

REPORT OF THE 8TH MEETING OF THE SIGNATORY STATES

**Da Nang, Viet Nam
21-25 October 2019**



**Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation and Management of
Marine Turtles and their Habitats of the Indian Ocean and South-East Asia**

All information relating to the 8th Meeting of the Signatory States to the IOSEA Marine Turtle MOU is available at www.cms.int/iosea-turtles/en/meeting/MOS8.

Contents

1. Welcoming Remarks	3
2. Signature of the Memorandum by Additional States	4
3. Election of Officers, Adoption of the Agenda and Schedule	4
4. Report of the Secretariat	5
5. Report of the Advisory Committee Chair	5
6. Reports of the Chairs of the Marine Turtle Task Forces and of Sub-regional Focal Points	7
7. Review of Implementation	9
7.1. National Reports	9
7.2. Review of Implementation of Action Points Arising from MOS7	10
7.3. Results of the Hawksbill Assessment	11
7.4. Priority Projects: Casuarina Trees	12
7.5. Environmental Impact Assessments	13
8. Introduction, Review and Prioritization of Draft Work Programme	14
8.1. Synthesis of Existing Recommendations	14
8.2. Draft Work Programme	14
9. IOSEA Site Network	14
9.1. Status Updates	15
9.2. Proposal for Inclusion of Con Dao National Park, Viet Nam	16
10. Partnerships and Collaboration	17
10.1. Illegal Take and Trade of Marine Turtles	17
10.2. Ramsar Resolution XIII.24 on Marine Turtles	18
10.3. RFMOs and Bycatch Reduction	18
10.4. CMS Work on Relevant Topics	19
10.5. Other Opportunities for Collaboration	20
11. Emerging Issues	21
11.1. Light Pollution	21
11.2. Underwater Noise	22
11.3. Hatcheries	22
12. Presentation and Adoption of Revised Draft Work Programme	24
13. Financial and Administrative Matters	24
13.1. IOSEA Secretariat Arrangements	24
13.2. Review of Income and Expenditures 2014-2019	24
13.3. Indicative Budget for 2020-2023	25
14. Institutional Matters	26
14.1. Advisory Committee Membership	26
14.2. Sub-regional Focal Points	29
14.3. Next Meeting of the Signatory States (MOS9)	29

15. Closing of the Meeting	29
Annex 1: List of Participants	30
Annex 2: Agenda.....	39
Annex 3: Statement by the Republic of Mauritius	40
Annex 4: Work Programme 2020-2024	42
Annex 5: Budget for the Financial Period 2020 to 2023 and Indicative Scale of Voluntary Contributions	66

Report of the 8th Meeting of the IOSEA Signatory States

1. Welcoming Remarks

1. Melanie Virtue (Secretariat) opened the meeting and announced that she would assume the chair until the election of the officers for the meeting (agenda item 3).
2. She called upon Tran Dinh Luan, the Director General, D-FISH, of the Vietnamese Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development to address the meeting. He welcomed participants to Viet Nam and explained the importance of marine turtles to the country and the efforts being made by the country to protect them through domestic action and international cooperation.
3. The meeting's agenda was full and included important points concerning climate change, the Conservation and Management Plan (CMP), the work programme and the possible approval of a candidate site from Viet Nam to be added to the Indian Ocean and South-East Asian (IOSEA) Marine Turtle Site Network.
4. Nguyen Phu Ban, the Director of the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development of Da Nang City, welcomed participants to Da Nang. He described aspects of the city's history and geography, including its ecosystems, rich biodiversity, habitats, which included coral reefs and seagrass, and species, which included marine turtles.
5. Viet Nam had been a Signatory State to the IOSEA Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on the Conservation and Management of Marine Turtles and their Habitats of the Indian Ocean and South-East Asia since 2001 and people in Da Nang were working with the Ministry sharing information on marine turtle conservation. It was an honour for the city to host the Eighth Meeting of the Signatory States (MOS8) and the opportunity would be used to learn from experts and national governments of the Range States.
6. Ms Virtue on behalf of the Secretariat thanked Viet Nam and the City of Da Nang for hosting the meeting, noting the country's commitment to turtle conservation, which was evidenced by the adoption of the National Plan of Action.
7. She explained that the Secretariat of the MOU was now based in Bonn and, following Douglas Hykle's retirement, Heidrun Frisch-Nwakanma had been appointed as the coordinator. Polina Orlinskiy was also working for the Secretariat as a consultant.
8. The IOSEA MOU was among the older and larger of such instruments, of which there were 19 under the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS). Others with which people present might be familiar were the Dugong MOU with its Secretariat based in Abu Dhabi and the Sharks MOU, which was also run from Bonn.
9. Turtles faced the same threats as other species, such as bycatch, debris, noise and climate change, and on these subjects IOSEA benefited from close association with the parent convention (CMS).
10. The 13th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP13) to CMS was being held in Gandhinagar, India, in February 2020, which Parties and non-Parties could attend. Its full agenda included many issues relevant to marine turtles.

