for certain species. These model information tools represented what it was possible to produce with the existing information sources. It was necessary to decide whether something useful and desirable could be developed from these sources of information, or whether the sources of information needed strengthening.

37. Mr Fragoso (UNEP-WCMC) reviewed the information tools produced on a trial basis in collaboration with CMS for the management of information on species, as indicated in document ScC12/Doc.5. These consisted of three basic tools, namely synoptic (or rapid) reviews, review reports (which were more comprehensive) and the concept of "rolling papers". The synoptic reviews were not intended to be comprehensive, but to provide an overview of the knowledge available to the CMS concerning the global status of each species and the actions taken within the context of the Convention. The key information sources were the data reported by the Parties through their national reports and the information available through selected expert organizations. The synoptic reviews were completed by a table showing the apparent trends for each species (indicated by arrows), the number of countries reporting action on the specific species and the areas in which a specific species and conservation actions were known to exist. The review reports provided a more extensive picture of the status of the species, their habitats and the legislative protection measures existing. The principal problem in this respect was to ensure the currency of the

information and to keep it up to date. The information exercise also served to highlight the tremendous information gaps that sometimes existed. The idea of a “rolling paper” was therefore intended to offer the possibility to the various parties to add information or notes on the Website on various related topics. The questions, which arose, concerned whether greater use should be made of the review reports, or just the synoptic reports, and the usefulness of the “rolling paper” concept. In addition, it was necessary to address the issue of how gaps and biases could be addressed, for example through the use of the information available to other Agreements.

38. Mr Limpus (Appointed Councillor) considered that this type of summary information was very valuable, although careful thought still needed to be given to its function and how it was to be used. He noted that there was a significant gap in the case of a number of countries between the action reported and what was actually happening. A reading of the synoptic reviews might give the impression that no action was being taken, when much was actually being done. Moreover, in time an increasing number of conservation actions would be covered by Agreements and MoUs, but these were not included in the document in its present format. A full picture should be provided of the action that was being taken and the Secretariat should be careful in its collaboration with UNEP-WCMC to ensure that this was taken into account. This should include information from countries which were not Parties to the CMS, but were members of its daughter Agreements or MoUs.

39. Mr Baker (Australia) added that reliance on country reports as a source of information for these information tools, particularly as the number of listed species increased, could give quite a misleading picture of the global status of a species. It might be more effective if the Appointed Councillors fulfilled a quality control role based on their expertise in relation to the various species.

40. Mr Davidson (Ramsar Convention) called for care to be taken in the use of indicators. In the present format of the synoptic reviews, arrows were used for a number of purposes. One of these was for the actual status of the species and another was on what was being done. This could be confusing and raise questions concerning the effectiveness of the action taken. It would be necessary to be very clear about the objectives and purpose of the information tools and the indicators produced.

41. Mr Fragoso (UNEP-WCMC) agreed that the trial information exercise highlighted the lack of information available through the Agreements and the CMS Secretariat. The information tools could perhaps be made more complete if they were used to indicate information gaps and circulated to governments and focal points to encourage a more complete response, through an updating exercise.

42. The Chair welcomed the proposed information tools as a major step forward in the work of the Scientific Council and thanked UNEP-WCMC for the work carried out. However, he noted the importance of the issue of quality control, which highlighted the value of the “rolling paper” concept. The high number of downward arrows relating to the status of the species covered by the exercise was also profoundly worrying. He would be able to provide an overview of this activity to the next COP. He encouraged the Secretariat to further analyse the purpose of the proposed information tools and indicators, clarify the reporting procedures from information sources and examine the possibility of the circulation of the information to fill gaps. There could also be an important role for the Appointed Councillors in terms of quality control. The proposed information tools could become very powerful instruments and indicators, but would need to be further developed in time for the next COP.

43. Later in the meeting Mr. Perrin (Appointed Councillor), in reporting on the relevant discussions held within the Marine Mammals and Large Fishes Working Group, made the suggestion that the synoptic reports be reviewed by the Scientific Council as a whole, possibly via a

limited-access website, and subsequently by the relevant appointed councillors, and revised accordingly before being released. The proposal was endorsed by the meeting.

3.4 *Modus operandi of the Scientific Council*

44. The Chair observed that as the number of Contracting Parties to the Convention increased, it was necessary to examine how its institutions operated. In particular, as the urgency for action grew, it was necessary to review the expertise available and to involve the councillors more fully in the work of the CMS, especially during the periods between the meetings of the Scientific Council. He drew the attention of the meeting to document ScC12/Inf.20.

45. Mr Barbieri recalled that this subject had been discussed at the previous meeting of the Scientific Council. The main points requiring further discussion included mechanisms to strengthen the work of the Council at the regional level. Up to now, the Scientific Council had been rather centralized, focusing on its meetings. In an effort to strengthen work at the regional level, two regional councillors had been appointed, but their terms of reference and expertise had still not been fully clarified. Further reflection would also be welcome on the integration of work at the regional and taxonomic levels. Another issue concerned the increased involvement of CMS Agreements and other bodies in the work of the Scientific Council, as recommended by COP7. The Chairs of the various bodies were invited to attend the meetings of the Scientific Council, but the question remained as to how their work could be further integrated with that of the Council. Attention should also be paid to how collaboration could be further developed with observer organizations.

46. Mr Devillers (European Communities) agreed that it was necessary to increase the variety of sources of information and expertise available to the Scientific Council, which was at present very centralized. The Convention was very clear on the role of councillors, which was not to represent or advise any particular country, but to bring their independent expertise to a general scientific body. Furthermore, the Convention called for the appointment of specialist councillors to fill gaps in existing expertise. It would not therefore be appropriate to make a broad distinction between appointed councillors and those from the Parties to the Convention. However, he did not consider that the increasing number of councillors constituted a problem in terms of the Council's *modus operandi*; rather it provided an opportunity for the Convention to increase its 'reach' and effectiveness.

47. Mr Schlatter (Appointed Councillor) said that the Appointed Councillors did not receive information from the focal points in certain countries and were not included in all the channels for the exchange of information. It was therefore necessary to increase the level of cooperation between the Secretariat, the members of the Scientific Council and the focal points. It would be beneficial to hold regional technical and scientific meetings so that regional bodies were kept fully informed and mechanisms were developed at the regional level.

48. Mr Limpus (Appointed Councillor) outlined an ambiguity in the role played by certain councillors, who appeared to represent their country, but were not in practice involved in the action that was being taken at the national level, for example in the case of marine turtles. The question therefore arose as to how councillors could be involved more fully in the work of the Council on an intersessional basis.

49. The Chair said that the focus was on the role played by councillors and whether their experience was being used to the maximum level for the benefit of the Convention. He paid tribute to the invaluable role played by the Appointed Councillors in the field of data quality assurance, although he recognized that a discussion was needed on how best to forward the information

available to the Appointed Councillors. The issues outlined in Document ScC12/Inf.20 should be reviewed by the regional working groups.

50. Reporting on the discussions of the regional working group for Africa, Mr Mshelbwala (Nigeria) and Ms Sene Thiam (Senegal) recalled that Africa was one of the world's most important reservoirs for biodiversity and that the African countries that were Parties to the CMS therefore had a vital role to play. They also noted the numerous challenges faced by councillors and focal points in the region in fulfilling their respective responsibilities, especially between the meetings of the Scientific Council. They accordingly pledged their determination to be more actively engaged in the work of the Scientific Council and the CMS in general. They also regretted that the post of officer for the coordination of work in the region had not yet been filled and recalled that several decisions of COP7 needed to be addressed immediately, including: negotiating and concluding MoUs for the conservation of the African elephant in West and Central Africa, small cetaceans in West and Central Africa and Sahelo-Saharan antelopes in North and West Africa; and the organization of regional workshops on information management and regional intersessional meetings for councillors and focal points. With a view to strengthening CMS activities in the region, the working group proposed the creation by the Secretariat of a rotating post of African Councillor, which could be filled for two years by each of the subregions in Africa. It also recommended that the Secretariat take action to reinforce the capacity of African focal points and councillors. Finally, it recalled that it would be more effective to send all communications in the region by both normal mail and electronic mail to ensure that the councillors actually received all the necessary information.

51. **Summary/Action.** The Chair noted the suggestion for the creation of a rotating post and asked the Secretariat to consider the practical aspects of the proposal and raise the issue at the next meeting of the Standing Committee. He also noted the other areas in which the working group had called for further efforts and the importance of sending communications by normal mail.

52. Reporting on the discussions of the working group for Asia and Oceania, Mr Custodio (Philippines) said that only four councillors were present from the two regions. There was an urgent need to expand membership in the regions, with particular reference to China and the Russian Federation. The working group suggested that the Appointed Councillor for Asiatic fauna might play an important role in this regard.

53. **Summary/Action.** The Chair noted the concerns expressed concerning the membership of CMS in Asia and Oceania and undertook to write to Mr Ichida, the Appointed Councillor for Asiatic fauna, with a view to the development of an understanding with potential Parties and the improvement of coordination with existing Parties to the CMS.

54. Reporting on the discussions of the working group for Latin America and the Neotropics, Mr Schlatter (Appointed Councillor) indicated that it had been agreed that a Scientific Councillor should be maintained for the region and that the exchange of information at the regional level would be improved between the focal points and the Scientific Councillor, to be reported subsequently to the Secretariat. This exchange of information would be facilitated by Internet. The working group also proposed that a regional meeting should be held every two years. Argentina had offered to hold the first of these meetings, for which funding was being sought from various national and international organizations, including the CMS. It was recalled that the region was active in undertaking projects for the conservation of species and that it benefited from funding from NGOs. Nevertheless, the funding available was not sufficient and the Secretariat would have to play a role in prioritizing projects and obtaining funding from other sources.

55. **Summary/Action.** The Chair noted the efforts made to improve coordination at the regional level and requested the Secretariat to write to the Parties to the CMS in the region which were not

present at the current meeting to encourage their increased participation in the work of the Scientific Council.

56. Reporting on the discussions of the working group for the European region, Mr Bino (Albania) noted the concern expressed in the working group with regard to the lack of activity intersessionally between the meetings of the Scientific Council and the lack of continuity of experience of individual councillors. With a view to improving communications and intersessional work, it was proposed that an e-mail group and Webpage should be established for each region, to be managed by the Secretariat. To assist with the preparation of meetings, it would also be helpful if councillors could be provided in advance with a summary of the key points for discussion at the Scientific Council. It was also suggested that regional reports should be included in the main report for each meeting of the Scientific Council. Councillors in the European region believed that they needed greater support to be able to perform their roles effectively, based on better communication between councillors, and also possibly through a strengthening of joint coordination with other Conventions (perhaps based on the method of regional coordination adopted by Ramsar). There was also a need to improve internal communications within countries through the development of an appropriate structure or process, so as to provide more support for councillors outside their own area of specialization and to improve linkages with the action carried out under other Conventions. The actual methods of implementation would be for each country to decide upon according to national circumstances.

57. ***Summary/Action.*** The Chair noted the concern expressed with regard to the need for greater communication between councillors on an intersessional basis, as well as at the national level. He requested the Secretariat to examine the suggestions made by the working groups and to submit relevant proposals to the next meeting of the Standing Committee, based on an analysis of the resources and other measures required.

4. Scientific Council tasks arising from resolutions and recommendations of the Conference of the Parties

4.1 Concerted Actions for selected Appendix I species/groups (Res. 3.2, 4.2, 5.1, 6.1 and 7.1)

58. Reporting on progress in the implementation of Concerted Actions, recommendations of the Council for ongoing Concerted Actions and possible identification of other candidate species to be the subject of Concerted Actions were discussed within the following taxonomic working groups: Terrestrial Mammals; Marine Mammals and Large Fishes; Birds; Aquatic Reptiles. The reports of the taxonomic working groups are reproduced as Annexes 4-7 to this report.

59. The Council heard a report by Ms Beudels (Belgium) on the progress made with the Sahelo-Saharan antelopes Concerted Action, with particular reference to *Oryx dammah*, *Addax nasomaculatus*, *Gazella dama*, *Gazella leptoceros*, *Gazella cuvieri* and *Gazella dorcas*, for which a thorough status report had been published. She said that the action plan was in the process of being reviewed following the holding of a Range State workshop in 2003. A large network of experts and collaborators had been established and funding (1,375,000 euros) had been obtained from the FFEM, with matching funds from Range States and CMS, to finance a regional project.

60. The Scientific Council also noted the proposal by the working group for Africa that the species *Crocodylus cataphractus*, *Crocodylus niloticus*, *Hippopotamus amphibius* and *Choeropsis liberiensis* should be listed for Concerted Actions.

61. The Chair called upon the Secretariat to finalize the list of proposals for Concerted Actions in consultation with the respective councillors.

4.2 Cooperative Actions for Appendix II species (Recommendations 5.2, 6.2 and 7.1)

62. Mr Barbieri recalled that, in view of the perceived need to clarify the meaning and purpose of Cooperative Actions, COP7 had requested the Scientific Council to examine the issue of Cooperative Actions for migratory species, with particular reference to the distinction between Cooperative and Concerted Actions. This included a review of the practices followed in identifying species for Cooperative Actions.

63. Mr Devillers (European Communities) presented the paper that he had prepared on Concerted Actions, Agreements and Cooperative Actions, the operational tools of the CMS (ScC12/Doc.6). He said that there was a need to specify more precisely what was meant by a “Cooperative Action”, since in some quarters “Cooperative Action” was seen as equivalent to “Concerted Action”. Referring to the relevant provisions, he explained that species listed on Appendix I were those that were “endangered”, within the meaning of the CMS, for which Range States were required to take action for their conservation. In the case of species listed on Appendix II, the obligation for Range States was of a lower level, namely to “endeavour to conclude Agreements”. The listing of a species on Appendix II normally led in the shorter or longer term to the conclusion of an Agreement which, once ratified, tended to become an autonomous tool. Reviewing the hierarchy of levels of action, he indicated that: species listed on Appendix I for Concerted Actions required collaborative actions to prepare and implement a recovery plan; species listed on Appendix I but not for Concerted Actions required monitoring of individual actions by Parties; species listed on Appendix II but not for Cooperative Actions required the taking of steps towards the preparation of an Agreement; and species listed on Appendix II and for Cooperative Actions required cooperative efforts amounting to at least the monitoring of individual actions, and at most the implementation of an action plan. He added that, in cases where it was uncertain that it would be practicable to conclude an Agreement, a Cooperative Action could offer a less rigid form of activity for the conservation of a species.

64. Mr Barbieri noted that the scheme proposed by Mr. Devillers was likely to reflect the original concept of Cooperative Actions. However, the practice over the years showed that the designation of Appendix II species for Cooperative Actions had been seen by many as a stimulus to intensify action under the auspices of the CMS, rather than the contrary. In this regard, he noted that for species designated for Cooperative Actions some type of action had in many cases been undertaken; on the other hand for many species listed on Appendix II for many years and not designated for Cooperative Actions no apparent action had been undertaken yet within the Convention. On the basis of these considerations, he wondered whether the designation of species for Cooperative Actions should not be seen as a way to defer, for the time the species was listed on the Cooperative Action list, the obligation of the Parties to develop an Agreement, notably in cases where the conclusion of an Agreement was not practicable or advisable, while undertaking a different type of action, without however this having implications on the degree of priority between the two regimes.

65. The Chair agreed that it served no purpose for species to be listed on Appendix II if they were covered by neither an Agreement nor a Cooperative Action. He thanked Mr Devillers for preparing the document submitted to the Scientific Council and welcomed the discussion of the subject as a means of clarifying the motivations and criteria for Cooperative Actions in relation to species listed on Appendix II of the CMS and of providing guidance for the allocation of resources. **Action.** He requested that the Secretariat, in consultation with the councillors concerned, review the

document (ScC12/Doc.6) with a view to its resubmission to the next meeting of the Scientific Council and the next COP.

4.3 Other resolutions and recommendations (not already covered under previous agenda items)

(a) Resolution 7.2: Impact assessment

66. Mr Glowka drew attention to the provisions of Resolution 7.2 adopted by COP7 and the information contained in document ScC12/Doc.8, with particular emphasis on the need for the Secretariat and the Parties to develop collaboration with the International Association for Impact Assessment (IAIA) and for the Scientific Council, in cooperation with IAIA, Ramsar STRP, CBD SBSTTA and other qualified bodies, including the CMS Agreements, to review existing international guidance relating to Environmental Impact Assessment, “identify gaps in relation to migratory species interests and if necessary, develop further guidance relating to migratory species issues for consideration and possible adoption” by COP8. The Scientific Council would therefore have to consider how this should be carried out, for example through the establishment of an intersessional working group.

67. Ms Treweek (International Association for Impact Assessment - IAIA) briefly reviewed the activities of IAIA, an international NGO with a network of experts and contacts covering almost 170 countries, which promoted good practice in impact assessment, including in the fields of social impact assessment, strategic environmental assessment and ecological impact assessment. While most of its work was of a voluntary nature, IAIA received funding from the Dutch Government for a capacity-building project in the field of biodiversity and impact assessment. The project addressed capacity building needs to make sure that EIA was used to support the work of the biodiversity-related conventions, and to promote good practices in IA as a tool to promote conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. The project was developing guidance on Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), which could be a subject of particular interest to CMS, considering the interest of assuring that the needs of migratory species were considered already at the policy and planning levels. The project was also developing a regional focus, with activities implemented primarily in southern Africa, Central America, possibly the Mekong Basin and some small island states. In view of the importance of migratory species, the IAIA was keen to develop collaboration with the CMS and other biodiversity Conventions, to which it could offer, through its extensive network of experts, a channel for the dissemination of information and the provision of expertise. She therefore called for a mechanism for interaction with the work of the Scientific Council, particularly to review the application at the national level of existing flyway treaties, the development of GROMS in relation to screening for impact assessment and the IUCN threat status list with a view to providing clear information on species for which conservation measures were required. IAIA could contribute by reviewing guidance in relation to migratory species and would like to be provided with advice and expertise on case studies related to these species so that IAIA could ensure that its outputs addressed the needs of migratory species.

68. Mr Davidson (Ramsar Convention) emphasized that IAIA was potentially a very valuable partner with its broad network, particularly in the important area of forming better links at the national level between governments and IAIA experts in the field of biodiversity. He said that impact assessment was an area in which there was already close cooperation between Ramsar, CBD and IAIA and that it was important to include the secretariats of other Conventions and Agreements in this collaboration. The ecosystem approach constituted a significant challenge in relation to migratory species, considering that it tended to focus on individual single ecosystems, whereas migratory species tended to use very different ecosystems at different times of the year. In this regard, IA-related techniques such as risk assessment and early warning systems, applied across the

range used by populations through their annual cycle could be a key focus for CMS. There was good potential for synergy in all the various areas of the conservation of biodiversity, provided that the necessary expertise was shared and transmitted in the correct manner. Mr Oteng-Yeboah (CBD SBSTTA) added that the integration of environmental impact assessment, as called for the Resolution 7.2, had the potential to be an effective mechanism for the removal of the traditional conflict between development processes and the conservation of biological diversity.

69. **Summary/Action.** The Chair recognized the clear synergy between the work of the Scientific Council and that of IAIA. He said that the working group on threats that had been formed should include responsibility for the scientific evaluation of the items discussed, but that the main contact should at first be between IAIA and the CMS Secretariat, which should identify the main priorities for the activities of the CMS based on the work carried out by CBD and Ramsar. The Secretariat should also facilitate contacts between IAIA and the individual councillors most closely concerned with its work, for example in the geographical areas outlined by the representative of IAIA. He also requested the Secretariat to report back to the next Scientific Council on the progress made in its collaboration with IAIA and for IAIA to be represented at the next meeting of the Scientific Council.

(b) Resolution 7.4: Electrocution of migratory birds and (c) Resolution 7.5: Wind turbines and migratory species

70. Mr Barbieri noted that preliminary reviews of these two subjects had been undertaken and the question before the Scientific Council was whether, and on what basis, it should continue to address these issues. The Chair recalled that the subjects had been raised at COP7 and, in view of the very sensitive issues involved, proposed the establishment of a working group on threats to migratory species to suggest the approach that should be adopted by the Scientific Council.