2. Signature of the Memorandum by Additional States

11. The Secretariat explained that there had been no further signatures to the MOU, but it was understood that Somalia was interested in joining. The Secretariat, supported by some members of the Advisory Committee (AC) and National Focal Points, was also in contact with other non-Signatory Range States to arouse their interest.

3. Election of Officers, Adoption of the Agenda and Schedule

12. Ms Virtue (Secretariat) asked for nominations for the post of Chair of MOS8.
13. Earl Possardt (USA) expressed his gratitude to the Government of Viet Nam for hosting the meeting, the Secretariat for preparing it and all those involved in marine turtle conservation in the region. Noting Viet Nam's importance as a Range State to many marine turtle species, Mr Possardt said that it would be fitting if Viet Nam chaired the meeting.
14. Ms Virtue asked for nominations for the post of Vice-Chair of the Meeting, in response to which Roui Kullai (India) proposed South Africa.
15. There being no other nominations, Viet Nam and South Africa were elected as Chair and Vice-Chair respectively by acclamation and took their places on the podium.
16. Mr Luan assumed the chair for Viet Nam and thanked the meeting for the expression of confidence in electing him. He introduced the meeting agenda and schedule, a revised version of which had been circulated in printed form and posted on the website ([CMS/IOSEA/MOS8/Doc.3/Rev.3](https://www.cms.gov/IOSEA/MOS8/Doc.3/Rev.3)). He called for any comments.
17. Devanand Norungee (Mauritius) read a prepared statement objecting to the United Kingdom's claim to sovereignty over the Chagos Archipelago and challenged the United Kingdom's inclusion among the Signatory Range States to the MOU. He also objected to France's claims to sovereignty over the Îles Éparses. The full text of the statement by Mauritius can be found in Annex 3.
18. Ms Frisch-Nwakanma (Secretariat) gave a brief overview of the agenda, the key item of which was the discussion of the draft work programme, which would recur throughout the meeting. It was intended to work in plenary throughout the first day and the morning of the second before breaking into sub-regional working groups. There were no comments on the agenda or schedule, and both were adopted as presented. The final agenda is attached as Annex 2.
19. With regard to speaking, precedence would be given to Signatory States over observers, and all working groups except the Credentials Committee and budget group, if one was formed, would be open to all participants. A participants list is attached as Annex 1.

Credentials Committee

20. Ms Virtue asked for volunteers to serve on the Credentials Committee, preferably one representing each of the four sub-regions. One speaker of Arabic would be required as some of the documents had been received in that language.
21. Subsequently, Ms Virtue said that a Credentials Committee made up of representatives of India, Jordan, the Maldives and the United Arab Emirates had been formed and that

it would meet at lunchtime of the first day. She explained some of the procedures of the MOS, given that some delegates were attending for the first time.

22. Later still, India as chair of the Credentials Committee reported that of the 25 Signatory States present, 19 had presented original documents, which were examined and found to be in order (Australia, Bahrain, Cambodia, Comoros, Eritrea, India, Kenya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritius, Myanmar, Oman, Pakistan, Seychelles, South Africa, Sudan, United Arab Emirates, United States of America and Viet Nam). Four Signatory States (Mozambique, Saudi Arabia, Thailand and the United Republic of Tanzania) had provided copies and promised to send the originals to the Secretariat as soon as possible after the meeting.
23. The Meeting agreed to allow the four countries that had provided copies of their credentials to participate in the vote to elect members of the Advisory Committee (see agenda item 14).

4. Report of the Secretariat

24. Ms Frisch-Nwakanma (Secretariat) drew the meeting's attention to [Document 4](#), explaining that since MOP7 each of the two Marine Turtle Task Forces (MTTF) had held two meetings, and the chairs of those two MTTFs were present. MOS7 had requested sub-regional meetings for the other two regions, *inter alia* to establish similar MTTFs, but this had not proved possible.
25. The document further provided details on efforts made to address bycatch in cooperation with the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) (see agenda item 10.3). Activities relating to illegal take and trade and collaboration with the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) would be discussed in detail under agenda item 10.1. Regarding the IOSEA Site Network, the documentation concerning Itsamia (Comoros) had been completed. Further necessary work would be discussed under agenda item 9.
26. The old IOSEA website had repeatedly been hacked and the new one was integrated in the CMS Family website. Archived material and online tools were slowly being restored, based on the priorities identified through a questionnaire sent in 2017. The old national reporting tool was incompatible with new IT developments and the questionnaire had therefore been recreated in the Online Reporting System also used by CMS.
27. The document and report were noted without comment from the Signatory States.

5. Report of the Advisory Committee Chair

28. Jack Frazier (AC Chair) reported on the Eighth Meeting of the Advisory Committee (AC), which had been held immediately before the MOS.
29. He explained that the AC currently consisted of eight members from six countries and that the members served in a personal capacity and not as national representatives. Between them they had worked in all but three of the Signatory States and had together accumulated hundreds of years of experience working on marine turtles and providing training at various levels.

30. It was not the aim of the AC to mould the thinking of those for whom it provided training but to open new possibilities. Its members were all renowned in their field and provided their expertise without payment. Five of the eight were present at the MOS and would be happy to provide advice to the Signatory States, the MTTF members and the regional coordinators.
31. The AC had discussed the action points arising from MOS7, notably the need to simplify the national report format, the Hawksbill Turtle assessment, the effect of planting *Casuarina* trees on the coast to prevent erosion, Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs), collaboration with other Multilateral Environment Agreements (MEAs) such as CITES and the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, the IOSEA Site Network, genetic studies, ghost gear and best practice for hatcheries, among other topics.
32. As Chair, he had repeatedly emphasized the need to set and respect priorities. The IOSEA MOU dealt with complex animals and ecosystems, and it was impossible to address all the issues. Priority should be given to the most important ones. The MOU also needed to adopt a culture of evaluation. Better communication and coordination were needed at all levels.
33. Humankind and wildlife were inextricably interrelated, and neither could survive without the other. Remains of Loggerhead Turtles showed that humans were interacting with marine turtles as much as 60,000 years ago.
34. The whole of the second day and much of the third and fourth days of the AC meeting had been dedicated to discussion of the draft IOSEA work programme, much of which would be implemented through the sub-regional working groups, so the present meeting would provide an opportunity to liaise with colleagues.
35. Fiona Bartlett (Australia) congratulated the AC on its report and the work done since MOS7. As prioritization of activities had been the main focus of the discussions in the AC, she asked what conclusions had been reached. She noted that the latest draft containing the AC's revision of the draft Work Programme no longer contained the prioritization that had been indicated in the earlier version.
36. Mr Frazier responded that the AC members all had different perspectives, therefore the AC felt it was more appropriate to let the National Focal Points decide what their regional and national priorities should be.
37. Mr Possardt (USA) said that nonetheless the MOS would like to hear the views of the AC to help inform decisions as national representatives often lacked a wider knowledge of issues across the entire region. It was recognized that the role of the AC was to advise, and it was for the MOS to decide.
38. Colin Limpus (AC) said that, when going through the draft Work Programme, the AC had had difficulties in producing a document of manageable size as there were so many diverse issues with different aspects in the four sub-regions. Little was uniform across the whole of the IOSEA region.
39. Ms Frisch-Nwakanma (Secretariat) explained that the priorities originally in the draft Work Programme had been identified from the responses in the national reports. Twenty national reports had been received from the 35 Signatory States and it could not be excluded that the missing fifteen would have indicated completely different priorities or skewed the overall outcome.

40. Mr Frazier said that the AC had based its discussions on the document provided by the Secretariat, and it had become apparent that it would be inappropriate to impose solutions on sub-regions from outside. A 'bottom-up' approach was much preferable to a 'top-down' one. Consideration had even been given to having separate work programmes for each of the sub-regions, with joint activities where there were overlaps.

6. Reports of the Chairs of the Marine Turtle Task Forces and of Sub-regional Focal Points

41. Ronel Nel (Vice-Chair /South Africa / AC) explained the difference between the Sub-regional Focal Points and the Marine Turtle Task Forces (MTTFs). Sub-regional Focal Points were chosen from among the National Focal Points in each sub-region to help with communication and coordination. The MTTFs were set up by governments and their members included government officials and individual specialists, not necessarily government representatives, and were usually self-funding with little or no financial support from the governments. The Western Indian Ocean (WIO) MTTF was also working with the Nairobi Convention. Two regions – South East Asia + (SEA+) and the North-Western Indian Ocean (NWIO) – did not have an MTTF, and the two that did, had seen the considerable contribution that MTTFs made to coordination.
42. Ms Nel mentioned that terms of reference existed for the MTTFs, but that at least in the case of the WIO-MTTF, these were now dated and should be revisited. It might be beneficial to develop standard text applicable to all regions. She also said that mechanisms needed to be put in place for renewing their membership.
43. Ms Frisch-Nwakanma (Secretariat) responded that the terms of reference of the two MTTFs differed substantially, as did their composition. Terms of Reference for the two existing MTTFs (Northern and Western Indian Ocean) were to be found on the IOSEA [website](#). Signatories were to give guidance whether these should be reviewed and potentially harmonized.
44. Ms Nel said that the Sub-regional Focal Points as the communications hubs in their regions should receive support from the MTTFs where they existed.