71. Mr Baker (Australia), subsequently reporting back on the discussions of the working group, recalled that the electrocution of migratory birds by powerlines and the threats to migratory species arising from wind turbines had been discussed previously by the Scientific Council, leading to the adoption of two resolutions by COP7. He drew attention to the report on the electrocution of migratory birds (ScC12/Inf.26), drawn up by BirdLife International on behalf of the Bern Convention, and which was made available to the Scientific Council with the kind permission of the Bern Convention Secretariat. The report drew attention to three main types of risk to birds from above-ground powerlines. These were: the risk of electrocution, when birds sitting on power poles or conducting cables were killed if they caused short circuits; the risk of collision with cables by birds in flight; and the reduction in the availability of staging and wintering areas for birds when above-ground powerlines cut across open landscapes and habitats. The main risk was to larger birds, such as the Great Bustard, storks, cranes and eagles. The report provided clear recommendations for technical solutions to these problems, but complained that many electric utility companies did not seem to be aware of the measures that could be taken. In particular, international companies continued to export equipment to developing countries which failed to include these precautionary measures. The report also noted that sensible changes to the routing of powerlines and changes to pole/tower design could effectively reduce the risks posed to birds. The issue was less clear-cut with reference to bats, although there was evidence of a threat to fruit bats from powerlines. He therefore called upon the CMS to request the parties to provide further information on this issue and to carry out case studies as a basis for taking steps to inform countries of the technical solutions available.

72. With regard to the threat of windfarms to birds, Mr Baker drew attention to the report prepared by BirdLife International (ScC12/Inf.27) on behalf of the Bern Convention, which was also made available to the Scientific Council with the kind permission of the Bern Convention

Secretariat. The main threats to birds from windfarms were disturbance and loss of, or damage to habitat due to the installation of wind turbines and the associated infrastructure, and collision. Moreover, there were cases in which windfarms, including those in the marine environment, had been constructed along the migratory routes of certain species. However, there were few comprehensive studies, and of those available most suffered from a lack of comparison of the situation before and after the installation of windfarms. There was a clear need for robust studies on the issue. In the case of the effect of windfarms on bats, it was difficult to gather together the necessary evidence. However, research in Sweden had showed that windfarms resulted in deaths of bats, which was supported by evidence from certain windfarms in the United States, where there was particular concern about the Indiana bat during its migration. There was therefore a need for a better assessment of the nature and scale of the problem in relation to bats, including the siting and design of wind turbines. There was also concern at the rapid and global expansion of windfarms in the marine environment, particularly with regard to the threats caused by habitat loss and the possible impact from the physical presence of the windfarms and from noise associated with their construction and operation. He noted that the possible impacts of marine windfarms on cetaceans were under review by the IWC. The overall issue was therefore of interest and concern to the CMS and should be kept under review.

73. On the subject of other barriers to the migration of migratory species, Mr Baker referred to the possible effects of noise, particularly of a powerful and low frequency nature, emitted into the marine environment, on cetaceans. A major review was being undertaken on this issue by the United States Marine Mammal Commission, the results of which would certainly help the Scientific Council evaluate this potential threat to migratory species. Another issue was that of light, especially in mountain areas, along important migratory routes, and its effect on birds, which should be reviewed. Finally, he noted the helpful review undertaken by Professor Wolff of artificial barriers to migration of species across international borders in terrestrial and riverine environments. The working group therefore proposed that an intersessional working group should be established to further consider the threats posed to migratory species from powerlines and windfarms, and that it should report back to the next meeting of the Scientific Council. The members of the current working group indicated their willingness to continue and would welcome the participation of other councillors. The full report of the working group is reproduced as Annex 8 to this report.

74. Mr El Mastour (Morocco) reported on the action taken in his country in relation to artificial barriers to migration, including motorways and electrical infrastructure. The approach that was being adopted was to require the promoters of such projects to cover the costs of initial impact and follow-up studies and of the adoption of the necessary measures, which were often implemented in collaboration with interested NGOs. This approach offered a model which could be followed elsewhere and which could provide a basis for assistance to developing countries with a view to the protection of migratory species.

75. ***Summary/Action.*** The Chair agreed that the working group should continue its work on an intersessional basis and welcomed the fact that the members of the group were willing to pursue their efforts. He noted the problem of powerlines and the expectation that all Parties should use appropriate technology, including in relation to the equipment exported to other countries. With regard to windfarms, he encouraged the working group and the Parties to carry out research to clarify and quantify any impact. He noted that in some cases windfarms might well be a barrier to migration, but in other cases it would be necessary to carry out research to clarify their impact.

(d) Resolution 6.2 and Recommendation 7.2: By-catch

76. Mr Barbieri indicated that this issue was being raised as an information point which did not require specific action by the Scientific Council. A working group had been established by the

previous meeting of the Scientific Council, leading to the adoption of Recommendation 7.2. He said that the problem could be examined in greater detail by the next meeting of the Scientific Council, based on the reports of the Parties. He drew attention to a study that had been undertaken by the Government of the United Kingdom (ScC12/Inf.10). Although the study focused on the situation in relation to the United Kingdom, it also considered the issues involved in relation to overseas territories and was one of the first studies to address specifically the impact of the issue of by-catch on migratory species.

77. Mr Notarbartolo di Sciara (ACCOBAMS) said that the issue of by-catch was of concern in the Mediterranean and Black Seas in relation to several species of Cetaceans, including some designated for Concerted Action such as the sperm whale and the fin whale, which were severely affected by drift nets. This issue was being raised with the General Fisheries Council of the Mediterranean. He also expressed concern at reports that there had been an increase in the global population of sperm whales and said that extreme caution should be exercised in this respect, recommending to take the advice of the IUCN cetacean specialist group in this regard.

78. Mr Baker (Australia), in response to an invitation from the Chair, volunteered to take on the role of leading the action of the Scientific Council on this issue. He added that the by-catch of seabirds was a matter of concern, especially within the context of ACAP. Mr Simmonds (WCDS) offered to assist in this work, especially insofar as it related to cetaceans.

79. The Chair noted that the aim of the work in this area should be to follow the action taken at the global level across taxonomic groups, in consultation with the respective Agreements and Appointed Councillors, with a view to submitting a short review paper to the next Scientific Council, so that the issue could be raised at the next COP and the attention of the Parties drawn to the matter.

5. Proposals for amendments to Appendices I and II of the Convention at COP8

80. The working group on birds proposed the addition of *Calidris canutus rufa* to Appendix I, as well as nearly 40 species identified by BirdLife International in the critically endangered and endangered categories. A further 60 species in the vulnerable category should also be added to the Appendix. The working group on terrestrial mammals endorsed the proposal to add the following bat species to Appendix I: *Pteropus vampyrus*, *Leptonycteris curasoae* and *Leptonycteris nivalis*; and the following to Appendix II: *Eidolon helvum*, *Choeronycteris mexicana*, *Miniopterus schreibersii* and *Otomops martiensseni*.

81. **Summary/Action.** The Chair requested the Secretariat to engage in further consultations with the respective councillors with a view to finalizing the list of proposed amendments to Appendices I and II of the Convention, for submission to COP8.

6. Progress on other matters requiring Scientific Council advice

6.1 Potential new agreements

82. The Scientific Council heard a presentation by Mr Hutson reviewing the feasibility of additional bats agreements under the CMS (ScC12/Doc.13). Recalling that there were around 1100 bat species around the world, of which 22 per cent were considered threatened and a further 25 per cent near-threatened, he said that three quarters of bats were insectivorous and one quarter fed on fruit flowers. A small number were carnivorous, and only three species fed on blood. Bats suffered

from many of the problems common to other wildlife, including habitat loss and degradation due to such factors as human population pressure and forestry and agricultural practices. Threats to roost sites, and particularly caves and trees, were of great importance. Bats, especially vampire bats, were regarded as pests and suffered from persecution and superstition. There was a lack of scientific knowledge, particularly regarding the migration of bats. Nevertheless, bats played an important role in the ecosystem as environmental indicators and in their functions of pollination, seed dispersal and insect population management.

83. Several councillors referred to the beliefs in their countries concerning bats as carriers of diseases, including rabies and the Ebola virus. They agreed that there was a pressing need for further information so as to dispel such superstitions. It was important however to identify any actual dangers to human health from bats and the best measures to address these dangers, and raise awareness of the value of bats to the ecosystem. For example, it was not often realized that measures to control bat populations could easily lead to a serious rise in the numbers of insects, with detrimental effects on crop yields. Further information was also needed on the migratory habits of bats, or indeed on whether or not certain species of bats, which travelled long distances in search of food, were in practice migratory. The working group for the European region expressed strong support for the conclusion of agreements similar to EUROBATS covering other regions. The regional working group for Africa also supported the adoption of an African regional agreement covering migratory species of bats.

84. ***Summary/Action.*** The Chair thanked Mr Hutson for his presentation. He noted the issue of the perception of bat populations and the need to promote the adoption of further Agreements under the CMS. He called on the Secretariat to continue to work closely with Mr Hutson to obtain fuller information clarifying the role and status of bat species, outlining any threats to human health and balancing this with information on the economic role of bats.

85. The Scientific Council also heard a presentation by Mr Williams from DEFRA, UK on raptors. He emphasized the importance of raptors as symbols throughout history, as well as sentinels and indicators, in view of their position at the top of the food chain. Populations of raptors were small in relation to those of other birds and they were very susceptible to threats. He outlined the legal and practical measures adopted in the United Kingdom for the conservation of its 15 breeding species of raptors, which were all migratory. Noting the popular success of the re-establishment of Ospreys in Scotland, he also highlighted the important role that raptors could play in raising awareness of biodiversity issues. In conclusion, he outlined a proposal by the United Kingdom for a way forward in relation to raptors, which consisted of carrying out a scoping study gathering together all the available information on the habitats, migratory habits and routes of raptors, mapping their flyways and identifying the status of the various species. This would also cover such issues as whether raptors should be defined as including vultures and owls. Finally, the scoping study would look at the advantages and disadvantages of the various means of action available, including the development of action plans, wider MoUs or a fully-fledged Agreement.

86. ***Summary/Action.*** The Chair thanked Mr Williams for the presentation and welcomed the proposed study by the United Kingdom. He recognized the symbolism of raptors and the threats that they faced at the global level. He requested Mr Williams to report back to the next Scientific Council, so that the subject could be raised at the next COP.

6.2 Small-scale projects funded by CMS

87. Mr Barbieri gave an overview of the status of the small-scale projects financed by the CMS Trust Fund (ScC12/Doc.15) and noted that since COP7 some US\$ 400,000 had been allocated to a total of 14 projects. He said that there had been a substantive improvement in project delivery and

that considerable efforts had been made to finalize and deliver the funding decided upon by the COP for the various projects. The table in Document 15 endeavoured to summarize the current status of resource use for conservation projects funded by the CMS Trust Fund, including the resources already obligated and those expected to be used during the course of 2004. Few resources (some US\$126,000) remained available for further projects during the present financial period and the projects proposed greatly exceeded the availability of funding. The Scientific Council would therefore need to establish clear priorities with regard to the projects proposed.

88. Several councillors commented on the form in which the information on the status of small-scale projects was submitted to the Scientific Council. Mr Devillers (European Communities) welcomed the improvement in the information provided, but said that the decision of the Scientific Council in relation to each project should be indicated in the right-hand column, which in the present document was often left blank. It would also be useful to provide an indication of which COP had allocated the funding for the various projects. Ms Neal (CMS Standing Committee Chair) said that it would also be helpful to give an up-to-date estimate of the actual expenditure for each project so far. Mr Perrin (Appointed Councillor) added that project proposals should be submitted at least one meeting before they were examined so that a standing list of priority projects could be developed.

89. Mr Limpus (Appointed Councillor) said that in his view it was necessary to establish and publish reports on all the projects that were carried out so that the information that was gathered through project activities could be made available to the broader public. He suggested that a peer review system also be set up for the final reports of projects, for example involving the specialist councillors. The Scientific Council should also be provided with information on cases in which projects that had been given a high priority were not carried out. Mr Rilla Manta (Uruguay) indicated that information on the results of the activities carried out in the context of projects relating to his country would be published.

90. Ms Sene Thiam (Senegal) recalled that certain countries encountered great difficulties in the development of action plans for the conservation of species listed in the Appendices to the CMS and which were covered by MoUs. In other cases, plans of action were developed at the national level, such as the one for marine turtles in her country, but were not followed up. Assistance was therefore required from the CMS and from other Conventions for the planning and implementation of the necessary action through projects where appropriate. Mr Muembo (Democratic Republic of the Congo) added that certain project proposals had been sent in (mountain gorilla, elephants and marine turtles), but appeared to have been lost. He therefore sought clearance to resubmit them.

91. Mr Barbieri indicated that in general reports on projects were made available to the members of the Scientific Council and that the advice of the relevant councillors was sought. However, this was not a standard procedure and could be further strengthened in future. The situation with regard to the publication of project reports depended on the type of project. Some projects consisted, for example, of capacity-building activities or the development of action plans, for which the final reports would not necessarily be of great interest for publication. In reply to a question concerning a project proposed by Kenya on marine turtles, he indicated that following the previous meeting of the Scientific Council a more detailed submission had been received, and the project was expected to be managed through the Secretariat for the MoU on the Conservation and Management of Marine Turtles and their Habitats of the Indian Ocean and South-East Asia.

92. ***Summary/Action.*** The Chair noted that the information provided to the Scientific Council in future on the status of small-scale projects should include an indication of the Council meeting that had taken the decision concerning the project, the origin of the funding and the overall resources available. A standing list of priority projects should be developed, for which proposals should be

submitted at least one meeting of the Scientific Council prior to that at which they were to be considered for prioritization. There should also be a quality check on projects, with their final reports being subject to peer review and routed through the respective councillors.

93. Mr Barbieri indicated that the list of projects proposed by the working groups would be circulated with the report of the meeting. The list is appended as Annex 9. The Secretariat would contact those who had proposed projects with a view to further developing their specifications and project proposals would be taken into consideration to the extent that funding was available.

94. The Chair said that the Secretariat should inform the Appointed Councillors, with the Chair's approval, of any funding that became available. He requested the Secretariat to produce a composite list of priority projects for funding. He noted that more funding was expected to be available by the time of the next Scientific Council and that it should be allocated in a systematic manner. The Scientific Council should aim to develop a shopping list of projects in time for its next meeting. In view of the shortage of the available resources for these projects, funding should be sought by the Secretariat from other sources, and particularly from the Parties themselves.

6.3 2010 Global biodiversity target

95. Mr Harrison (UNEP-WCMC) recalled that 2002 had been a significant year for biodiversity, with the adoption of a strategic plan for the CBD at its sixth COP in April, the meeting of the Ministers responsible for CBD implementation in the Hague the same month and the gathering of Heads of State at the WSSD in Johannesburg in September. As noted in Document ScC12/Doc.17, the WSSD had implicitly endorsed the 2010 target for a significant reduction in the rate of loss of biodiversity in paragraph 44 of its Plan of Implementation. He described the progress that was being made by the CBD Secretariat in developing targets, objectives and global indicators for the achievement of the 2010 target. Reviewing the information and proposals contained in Document 17, he emphasized that the CMS was one of the very few global multilateral agreements explicitly dealing with the conservation of species and their habitats. It therefore directly addressed one of the key components of biodiversity and its mandate explicitly covered species with populations that occurred regularly in more than one country. He accordingly proposed that the CMS should explicitly recognize the relevance of the 2010 target to its activities and objectives, report on the action that it had taken to achieve the target and develop indicators on migratory species that could help assess progress in achieving the target. Document 17 contained a set of 10 recommendations on action to be taken for this purpose. He described the document as a rolling draft that could be significantly improved based on the initial advice of the Scientific Council, and with further input from the CMS and Agreement secretariats. He concluded that UNEP-WCMC would be very pleased to work with the Scientific Council and CMS on this subject.

96. Mr Oteng-Yeboah (CBD SBSTTA) indicated that there was already very close collaboration between CBD and CMS. He said that CMS was an important source of indicators on migratory species, which were important in indicating overall trends in the ecosystem as a whole. He therefore called upon the Scientific Council to determine how the CMS could best contribute information on the progress that was being made towards the achievement of the 2010 target.

97. Mr Davidson (Ramsar Convention) said that the information provided in national reports almost always concerned what was being done, rather than the outcomes of such action. This meant that the indicators that could be developed on the basis of this information were process indicators (for example on the creation of protected areas), rather than outcome indicators (any change for the better or worse in the status of specific species). The Ramsar Scientific and Technical Review Panel (STRP) had established a working group with the task of developing indicators for the effectiveness of the implementation of the Ramsar Convention. The group had produced a discussion paper

identifying the topics of possible indicators, and was now looking more practically at the construction of indicators able to yield understandable and relevant information. The availability of reliable data sets was a pre-requisite, and it could well be expected that for certain topics it might not be possible to construct a sensible indicator for the time being. For some type of indicators an obvious source of reliable information would have been the IUCN Red List, which was likely to be used by different conventions such as CMS and CBD. While each convention had to find the indicators fulfilling their specific needs, collaboration among them was to be recommended to mutually reinforce their respective efforts, rather than each one trying to reinvent the wheel.

98. Mr Vié (World Conservation Union – IUCN) referred to the work that was being undertaken by his organization on assessing the survival status of species. This work was well advanced in the case of birds, with the valuable collaboration of BirdLife International, the same work was being undertaken for mammals and was expected to be further expanded to cover other groups. One of the difficulties encountered was that each organization appeared to use a different reporting format, which made comparisons difficult, and that the various organizations were working on the production of indicators at different levels. He therefore called for greater collaboration between all those involved in the process of developing indicators and, more specifically, for the Scientific Council to look at the way in which information was captured from the Parties to the CMS.

99. Mr Simmonds (Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society - WDCCS) observed that the CMS was unique in being at the centre of its daughter Agreements, which should all be good sources of information for the development of indicators. He therefore called for closer collaboration with these Agreements, as well as with concerned NGOs in general. WDCCS, which was managing around 40 field projects, would welcome closer collaboration with CMS. He also noted that ACCOBAMS was well into the process of thinking about how to gauge the success of the action taken for the conservation of cetaceans in the area under its responsibility.

100. Mr Devillers (European Communities) welcomed the document prepared by UNEP-WCMC. However, he noted that it referred mainly to the measurement of the situation and he wondered what action was being taken in practice to achieve the goals set out, rather than just measuring them. In response, Mr Harrison said that all the various organizations were already taking action for the achievement of the targets, and it was for this reason that it was important to be able to measure the progress that was being achieved. Mr Oteng-Yeboah (CBD SBSTTA) indicated that the action that was being taken by all the organizations working for the conservation of biodiversity should be strengthened and extended through further partnerships. Ms Nickson (WWF International) noted that at the last CBD COP the conservation of migratory species was mentioned as a focal activity of the parties to that convention particularly in relation to the establishment of networks of protected areas within the protected areas programme of work, as well as in relation to marine and coastal programme of work. But such action would be more effective if collaboration was improved between the various Agreements.

101. **Summary/Action.** The Chair thanked UNEP-WCMC for preparing the document, which provided a good basis for further work. He noted the importance of all the parties concerned working together for the achievement of the 2010 target, which provided a focus for all the work that was being carried out in the field of the conservation of biodiversity and for the promotion of synergy in this respect. He therefore called upon the Secretariat to engage in further work with UNEP-WCMC, in liaison with the CBD, to clarify the best inputs, in terms of being realistic, effective and proactive, that the CMS could make to the achievement of the 2010 target. He undertook to write to the Chairs of CBD SBSTTA, Ramsar STRP and to IUCN offering the help of the Scientific Council in this respect, particularly in relation to the development of indicators.

6.4 Range State List for species listed on the CMS Appendices

102. Mr Barbieri indicated that the list of Range States of migratory species included in the CMS Appendices (ScC12/Doc.18) was being submitted to the Scientific Council for review and feedback. The list included all the new species added to the Appendices by COP7. The Range States for these species had been compiled on the basis of the information contained in the original proposals for their inclusion in the Appendices, in consultation with the councillors concerned. As a new feature, the document also contained an Addendum listing species by Range State Parties. He requested feedback on whether this new format was useful. The next Scientific Council would probably have to address the issue of the compatibility of the various lists of Range States produced within the context of CMS and in frameworks close to CMS. This issue was also raised in the document relating to GROMS (ScC12/Doc.23).