Western Indian Ocean (WIO)

45. Lindsey West (Sea Sense / WIO-MTTF Vice-Chair) reported that the task force had been established in 2008 and comprised 10 of the 11 Range States (only Somalia was not a Signatory to the MOU). The MTTF had met in the United Republic of Tanzania in 2017 and most recently in July 2019 in Mauritius, when six of the ten Range States had been represented. The key actions were capacity-building and considering how to integrate socio-economic issues into conservation activities. The sub-region had five of the IOSEA Site Network areas and an information exchange mechanism was needed.
46. The challenges were communicating effectively and the prohibitive cost of travel. Members could try to meet in the margins of other events, as had been done for the past two meetings, which had been special sessions during the Western Indian Ocean Marine Science Association (WIOMSA) Symposium, but that severely limited the time available. Working through email lacked immediacy. Funding was urgently needed for a longer meeting with participation from all countries.
47. Jacqueline Benard (Kenya), in her capacity as Sub-regional Focal Point for IOSEA, said that threats in the WIO included fisheries interactions, poaching, coastal development and erosion, and pollution, including that caused by vessels. Conservation initiatives

included the designation of marine protected areas (MPAs), legislative reviews, reducing bycatch, removing plastic, the rehabilitation of key habitats, sharing research through the WIOMSA. The main challenges were weak enforcement, lack of capacity and lack of data, while priorities were research, capacity-building, improving enforcement, better cooperation at all levels and increasing understanding of the threats.

48. Anfani Msoili (Comoros) reported that progress had been made on designating an MPA, but there were major challenges in addressing climate change and its effects on Small Island Developing States.

North-Western Indian Ocean (NWIO)

49. Thuraiya Al Sariri (Oman), in her capacity as Sub-regional Focal Point for IOSEA, outlined the main threats to marine turtles in the NWIO, which included interactions with fisheries and light pollution, and the main activities being undertaken for turtle conservation, including the banning of certain gear types (trawls, anchored fish aggregating devices and drift nets) and limiting commercial fishing near the coast.
50. Ms Nel (Vice-Chair /South Africa / AC) noted that, according to their national reports, Egypt and the United Arab Emirates had begun to address light pollution. This issue would be discussed later on the agenda (see item 11.1)
51. Baloch Sharif-ud-Din (Pakistan) informed the meeting that Pakistan had introduced harsher penalties for poaching but needed to strengthen enforcement.

Northern Indian Ocean (NIO)

52. Muralidharan Manoharakrishnan (Dakshin Foundation / NIO-MTTF Chair) reported on activities of the Northern Indian Ocean MTTF, which had been formed in 2015 and had met again in 2018. Reports of both meetings were available on the IOSEA website. The NIO-MTTF still did not have a full complement of members. Common themes and knowledge gaps had been identified and a work plan developed.
53. Saaif Mohamed Rasheed (Maldives), in his capacity as Sub-regional Focal Point for IOSEA, said that the national reports received had shown that entanglement was a serious issue. A GEF-funded project on the sustainable use and conservation of marine turtles and large marine animals was being carried out.

South-East Asia (SEA+)

54. Kongkiat Kittiwattanawong (Thailand) said that in his region, not counting the Plus (Australia and the USA), only four national reports had been received (from Myanmar, Thailand, the Philippines and Viet Nam) and other countries from the region were asked to provide theirs as soon as possible. Population trends were all negative over the past 60 years for the Green Turtle *Chelonia mydas* and the Leatherback Turtle *Dermochelys coriacea*. The Coral Triangle Initiative was contributing to marine turtle conservation and training workshops had been held over the past three years. Communication and cooperation were vital to the successful conservation of marine turtles in the region, including one in Cambodia attended by representatives from Cambodia, Myanmar, Thailand and Viet Nam.
55. Vibol Ouk (Cambodia) apologized for not submitting a national report, but the former National Focal Point had left and had not yet been replaced.

56. Nguyen Thi Phuong Dzung (Viet Nam) said that many training and communication activities had been undertaken as mentioned in the national report and planned to hold more to promote further regional cooperation.

7. Review of Implementation

7.1. National Reports

57. Polina Orlinskiy (Secretariat) introduced [Document 7.1](#). This document followed the structure of the CMP and was based on 20 national reports. Six reports had been received too late to be included in the analysis, but all had been posted on the IOSEA website as Information Documents 7.1 a-z. The national reports had not been scored but an attempt had been made to assess which of the six objectives had been achieved and which had not.
58. Ms Orlinskiy provided an overview of the progress reported relating to each of the objectives of the CMP. It was apparent that some progress had been achieved by individual countries, but more effort was required with regard to international aspects.
59. Key points had been taken from the national reports and had been incorporated into the draft work programme.
60. Ms Frisch-Nwakanma (Secretariat) sought feedback on the type of analysis Signatories wished to see in future, noting that a different approach had been used this time from that adopted at previous meetings. There had also been some calls for a revision of the questionnaire itself, something which could be included in the Work Programme for the coming period.
61. Jeff Miller (AC) said that the information contained in the national reports should be useful to the country reporting as well as to the other Signatory States and to the Secretariat, and it was therefore important that the data provided were correct and up to date, and preferably supported by citations and sources. The questionnaire was already long, so reducing its size was desirable, but further questions could be added if necessary.
62. Ms Nel (Vice-Chair /South Africa / AC) welcomed the insights from the AC and asked Signatory States how useful they found the national reports and what changes they thought necessary. The complexity of the national reporting process reflected the complexity of the CMP.
63. Ms Bartlett (Australia) found the national reports useful. Australia had a two-tier system of government with Federal and State levels. The national report provided useful information on key points such as research and monitoring and reducing bycatch.
64. Milali Machumu (United Republic of Tanzania) said that completing the reports was too tedious and time-consuming. It was difficult to find citations for some entries, as work being done on the ground was not always fully documented. Advantage should be taken of the presence of delegates at the current meeting to exchange ideas.
65. Ms Al Sariri (Oman) found the reports very useful, but difficulties arose when new members of staff entered on duty and had to familiarize themselves with the workings of IOSEA.

66. Nguyen Thanh Binh (Viet Nam) said that preparing the Vietnamese national report required issuing it to many other offices and organizations. There were also questions about the level of detail required.
67. Ms Kullai (India) said that the Indian Government had prepared the report in consultation with stakeholders, NGOs, academia and other partners. Just after the national report had been submitted, a new government initiative had been launched to create more MPAs with greater coordination with the shipping ministry, the coast guard and fisheries to address bycatch.
68. An intersessional working group was established to review the national report format. Members included the Comoros, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America, the University of Swansea and Mr Miller of the AC. The working group would elect its own chair. Unless an intersessional process was agreed, a new format could only be adopted at MOS9. The Vice-Chair suggested that if funding were available a physical meeting should be organized, otherwise business would have to be conducted through e-mail or Skype. She sought confirmation from Signatory States that the priorities identified by the Secretariat from the national reports were correct, namely at the national level: education and awareness raising, reducing bycatch, researching threats and conservation, rehabilitation of degraded habitats, public participation, enforcement, fundraising, creating economic incentives and capacity-building, and internationally bycatch from foreign fleets, illegal taking and trade, and pollution. The Vice-Chair noted that the report did not break down by region the countries identifying particular priority actions.

7.2. Review of Implementation of Action Points Arising from MOS7

69. Ms Orlinskiy (Secretariat) explained that action points had first been adopted at MOS6 in 2012 for the intersessional period ending at MOS7. MOS7 had agreed 35 action points and [Document 7.2](#) provided an overview of their implementation. In particular activities requiring external funding had not been addressed or completed, whereas the action points requiring little or no extra funding were better implemented. Going forward, action points were being replaced by a more comprehensive work programme. Based on the experience so far, the Secretariat's recommendations would be to reduce or limit the number of measures in the Work Programme, prioritize them, discuss how to finance them, and develop alternative plans when problems arose, such as host governments deciding that they could no longer organize a meeting.
70. Ms Bartlett (Australia) asked how the action points fitted in with the work programme and Ms Orlinskiy explained that those action points that had been completed had not been included in the draft. Open items had been carried over. There would now be a single consolidated document and no more stand-alone action points.
71. Malta Qwathekana (South Africa) said that while priorities were set, there were still insufficient resources for implementation, hence the backlog. A system similar to the National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) under the Convention of Biological Diversity, regional coordination and fundraising were needed. She asked whether a system was in place to follow up on completed actions.
72. The Vice-Chair pointed out that the report on Leatherback Turtles in 2006 had resulted in an action plan. She also suggested that part of the prioritization process should be identifying sources of funding.