103. Mr Biber (AEWA) expressed some concern at the differences between the species listed in the CMS Appendices and those in AEWA Appendices, which included a greater number of species. He therefore raised the question of the process that would need to be followed for the inclusion of these other species in the Appendices to the CMS.

104. **Summary/Action.** The Chair called for any comments on the accuracy of the Range State list to be sent to the Secretariat within three months, so that an amended version of the list could be established. He added that the next meeting of the Scientific Council would have to devote some attention to information issues in general, and particularly to the manner in which information was collated. He also noted that the differences in the species listed on the Appendices of the CMS and the AEWA mainly concerned birds. He observed in this respect that the Agreements were free-standing and could have different lists from those contained in the Appendices of the CMS, although there were clearly scientific and conservation-related reasons for endeavouring to align the various lists as much as possible. What was important was for there to be a common understanding between the CMS and its daughter Agreements on the scientific criteria applicable for the inclusion of species in the various Appendices.

6.5 Guidelines for application of IUCN Red List Criteria at regional levels

105. Mr Vié (World Conservation Union – IUCN) gave a presentation on the background of the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species and on guidelines for the application of IUCN red list criteria at the regional and national levels (ScC12/Inf.11), providing examples and indications of how the criteria applied to migratory species, how the situation of each species should be evaluated at the various levels and the relationship between the status of endangered species at the national, regional and global levels. In reply to a question as to whether the system would remain stable, he indicated that it had been in existence for 40 years, had been amended in the late 1980s and a new system introduced in 2001. This latter system was intended to remain stable so that it could be used as an indicator.

106. **Summary/Action.** The Chair recalled that COP7 had indicated its approval of the overall IUCN system. He called for this system to be further reviewed by the Scientific Council at its next meeting.

6.6 Artificial barriers to migration and other threats to migratory species and their habitats

Migratory species as vectors of diseases

107. Introducing the subject, Mr Hagemeyer (Wetlands International), referred in particular to migratory birds and the recent claims that they might be vectors of Asian flu, with the demands in

the countries affected, where large numbers of poultry were infected with the disease, to start the culling of migratory birds. In this connection, Wetlands International had approached the main organizations dealing with the issue, namely WHO and FAO, to provide them with information on migratory birds, and especially waterbirds, demonstrating that large-scale culling would not be an effective solution, even if the birds did indeed prove to be the vectors. He added that there was very little information on the prevalence of the disease among migratory birds, which was hampering the process of the provision of advice to the organizations concerned, even though they had shown a certain readiness to listen to the information available. It was for this reason that this subject was being raised in the Scientific Council, which might have a role to play in ensuring that information on this issue was more readily available for any similar events in future. Referring to the information contained in the documents before the Council (ScC12/Inf.23 and 24), he said that FAO appeared to be prepared to issue a statement in collaboration with the countries concerned underlining that culling was not an effective solution and instead calling for efforts to separate domestic and wild birds. This position had been confirmed at an FAO meeting in February 2004 in Bangkok. FAO had also developed a Newsletter on the Avian Influenza, of which 9 issues had been produced so far. The latest information showed that the virus had been positively identified in a small number of birds belonging to migratory species, though it was not always clear whether the infected specimens came from wild or domesticated populations. He added that WHO was in the course of preparing a draft paper on this issue, which apparently called for sampling research to establish the actual situation. It was important for the CMS to take up this subject because intergovernmental organizations were sometimes unwilling to let NGOs play a role in their meetings, whereas they would be more receptive to an intergovernmental organization such as CMS.

108. Mr O'Sullivan (Appointed Councillor) agreed fully with the need to take measures to try and prevent authorities from panicking and unnecessarily killing wild bird populations. Mr Schlatter (Appointed Councillor) warned that in such cases bird species that were already in a precarious situation could suffer greatly. It was urgent for the CMS to call upon countries to carry out surveys and regular monitoring work on the presence of antibodies in wild birds, on the manner in which Avian flu and other diseases were spread and on the wild populations that came into contact with such diseases.

109. Mr Custodio (Philippines) said that although it had been found that migratory birds had been infected with non-virulent forms of the virus, it was necessary to investigate whether they had been exposed to its virulent forms, and whether cases of the virus had been found in live or dead birds.

110. Mr Woloszyn (Poland) noted that bats had been found to carry two diseases, namely rabies and histoplasmosis, the latter in tropical and subtropical areas as a fungus on their droppings. Histoplasmosis took two forms, one of which affected the lungs, and a progressive form which was generally fatal, although it was relatively rare. It nevertheless meant that certain caves, in such countries like Mexico, were very dangerous for humans. It was therefore important for more information to be made available on this disease.

111. Mr Ankara (Congo) emphasized the importance of the question, as migratory species were endangered because they were considered to be vectors of diseases. Taking as an example the Democratic Republic of the Congo, he noted that migratory species continued to be controlled because they were suspected by the population of carrying the Ebola virus. He called for a working group to be set up to reflect on this issue and for the Scientific Council to be represented in international meetings, particularly those of the FAO and WHO, which considered these matters so that information could be provided before drastic decisions were taken affecting migratory species.

112. **Summary/Action.** The Chair recognized the importance and urgency of the issue. He called on the WHO and the community in general to clarify the science in relation to this question and offered the assistance of the Scientific Council to do so. He urged that there should be no further killing of migratory species as a preventive measure to stop the spread of disease until the scientific background had been clarified. With regard to the Avian flu outbreak, he urged the adoption of measures to separate domestic and wild birds, and in particular to separate wild birds from the food and water supplies of domestic birds. The Scientific Council should offer any assistance that it could provide, but noted that Wetlands International was playing the leading role in this respect. It was recognized that the issue involved a mixture of science and perception. In view of the urgency of the problem in terms of both human health and its effects on migratory species, the Scientific Council decided to form a working group, which would collaborate with Wetlands International and would work by e-mail or correspondence. The working group would be responsible for clarifying the science in relation to migratory species by reviewing the key diseases that migratory diseases might carry, and for examining the perceptions of governments and populations in terms of the manner in which they handled the prevention of such diseases. The working group should report to the next meeting of the Scientific Council and should make its findings available to the Appointed Councillors, and particularly to Mr O'Sullivan. The councillors from Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Hungary, Philippines, Poland, Gambia, Mr. Schlatter, Mr. Hutson, and the representatives of Wetlands International and IUCN volunteered to be members of the working group.

Lead shot poisoning

113. Mr Barbieri noted that CMS had not yet been directly involved in the issue of the poisoning of migratory species by the ingestion of lead shot, but that consideration should be given as to whether the Convention could make a contribution on this subject, which was not only of concern to a wide variety of migratory species, but also to resident species. He noted that AEWA had been undertaking an initiative on the issue for several years and that one way in which CMS might address the issue was to help disseminate the work of AEWA in other regions. He added that the question was not only of concern to waterbirds, and CMS could perhaps therefore be instrumental in broadening the taxonomic scope of the question. The Scientific Council was therefore being consulted to consider whether any further work was advisable on this matter and any action that it might take.

114. Mr Biber (Switzerland), speaking as the representative of the AEWA Technical Committee, indicated that the phasing out of the use of lead shot as ammunition was part of the strategy adopted by AEWA and that it would be very useful if the CMS could spread this information in all the other regions. Mr O'Sullivan (Appointed Councillor) added that groups of birds other than waterfowl were also affected by the problem, such as birds of prey which ingested lead shot when eating crippled birds. The issue could therefore also be addressed in the context of the CMS's work on raptors. Mr Hagemeyer (Wetlands International) saw a role for the CMS, principally outside the AEWA region, in raising awareness of the problem and in encouraging the hunting community to engage in a discussion of the possibility of banning lead shot, where this had not already been done. Mr Schlatter (Appointed Councillor) recalled that Wetlands International had already carried out considerable work on this issue and that it would not therefore be very difficult to obtain a clear idea of the countries that had already prohibited lead shot, as well as the countries in which information was lacking on this subject. Mr Hagemeyer offered to submit to the next Scientific Council the findings of the survey undertaken by Wetlands International on the countries in which lead shot had been banned.

115. **Summary/Action.** The Chair thanked Wetlands International for its contribution and requested it, in collaboration with AEWA and the Secretariat, to lead the action on this question and

to submit an overview paper to the next Scientific Council on the particular parts of the world that were affected by the issue and the species that were of concern, so that it could be referred to the next COP.

Impact of climate change on migratory species

116. Ms Neal (CMS Standing Committee Chair) indicated that the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs in her country had decided to commission a study to assess the strength of scientific evidence of links between climate change and the behaviour, abundance and distribution of migratory species, and whether the predicted effects on these species could be relied upon if climate change followed the expected patterns (ScC12/Doc.19). Tenders had already been received from contractors interested in carrying out the study. She said that, in view of the lack of fundamental research on this subject, it was essential to undertake an initial review of knowledge. While the study would naturally focus on species migrating through the United Kingdom, it was intended as a contribution to an international project and its findings could be expected within about nine months. She suggested that it would be difficult at the present stage to make any fundamental changes to the specifications of the study, although it had not yet commenced and any general reflections made by members of the Scientific Council would be useful. Moreover, the project included the holding of an international workshop in which she hoped that the Scientific Council would participate.

117. Mr Davidson (Ramsar Convention) indicated that a review of the impact of climate change on wetlands undertaken by the Secretariat of the Ramsar Convention had shown the need for further work and had revealed a significant gap in relation to the impact of climate change on migratory species. The project undertaken by the United Kingdom was therefore most welcome. He suggested that it might be interesting to see how its findings could contribute to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), thereby providing a valuable example of how the work of the CMS could contribute to that of other Conventions and bodies. Mr Finlayson (Ramsar Convention - STRP) added that the relation between biodiversity issues and global climate change raised very difficult and pressing issues. He therefore called for a formal arrangement for closer collaboration between the Scientific Council and the STRP on the related issues, including a common programme of work with outputs well before 2008. Innovative and reinforced partnerships, such as those being developed with various space agencies to obtain remote sensing information, were essential to help close the information gap.

118. Mr Oteng-Yeboah (CBD SBSTTA) said that CBD COP7 had noted the important impact of climate change on biodiversity issues, including issues relating to migratory species. He thanked the CMS for the efforts made to contribute to the work of the CBD on this question.

119. **Summary/Action.** The Chair welcomed the offers of collaboration and emphasized the need for joint work between the Scientific Council, STRP and SBSTTA. He called on the various secretariats to discuss the ways and means of giving effect to this collaboration. He thanked the United Kingdom for taking the initiative in commissioning a study on the subject. He also noted the interest of other Conventions and Agreements in contributing to the assessment of the impact of climate change. The Chair would write to the respective chairs of the scientific bodies of the CBD, the Ramsar Convention and other bodies likely to be interested indicating the willingness of the Scientific Council to undertake joint work on this subject.

6.7 Global Register of Migratory Species (GROMS)

120. Mr Barbieri noted that the subject of the Global Register on Migratory Species (GROMS) (ScC12/Doc.23) had been discussed by several previous meetings of the Scientific Council. The

main reason for its inclusion on the agenda of the present meeting was that the initial phase of the project was nearing conclusion. In accordance with Resolution 7.8 adopted by COP7, its further development was to be guided by a consultation group. The question therefore arose as to the extent to which the Scientific Council should be involved in this process. He suggested that the Scientific Council might wish to identify one or two councillors who could be involved in guiding the future development of this information tool. It would also be useful if the Scientific Council could comment on the effectiveness of the database and the quality of the information provided.

121. Mr Hagemeyer (Wetlands International) noted that this issue had recently been discussed by AEWA, which was awaiting the adoption of a position by the Scientific Council concerning GROMS as a basis for deciding upon its own position in this respect and on any financial contribution that it could make to the development of GROMS. Before making any decision on this, AEWA needed to know what role the CMS planned for GROMS in the future.

122. Mr Limpus (Appointed Councillor) perceived some problems rationalizing the messages that were being issued to organizations such as UNEP WCMC concerning the development of summaries by species. It appeared that GROMS was doing something similar to the information exercise undertaken by UNEP WCMC. Mr Glowka urged the Scientific Council not to miss the opportunity to participate in the evaluation group for information management.

123. ***Summary/Action.*** The Chair said that the underlying information used by the Scientific Council for its work was of great importance and that GROMS made a significant contribution to the provision of information. The medium-term question was how to align all the various data sources available. This issue should be examined in depth at the next meeting of the Scientific Council, where it would be useful if those responsible for the development of GROMS could be present. It would be beneficial if one or two councillors could be involved in the future development of the process on a continuing intersessional basis. He called upon the Secretariats of the CMS and AEWA to liaise on this issue and to focus on the key questions of the origin, collation and utilization of the data in GROMS. To be meaningful, an information tool such as GROMS needed effective quality control and planning for its use.

7. Collaboration with other intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations

Millennium Ecosystem Assessment

124. The Scientific Council heard a presentation of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA) by Mr Ash (UNEP-WCMC), who recalled that the CMS at COP7 had, through Resolution 7.9, called upon its Parties to play an active role in the MA, which evidently included migratory species within its scope. In his presentation, Mr Ash recalled that the purpose of the MA, using the baseline of 2000, was to provide an international scientific assessment of the consequences of ecosystem changes for human well-being with the goals of meeting the information needs of decision-makers and building capacity. The MA, the findings of which would be released in 2005, consisted of a review of the state of knowledge and was not intended to make recommendations, but drew attention of the benefits derived from the ecosystem for human well-being. He noted that several councillors and the national focal points had been invited to draft and review sections of the MA and that all councillors would be invited to review chapters of the MA during the course of the second review round between June and August 2004. For further information, he invited those interested to visit the website www.millenniumassessment.org.

125. Mr Oteng-Yeboah (CBD SBSTTA) noted that CBD was fully involved in the MA process and that its COP would fully review the Assessment. It had decided to inform its parties about the

first products of the MA and to encourage them to use these products to inform decisions at the national level. It was also encouraging its parties to provide peer reviewers for the further development of the MA. Through the CBD's relationship with the four biodiversity-related Conventions, namely Ramsar, CITES, CMS and World Heritage, it wished to encourage scientists to be involved in the review process.

126. Mr Davidson (Ramsar Convention) noted that the timing for the review of the draft chapters of the MA was critical. He strongly urged the members of the Scientific Council to examine the draft chapters as they became available. The Secretariat of the Ramsar Convention had done this for the first chapters and had found that a significant amount of further work was still needed, as very little information had been included on species, or indeed on migratory species. A two-way process was therefore required of the provision of information and the indication of sources of information so as to ensure the quality of the end product.

127. **Summary/Action.** The Chair thanked Mr Ash for his presentation and noted the importance of the work that was being undertaken in the context of the Millennium Assessment and its relevance to migratory species. He noted the need for effective input into the process and the schedule that had been outlined. He encouraged all the scientific councillors to participate in the process, either on a taxonomic or a regional basis, so that they would be satisfied with the final product. Finally, he noted that the MA would be very important in underpinning the 2010 target.

Collaboration with other intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations

128. Mr Hagemeyer (Wetlands International) referred to the joint workplan that existed between Wetlands International, CMS and AEWI covering several issues, including the conservation of migratory waterbirds in the Asia and Pacific region and the Central Asian flyway initiative. He communicated the 2003 report of the Asia-Pacific Migratory Waterbird Conservation Committee (MWCC) to the Scientific Council, which referred in particular to the three plans developed for the conservation of species, relating to *Anatidae*, cranes and shore birds and the progress made in identifying and developing networks of conservation sites. The work of the MWCC covered a number of areas under the responsibility of the CMS. He therefore hoped that collaboration and interaction with CMS Parties and bodies would be strengthened and he invited the Secretariat and the Parties to continue their active participation in the MWCC and monitor the implementation of the initiative, consider providing financial resources to improve its stability and participate actively in reviewing the implementation of the strategy proposed for 2004 and in the framework developed for subsequent years.

129. Mr Vié (IUCN) recalled that IUCN had been collaborating with CMS for many years. He welcomed the MoU that had been signed between the two organizations and looked forward to formalizing their cooperation. He encouraged the CMS to take advantage of the World Conservation Congress to establish new partnerships with the many members of IUCN worldwide, and hoped that such partnerships could also be instrumental in increasing the membership of the CMS. Mr Glowka welcomed the collaboration of IUCN, particularly in publicising the work of the CMS.

130. Mr Oteng-Yeboah (CBD SBSTTA) referred to a number of decisions made by CBD COP7 which made direct reference to CMS in the areas of: dry and sub-humid lands, the biodiversity of inland water ecosystems, marine and coastal biodiversity, the ecosystem approach, sustainable use, tourism, climate change, CBD Article 8(j) and related provisions, mountain biodiversity and protected areas. He noted that the present joint work programme between CBD and CMS needed to be reviewed and called for more active synergy between the two Conventions.

131. ***Summary/Action.*** The Chair welcomed the intervention of Mr Oteng Yeboah and outlined the need for greater dialogue at the scientific level on common issues and actions. Mr Glowka added that migratory species cut across nearly all aspects of the CBD work programme and that the joint work programme would be revised in the context of broader action for the development of guidelines to integrate migratory species considerations into national biodiversity strategies and action plans.

132. Mr Davidson (Ramsar Convention) said that the STRP was engaged in work that was of considerable relevance to the Scientific Council, particularly in relation to the development of outcome-oriented ecological indicators of the effectiveness of action taken under the auspices of the Convention and on other aspects of wetlands conservation and wise use, including the provision of guidance on water use and agriculture. He also referred to the work underway on site selection, especially for non-waterbird taxa. The holding of the next Ramsar COP in 2005 in Uganda would be particularly important, as the first COP held in Africa, and he called upon African councillors to collaborate with their counterparts in the preparation of this important event. He added that the joint workplan between Ramsar, CMS and AEWA had now been finalized and would be signed at the occasion of the celebration of the 25th Anniversary of CMS next week in Edinburgh. The workplan would provide an effective mechanism for the exchange of information. However, he called upon the Scientific Council to appoint one of its members as the formal liaison councillor with the STRP and hoped that the relevant materials produced by the STRP would be reviewed by the members of the Scientific Council.

133. Mr Simmonds (WDCS) said that, as a newcomer, he was intrigued by the dynamic that was being developed between what might at first appear to be two disparate approaches to conservation, namely the more holistic ecosystems-based management approach and what might be perceived as the more traditional species-focused approach of the CMS. He felt that in practice these two approaches were entirely complementary, but that there was an issue of perception. He therefore called on the Scientific Council and the CMS to look to the future and explore the role of the CMS in relation to other fora. He welcomed the development of CMS conservation work in the marine environment, where there were many problems that were not widely known. He believed that CMS and its daughter Agreements were making a unique and important contribution to marine conservation in the face of accelerating threats and habitat degradation and loss, which were affecting many marine migratory species. He welcomed the involvement of WDCS with ASCOBANS and ACCOBAMS and looked forward to collaboration with future Agreements and MoUs and to working closely with the Scientific Council through WDCS' worldwide network of offices and affiliates. Mr. Glowka thanked Mr. Simmonds for his intervention and highlighted that WDCS had produced in cooperation with CMS a publication on CMS' work on cetaceans.

134. Mr Baker (Australia), speaking on behalf of the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP), welcomed the short time that it had taken to develop the operations of ACAP since its inception and expressed gratitude for the support received from the CMS Secretariat and the Scientific Council.

135. Mr Notarbartolo di Sciara (ACCOBAMS) looked forward to long-term cooperation with the Scientific Council and believed that the increased exchange of information and action between Agreements would be of great benefit. The effort required would undoubtedly pay off in the future.

136. Mr Biber (Switzerland), speaking on behalf of the African Eurasian Waterbird Agreement (AEWA) said that the Agreement was keen to strengthen its contacts and relations with the mother Convention. Although AEWA was an independent Agreement, there were many areas in which collaboration was necessary with the CMS. He noted the progress that had been made on the proposed agreement for a Central Asian flyway. The Technical Committee of AEWA had taken up

the position on this matter that, from a scientific and technical point of view, there was no reason why AEWA could not take on board an enlargement of its area of responsibility to cover the proposed flyway. Mr Hagemeyer (Wetlands International) emphasized the importance of Central Asia for the migration of waterbirds, but noted that it was not yet effectively covered by the Asia Pacific Waterbird Strategy. A workshop had already been held with the countries concerned and it was proposed to hold another in India, with the participation of the CMS and AEWA, with a view to finalizing the existing draft action plan, and make a final choice among the possible options to provide the plan with an implementation framework, namely the inclusion of the flyway agreement under AEWA, the adoption of a separate agreement under the CMS or the development of a strategy like the existing one for the Asia-Pacific region.

137. ***Summary/Action.*** The Chair undertook to contact the Chair of the Technical Committee of AEWA on this matter. He noted the planned workshop and hoped that the relevant members of the Scientific Council would be kept informed, and particularly the Appointed Councillor for the region.

138. With regard to other Conventions and Agreements, Mr Glowka informed the Scientific Council that an MoU had been signed with the Secretariat of CITES covering the development of a series of joint actions, including concerted actions on several species. The previous year, an MoU had been concluded with the Secretariat of the Desertification Convention and it was hoped to develop joint activities between the Secretariats and a joint programme of work between the Fora. He also informed the meeting that the CMS Secretariat was involved in the development of a strategic initiative for migratory species in the Western Hemisphere. A meeting had been held in Chile in 2003 gathering representatives of over 20 countries of the Western Hemisphere, which had provided a great opportunity to the CMS Secretariat to highlight the advantages of CMS in the context of regional and species initiatives. The result of the meeting was an agreement among the representatives of the countries present to keep the process going and to establish an interim steering committee including a CMS representative. Finally, he welcomed the close cooperation with UNEP-WCMC in the field of information management.

139. Mr Perrin (Appointed Councillor) reported on the 2003 meeting of the Scientific Committee of the International Whaling Commission, summarizing the information presented at the meeting on the status of cetacean species included in Appendices I and II of CMS (ScC12/Doc.20).

140. ***Summary/Action.*** The Chair thanked the representatives of the organizations concerned for the information provided and welcomed their collaboration with the Scientific Council and the CMS in general. He noted that volunteers were required for liaison work with the Ramsar Convention and UNESCO and asked any councillors interested to contact Mr Barbieri.

8. Date and venue of the thirteenth meeting of the Scientific Council

141. Mr Barbieri noted that the next meeting of the Scientific Council would be held in conjunction with COP8, for which no final date or venue had yet been decided, although it was probable that it would be held in the second half of 2005.

142. The Chair requested the Secretariat to consider the holding of the next meeting of the Scientific Council over four days. Although the present meeting had been very productive, its work had been constrained by the time available. He added that the next meeting of the Scientific Council would have to cover six main areas: a more systematic examination of matters related to the species listed in the Appendices, including the action plans and projects undertaken; the conclusion of the discussion on the modus operandi of the Scientific Council, particularly with regard to the regions

(including the number of councillors concerned); the preparation of an overview of threats to migratory species for submission to the COP; the development of all of these issues into a coherent Plan of Implementation for the years ahead; the refinement of the work carried out by UNEP-WCMC on information and reporting, so that the issues could be explained to the COP in a manner that would be easily understood by decision-makers; and the presentation of a more collective picture to the COP and the world at large based on closer collaboration between the wider family of institutions involved in the work of the CMS.

9. Any other business

143. There was no other business.

10. Closure of the meeting

144. Following the usual exchange of courtesies, the Chair closed the meeting at 17.30 pm on Friday 2 April 2004.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS / LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS / LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES

Chairman/President/Presidencia

Prof.Dr. Colin A. **Galbraith**
 Director of Scientific and Advisory Services
 Scottish Natural Heritage
 2/5 Anderson Place
 Edinburgh EH6 5NP
 UNITED KINGDOM

Tel.: (+44 131) 446 2404
 Fax: (+44 131) 446 2491
 E-Mail: colin.galbraith@snh.gov.uk

**Vice-Chairman/Vicepresident/
Vice-Presidente**

Mr. John H. **Mshelbwala**
 Assistant Director (Conservation)
 Federal Ministry of Environment
 Environment House, Rm 321
 Independence Way
 opposite National Hospital
 P.M.B. 265
 Garki, Abuja, F.C.T.
 NIGERIA

Tel.: (+234 9) 523 4119
 Fax: (+234 9) 523 4119
 E-Mail: johnmshelbwala2@yahoo.com

Members/Membres/Miembros

M. Dieudonné **Ankara**
 Ministère de l'industrie minière et de l'environnement
 Direction générale de l'environnement
 B.P. 958
 54, rue Bordeaux Oeunzé
 2124 Brazzaville
 CONGO

Tel.: (+242) 516750 / 814030 / 815979
 Fax: (+242) 81 03 30 / 81 08 47
 E-Mail: graspcongo@yahoo.fr

Dr. Richard K. **Bagine**
 Deputy Director Research and Planning
 Kenya Wildlife Service
 P.O. Box 40241
 Nairobi
 KENYA

Tel.: (+254 20) 60 08 20
 Fax: (+254 20) 60 77 59
 E-Mail: kws@kws.org, research@kws.org

Mr. Barry **Baker**
 Department of the Environment and Heritage
 Australian Antarctic Division
 Channel Highway
 Kingston, Tasmania 7050
 AUSTRALIA

Tel.: (+61 3) 6232 3407
 Fax: (+61 3) 6232 3288
 E-Mail: barry.baker@aad.gov.au

Dr. Attila **Bankovics**
 Hungarian Natural History Museum
 Baross u. 13
 1088 Budapest
 HUNGARY

Tel.: (+36 1) 210 1075 ext 5044
 Fax: (+36 1) 334 2785
 E-Mail: bankovic@zool.nhmus.hu

Dr. Roseline C. **Beudels-Jamar de Bolsee**
Institut Royal des Sciences Naturelles de Belgique
29, rue Vautier
1000 Bruxelles
BELGIUM

Tel.: (+32 2) 627 43 54
Fax: (+32 2) 649 48 25
E-Mail: roseline.beudels@naturalsciences.be

Dr. Olivier **Biber**
Chef des Questions internationales Nature et Paysage
Office fédéral de l'environnement, des forêts, et du
paysage (OFEFP)
3003 Berne
SWITZERLAND

Tel.: (+41 31) 323 0663
Fax: (+41 31) 324 7579
E-Mail: olivier.biber@buwal.admin.ch

Dr. Taulant **Bino**
Museum of Natural Sciences
Muzeu i Shkencave te Natyres
Rr. e Kavajes 134
Tirana
ALBANIA

Tel.: (+355 4) 22 90 28
Fax: (+355 4) 22 90 28
E-Mail: taobino@icc-al.org

Lic. Daniel E. **Blanco**
Encargado de Programa de América del Sur
Wetlands International South America Programme
25 de Mayo 758 10 "I"
C1002 ABO
Buenos Aires
ARGENTINA

Tel.: (+54 11) 43 12 09 32
Fax: (+54 11) 43 12 09 32
E-Mail: dblanco@wamani.apc.org

Dr. Almamy **Camara**
Director of Parks and Wildlife Management
Department of State for Fisheries, Natural Resources
and the Environment
Abuko Nature Reserve
Banjul
GAMBIA

Tel.: (+220) 437 5888 / 992 1976 / 437 6972/3
Fax: (+220) 439 2179
E-Mail: wildlife@gamtel.gm, almamoc@hotmail.com

Mr. Carlo C. **Custodio**
Chief, Wildlife Resources Division
Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau (PAWB)
Department of Environment and Natural Resources
Quezon Avenue, Diliman
Quezon City 1100
PHILIPPINES

Tel.: (+6 32) 925 8952/53
Fax: (+6 32) 925 8953 / 924 0109
E-Mail: wildlife@pawb.gov.ph

Dr. Pierre **Devillers**
Institut Royal des Sciences Naturelles de Belgique
29, rue Vautier
1000 Bruxelles
BELGIUM

Tel.: (+32 2) 627 43 54
Fax: (+32 2) 649 48 25
E-Mail: pierre.devillers@naturalsciences.be

Dr. Torbjörn **Ebenhard**
Scientific Research Director
Swedish Biodiversity Centre
P.O. Box 7007
75007 Uppsala
SWEDEN

Tel.: (+46 18) 67 22 68
Fax: (+46 18) 67 35 37
E-Mail: torbjorn.ebenhard@cbm.slu.se

M. Abdellah **El Mastour**
Chef du Service des Parcs et Réserves
Haut Commissariat aux Eaux et Forêts et à la Lutte
contre la Désertification
B.P. 65 - Quartier Administratif
Rabat-Chellah
MOROCCO

Tel.: (+212 37) 67 11 05
Fax: (+212 37) 76 68 55 / 76 44 46 / 67 00 87 / 66
08 26
E-Mail: elmastour@athena.online.co.ma

Dr. Esam Ahmed **Elbadry**
Nature Conservation Section
Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency
42 El Medina El Monawara St. Apt. 6
Cairo, Mohandeseen, 12411
EGYPT

Tel.: (+20 2) 336 9083
Fax: (+20 2) 761 5542
E-Mail: medwetcoast@link.net

Dr. Jirí Flousek
Deputy Director
Krkonoše National Park
Vrchlabí-zámek
543 11 Vrchlabí
CZECH REPUBLIC

Tel.: (+420 499) 45 62 12
Fax: (+420 499) 42 20 95
E-Mail: jflousek@krmnp.cz

Mr. Zurab Gurielidze
Protected Areas Development Center
9 Anbjapazidze str.
380079 Tbilissi
GEORGIA

Tel.: (+995 32) 25 15 66
Fax: (+995 32) 25 13 49
E-Mail: zgurielidze@gpadc.org.ge

Dr. Borja Heredia
Head of Wildlife Service
Ministerio de Medio Ambiente
Dirección General de Conservación de la Naturaleza
Gran Vía de San Francisco 4
28005 Madrid
SPAIN

Tel.: (+34 91) 596 4658
Fax: (+34 91) 596 4809
E-Mail: bheredia@mma.es

M. Abdou Malam Issa
Ingénieur des Eaux et Forêts
Direction de la faune, pêche et pisciculture
Ministère de l'Hydraulique, de l'Environnement et de la
Lutte Contre la Désertification
B.P. 721
Niamey
NIGER

Tel.: (+227) 73 40 69 / 92 85 52
Fax: (+227) 73 60 12
E-Mail: ucnpmedp@intnet.ne, malam_ia@yahoo.fr

Dr. Teodora Ivanova
National Museum of Natural History
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
Blvd. Tzar Osvoboditel 1
1000 Sofia
BULGARIA

Tel.: (+359 88) 896 2361 / (+359 2) 987 5072
Fax: (+359 2) 988 2894
E-Mail: tea@nmnh.bas.bg

Mr. Umeed Khalid
Conservator (Wildlife)
National Council for Conservation of Wildlife
Ministry of Environment
Enercon Building, Ground Floor
Near State Bank of Pakistan, G-5/2
Islamabad
PAKISTAN

Tel.: (+92 51) 920 4515
Fax: (+92 51) 922 2472
E-Mail: nccw@isb.paknet.com.pk,
umeed_khalid@hotmail.com

Dr. Jelena Kralj
Institute for Ornithology
Croatian Academy of Science and Art
Gunduliceva 24
10000 Zagreb
CROATIA

Tel.: (+385 1) 482 5401
Fax: (+385 1) 482 5392
E-Mail: zzo@hazu.hr

M. Jalel Laabidi
Sous-directeur de la Chasse et des Parcs Nationaux
Ministère de l'Agriculture, de l'Environnement et des
Ressources Hydrauliques
Direction Générale des Forêts
30, rue Alain Savary
1002 Tunis
TUNISIA
Tel.: (+216 71) 89 14 97
Fax: (+216 71) 80 19 22
E-Mail: jalel.labidi@francite.com

Mr. Ernest L. Lamptey
Principal Wildlife Officer
Department of Wildlife
P.O. Box M 239
Accra
GHANA

Tel.: (+233 21) 662360 / 666129
Fax: (+233 21) 666 476
E-Mail: ellamptey@yahoo.com

Dr. Badamjav Lhagvasuren
Head of Mammalian Ecology Laboratory
Institute of Biology, MAS
Ulaanbaatar-51
MONGOLIA

Tel.: (+976 11) 453 583
Fax: (+976 11) 451 781
E-Mail: ecolab@magicnet.mn, lhagvabad@yahoo.com

Prof. Dr. Branko **Micevski**
President
Bird Study and Protection Society of Macedonia
Zoological Department, Faculty of Sciences
Gazi Baba b.b. str.
1000 Skopje
REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

Tel.: (+389 2) 243 2071 / 0927 / 311 7055 ext 614
Fax: (+389 2) 243 2071
E-Mail: brankom@ukim.edu.mk

M. Abdou-Kérim **Moumouni**
Directeur de la Faune et Chasse
Ministere de l'Environnement
B.P. 355
Lomé
TOGO

Tel.: (+228) 260059 / 2214028/29
Fax: (+228) 221 40 29
E-Mail: direfaune@caramail.com,
direfaune@yahoo.fr, sokode1@yahoo.fr

M. Kabemba **Muembo**
Directeur scientifique
l'Institut Congolais pour la Conservation de la Nature
ICCN
13, avenue des Cliniques
Gombé Kinshasa 1
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO

Tel.: (+243) 98 13 02 96 / 98 26 93 84
Fax: (+1775) 206 9388
E-Mail: pdg.iccn@ic.cd, dmuembo2003@yahoo.fr

Dr. Otars **Opermanis**
Laboratory of Ornithology
Institute of Biology
Miera Str. 3
2169 Salaspils
LATVIA

Tel.: (+371 7) 50 35 22
Fax: (+371 7) 50 36 01
E-Mail: otars.opermanis@undp.riga.lv,
otars@mail.delfi.lv

Dr. Anatoliy **Poluda**
Head of Ukrainian Bird Ringing Centre
Schmalhausen Institute of Zoology
Bogdana Knmelnitskogo str. 15
01601 Kyiv 30
UKRAINE

Tel.: (+38 044) 235 0112
Fax: (+38 044) 235 0112 / 224 1569
E-Mail: poluda@urc.freenet.kiev.ua

Dr. Hannu **Pöysä**
Research Professor
Finnish Game and Fisheries Research Institute
Joensuu Game and Fisheries Research
Kauppakatu 18-20
80100 Joensuu
FINLAND

Tel.: (+358 20) 57 51 400
Fax: (+358 20) 57 51 409
E-Mail: hannu.poysa@rktl.fi

Dr. Francisco Daniel **Rilla Manta**
Av. 8 de octubre 2738
C.P. 11600
Montevideo
URUGUAY

Tel.: (+598 2) 487 2717 ext 219
Fax: (+598 2) 709 5230
E-Mail: pico@internet.com.uy

M. Tano **Sombo**
Directeur de la Protection de la Nature
Ministère d'Etat
Ministère de l'Environnement
06 B.P. 6648
Abidjan 06
COTE D'IVOIRE

Tel.: (+225 20) 22 53 66
Fax: (+225 20) 22 53 66
E-Mail: sombotano@yahoo.fr

Mr. Oystein **Storkersen**
Senior Advisor
Directorate of Nature Management
Tungasletta 2
7485 Trondheim
NORWAY

Tel.: (+47) 7358 0500
Fax: (+47) 7358 0501
E-Mail: oystein.storkersen@dirnat.no

Mme. Ndèye Sene **Thiam**
Conseiller Technique
Direction des Parcs Nationaux
Ministère de l'Environnement et de la Protection de la
Nature
Sise au Parc Zoologique et Forestier de Hann
B.P. 5135
Dakar Fann, SENEGAL

Tel.: (+221) 832 2309 / 9381
Fax: (+221) 832 2309/11
E-Mail: dpn@sentoo.sn,
ndeyesenethiam2003@yahoo.fr

M. Namory **Traoré**
Projet Biodiversité du Gourma
Direction Nationale de la Conservation de la Nature
B.P. 275
Bamako
MALI

Tel.: (+223) 223 3695/97
Fax: (+223) 223 3696
E-Mail: ntraore2002@yahoo.fr

Dr. Marcel **Uhrín**
Director General
National Park Muránska Planina Administration
str. Janka Král'a 12
05001 Revúca
SLOVAKIA

Tel.: (+421 58) 442 2061
Fax: (+421 58) 488 1790
E-Mail: uhrin@soprsr.sk

Mr. H. John **Wilson**
Senior Research Scientist
Department of Environment, Heritage & Local
Government
National Parks & Wildlife Service
7 Ely Place
Dublin 2
IRELAND

Tel.: (+353 1) 647 2394
Fax: (+353 1) 678 8123
E-Mail: jwilson@duchas.ie

Prof. Bronislaw **Woloszyn**
Institute of Animal Systematics and Evolution
Polish Academy of Sciences
ul. Slawkowska 17
31.016 Kraków
POLAND

Tel.: (+48 12) 422 6410
Fax: (+48 12) 422 6410
E-Mail: woloszbr@isez.pan.krakow.pl

Instituto Nacional de Recursos Naturales
Atn. Ms Marina Rosales Benites
Calle Diecisiete N 355
Urbanización El Palomar
San Isidro
Lima 27
PERU

Tel.: (+51 1) 225 9809 / 224 3298
Fax: (+51 1) 225 9809 / 224 3218
E-Mail: mrosales@inrena.gob.pe

**Scientific Councillors appointed by the Conference of the Parties/
Conseillers Scientifiques nommés par la Conference des Parties/
Consejeros Científicos designados por la Conferencia de las Partes**

Dr. Colin J. **Limpus**
Senior Principal Conservation Officer
Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service
P. O. Box 541
Capalaba QLD 4157
AUSTRALIA

Tel.: (+61 7) 3227 7718
Fax: (+61 7) 3247 5966
E-Mail: col.limpus@epa.qld.gov.au

Mr. John **O'Sullivan**
International Treaties Adviser
BirdLife International
c/o RSPB The Lodge
Sandy, Bedfordshire SG19 2DL
UNITED KINGDOM

Tel.: (+44 1 767) 680 551
Fax: (+44 1 767) 683 211
E-Mail: john.osullivan@rspb.org.uk

Dr. William F. **Perrin**
Senior Scientist
Southwest Fisheries Science Center
8604 La Jolla Shores Drive
La Jolla CA 92037
United States of America

Tel.: (+1 858) 546 7096
Fax: (+1 858) 546 7003
E-Mail: william.perrin@noaa.gov

Dr. Roberto P. **Schlatter**
Instituto de Zoología
Universidad Austral de Chile
Casilla 567
Valdivia
CHILE

Tel.: (+56 63) 21 13 15 / 22 14 08
Fax: (+56 63) 22 13 15
E-Mail: rschlatt@uach.cl

**Alternates substituting for Scientific Councillors from CMS Parties
Suppléants des Conseillers Scientifiques des Parties à la CMS
Suplentes de Consejeros Científicos de Partes en la CMS**

Dr. Alexander **Kozulin**
Zoological Institute
National Academy of Sciences
ul. Akademicheskaya 27
220072 Minsk
BELARUS

Tel.: (+375 17) 268 4713
Fax: (+375 17) 284 1036
E-Mail: kozulin@biobel.bas-net.by

**Governmental Observers / Observateurs de Gouvernements /
Observadores Gubernamentales**

CHAD

M. Mahamat Hassane **Idriss**
Ingénieur des Eaux et Forêts
Chef de Service de Sensibilisation, Information et de
Formation
Direction de Conservation de la Faune et des Aires
Protégées
Ministère de l'Environnement et de l'Eau
B.P. 2115
N'Djamena
CHAD

Tel.: (+235) 52 23 05
Fax: (+235) 524412 / 523839 / 523214
E-Mail: mhthassan@hotmail.com, cnar@intnet.td