7.3. Results of the Hawksbill Assessment

73. Mr Limpus (AC) said that assessments of Leatherback and Loggerhead Turtles had been done in previous years and the current species under review was the Hawksbill Turtle (draft available as [Document 7.3](#)). The process was being led by the AC but the input of Signatory States was essential.
74. Hawksbills nested in many places across the region. The focus of the assessment was not on countries but on 'stocks', of which nine had been identified. There were gaps in knowledge and more genetic stock assessments were needed. Linkages between nesting and foraging grounds could be established by tagging.
75. The final report would be detailed, but, unless more information was submitted by Signatories and researchers, it would rely mostly on published literature. It would address identified gaps in areas such as biology and ecology, population structure and genetics and socioeconomic considerations.
76. There was some good news, as it was clear that some stocks were recovering as a result of Japan lifting its reservation under CITES on trade in tortoise shell. However, while the population in Ko Kram had risen since 1992, conservation efforts on Milman Island in the Torres Strait had not reversed the decline.
77. There were no uniform levels of threat across the region. The threats included trade (both legal and illegal, international and domestic), climate change and feminization, coral bleaching, extreme weather and more frequent storms leading to erosion, and development along the coast.
78. Not all actions taken to reduce the impacts of threats were being properly reported. Data from 2000 and earlier were available, but information from the current century was incomplete and Signatory States were not responding to requests for data. It was possible therefore that the report was based on outdated information. The draft was almost ready with some gaps to be filled, but there was still time to address these. It was hoped to be able to send the final report to the Secretariat in June 2020, which was later than had been hoped.
79. The next species to be examined would be Olive Ridley Turtles.
80. Himansu Das (United Arab Emirates) asked what information was available on post-hatchlings as these were being lost to an infestation of barnacles. There was some localized anecdotal evidence but no overall picture.
81. Mr Limpus said that national input was needed from all Signatory States to help build up a regional assessment. The authors of the report would use their expertise to evaluate individual inputs, but setting local priorities would be left to the Signatory States.
82. Ashley Dias (Seychelles) said that a ban on trade had been in place since 1994. Dr Mortimer of the Save Our Seas Foundation would be writing a report on Hawksbill Turtles in the Seychelles and the Chagos Archipelago, and there were currently 20 turtle projects under way so more data would therefore be forthcoming. Mr Limpus undertook to liaise with Dr Mortimer now that he had correct contact details.
83. WWF expressed willingness to help review the Hawksbill assessment document and provide additional information to support the regional assessment through its network of NGOs and academics.

7.4. Priority Projects: Casuarina Trees

84. The Chair invited Ms Nel (Vice-Chair / South Africa / AC) to introduce this item, which had arisen as a result of the Loggerhead and Leatherback Turtle assessments. The study summarised in [Document 7.4](#) examined the effects of planting *Casuarina* trees on the coast as a measure to counter erosion.
85. A quarter of the world's beaches were being eroded. Various mitigation measures had been used such as building sea walls and groynes, beach nourishment and strip planting. Some measures were expensive and needed sophisticated engineering. Strip planting was relatively inexpensive and low-tech.
86. In response to the 2004 tsunami, Casuarinas, a tree species native to Australia, had been planted along the Indian coast. Outside of their natural range, Casuarinas tended to create a monoculture with little other plant life thriving in their shade. The species *Casuarina glauca* and *C. equisetifolia* were suited to coastal locations as they liked high salinity. Once established, they spread fast; they were native to much of Australia and South-East Asia but had spread beyond, where they displaced native flora and fauna species, changing soil quality by making it more acidic and raising ground temperatures. Their roots and fallen branches posed a threat to marine turtles and their nests. There was concern that Casuarinas induced erosion by affecting natural fluctuations as the lack of undergrowth meant that sand from dunes flowed through the stand and flattened natural undulations.
87. The study examined the extent of presence of *Casuarina* trees and assessed the difference in erosion rates in sites with and without the trees. Fifty representative rookeries were identified covering both the natural and introduced range of the trees. A coastal vulnerability index was derived from a database drawn from Google Earth surveys, taking account of the width of the back beach, the threat of rising sea level and the frequency of storms. It was evident that *Casuarina* did not protect against erosion and given other disadvantages, consideration should be given to replacing them with native species.
88. Mr Possardt (USA) said that in south-east Florida there had been a problem with Casuarinas where they exacerbated erosion and damaged diversity. Ms Nel advocated removing the trees before they became a problem. They were particularly good at re-establishing themselves and the American model of eradicating them was an example of good practice. It would be useful to make such guidance available on the MOU website.
89. Ms Qwathekana (South Africa) said that this was an example of measures intended to protect the environment backfiring. The information on the effects on biodiversity of planting non-native trees as a mitigation measure against climate change should be passed to the [Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services](#) (IPBES) and the [Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change](#) (IPCC).
90. Mr Ouk (Cambodia) asked whether there were any circumstances where planting Casuarinas could be recommended.
91. Ms Nel said that forestry policies had changed considerably over the past 100 years in South Africa as the operation of the wider ecosystem and coastal dynamics were better understood. She said that it was important to tailor measures to local circumstances. Casuarinas would usually form a monoculture and then their seeds would spread. They did not protect the coastline from erosion.