UNITED KINGDOM

Ms Hilary **Neal**
Head of Zoos and International Species Conservation
Branch
Global Wildlife Division
Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
Temple Quay House, Zone 1/16
2 The Square, Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6EB
UNITED KINGDOM

Tel.: (+44 117) 372 8295
Fax: (+44 117) 372 8317
E-Mail: hilary.neal@defra.gsi.gov.uk

Dr. Ian **McLean**
Joint Nature Conservation Committee
Monkstone House, City Road
Peterborough PE1 1JY
UNITED KINGDOM

Tel.: (+44 1733) 86 68 13
Fax: (+44 1733) 55 59 48
E-Mail: ian.mclean@jncc.gov.uk

Mr. Nick **Williams**
Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
Zone 1/13
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6EB

Tel.: (+44 117) 372 8997
Fax: (+44 117) 372 8317
E-Mail: Nick.williams@defra.gsi.gov.uk

Intergovernmental and Non-Governmental Organization Observers /
Observateurs d'Organisations Intergouvernementales et Non
Gouvernementales / Observadores de Organizaciones
Intergubernamentales y No Gubernamentales

Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses & Petrels - ACAP

Mr. Barry **Baker**
Department of the Environment and Heritage
ACAP Interim Secretariat
Australian Antarctic Division
Channel Highway
Kingston, Tasmania 7050
AUSTRALIA

Tel.: (+61 3) 6232 3407
Fax: (+61 3) 6232 3288
E-Mail: barry.baker@aad.gov.au

Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans of the Black Sea, Mediterranean Sea and Contiguous Atlantic Area - ACCOBAMS

Dr. Giuseppe **Notarbartolo di Sciara**
Chair, ACCOBAMS Scientific Committee
Tethys Research Institute
Via Benedetto Marcello 43
20124 Milano
ITALY

Tel.: (+39 335) 637 6035
Fax: (+39 02) 700 518 468
E-Mail: disciara@tin.it

Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds - AEWA

Dr. Olivier **Biber**
Chef des Questions internationales Nature et Paysage
Office fédéral de l'environnement, des forêts, et du paysage (OFEFP)
also representing: AEWA Secretariat
3003 Berne
SWITZERLAND

Tel.: (+41 31) 323 0663
Fax: (+41 31) 324 7579
E-Mail: olivier.biber@buwal.admin.ch

**Convention on Biological Diversity
Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and
Technological Advice – CBD SBSTTA**

Prof. Alfred **Oteng-Yeboah**
Deputy Director-General
Council for Scientific and Industrial Research
Chair CBD SBSTTA
P.O. Box M32
Accra
GHANA

Tel.: (+233 24) 477 2256 / (+233 21) 77 43 80
Fax: (+233 21) 77 76 55 / 77 98 09
E-Mail: aaoyeboah@ucomgh.com,
otengyeboah@yahoo.co.uk

**Convention on Wetlands of International
Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat
(Ramsar Convention)**

Dr. Nicholas **Davidson**
Deputy Secretary General
Ramsar Convention Secretariat
28, rue Mauverney
1196 Gland
SWITZERLAND

Tel.: (+41 22) 999 0171
Fax: (+41 22) 999 0169
E-Mail: davidson@ramsar.org

**Ramsar Convention, Scientific and Technical
Review Panel - STRP**

Dr. Max **Finlayson**
Director
Environmental Research Institute of the Supervising
Scientist
GPO Box 461
Darwin, NT 0801
AUSTRALIA

Tel.: (+61 8) 89 20 11 00
Fax: (+61 8) 89 20 11 90
E-Mail: max.finlayson@deh.gov.au

**International Association for Impact Assessment
Capacity Building in Biodiversity and Impact
Assessment Project**

Dr. Jo Treweek
Technical Programme Manager
Chancery Cottage
Kentisbeare, Collumpton
Devon, EX15 2DS
UNITED KINGDOM

Tel.: (+44 1884) 266 798
Fax: (+44 1884) 266 711
E-Mail: jo@treweek.fsnet.co.uk

UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre

Mr. Jerry Harrison
UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-
WCMC)
219 Huntingdon Road
Cambridge CB3 0DL
UNITED KINGDOM

Tel.: (+44 1223) 27 73 14
Fax: (+44 1 223) 27 71 36
E-Mail: jerry.harrison@unep-wcmc.org

Ms Amelie Knapp

UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-
WCMC)
219c Huntingdon Road
Cambridge CB3 0DL
UNITED KINGDOM

Tel.: (+44 1 223) 277 314
Fax: (+44 1 223) 277 136 / 365
E-Mail: amelie.knapp@unep-wcmc.org

Mr. Neville J. Ash

Condition Working Group Coordinator
Millennium Ecosystem Assessment
UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-
WCMC)
219 Huntingdon Road
Cambridge CB3 0DL
UNITED KINGDOM

Tel.: (+44 1223) 27 73 14
Fax: (+44 1 223) 27 71 36
E-Mail: ash@millenniumassessment.org

Mr. Gerardo Fragoso
Head - Species Programme
UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-
WCMC)
219c Huntingdon Road
Cambridge CB3 0DL
UNITED KINGDOM

Tel.: (+44 1 223) 277 314
Fax: (+44 1 223) 277 136 / 365
E-Mail: gerardo.fragoso@unep-wcmc.org

World Conservation Union - IUCN

M. Jean-Christophe Vié
Deputy Coordinator, Species Programme
IUCN World Conservation Union
28, rue Mauverney
1196 Gland
SWITZERLAND

Tel.: (+41 22) 999 0208
Fax: (+41 22) 999 0015
E-Mail: jcv@iucn.org

Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society - WDCS

Mr. Mark Peter Simmonds
Director of Science
Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society
Brookfield House
38 St. Paul St.
Chippenham, Wiltshire SN15 1LY
UNITED KINGDOM

Tel.: (+44 1 249) 44 95 00
Fax: (+44 1 249) 44 95 01
E-Mail: mark.simmonds@wdcs.org.uk

Wetlands International

Mr. E.J.M. Hagemeyer
Senior Species Conservation Officer
Wetlands International
Postbus 471
6700 AL Wageningen
NETHERLANDS

Tel.: (+31 317) 47 88 67
Fax: (+31 317) 47 88 50
E-Mail: ward.hagemeyer@wetlands.org

World Wide Fund for Nature - WWF International

Ms Amanda **Nickson**
Species Programme
World Wide Fund for Nature
c/o WWF UK
Panda House, Weyside Park
Godalming, Surrey GU7 1XR
UNITED KINGDOM

Tel.: (+44 1483) 412 567 / 568 (direct)
Fax: (+44 1483) 426409
E-Mail: anickson@wwf.org.uk

Secretariat/Secretaría

Dr. Marco **Barbieri**
Technical Officer
UNEP/CMS Secretariat
Martin-Luther-King-Str. 8
53175 Bonn
GERMANY

Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2424
Fax: (+49 228) 815 2449
E-Mail: mbarbieri@cms.int

Mr. Lyle **Glowka**
Agreements Officer
UNEP/CMS Secretariat
Martin-Luther-King-Str. 8
53175 Bonn
GERMANY

Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2422
Fax: (+49 228) 815 2449
E-Mail: lglowka@cms.int

Report Writer

Mr. Mark **Johnson**
Report Writer
19 rue C. Harent
01170 Gex
FRANCE

Tel.: (+33 4) 50 42 30 17
Fax:
E-Mail: sipijohn@infonie.fr

Consultant to CMS (on bats)

Mr. Anthony M. **Hutson**
Co-Chairman, IUCN/SSC Chiroptera Specialist Group
Winkfield, Station Road
Plumpton Green
East Sussex BN7 3BU
UNITED KINGDOM

Tel.: (+44 1273) 89 03 41
Fax: (+44 1273) 89 08 59
E-Mail: hutsont@pavilion.co.uk

AGENDA OF THE MEETING

1. Opening remarks
2. Adoption of the agenda
3. Developing a strategy for the work of the Scientific Council
 - 3.1 Suggested structure for the strategy (from the November 2003 Edinburgh workshop)
 - 3.2 Links to the CMS Strategic Plan and the role of the Scientific Council
 - 3.3 Reporting needs and the requirement to focus on conservation priorities
 - 3.4 Modus operandi of the Scientific Council
4. Scientific Council tasks arising from resolutions and recommendations of the Conference of the Parties
 - 4.1 Concerted actions for selected Appendix I species/groups (Res. 3.2, 4.2, 5.1, 6.1 and 7.1 refer)
 - 4.2 Co-operative actions for Appendix II species (Recommendations 5.2, 6.2 and 7.1 refer)
 - 4.3 Other resolutions and recommendations (not already covered under previous agenda items)
 - a) Resolution 7.2: Impact Assessment
 - b) Resolution 7.4: Electrocutation of Migratory Birds
 - c) Resolution 7.5: Wind Turbines and Migratory Species
 - d) Resolution 6.2 and Recommendation 7.2: By-catch
5. Proposals for amendments to Appendices I and II of the Convention at COP8
6. Progress on other matters requiring Scientific Council advice
 - 6.1 Potential new Agreements
 - 6.2 Small-scale projects funded by CMS
 - a) Progress report by the Secretariat on completed and ongoing projects
 - b) New project proposals
 - 6.3 2010 Global biodiversity target
 - 6.4 Range State List for species listed on the CMS Appendices
 - 6.5 Guidelines for application of IUCN Red List Criteria at regional levels
 - 6.6 Artificial barriers to migration and other threats to migratory species and their habitats
 - 6.7 Global Register of Migratory Species (GROMS)
7. Collaboration with other intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations
8. Date and venue of the thirteenth meeting of the Scientific Council
9. Any other business
10. Closure of the Meeting

CMS Scientific Council Draft Strategy Implementation Plan 2006-2011

(as revised by the Scientific council at its 12th meeting)

Introduction

This Strategy Implementation Plan describes the contribution that the CMS Scientific Council will make to the implementation of the CMS Strategic Plan for 2006-2011¹, and is a response to COP Resolution 7.12. The proposed activities are based upon, and structured under, the Goals and Operational objectives [to be] adopted for the CMS Strategic Plan by COP8, which seek to address the [proposed] mission of CMS, which is:

To conserve migratory species, particularly those species which have an unfavourable conservation status, and that endangered migratory species are returned to favourable conservation status, and that major threats to migratory species are controlled or mitigated.

The specific functions of the Scientific Council are defined in the text of the Convention, and can be summarised as:

- providing scientific advice to the Conference of the Parties, and all other bodies of the Convention, including Agreements;
- recommending and evaluating research on migratory species;
- making recommendations as to the migratory species to be included in Appendices I and II;
- making recommendations as to specific conservation and management measures to be included in Agreements on migratory species; and
- recommending solutions to problems relating to the scientific aspects of the implementation of CMS, in particular with regard to the habitats of migratory species.

This is the first Strategy Implementation Plan to be adopted by the Scientific Council and, as such, represents a major shift to a more strategic and outcome-focused way of working. The major changes are:

1. The development of a number of strategic rolling documents to summarise key information for decision-making by the Convention, including a regular review of the status of species on Appendix I.
2. Improved scientific integrity of the Convention's Appendices (taxonomy and completion).
3. Enhanced attention to species on Appendix 1.
4. Enhanced attention to issues concerning habitat loss and fragmentation.
5. Greater scientific cooperation between the Scientific Council and CMS Agreements, and with the technical bodies of other conventions.

Each Activity is designed to be measurable, with a defined deadline, so that progress can be assessed at each meeting of the Scientific Council. It is recommended that evaluations of the implementation of this plan be presented to the ninth and tenth meetings of the COP.

¹ In order to plan for this period, some activities for 2004 and 2005 are also included.

GOAL 1 ALL ENDANGERED MIGRATORY SPECIES ARE PROTECTED AND BENEFIT FROM CONSERVATION ACTIONS TO RETURN THEM TO FAVOURABLE CONSERVATION STATUS (Appendix I species (Art III))			
No.	Scientific Council Activity	Expected Result and Deadline	Progress Tracker
Operational Objective 1.1: To ensure that migratory species, which are endangered, are listed in Appendix I			
1.1.1	Undertake summary scientific reviews of the main taxonomic groups of migratory species, to identify outstanding candidate species for listing on Appendix I (based on the scientific criteria defined in CMS Res. 5.3). This process should also clarify the level of completion required with respect to already listed populations / partial listings. This work should be done using, to the fullest extent possible, the expertise in the Scientific Council.	ScC14 Aquatic mammals review assessed ScC14 Aquatic reptiles review assessed ScC14 Terrestrial mammals review assessed ScC14 Birds review assessed ScC14 <i>Bats review assessed</i> ScC16 Fishes review assessed ScC16 Invertebrates (Butterflies) review assessed	Marine turtles: Appendix I Listing is complete
1.1.2	Using the results of activity 1.1.1, and following review by the Scientific Council, prepare and maintain a list of species which meet the scientific criteria for listing on Appendix I (see CMS Res.5.3), but which have not yet been listed. This list, which should be prioritised according to the IUCN Categories of Threat, should become known as the <i>ScC Appendix I Candidate List</i> , and should become a regular internal working document of the Scientific Council.	ScC13 Concept/format for List approved ScC14 1st additions to the List approved ScC16 List reviewed and updated	
1.1.3	Support Contracting Parties (particularly developing countries) to prepare and submit standard proposals for listing of species that are on the <i>ScC Appendix I Candidate List</i> , using CMS-IMS, GROMS and IUCN Red Lists as information resources.	ScC15 Listing proposals reviewed/submitted to COP9 for >50% of species on List ScC17 Listing proposals reviewed/submitted to COP10 for >50% of species on List	
1.1.4	Review Appendix I to identify any candidate species for de-listing. Formulate a proposal to the COP to remove these species from Appendix I.	ScC14 Results of review received, and list of species approved ScC15 De-listing proposals submitted to COP9	
Operational Objective 1.3: To prioritise Appendix I species for concerted action, and to identify priority conservation activities in collaboration with relevant stakeholders.			
1.3.1	Prepare a prioritised list of Appendix I species for concerted action taking into account also the feasibility of achieving positive conservation outcomes. Include with this list a record of all concerted actions so far undertaken by CMS and others. This information should be included in the <i>CMS Appendix I Action for Recovery Table</i> .	ScC13 Concept/format for Table approved ScC14 Prioritised list approved	
1.3.2	Review the availability of action plans for all Appendix I species, including format, dates of preparation and review, source, comprehensiveness / adequacy. Include this information in the <i>CMS Appendix I Action for Recovery Table</i> , and make appropriate recommendations to meetings of the COP.	ScC13 Concept/format for Table approved ScC14 Review completed and information included in Table ScC14 Prioritised list of species requiring action plans approved, deadlines and owners agreed ScC15 Rec. submitted to COP9 ScC16 Table reviewed ScC17 Rec. submitted to COP10	
1.3.3	Prepare new Action Plans (prioritised according to threat status), according to the CMS format, for the protection and recovery of all Appendix I species that do not yet have one, to identify key priorities and provide a framework for concerted action and evaluation. Where information or resources are lacking, a review report (preliminary action plan (See Res 3.2)) should be prepared as a first step.		

Operational Objective 1.4: To promote effective conservation actions for all species listed in Appendix I, in collaboration with relevant stakeholders, according to an agreed list of priorities.			
1.4.1	Submit a prioritised programme of concerted action recovery projects for Appendix I species to each meeting of the COP for funding, which meets priorities identified in scientific reviews or Action Plans. Where necessary, assistance should be provided, particularly to developing countries to prepare project proposals. Such proposals will only be considered if submitted for consideration at the previous inter-sessional meeting of the ScC.	ScC13 ScC14 ScC15 ScC16 ScC17	Prioritised list of proposals submitted to COP8 Project proposals received for review Prioritised list of proposals submitted to COP9 Project proposals received for review Prioritised list of proposals submitted to COP10
1.4.2	Continue to support concerted actions for Appendix I species, even if these are covered by an Agreement, through joint work plans with the relevant Agreement secretariats.	ScC13 ScC14 ScC16	Rec. to COP8 for cooperation mechanism Work plans for cooperation between ScC and Agreement Secretariats determined Achievements reviewed
Operational Objective 1.5: To review the success of conservation activities			
1.5.1	Undertake a complete review of Appendix I for consideration at every 3 rd COP (starting with COP9). This review should include the following items: a review of the status of the Appendix (level of completion); review of the principles and procedures for listing or de-listing; adoption, if necessary, of changes to the taxonomic reference systems.	ScC13 ScC14 ScC15 ScC17	TOR and procedure for review agreed Results of review considered Rec. submitted to COP9 Progress reviewed
1.5.2	Through the CMS-IMS, the Scientific Council will report to each meeting of the COP on the population status (size and range) of all Appendix I species, using the most up to date information available. This will be achieved by means of a standardised report (included within the <i>CMS Appendix I Action for Recovery Table</i>). Methods will be developed to show clearly whether the status of each species is stable, increasing or declining.	ScC14 ScC15 ScC16 ScC17	Methodologies for reporting approved Report agreed for submission to COP9, with Rec. Report reviewed Report agreed for submission to COP10, with Rec.
1.5.3	Through the CMS-IMS, the Scientific Council will report to each meeting of the COP on the concerted actions being undertaken for all Appendix I species, using the most up to date information, by means of a standardised report (included within the <i>CMS Appendix I Action for Recovery Table</i>).	ScC14 ScC15 ScC16 ScC17	Methodologies for reporting approved Report agreed for submission to COP9, with Rec. Report reviewed Report agreed for submission to COP10, with Rec.