92. Mr Limpus (AC) said that much of the India Ocean coastline was naturally treeless, so planting alien trees was not a good idea. He asked what native species would be beneficial for providing shade, habitat and stabilizing the coastline.
93. Nicole Esteban (University of Swansea) said that research in Chagos was identifying the preferred vegetation for nesting turtles and the report was due in 2020.

7.5. Environmental Impact Assessments

94. Ms Nel (Vice-Chair / South Africa / AC) said that the use of environmental impact assessments (EIAs) should be familiar with all dealing with marine turtle conservation. It was recognized that a balance had to be struck between encouraging economic development and nature conservation. Her presentation was based on a study she had prepared with an MSc student and Dr Kellie Pendoley of Australia, available as [Document 7.5](#).
95. Oil and gas installations, harbour facilities, urban development and golf courses all had potential effects on natural habitats. EIA processes followed a basic pattern in all countries, but any flaws in the process could render them ineffective. The presence of endangered species should be an automatic trigger for EIA, but the complex life cycle of marine turtles made it difficult to assess the effects of a project on the species.
96. The threats included port developments, disturbance (including light and noise pollution), artificial conditions, direct mortality and reduced long-term resilience of habitat and species (increased susceptibility to disease).
97. A number of threats emanated from developments in the marine environment, and experience from the Deepwater Horizon incident had shown the importance of establishing buffer zones). Other threats included light (see agenda item 11.1 and the accompanying document, which showed how different species reacted to exposure to light), noise (marine turtles were not deaf, and usually swam away but could over time habituate to noise) and air pollution. The data upon which management, mitigation and monitoring were based had to be robust and ideally should go back five years. Consideration should be given to establishing 'choke species', where operations would be suspended if a certain number of animals were harmed. Also, where the EIA led to a project being given permission to proceed, conditions should be imposed requiring habitat restoration and the whole life cycle of the species and the duration of all stages of the project should be taken into account.
98. Mr Das (United Arab Emirates) stressed the need for having a sound scientific case, to counter dubious assertions in EIA reports.
99. Ms Qwathekana (South Africa) said that when striking a balance between socio-economic and conservation concerns, greater weight was usually given to the former. Scientific evidence had to be presented in a compelling way. The developer's mantra included promising to create compensatory habitat when a project damaged the environment, but this often was ineffective for many species.
100. The Vice-Chair said that the report had provided food for thought and urged delegates to consider the table in the document setting out safe distances and suitable buffer zones. Document 11.2 commissioned by the CMS Secretariat included sample questions to put to developers regarding noise and vibration and this kind of approach would help make EIAs more robust.

8. Introduction, Review and Prioritization of Draft Work Programme

8.1. Synthesis of Existing Recommendations

101. Ms Orlinskiy (Secretariat) presented [Document 8.1](#) and said that the IOSEA MOU was 18 years old, and during this time many issues had been identified and many activities undertaken. Past recommendations were spread over many documents, and their status was not always clear. This spread made it difficult especially for new Focal Points and for the new Secretariat to benefit fully from the wealth of discussions and resulting recommendations made and to ensure adequate follow-up. The Secretariat had therefore decided to create a synthesis collecting all recent recommendations in one reference document to facilitate continuity in the work of the MOU. The document was meant as a reference document and drew from ten key documents. It also served as the basis for the development of the draft Work Programme to be discussed under the next agenda item.