GOAL 2: ALL MIGRATORY SPECIES WITH AN UNFAVOURABLE CONSERVATION STATUS BENEFIT FROM APPROPRIATE CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT MEASURES (Appendix II species (Art. IV))			
No.	Scientific Council Activity	Expected Result and Deadline	Progress Tracker
Operational objective 2.1: To ensure that Appendix II reflects accurately those migratory species with an unfavourable conservation status and which require international agreements for their conservation and management, as well as those which have a conservation status which would significantly benefit from international co-operation.			
2.1.1	Undertake summary scientific reviews, by taxonomic group, to identify those migratory species and groups of species with an unfavourable conservation status that would significantly benefit from new CMS Cooperative Actions, including Agreements. This work should be done using, to the fullest extent possible, the expertise in the Scientific Council.	ScC14 Aquatic mammals review assessed ScC14 Aquatic reptiles review assessed ScC14 Terrestrial Mammals review assessed ScC14 Birds review assessed ScC14 <i>Bats review assessed</i> ScC16 Fishes review assessed ScC16 Invertebrates (Butterflies) review assessed	
2.1.2	Using the results of activity 2.1.1, and following review by the Scientific Council, prepare and maintain a list of species which meet the scientific criteria for listing on Appendix II, but which have not yet been listed. This list, which should be prioritised according to the IUCN Categories of Threat, should become known as the <i>ScC Appendix II Candidate List</i> , and should become a regular internal working document of the Scientific Council.	ScC13 Concept/format for List approved ScC14 1st additions to the List approved ScC16 List reviewed and updated	
2.1.3	Support Contracting Parties (particularly developing countries) to prepare and submit standard proposals for listing of species that are on the <i>ScC Appendix II Candidate List</i> , using CMS-IMS, GROMS and IUCN Red Lists as information resources.	ScC17 Listing proposals reviewed and submitted to COP10 for >50% of species on List	
2.1.4	Review Appendix II to identify any candidate species and group species for de-listing. Formulate a proposal to the COP to remove these species from Appendix II.	ScC14 Results of review received and list of species approved ScC15 De-listing proposals submitted to COP9	
Operational objective 2.2: To prioritise the elaboration of Agreements for species not adequately covered by other international or regional initiatives and to seek for that purpose collaboration with relevant organisations.			
2.2.1	Develop and maintain an overview of all Agreements, regional initiatives, and other cooperative actions/initiatives being undertaken under CMS and other auspices for migratory species with an unfavourable conservation status. This should be known as the <i>CMS Appendix II Agreements and MOUs Table</i> , which should become a working document of the Scientific Council.	ScC13 Concept/format for Table approved ScC14 1st additions to the Table approved ScC16 Table reviewed and updated	
2.2.2	On the basis of the reviews conducted in 2.1.1 and an analysis of gaps from the <i>CMS Appendix II Agreements and MOUs Table</i> , submit prioritised recommendations to meetings of the COP for new Cooperative Actions to be developed through CMS. For reasons of efficiency, Cooperative Actions should usually encompass large terrestrial and marine regions (both within and beyond the limits of national jurisdiction) and multiple species, and may include multi-taxa Agreements. Where appropriate, the Scientific Council should recommend appropriate partnership arrangements for such Cooperative Actions.	ScC15 Rec. submitted to COP9 considered and approved ScC17 Rec. submitted to COP10 considered and approved	

Operational objective 2.3: To promote the conservation and management of Appendix II species throughout their migratory range through Agreements or cooperative actions.			
2.3.1	Provide the scientific leadership to the development of priority new CMS Agreements and Cooperative Actions identified in the <i>CMS Appendix II Agreements and MOUs Table</i> , through appointment of focal Councillors, inception workshops, project funding proposals etc.	ScC15 Programme of inception activities agreed for list to be approved at COP9 ScC16 Progress reviewed ScC17 Programme of inception activities agreed for list to be approved at COP10	
2.3.2	Maintain close cooperation with scientific focal points and committees of daughter Agreements, regional initiatives (particularly in the marine environment), and the Scientific bodies of UNEP and other conventions (particularly with regard to synergistic actions and cross cutting issues (Research, monitoring, capacity building, addressing threats, recovery actions for Appendix I species etc.)). This will be achieved through cross-representation on appropriate bodies, periodic meeting of Chairs, cross-reporting and joint activities.	ScC14 Focal points and mechanisms for cooperation agreed ScC15 Progress reviewed and Rec. submitted to COP9 ScC17 Progress Reviewed and Rec. submitted to COP10	
Operational objective 2.4: To review the success of conservation and management measures.			
2.4.1	Undertake a complete review of Appendix II for consideration at every 3 rd COP (starting with COP10). This review should include the following items: a review of the status of the Appendix (level of completion); review of the principles and procedures for listing or de-listing; adoption, if necessary, of changes to the taxonomic reference systems.	ScC15 TOR and procedure for review agreed ScC17 Results of review considered and Rec. submitted to COP10	
2.4.2	Develop a rolling programme of outcome-focused reviews of the effectiveness of CMS Agreements and other cooperative actions in conserving species on Appendices I and II. This should also include review of any initiatives to launch a Cooperative Action that have stalled for more than 3 years. Following consideration of the results of such reviews, submit recommendations to meetings of the COP for their enhancement and to improve synergies.	ScC13 TOR and list of reviews agreed ScC14 50% of reviews completed and assessed by Scientific Council ScC15 All reviews completed and assessed by Scientific Council. Rec. submitted to COP9	

GOAL 3: MAJOR THREATS TO MIGRATORY SPECIES AND OBSTACLES TO ANIMAL MIGRATION ARE IDENTIFIED AND ASSESSED, AND MEASURES ARE TAKEN TO CONTROL, REMOVE OR MITIGATE THEM			
No.	Scientific Council Activity	Expected Result and Deadline	Progress Tracker
Operational objective 3.1: To identify and assess the major threats to migratory species, and provide guidelines on their control or mitigation			
3.1.1	Review the results of scientific work on climate change under the auspices of other bodies, as well as by Contracting Parties. Assess the relevance and importance of such work for the conservation of migratory species and the aims of the CMS (Rec 5.5).	ScC12 TOR for review agreed ScC13 Review considered and Rec. submitted to COP8	
3.1.2	Review the effects of hunting (taking) on migratory species, particularly marine mammals/large fish, marine turtles, large terrestrial mammals and birds, to identify priority issues to be addressed through CMS.	ScC13 TOR for review agreed ScC14 Review considered ScC15 Rec. submitted to COP9	
3.1.3	Review the effects of by-catch and unregulated fisheries on migratory species, particularly of marine mammals, large marine fish, marine turtles and albatrosses/petrels to identify priority issues to be addressed through CMS.	ScC13 TOR for review agreed ScC14 Review considered ScC15 Rec. submitted to COP9	
3.1.4	Review the effects of habitat loss, fragmentation and degradation on migratory species in terrestrial and coastal environments (particularly wetlands, forests, grasslands, arid lands) to identify priority issues to be addressed through CMS.	ScC15 TOR for review agreed ScC16 Review considered ScC17 Rec. submitted to COP10	
3.1.5	Review the effects of barriers to migration on migratory species (see Operational Objective 3.4).	ScC13 TOR for review agreed ScC14 Review considered ScC15 Rec. submitted to COP9	
3.1.6	Review the effects of pollution (including oil pollution – see Res. 7.3), disease and alien invasive species on migratory species to identify priority issues to be addressed through CMS.	ScC15 TOR for review agreed ScC16 Review considered ScC17 Rec. submitted to COP10	
3.1.7	On the basis of 3.1.1 – 3.1.6, and using examples of best practice, prepare (or make available existing) guidelines to control or mitigate the impacts from major threats to migratory species, for dissemination to Contracting Parties.	ScC15 Guidelines on climate change, Hunting, by-catch and barriers to migration submitted to COP9 ScC17 Guidelines on habitat loss and Pollution/disease/alien species submitted to COP10	
Operational objective 3.2: To ensure the establishment of networks of protected areas and required species-specific habitats along migratory routes through ecosystem management and habitat restoration.			
3.2.1	Identify (through the Action Plans described under Operational Objective 1.3) networks of critical sites for Concerted Action species throughout their range (see Operational Objective 1.2).	ScC13 Methodology approved ScC15 Critical Sites identified for >50% of species listed on Appendix I ScC17 Critical Sites identified for >90% of species listed on Appendix I	
3.2.2	Through the implementation of Concerted Actions, promote the protection of sites identified under 3.2.1, and their management and restoration to favour their recovery.	ScC15 Rec. submitted to COP9 identifying unprotected sites ScC17 Rec. submitted to COP10 identifying unprotected sites	
3.2.3	Identify, in the framework of Agreements or the preparation of Cooperative Actions, important ecological networks of sites/habitats and key migration corridors required by Appendix II species.	Adequacy of knowledge determined in reviews under Activity 2.1.1 ScC15 Rec. submitted to COP9 identifying priorities for further work	
3.2.4	Through the implementation of Agreements, Cooperative Actions, and synergy/partnerships with other Conventions (particularly CBD, Ramsar and the Convention to Combat Desertification), ensure that programmes are developed to restore and sustainably manage the sites and habitats for migratory species identified in 3.2.1 and 3.2.2, using the principles of ecosystem management.	ScC15 Adequacy of measures determined in reviews under Activity 2.4.2 Rec. submitted to COP9 identifying priorities for daughter Agreements and synergy with other conventions	

Operational objective 3.3: To address threats to migratory species and include conclusions in impact assessment procedures where possible.			
3.3.1	Review the existing international guidance on environmental impact assessment, identify gaps in relation to migratory species interests and if necessary develop further guidance relating to migratory species issues for consideration and possible adoption by COP8 (Res.7.2).	ScC13 ScC17	Results of review considered and Rec. submitted to COP8 Progress reviewed
3.3.2	Develop guidance and formalise a mechanism for rapid CMS action and advocacy in response to emergency and non-compliance situations (eg pollution incidents, epidemics, detrimental taking of endangered species), using experience from previous arrangements (eg for Monk Seal).	ScC13 ScC17	Mechanism identified and proposed to COP8 Progress reviewed
3.3.3	Recommend to the COP or to the Standing Committee, as appropriate, concerted measures to be taken by Parties in respect of by-catch of seabirds, marine turtles and cetaceans listed in Appendices I and II (Res.6.2, and see Rec. 7.2).	ScC15 ScC16	Concerted measures proposed to COP9 based on review in Activity 3.1.3 Progress reviewed
3.3.4	<i>Consider the role CMS may play in addressing oil pollution and migratory species by reviewing existing plans and provisions to address oil pollution; and similarly, reviewing existing relevant programmes for training and information exchange (see Res.7.3).</i>	ScC17	Mechanism identified and proposed to COP10
3.3.5	<i>Review existing scientific links between the CMS and other bodies undertaking work on threats to migratory species (eg. CBD, Ramsar Convention, Climate Change Convention, Convention to Combat Desertification). Formulate proposals for improving and strengthening such links where necessary with the objective of ensuring that the CMS has access to the most up to date scientific information available to assist and inform its deliberations; report conclusions and make recommendations to the meeting of the COP.</i>	ScC14 ScC15	Review of existing links received, and options for improvement formulated Rec. submitted to COP9
3.3.6	<i>Review the issue of the use of tracking devices with endangered migratory species including the Guidelines already developed by the Scientific Council, and review further issues that may arise concerning such techniques at every second inter-sessional meeting.</i>	ScC14 ScC17	Guidelines approved/circulated New issues reviewed
Operational objective 3.4: To remove or mitigate the impediments of obstacles to animal migrations			
3.4.1	Build on work already initiated by the Scientific Council (Doc. UNEP/CMS/ScC 5.3) through a commissioned study, to advise how CMS can most effectively address the problems caused by obstacles to migration. Special attention should be given to impacts on Appendix I species.	ScC13 ScC15	TOR for study approved Study reviewed and Rec. submitted to COP9
3.4.2	Support implementation of the recommendations from 3.4.1 by preparing guidelines for remedial measures, and by gathering and disseminating the results of case studies.	ScC15	Guidelines submitted to COP9
3.4.3	Assess existing and potential threats from wind turbines in relation to migratory mammals and birds, including their habitats and food sources, to develop specific guidelines for the establishment of such plants and to report to COP8 (see Res.7.5).	ScC13 ScC16	Threats assessed and guidelines submitted to COP8 Guidelines reviewed
Operational objective 3.5: To review the success of conservation and management measures.			
3.5.1	Undertake ongoing evaluation of the contribution that CMS has made to achieve Goal 3.	ScC17	1 st evaluation completed, and Rec. submitted to COP10

GOAL 4: TO IMPROVE THE AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION FOR CONSERVING MIGRATORY SPECIES THROUGH STRATEGIC RESEARCH AND MONITORING, AND TO USE THIS TO DEVELOP CAPACITY AND AWARENESS			
No.	Scientific Council Activity	Expected Result and Deadline	Progress Tracker
Operational objective 4.1: To undertake or promote strategic research to address the major issues affecting migratory species.			
4.1.1	On the basis of the reviews described in Activities 1.1.2 and 2.1.1, and species Action Plans, identify the main strategic research priorities required to address the conservation of migratory species.	ScC16 Research priorities for Appendix I and II species assessed	
4.1.2	Maintain a <i>List of CMS Research Priorities</i> , as identified in 4.1.1, that can be promoted widely to national and international research funding bodies.	ScC13 Concept/Format of List approved ScC13 1 st draft of List submitted to COP8 with Rec. ScC15 List submitted to COP9 with Rec. ScC17 List submitted to COP10 with Rec.	
4.1.3	Explore the best ways and means to promote and facilitate scientific and technical co-operation and research on migratory species (including via the CBD Clearing House Mechanism).	ScC14 Options reviewed ScC15 Rec. submitted to Cop9	
Operational objective 4.2: To support whenever possible the systematic monitoring of migratory species as a basis for decision-making, and to provide capacity building for monitoring.			
4.2.1	Ensure that all Action Plans for Appendix I species adequately address the priority needs for monitoring and research on these species.	Assessment completed through Activities 1.3.2 and 1.3.3	
4.2.2	Incorporate in the <i>CMS Appendix I Actions for Recovery Table</i> , information showing whether or not adequate monitoring information is being provided per Range State for each Appendix I listed species. Advise each meeting of the COP to address any gaps in monitoring, and to provide any necessary support to increase the capacity of developing countries to undertake monitoring, particularly of Appendix I species.	ScC15 Table reviewed and draft Rec. submitted to COP9 ScC17 Table reviewed and draft Rec. submitted to COP10	
4.2.3	On the basis of monitoring information provided through the CMS-IMS for Appendix I species, include a simple assessment of population trend (stable, increasing, declining, unknown) for each species in the <i>CMS Appendix I Actions for Recovery Table</i> .	ScC15 Assessment included in Table ScC17 Updated assessment included in Table	
4.2.4	Through the development of closer scientific liaison with daughter Agreements, promote collaboration and enhancement of monitoring programmes, where necessary through appropriate recommendations to the COP and capacity building.	Adequacy reviewed through Activity 2.3.2	
Operational objective 4.3: To disseminate information on migratory species so as to enhance their conservation, through improved decision-making and greater public awareness			
4.3.1	Review and suggest materials for the CMS web site.	ScC14 Advice completed ScC16 Progress reviewed	
4.3.2	Advise the CMS Secretariat on the (scientific / technical) contents of an Information Pack to be provided to all Contracting Parties and Scientific Councillors, particularly concerning actions required for Appendix I species.	ScC14 Advice completed	
4.3.3	Identify flagship species that CMS could use to raise public/ government awareness and capacity (eg satellite tracking of turtles and by-catch).	ScC14 Flagship species identified ScC16 Progress reviewed	

Operational objective 4.4: To review the progress made in research, monitoring (coverage and quality), as well as in the degree of awareness of conservation enhancement and in monitoring capacity		
4.4.1	Use the information gathered under Operational Objective 4.1 to prepare a report to each meeting of the COP on the progress in research, and the outstanding research priorities, as summarised in the <i>List of CMS Research Priorities</i> .	ScC15 Progress reported to COP9 ScC17 Progress reported to COP10
4.4.2	Use the information gathered under Operational Objective 4.2 to prepare a report to each meeting of the COP on the progress in monitoring of migratory species, and the outstanding monitoring priorities.	ScC15 Progress reported to COP9 ScC17 Progress reported to COP10
Operational objective 4.5: To contribute to the WSSD targets through the joint work programme with CBD, and by using the global goals of CBD, through the development of appropriate indicators		
4.5.1	Identify experts on migratory species as indicators who could be included on the CBD roster of experts.	ScC13 Experts identified
4.5.2	Organize a technical workshop or commission a study to examine migratory species as indicators, as a contribution to the CBD work programme on indicators (Action 9.4 of CMS-CBD JWP).	ScC14 Workshop organised and results reviewed
4.5.3	From the candidate list of indicators identified in 4.5.2 (including Appendix I species, marine / coastal / terrestrial / freshwater species, threats), select and develop 1-3 SIMPLE indicators of the status of migratory species, as a contribution to WSSD targets and to support a CMS bid for Action Funds.	ScC15 Draft indicators submitted to COP9 with Rec.

Report of the Working Group on Terrestrial Mammals

The Terrestrial Mammals Working Group, meeting during the 12th CMS Scientific Council meeting in Glasgow, on the 1st of April 2004:

1. considered the proposals for addition to Appendices I and II submitted in preliminary form by Mr Hudson, and endorsed them. It thanked Mr Hudson for his preparatory work, and encouraged him to continue with the preparation of formal proposals for the next COP. It suggested that Mr Hudson considers the possibility of additional species in need of conservation, including ones with limited migratory movements, and that he pursues reflection on possible agreements or concerted actions.
2. recommended extension of listing of *Gorilla gorilla beringei* to the species “*Gorilla gorilla*” and the preparation of a comprehensive concerted action that would include existing preliminary projects on mountain gorilla as well as projects on lowland populations.
3. reviewed the progress of the Concerted Action on Sahelo-Saharan Antelopes, and noted in particular the advances in the implementation of the first regional project. It strongly endorsed the suggestion already made in plenary by the councillor of Senegal that the Convention continues to give high priority to the support of existing actions and their implementation in the Range States, in particular to the Sahelo-Saharan Antelopes Concerted Action. A progress report on the Concerted Action is appended.
4. discussed the feasibility of initiating a second large scale high profile Concerted Action, in favour of desert and sub-desert mammals of central and eastern central Asia, anchored on present Range States Parties, Mongolia, India, Pakistan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan. The Working Group endorsed the proposal and decided to present an elaborated formal project proposal to the next Scientific Council meeting. This Concerted Action will necessitate additions of species to the Appendices, including that of *Cervus elaphus bactrianus* as well as extension of listing of *Saïga tatarica tatarica* to the species *Saïga tatarica*, a proposal that was endorsed by the group.
5. noted the development of the cooperative action on the west African elephant, in particular the existing strategy for west Africa, currently in circulation among the west African Range States for the purpose of signing the CMS MoU being developed, and the preparation by the Range States of national strategies. The Range States meeting for the signature and launching of a MoU is scheduled for late 2004. The cooperative action however covers both the west African and the central African populations. The WG encourages similar progress to be made with the drafting of the strategy for the central African populations, to allow central African Range States to join the MoU as soon as possible. The WG was also aware of an initiative by IFAW and the SNPS (Société Nationale de Protection de la Nature), through the organisation of a workshop to discuss the status of the west and central African elephants in June 2004 in Paris.
6. noted the preparation of experimental datasheet on mammals as referred in ScC12/Doc 5. The datasheet will be circulated to all the members of the WG to allow them to provide comments by mail or e-mail once they have had the opportunity to analyze them.

CONCERTED ACTION ON SAHELO-SAHARAN ANTELOPES (SSA)
PROGRESS REPORT TO THE 12TH MEETING OF THE CMS SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL
Glasgow, 31 March - 3 April 2004

1. Appendix I Species concerned:

- *Oryx dammah*
- *Addax nasomaculatus*
- *Gazella dama*
- *Gazella leptoceros*
- *Gazella cuvieri*
- *Gazella dorcas*

2. Actions undertaken in the last 18 months:

◆ First Regional project:

Following the adoption of the CMS Action Plan by all Range States, efforts were directed at developing projects to allow implementation of this action plan. A two year project development phase was concluded in May 2003 with the signature of the first Sahelo-Saharan Antelopes regional project under CMS, financed for the most part by the FFEM (Fonds Français pour l'Environnement Mondial), with co-funding from CMS. The 4 year project is constructed around three pilot countries, namely Tunisia, Niger and Mali, where different activities should take place, including *in situ* conservation actions, development of effective networks of protected areas, reintroduction and/or captive breeding efforts, communities involvement actions, public awareness. A series of transversal activities will take place in those pilot countries as well as in Morocco, Senegal, Mauritania, and Chad, including much needed new inventories and habitat evaluation, training and capacity building.

During the first year of the project, much time was spent defining in detail realistic targets in the current context (more than 2 years had passed since the first project evaluation was completed, and in some cases the general context has been considerably modified), evaluating the most pressing needs, and co-ordinating with other international or national conservation efforts.

In Tunisia, which is, with Morocco, the most advanced Range State in terms of restoration attempts of the Sahelo-Saharan fauna, the accent is now the consolidation of a real network of protected areas for the Sahelo-Saharan Antelopes, on the preparatory work for the future reintroduction of *Addax nasomaculatus* in the wild, and on the preservation of one of the only known populations of *Gazella leptoceros* in the world. A workshop will be organised in Tunisia by CMS in April 2004 for the development of a strategy on the necessary reshuffling of semi-captive animals within the Tunisian protected areas system.

In Niger, the accent has been shifted on the Termit massif and the Erg Tin Tounma, in north-eastern Niger, which is possibly now the best refugium of Saharan biodiversity in the world, including the existence of what could be the last population of wild addax. The Termit massif and its surrounding areas, if formally gazetted as a protected area, could represent one of the last hopes for preventing the extinction of Sahelo-Saharan wildlife and habitats *in situ*. Today, the entire area's wildlife is threatened by unsustainable hunting practices by Gulf States VIP.

Solutions are being sought in the form of a large protected area managed in an integrated manner with surrounding hunting concessions, together with local communities, national and international conservation bodies.

In Mali, efforts will be concentrated on developing a feasibility study for the establishment of a protected area around the Tamesna, and on confirming the importance of the *Gazella dama* population in the south Tamesna region, including identify the most appropriate actions to be taken in favour of such a threatened population of an almost extinct species.

◆ Senegal:

Rehabilitation of the vegetation cover and the establishment of the Ferlo National Park, as well as installation of a first 600 ha enclosure have permitted the translocation of the captive *Oryx dammah* and *Gazella dama* mohr from the Gueumbeul National Park to the Ferlo NP, as well as capacity building opportunities for the national park staff.

◆ Chad, Libya and Sudan:

Continuous consultations are taking place between the CMS SSA working group and the national conservation authorities in Chad, on the development of another regional project around the Ouadi Rime Ouadi Achim PA. Preparations are going on for holding a stakeholder workshop in Chad for the development of a project concept.

◆ SSA database:

A database is being constituted, which will include all recorded sightings of Sahelo-Saharan Antelopes, data on their habitats, historical distribution, evolution of habitats. New inventories and sightings recorded since the development of the CMS Concerted Action will be included. An updated version of the conservation status reports for each of the six species will be available in 2004.

◆ SSA CMS website:

A CMS SSA website is currently being developed, which will allow access to hard to find literature, reports, current problems and issues.

◆ Links with other conservation bodies:

The CMS SSA working group is keeping very close links and interacting with other conservation initiatives that could impact or enhance its own efforts, in particular with the SSIG (Sahelo-Saharan Interest Group), itself created after the CMS Djerba workshop (1998).

**REPORT OF THE TAXONOMIC WORKING GROUP
ON AQUATIC MAMMALS AND LARGE FISHES
(W. Perrin)**

Agenda Item 5: Proposals for amendments to Appendices

There were no relevant proposals for additions to Appendix I or II

Agenda Item 4.1: Review of Concerted Actions and recommendations for additions to list

Monk seal - The group received a report from Spain on the Mediterranean monk seal. The most recent population estimates are: Black Sea 0, eastern Mediterranean 260-315, western Mediterranean 16-32, Atlantic 175-182; for a total of 451-529 (around 500). Major changes from the last report at SC11 in 2001 are apparent extirpation from the Black Sea, possible extirpation in Croatia, and sightings in Italy and Sardinia, and a possible increase in Turkey (possibly due to more comprehensive survey). Recent records of annual pup production are 16 in Greece, 9 in Turkey (incomplete), 1 in Madeira and 25 on the African Atlantic coast. Pup mortality on the Sahara coast has decreased to about 0.33 due to later occurrence of storms. Good progress has been made on implementation of the Recovery Plan for the Atlantic populations by Portugal, Spain, Morocco and Mauritania; details on individual projects in Mauritania are given in Doc. 5 Attach 1 Annex B. Emphasis on community involvement and assistance to fishermen has resulted in a change toward positive perception of the monk seal and good cooperation with the research program. Consideration is being given to expansion of the project to Morocco. The potential exists for expanding the international cooperative effort to an MOU; the group endorses this approach and recommends that the Secretariat offer advice to Spain on the advisability of and procedures for such an initiative.

Franciscana – The CMS project started in 2002 will be completed in 2005. It will provide population estimates and recommendations for concerted actions for populations in Argentina, Uruguay and Brazil.

Southern marine otter – The CMS project begun in 2003 focussing on population estimates for Peruvian waters is close to completion and will offer recommendations for concerted actions after consultation with Chilean experts.

Southern river otter – No action has been initiated for this species, which is shared by Argentina and Chile.

Giant catfish - The group recommends that the giant catfish of the Mekong River (*Pangasianodon gigas*) be added to the list of species for Concerted Action. This is based on the recent classification by IUCN as Critically Endangered (under the criterion of ongoing rapid decline in population) and the internationally recognized need for immediate conservation action to save the species from imminent extinction. A proposal submitted to this meeting by the IUCN Mekong Wetlands Biodiversity Program offers the opportunity for Concerted Action.

Agenda Item 4.2: Review of cooperative actions and recommendations for additions to list

South American dolphins [*Lagenorhynchus obscurus*, *L. australis*, *Cephalorhynchus commersonii*, *C. eutropia*, *Phocoena spinipinnis*, *P. dioptrica*]- No cooperative actions were reported, but

proposals for action may result from the recommendations of the CMS workshop held in Chile in 2002 and from an upcoming meeting in Ecuador.

Whale shark - The Philippines has been identified as the focal point for the species for the development of an MOU for whale shark range states. There has been virtually no progress on drafting of the MOU pending advice on how to proceed in a more effective manner. The Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (BFAR) of the Philippines has expressed interest in whale shark conservation and linking up with the other fishery agencies in Southeast Asia. BFAR and the Philippine Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) could work together in development of an MOU. Seychelles has also expressed interest in the MOU. It was noted that Seychelles is not a CMS Party but that its interest is welcomed. The Philippines was successful in supporting inclusion of the whale shark in CITES Appendix II at the last CITES COP.

Sturgeons and paddlefishes – No report was received on these taxa.

Agenda Item 3.3: Reporting needs [Feedback on WCMC review of Concerted Action spp.] - The group did not have time to examine the document in detail (check data and references, etc.). However, some deficiencies and potential problems were noted. The group recommends strongly that the document be considered a draft at this point. Some items noted:

- a) Two concerted-action aquatic spp. are missing (*Platanista g. gangetica*, *Lontra provocax*)
- b) Classification not up to date; e.g., *Pontoporia* included in family Platanistidae rather than Pontoporiidae
- c) The arrows in the summary indicating status may be over implications and somewhat misleading. They are not sufficiently analytical, for example not taking into account infra specific variation.
- d) Some references are of questionable provenance. For example, the reference given as the source for indicating that the sperm whale is increasing is the website of the South Carolina Wildlife Federation. While the ultimate source used by the website might be reliable, this could not be determined from the document at hand.
- e) Some country reports are incomplete, indicating a need to check back with the countries.

It is recommended that the document be reviewed by the Scientific Council as a whole, perhaps via a limited-access website, and subsequently by the relevant appointed councillors, and revised accordingly before being released.

Agenda Item 6.2b: New project proposals

The group had before it four proposals. All were solicited. Need were identified and potential contractors invited to submit preproposals for consideration by the Council, with the understanding that full proposals in the format required by the Secretariat would be prepared if the preproposals were accepted in principle. The group agreed that all four proposed projects were relevant to CMS goals and should be supported if possible. The proposals are discussed below in the order of priority agreed by the Group. The members of the group wished to emphasize that all four were thought to be important and that ranking them was difficult and somewhat arbitrary in view of the variety of considerations and perspectives involved, i.e., balancing urgency of conservation need with the need to develop the scope and operations of CMS.

1. *Regional workshop on the giant catfish (Pangasianodon gigas) of the Mekong River Basin (\$34,000)* - The giant catfish is on Appendix I. It was classified by IUCN as Critically Endangered in 2003, based on the criterion of rapid ongoing decline in population. It is the largest freshwater fish in the world, reaching 300kg. It presently occurs in Thailand,

Cambodia and Laos; its range formerly extended to Vietnam, China and Myanmar. It is migratory, with documented movements of 300km but total range of migration unknown. Threats are fishing, dams, navigation projects and habitat destruction. Development and implementation of an action plan are critical if extinction is to be avoided. The proposal is for a 5-day workshop to develop a draft conservation action plan, as part of a proposed joint project by CMS and IUCN. The host institution would be the IUCN Mekong Wetlands Biodiversity Program headquartered at the University of California at Davis. It was noted that the project would contribute to sustainable development in the region, as a goal would be to reconstitute the population to the point that it could sustain a fishery. It was also noted that a joint CMS-IUCN project would help promote CMS in the Southeast Asian region, where efforts have also been underway to develop regional cooperation on marine mammals and whale sharks. Although there are no Parties among the range states of the species, it was agreed that this would not necessarily preclude Concerted Action by Parties. It was suggested that RAMSAR be consulted for additional advice.

2. *Training workshops in the South Pacific on cetacean research methods (\$35,000)* - This proposal arose from the recent CMS/SPREP workshop on potential regional CMS-sponsored cooperation on marine mammals in the South Pacific (Melanesia, Micronesia, Polynesia and Australasia). Progress was made at the workshop toward development of an MOU on cetaceans. A serious barrier to effective regional conservation planning and action is the lack of information on the distribution, status and population threats of cetaceans in the region, and capacity building was identified as a prerequisite for developing the needed information. The proposed workshops would be organized by the South Pacific Whale Research Consortium and the New Zealand Government and be conducted in Melanesia and Polynesia. They would concentrate on basic research techniques, including species identification, collection of data on bycatch, processing stranded animals, and designing population surveys. The trainees would be nominated by the relevant national wildlife/fishery agencies. Additional necessary financial support has been promised by the Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society (WDCS), and WDCS here reiterated its strong support for the project. The question was posed as to whether participation by individuals from other countries needing capacity building would be possible; the group thought that this might be possible but referred the question to the Council and the Secretariat.
3. *Regional symposium and planning workshop to assess status of, and threats to, small cetaceans in the western Indian Ocean (\$41,300)* - The purpose of this initiative is to give attention to the status of marine mammals in a region of the world not yet considered for CMS-sponsored regional marine cooperation. CMS Parties in the region include South Africa, Tanzania, Kenya and Somalia. The status of small cetacean populations is unknown, but threats include bycatch in fisheries, direct hunting, and habitat degradation. For example, substantial bycatch has been documented in Madagascar. Awareness of conservation threats to migratory small cetaceans and the capacity to assess and mitigate them are absent in many parts of the region. The purpose of the proposed workshop is to enable development of a collaborative regional approach, potentially leading to a regional CMS Agreement. The proposed venue is Cape Town; the host organization is the Wildlife Conservation Society, in collaboration with the Center for Biodiversity and Conservation of the American Museum of Natural History. Members of the group noted the lack of information on cetaceans along most of the coast of East Africa highlighted by the IUCN Cetacean Specialist Group in its most current review and strongly supported the involvement of CMS in the region. It was advised that the geographic scope be from South Africa north to Somalia and east to Mauritius, but that wider participation might be possible depending on availability of funds.

4. *A review of migration in sharks (~\$10,000)* –Expertise on large fishes, including sharks, is severely limited in the Council. This is a shortcoming in the capability of the Council to develop and evaluate likely future proposals for listing of migratory sharks in addition to the great white shark and whale shark presently in the Appendices. One approach to this problem would be to commission a review of migration in sharks by an outside expert. Potential contractors include the IUCN Shark Specialist Group or someone nominated by that body. It was noted that there are likely more species of migratory sharks than those listed by species and family in UNCLOS Annex I (“Highly Migratory Species”), e.g., the blue shark. It was also noted that this issue cuts across that of bycatch of other marine taxa, as bycatch of sharks is often logistically interactive with bycatch of birds and mammals. The group agreed that the scope of the review should be extended to all elasmobranchs, including rays and sawfishes. ACCOBAMS noted that the IUCN Shark Specialist Group is highly competent to carry out such a review.

Report of the Working Group on Birds

4.1 Concerted Actions for selected Appendix I species/groups

Written reports (ScC12 Doc 5) had been made available for the Lesser White-fronted Goose (*Anser erythropus*) and the Humboldt Penguin (*Spheniscus humboldti*) by UNEP WCMC and for the Ruddy-headed Goose (*Chloephaga rubidiceps*) by the species Focal Point, Daniel Blanco. Verbal reports were made at ScC12, giving further detail on the same three species and on others; brief details are given here.

Andean flamingos: the ongoing population assessment and radio tracking of birds in the altiplano will continue until mid-2004. An Agreement between Argentina, Bolivia, Chile and Peru continues under discussion.

Ruddy-headed Goose: comparison of population estimates made in 1999 and 2003 suggests a decline in the continental/Fuegian population of this species. The cause of declines on the breeding grounds is still considered to be the Patagonian grey fox. Recent work suggests that, on the wintering grounds and on passage, the main factor affecting the population is shooting, both for sport and in often-intense control efforts by agricultural interests. The CMS project implemented by Wetlands International, including elements of survey, practical management measures and awareness-raising, was active and successful in 2003. First steps have been taken towards a comparative study of the genetics of the populations of the species on the mainland and on the Malvinas/Falklands.

Great Bustard (*Otis tarda*): after many years of decline, the Middle European population of this species has shown a slight increase in the last two years. This is believed to be as a result of improved management methods in the Kiskunsag National Park (where more than a third of all Hungarian birds now occur) as well as in Austria and Slovakia. There is no room of complacency, however, as populations remain small and vulnerable. A CMS-funded workshop on the conservation and management of the species, originally planned for 2003, is now expected to take place in 2004 in Austria.

Slender-billed Curlew (*Numenius tenuirostris*): the species remains very difficult to find, with few recent records, though an interesting report from south-eastern Egypt of a single bird in mangrove habitat gives some encouragement that the species may be holding on in areas which are rarely checked. Work continues on the analysis of isotopes in feather samples from museum specimens, which it is hoped will enable the identification of possible breeding areas. Measures to conserve the habitat of the species in the European Union, particularly in Greece, continue to benefit the few individuals of the species that may use the sites concerned (as well of course as benefiting other migratory waterbird species).

Lesser Kestrel (*Falco naumanni*): there is nothing new to report, but it is worth noting that the species of course falls within the proposed scoping study for an Agreement on raptors.

Aquatic Warbler (*Acrocephalus paludicola*): there has been much progress in the last year, with the conclusion and entry into force of a Memorandum of Understanding on the species. The current estimate of the world population is about 20,000 birds, with some 60% breeding in Belarus. The species continues to decrease across its breeding range; only the Hungarian population is increasing. The threats have been well studied and the conservation priorities established. A survey, funded by

the United Kingdom via CMS, has been undertaken in the last few months, using isotope techniques to identify more precisely the wintering grounds in West Africa: the results of the necessary analyses are awaited. Investigations into migration routes are needed (particularly of the Ukrainian sub-population, see the project proposal in 6.2 (b) below).

White-headed Duck (*Oxyura leucocephala*): the CMS-supported review of the status of the species in Central Asia` identifying threats and including recommendations for conservation action, has been well received in the region. A revised Action Plan for the species is being planned (see the project proposal in 6.2 (b) below). Measures to control and/or eliminate populations of the alien Ruddy Duck (*O. jamaicensis*), a particular threat to the Spanish population of the *leucocephala*, continue, notably in the United Kingdom.

Lesser White-fronted Goose: one of the key priorities in the conservation of this species remains the identification of wintering grounds beyond staging areas in Kazakhstan. The CMS-funded expedition to Lake Kulykol to catch birds and attach satellite-tracking devices was unfortunately not successful: it proved very difficult to predict precisely where to site the cannon nets to catch roosting birds, and a quite unexpected problem occurred when the firing-wires were bitten through, probably by foxes or wolves. It is intended to try to catch birds in autumn 2004 in Norway.

Ferruginous Duck (*Aythya nyroca*): a draft status report on the species has been published and an action plan is in preparation. The European population unfortunately continues to decline, but a hitherto unknown population has been found wintering in south-east Asia. The breeding grounds of this population are not yet known, and this highlights the need to get a clearer picture of the species' migratory routes. It was noted that in Croatia, the species had proved vulnerable to disturbance from aggressive Mute Swans (*Cygnus olor*) at its breeding fish-ponds.

Humboldt Penguin: the population size is still unknown; it may be of the order of 13,000 birds (7500 in Chile and 5500 in Peru), although it could be somewhat higher, judging by a recent estimate of 7000 pairs at a single site in Chile. Conservation action considered to be necessary includes better enforcement of protection legislation, the establishment of fishing-restricted and fishing-free zones, banning the use of the most dangerous drift-gill nets in penguin foraging areas, the protection of landing areas, and in particular the protection of major colonies (including by guarding during the breeding season).

For the three Concerted Action species added by COP7 (*Platalea minor*, *Eurynorhynchus pygmeus* and *Sterna bernsteini*), a project approved in principle by ScC11 remains to be defined. For the other Concerted Action species (as listed in Resolution 7.1), there were no reports made, usually because of the absence from the meeting of the designated Focal Point for the species. It will be important to close these gaps as far as possible at the next meeting of the Scientific Council. The Working Group particularly regretted having no report on the Houbara Bustard (*Chlamydotis undulata*) and asked that the Chairman of the Scientific Council consider making the appropriate contact with Saudi Arabia, perhaps involving also other Contracting Parties, which might be able to assist.

The Working Group addressed the question of Focal Points for Concerted Action species. For the Aquatic Warbler, it was agreed that Dr Alexander Kozulin would make contact with the Scientific Councillor for Belarus, Dr Nikiforov, to discuss whether Belarus might provide the Focal Point. No suggestions were made with respect to White-headed Duck and Lesser White-fronted Goose: the appointed Councillor for Birds will continue in this role for the present. As to the three new Concerted Action species added by COP7, no Range State Contracting Parties were present, but a name was suggested, and it was decided that we should pursue this after the meeting, perhaps via the appointed Councillor for Asian fauna in due course.

At this stage, no species were proposed to be added to the list for Concerted Action.

4.2 Cooperative actions for Appendix II species

A written report on the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels had been made (Sc12 Inf 28). Verbal reports were also made as follows.

Corncrake: a recent review of this species by BirdLife International has resulted in revision of its conservation status from Vulnerable to Near Threatened. The management techniques introduced for the species near the edge of its range in the UK continue to give grounds for optimism. No other information has been received.

Black-necked Swan: population monitoring continues in parts of Argentina, southern Brazil, Chile, and Uruguay. A project involving banding and marking is expected to be discussed at the forthcoming Waterbirds around the World conference in Edinburgh.

Albatrosses and Petrels: the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP) came into force at the beginning of February 2004, when the fifth country ratified. It is expected that a sixth ratification will be announced and that two more countries are not far behind. A first Meeting of the Parties is expected to be held in late 2004, perhaps in Australia in association with the CCAMLR meeting in Hobart, Tasmania. It was reported that a prize (sponsored by the SEO, the BirdLife Partner in Spain) for innovative methods to save albatrosses from death on longlines, had recently been awarded to a New Zealand fisherman for the development of a repellent oil made from fish livers. It was noted that other fishing methods are giving increasing cause for concern with respect to albatrosses and petrels. Clearly, ACAP has many challenges before it.

For the remaining few Cooperative Action species (as listed in Recommendation 7.1) no reports were made, usually because of the absence from the meeting of the designated Focal Point for the species. Once again, the aim should be to close these gaps at the next meeting.

No changes were proposed to the Focal Points on the Cooperative Action species, and no names were suggested to cover the three species added to the list by COP7 (*Polystictus pectoralis pectoralis*, *Sporophila ruficollis* and *Pseudocolopteryx dinellianus*).

There were no firm proposals to add species to the Cooperative Action list at this stage, but it was suggested that the Houbara Bustard might qualify as a possible candidate. Criteria were not discussed.

5 Proposals for amendments to Appendix I and II of the Convention at COP8

Argentina introduced a paper proposing that *Calidris canutus rufa*, a subspecies of the Red Knot, which is believed to have declined by 50% in the past three years, should be added to Appendix I. The meeting agreed with Argentina's conclusions.

BirdLife International's Threatened Birds of the World 2004, published in March, has enabled the identification of nearly 40 species in the Critical and Endangered category that appear to qualify for listing in CMS Appendix I. There are over 60 more such species in the Vulnerable category. The feeling of the Working Group was that the Scientific Council should in principle promote the addition of all these species to the Appendix. The views of other Scientific Councillors on the scale of such potentially major changes to the Appendix would be welcome.

A number of species groups among these potential new species for Appendix I are also possibilities for addition to Appendix II, including many seabirds, particularly penguins and various petrels, but also including passerines, for instance, of the Americas.

The range of possibilities was too broad for the Working Group to make firm recommendations to the Scientific Council at this stage.

A number of species currently on Appendix I are good candidates for addition to Appendix II, specifically *Alectrurus risora*, *A. tricolor*, *Sporophila zelichi*, *S. palustris*, *S. cinnamomea*, *S. hypochroma* and *Xanthopsar flavus*.

6.1 Potential new Agreements

The Working Group briefly discussed the idea of an Agreement on raptors, and supported the idea of a scoping study, as proposed by the representative of the United Kingdom under an earlier agenda item. At least one Councillor felt that the boundaries of such an Agreement should be drawn as widely as possible.

6.2 (b) New project proposals

The Working Group received project proposals, brief details of which follow in systematic order.

White-headed Duck (Endangered: App I and II): CMS is asked to provide 2000 Euros to enable the European office of BirdLife International to update the existing single species action plan, alongside funding from the EU's DG Environment and the African Eurasian Waterbird Agreement. The Working Group considered that this small sum generated several benefits, including that of cooperation with the European Union. The proposal was supported.

Corncrake (Near Threatened: App II: a very similar case to the White-headed Duck, except that the sum requested is 2500 Euros. The proposal was supported.

Olog's Gull (*Larus atlanticus*) (Vulnerable: App I): a proposal from Argentina for banding/ringing studies of the species, to identify the main wintering areas in Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay, to create a network of observers along the migration route and to inform local communities by means of educational and outreach materials. The sum of \$17,200 is requested. The proposal was supported.

Audouin's Gull (*Larus audouini*) (Near Threatened: App I and II): a proposal from Croatia to discover the status and population trend in Croatia, to find the main feeding sites of the Yellow-legged Gull (*Larus cachinnans michahellis*) with a view to controlling the population of this species, which competes with Audouin's Gull. The sum requested is approximately \$50,000. The Working Group supported the proposal, but did not debate whether a smaller sum (more typical of such grants from CMS) would still enable the project to go ahead.

Grey-cheeked Parakeet (*Brotogeris pyrrhopterus*): (Endangered: Appendix I): a proposal from Peru to discover the current conservation status of this species on the border of Peru and Ecuador. This area (the Tumbesian Dry Forest Endemic Bird Area) is gravely threatened, mainly by forest clearance for cattle ranching, and this species is one of many range-restricted species threatened. Its population is estimated to have declined in Peru by 80% in the 1990s. Very little is known about its

numbers and distribution in Ecuador. The sum requested from CMS is \$20,000 as part of a project totalling \$53,000. The Working Group supported the proposal.

Aquatic Warbler (Vulnerable: App I and II): a proposal from Ukraine to discover whether the breeding birds of the Ukrainian sub-population make use of an easterly migration route (down the Balkan flyway). The project involves ringing/banding studies using taped lures. The sum requested of CMS is \$17,580 from a total project cost of \$22,380. The project was supported.

Unfortunately, we had no time to prioritise these proposals. If this is regarded as essential, I would welcome guidance by the Scientific Council and the Secretariat.

Report of the Working Group on Marine Turtles
CMS ScC12: 2 April 2004
 Discussion chaired by Dr C. Limpus, Appointed Councillor.

1. **There were no proposals to consider for changes to Appendix listings with respect to aquatic reptiles.**

2. **Concerted actions & Cooperative actions:**

It is apparent from discussion within the group that there is a need to strengthen linkage between the CMS signatory states and the delivery of conservation actions under the **West African MoU** and Indian Ocean – Southeast Asian MoU.

West African MoU

- There has been limited significant progress in implementing the MoU and the associated agreed actions since the meeting of Signatory States in Nairobi in 2002.
- Nigeria identified the need to revitalize the activities under this MoU.
- The French offer to provide financial support for technical assistance to the signatory states needs to be followed up. CMS secretariat indicated that they were that they are in discussion with Dr Fretey regarding the establishment of secretarial support and the holding of a regional meeting of Signatory States.
- Timely communication between CMS secretariat, Signatory States and technical advisors concerning approved /current/completed projects, including final reports is needed.
- A Regional MoU website is recommended, modelled on the style of the IOSEA MoU.
- CMS Secretariat will keep the Appointed Councillor informed of the all correspondence relative to this MoU.
- Congo identified that the threats for their marine turtles include fisheries bycatch and egg collection. Support was requested for developing training and monitoring. The delegate was invited to prepare a project proposal for consideration at ScC13.

IOSEA MoU

- 2nd Meeting of Signatory States held in Bangkok in March 2004.
- IOSEA is progressing well with States initiating new actions within country and in collaboration with near neighbours. Much of the progress has resulted from the establishment of a secretariat in Bangkok with an associated informative website.
- Three countries, Oman, Jordan and Thailand, signed the MoU during SS2, bringing the total to 19 signatory states.
- It is disappointing that many CMS signatory states have not signed to the MOU. In contrast, it is encouraging that so many non-signatory states to CMS have now signed on to the IOSEA MoU.
- The website allows for direct entry of country reports via the website and the subsequent analysis of these data to regional reports.
- It was recognised that Japan, Korea and China have a significant interaction with the regions marine turtles. The decision was made to expand the scope of the IOSEA and encourage Japan, Korea and China to sign the MoU.
- Technical experts were invited to present on several key issues
 - Case study: Traditional harvest and killing of turtles in Bali. Advisory Committee has been requested to prepare a review paper on the issue of traditional use of marine turtles.

- Case study: Use of hatcheries in turtle conservation in Sri Lanka. Advisory Committee has been requested to prepare paper outlining best practice management of turtle nesting beaches and hatcheries.
- Because the range states for dugong encompasses a similar area to the IOSEA region, the Australian Government made a presentation on CMS COP7 Recommendation 7.5 to develop a range state agreement for Dugong conservation. No country/agency has as yet indicated a willingness to take the lead in developing this action.

3. Funded studies

An interim report was received from the funded project in Peru (ScC11). This report has yet to be examined in detail.

Three proposals that had been tabled for consideration for funding as a CMS were examined and prioritised as follows.

Project ID	Project title	Requested	Comments	Recommendation	Priority
Doc.16/A2	Movements of Atlantic leatherback turtles – steps toward by-catch reduction and trans-oceanic cooperation for conservation	\$70,654 \$30,000	The project will engage collaboration between agencies in Panama, French Guiana, Uruguay and Gabon – spanning both sides of the Atlantic – to raise awareness of trans-oceanic migration of leatherback turtles and their interaction with fisheries using satellite telemetry.	Consider for part funding to cover the costs for deployment of 3 PTTs with associated temperature-depth datalogging	High
Doc.16/A4	An evaluation of the status of sea turtles in Seirra Leone	\$18,820 \$16,000	The project plans to survey the turtle resources of Sierra Leone in collaboration local University and NGO. The results will be used to develop a “Conservation Action Plan” for marine turtles in Sierra Leone although the local management agency is a partner.	Consider for part funding to cover the cost of one consultant to visit Sierra Leone but to increase the support for involvement of the local NGO participation. Conditional upon (1) receipt of letter(s) of endorsement from collaborating agencies and (2) a complete application that addresses all the aspects of the standard CMS application requirements.	medium
Doc.16/A3	Tracking loggerhead turtles (<i>Caretta caretta</i>) from Cape Verde; the largest remaining rookery in West Africa: Research and environment awareness	\$12000 - 20,000	The project addresses migration of adult turtles from the largest breeding colony in the east Atlantic. The results of the research will be used to publicise marine turtle biology/migration and conservation. The methodology is well established and appropriate. The collaborating workers/agencies have a good track record for succeeding with their projects. The project can proceed without input from CMS. CMS support will enhance the quality of the results. The project makes no direct linkage to improving the conservation of this population.	Do not consider for funding at this time. Request that the project be reconfigured to increase local participation and to focus on improving the conservation of this population.	low

4. Regional trends:

A new book has been published which reviews the global status and biology of the loggerhead turtle, *Caretta caretta*.

Bolten, A. B. & Witherington B. E. (eds) (2003). "Loggerhead Sea Turtle". (Smithsonian Books: Washington.)

It is concluded that:

- There are a limited number of genetic stocks for the species within in any one ocean basin.
- The two stocks within the Pacific Ocean are critically endangered.
- At least the Sri Lankan stock within the Indian Ocean is endangered.
- Loggerhead turtles appear to be most secure within the Atlantic Ocean basin.

Fisheries bycatch, feral predation of eggs and habitat degradation appear to be the principal threats impacting the various stocks.

When considered in conjunction with previously reported major declines of leatherback turtles (Critically Endangered) in the Pacific Ocean, high lights the need for broad regional turtle conservation action throughout the Pacific Ocean.

At the IOSEA SS2, the concensus of opinion was that there was a need for increased turtle conservation activity in the Pacific but it was considered appropriate for the boundaries of IOSEA be expanded at this time to include the Pacific Ocean. However, the Secretariat in Bangkok has been active in discussions on potentials for collaboration with the SPREP secretariat in Western Samoa.

WORKING GROUP ON THREATS - WINDFARMS & POWERLINES

Threats to migratory species from windfarms and powerlines were considered by CMS SC11 and resulted in two resolutions at CoP 7. Of particular relevance to the work of the Scientific Council are:

Resolution 7.4 (powerlines) - which *requests the Secretariat (and hence the Scientific Council) to collect more information with respect to collisions and electrocution on electricity transmission lines of railway infrastructure and other related issues;*

and

Resolution 7.5 (wind turbines and migratory species) - which *instructs the Scientific Council to assess existing and potential threats from offshore wind turbines in relation to migratory mammals and birds, including their habitats and food sources, to develop specific guidelines for the establishment of such plants and to report to the Conference of Parties accordingly at its next meeting.*

Two reviews provided by Birdlife International to the 23 meeting of the Standing Committee of the Berne Convention in December 2003, have been made available for consideration by the CMS Scientific Council as information documents. These are:

- 1) *Protecting Birds from Powerlines: a practical guide to the risks to birds from electricity transmission facilities and how to minimise any such adverse effect* (CMS/ScC12/Inf.26); and
- 2) *Windfarms and birds: an analysis of the effects of windfarms on birds, and guidance on environmental assessment criteria and site selection issues* (CMS/ScC12/Inf.27).

The Working Group on Threats of the Scientific Council reviewed these papers to:

- assess if the issues raised for migratory species by windturbines and powerlines are clear;
- determine if scientific evidence exists to support the conclusions that windturbines and powerlines are key threats to migratory species; and
- identify necessary actions that may be implemented by CMS before the next CoP.

Power lines

CMS/ScC12/Inf.26 reviews the extent of the three main types of risk to birds from above-ground powerlines. These are the risk of electrocution, the risk of collision with overhead lines, and the reduction of staging and wintering areas when powerlines cut across open landscapes and habitats. The main birds affected by this threatening process are larger species. The paper provides clear recommendations and guidance on technical solutions to mitigate the effects of powerlines on migratory species and hence reduce the risk posed to their conservation status. It was noted that ongoing problems for a range of bird species – including the great bustard, stork and crane species and potentially the rare booted eagle - resulting from electrocution by powerlines and collisions had not been identified in the paper. However, the Working Group believed the clear recommendations and guidelines provided in CMS/ScC12/Inf.26 would address problems for these and other bird species.

Of particular concern was a trend for multi-national companies to export technology to developing nations which was identified in CMS/ScC12/Inf.26 as causing a major threat of electrocution to certain bird species. Parties need to be aware of this issue and take steps when specifying works for large electrical distribution infrastructure.

The issues are less clear for many bat species but widespread mortality of fruit bats in the tropics is due to powerlines. To what extent this may be a conservation issue and how it relates to migration remains unclear. Islands that contain endemic species and where powerlines are being introduced are of particular concern.

It was concluded that further information would help CMS in its efforts to address these threats. This should include gathering literature further to that considered in CMS/ScC12/Inf.26, and requesting Parties to provide information to the Scientific Council before the next CoP. It was noted that this could usefully include information on case studies which describe steps taken to address powerline problems and the outcomes of such actions; and the approaches taken by Parties to inform relevant industries of technical solutions and thus alleviate the problem. The Working Group also encouraged Parties to consider the potential impacts of powerlines when undertaking environmental impact assessments for major developments.

Windfarms

The working group concluded that paper CMS/ScC12/Inf.27, although largely based on experience in Europe and North America, had most adequately summarised the threats to birds from windfarms. It was noted that the main potential hazards to birds from windfarms was disturbance leading to displacement or exclusion from windfarm areas (and in some cases this posed a barrier to migration), collision mortality, and loss of habitat resulting from windfarm infrastructure. There were few comprehensive studies, and most studies suffered from a lack of pre-treatment/ post-treatment comparisons, or lacked treatment/control comparisons, which clearly demonstrated cause and affect. There was a need for empirical data in this regard.

However, sufficient information exists to demonstrate that the proliferation of windfarms poses a threat to some migratory avian species. The problems are species, seasonal and site specific. CMS/ScC12/Inf.27 suggests that future modelling of impacts and gathering more data will be useful and that “It is clear that there is a need for robust, objective baseline studies to inform sensitive siting to minimise deleterious effects on birds, other wildlife and their habitats, and a need for post construction monitoring at consented installations where there are environmental sensitivities”. The working group noted that the principles from this paper could be applied to other species, and encouraged Parties to consider the potential impacts of windfarms when undertaking environmental impact assessments.

With respect to bats, there is sufficient evidence and concern in Europe for the latest meeting of the Parties to EUROBATS to adopt a resolution (4.7) registering concern.

Evidence is difficult to collect, because bats (and their remains) are relatively small. However, research in Sweden has identified high levels of mortality in at least six species, including some migrants. Research using ultrasound detectors, search lights and heat-image cameras suggest bats (and some insectivorous birds) may be attracted to turbines, possibly by insects collecting around turbines; other possible causes for mortality are also being investigated. Several proposed Swedish windfarms (including some offshore) are directly in line with known bat migration routes. There is evidence from other European countries (for example in Germany) of mortality in bat species not found in the Swedish studies.

In the USA, 400 dead bats were recorded from one windfarm which comprised 44 turbines. An estimate was made of an annual mortality of 3,000 bats of at least seven species at one farm destined for a five-fold increase in size in the near future. There is a particular concern about the endangered Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*) during its migration. Concern in the USA has led to a

stakeholder partnership considering the implications for bats, including in an international meeting in February 2004 - the report from this meeting has yet to be published.

Overall, for bats, there remains a need to better assess the nature and scale of the problem, including siting and design of windturbines.

The rapid and global expansion of windfarms in the marine environment was discussed, and this also raised concerns about habitat loss and possible impacts on migration caused either by the physical presence of the windfarms, or associated noise and disturbance during operation or construction. The working group noted that this matter had been considered at the last meeting of Scientific Committee of the IWC, where a review of the potential affects on cetaceans (IWC/SC55-E4) was submitted. This paper concluded that this was an issue of interest and concern to CMS too and which should be kept under review. A copy of this review is available from the secretariat for members of the Scientific Council.

Other barriers to migration

It was noted that noise, particularly of a powerful and low frequency nature, emitted into the marine environment might affect migration (there is some evidence of this for cetacean species) or otherwise displace species from feeding or breeding grounds. A major independent review of the significance of marine noise pollution is being undertaken this year by the US Marine Mammal Commission and it was noted that the results of this large-scale and well-funded review would help CMS to further evaluate the significance of this threat to migratory species.

Also raised was that light (especially in mountain areas along important migration routes) might affect bird migration. A review of this potential threat would be desirable to assess its importance or significance to migrating birds.

The working group also took note of the helpful review of artificial barriers in the terrestrial and riverine environments to migration across international borders prepared by Professor Wim Wolff and provided in CMS/ScC12/Inf.21. The working group did not have time to consider these issues in detail and suggested that either this should be reviewed at the next ScC meeting or that a relevant group of experts might review this matter intersessionally.

Recommendation

The working group proposed – in addition to its request to parties to provide information - that an intersessional working group should be established to further consider the threats posed to migratory species from powerlines and windfarms. This intersessional group would report back to the next Scientific Council. The members of the current group indicated their willingness to continue in the role, if so desired by the Scientific Council, and welcomed the participation of other councillors.

Barry Baker (Chair)
Attila Bankovics
Jiri Flousek
Borja Heridia
Tony Hutson
Roberto Schlatter
Mark Simmonds
John Wilson

**LIST OF PROJECTS APPROVED IN PRINCIPLE DURING THE 12TH MEETING OF
THE CMS SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL**

The table here below summarizes basic information on project proposals considered by the 12th meeting of the CMS Scientific Council for possible funding under the CMS Small Grant Programme. The project proposals have been examined by the relevant taxonomic working groups during their meetings on 1st April 2004. Details on the evaluation of the project proposals and recommendations concerning their funding by the working groups are included in the reports of the latter (Annexes 5-7 of this report). In a meeting between the representative of the Secretariat and the rapporteurs of the working groups held on 2 April 2004 the prioritization of the projects for funding was further discussed.

Project proposals are grouped by taxonomic group, and ranked by decreasing level of priority for CMS funding within each group.

Project title	Country/ies involved	Tentative implementation time frame	Recommended CMS contribution	Co-funding available?	Project proposal available?	Contact for follow-up and developing the full project proposal	Level of Priority
BIRDS							
Drafting of a single species Action Plan for the White-headed duck <i>Oxyura leucocephala</i>	Range states of the WHD	July 2004 – April 2005	2,000 EUR	yes	yes	BirdLife International	1 st Priority
Drafting of a Single Species Action Plan for the Corncrake <i>Crex crex</i>	Range states of the Corncrake	July 2004 – April 2005	2,500 EUR	yes	yes	BirdLife International	1 st Priority
Conservation status of the Grey-cheeked Parakeet (<i>Brotogeris pyrrhopterus</i>) in Peru and Ecuador	Peru, Ecuador	Jan. 2005 – Dec. 2006	20,000 USD	yes	yes (Spanish)	INRENA (Peru), MoE Ecuador	3 rd Priority
Migration Routes of Aquatic Warbler <i>Acrocephalus paludicola</i> L.”	Ukraine, Belarus	April 2004 – March 2006	17,580 USD	yes	yes	Ukrainian Union for Bird Conservation (UTOP)	4 th Priority
Monitoring programme for the Olog’s Gull (<i>Larus atlanticus</i>) in outhern south America	Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay,	1 year	17,200 USD		yes (Spanish)	Tellus, Asociación Conservacionista del Sur, Argentina	5 th Priority
Monitoring of Audouin's Gull, <i>Larus audouinii</i> , breeding population and effects of competition with Yellow-legged Gull, <i>Larus cachinnans michahelis</i> , in Croatian part of Adriatic	Croatia	April 2004 - Dec 2006	49,985 USD		yes	Croatian Ornithological Society (COS)	6 th Priority

Project title	Country/ies involved	Tentative implementation time frame	Recommended CMS contribution	Co-funding available?	Project proposal available?	Contact for follow-up and developing the full project proposal	Level of Priority
BIRDS							
AQUATIC MAMMALS AND LARGE FISHES							
Regional workshop on the giant catfish (<i>Pangasianodon gigas</i>) of the Mekong river basin - Development and implementation of a species conservation plan as a proposed joint project of CMS and IUCN	Thailand, Cambodia, Laos	June 2004 – Dec. 2005	34,000 USD		yes	IUCN Mekong Wetlands Biodiversity Program	1 st Priority
Training workshops in the South Pacific on cetacean research methods	Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Fiji, Tonga, Samoa, Niue, Tuvalu, Tokelau	2005	35,000 USD	yes	yes	South Pacific Whale Research Consortium	2 nd Priority
Regional symposium and planning workshop to assess status of, and threats to, small cetaceans in the western Indian Ocean	Comoros, Djibouti, Kenya, Madagascar, Mozambique, Seychelles, Somalia, S. Africa, Tanzania	Late 2005 – early 2006	41,300 USD		yes	Wildlife Conservation Society	3 rd Priority
A review of migration in sharks		2004 - mid 2005	10,000 USD		yes	IUCN Shark Specialist Group	4 th Priority
MARINE TURTLES							
Movements of Atlantic Leatherback turtles – steps toward by-catch reduction and trans-oceanic cooperation for conservation	French Guiana, Panama, Uruguay and Gabon	Dec. 2004 – mid 2006	30,000 USD	To be identified	yes	WWF Latin America & the Caribbean Program (LAC)	1 st Priority
An evaluation of the status of sea turtles in Sierra Leone	Sierra Leone	2004 - 2005	16,000 USD		Concept	IUCN France	2 nd Priority
Tracking loggerhead turtles (<i>Caretta caretta</i>) from Cape Verde; the largest remaining rookery in West Africa: Research and environment awareness	Cape Verde	May 2004 – Feb. 2005	12,000 - 20,000 USD	yes	yes	Marine Turtle Research Group	3 rd Priority