8.2. Draft Work Programme

102. Ms Frisch-Nwakanma (Secretariat) presented the draft Work Programme ([Document 8.2/Rev.2](#)), explaining that two versions had been made available so that delegates could see what changes had been proposed by the AC. Printed copies of Revisions 1 and 2 were distributed to facilitate comparison.
103. The Work Programme would be the main outcome of the MOS and was intended to cover the next five years or the period up to the next MOS, reflecting the needs and priorities of the Signatory States. It was comprised of three sections: the first covering objectives of the CMP, the second covering administration of the MOU and the third covering other issues.
104. The AC had been keen to reduce the bulk and deleted some measures, revised others to make them more concrete, but the document still contained 106 measures. The aim was to prioritize to create a realistic work programme for the next few years. Ideally the document would be reduced in size. Activities should clearly be assigned to specific actors and made as concrete as possible to facilitate implementation. The initial examination would be done in plenary, but regional issues and other themes would then be addressed in detail in working groups.
105. Mr Frazier (AC Chair) stressed that the work programme was intended to be a living document, subject to regular amendment unlike the CMP. Ms Frisch-Nwakanma confirmed that the next opportunity to amend the work programme would be at the next MOS, as the work programme could not easily be changed intersessionally.
106. The Chair urged all in attendance to familiarize themselves with the contents and structure of the document in order to facilitate the work of the working groups. The working groups would report back to plenary under agenda item 12 on the last day of the MOS.

9. IOSEA Site Network

107. Ms Dzung (Viet Nam) assumed the chair as Mr Tran Dinh Luan had other engagements elsewhere.

9.1. Status Updates

108. Ms Frisch-Nwakanma (Secretariat) said that managers of existing sites had been invited to provide written updates. All reports received had been made available online as Information Documents 9.1 a-h. A series of presentations followed, with updates from some of the sites included in the IOSEA Site Network.
109. Mr Msoili (Comoros) described progress made at the Itsamia site, which was part of the Mohéli National Park. The documentation had only recently been completed. Mr Frazier (AC Chair) said that this site was a good example of the bottom-up and top-down approaches working together.
110. Maung Maung Lwin (Myanmar) described the threats and challenges managing the Thameehla (Diamond) Island site, where the authorities were working with NGOs such as Flora and Fauna International and Wildlife Conservation Society and universities. The site benefitted greatly from nomination as an IOSEA Site, which had resulted in increased interest from specialists and the general public, and also helped to raise funds for basic research.
111. Ms Nel (South Africa) reported on progress at the iSimangaliso site in the north-east of South Africa extending to the border with Mozambique. This site included both terrestrial and marine elements and the threats included extraction industries to the south, plans for a deep-water port to the north and issues of compensation for displaced communities with historic claims to the land.
112. Mr Machumu (United Republic of Tanzania) gave an account of work done at the Rufiji Delta/Mafia Island site, which covered 4,000 km². The threats facing the site included a hydroelectric dam, illegal fishing and habitat loss and modification. The site also hosted Dugongs and benefitted from cooperation with Kenya.
113. Wadima Ali and Fadi Yaghmour (United Arab Emirates) spoke about the Bu Tinah Shoal and Sir Bu Na'ir respectively, the latter being a Ramsar Site and candidate World Heritage Site. The presentations concluded with a video from the Emirates' Environment and Protected Areas Authority. Sir Bu Na'ir's status as a Ramsar Site raised the question of the added value that inclusion in the IOSEA Site Network could bring.
114. Ms Dias (Seychelles) spoke about the Aldabra Atoll site highlighting its location and history of designations and gazetting. The site's management included dealing with invasive species.
115. Ms Frisch-Nwakanma presented [Document 9.1](#), an overview of the state of the network. The network had been conceived in 2012 and the first sites designated under it had been approved at MOS7 in 2014. Signatory States had, however, decided that the process by which sites were chosen, the scoring criteria and the template of the evaluation form needed revision. Some progress had been made post-MOS7, but momentum had been lost as those involved moved on to other duties. The MOS was asked to confirm that the tasks were still valid and to decide a process and timeframe. It was suggested that an intersessional working group be formed. If the new procedures were to be in place to allow further sites to be adopted at MOS9, an intersessional process would be required to approve the outputs of the working group. Only when the dates of MOS9 were clearer, could a timetable be set for the nomination of further sites. It would take six months for the evaluation process to be completed, so nominations would have to be prepared well in advance.

116. Ms Nel (Vice-Chair / South Africa / AC) invited comments from the Signatory States and suggested that four or five would be asked to volunteer to serve on the intersessional working group. Choosing which countries should serve could be left to the sub-regional working groups. She had been involved in the process before and considerable ground work had already been done by the AC. She explained that to date ten sites had been adopted with an eleventh being considered at the present meeting and indications that Mauritius had further candidates to propose.
117. Mr Frazier (AC Chair) recalled that there had been three telephone conferences after MOS7 involving the National Focal Points of Oman, the UK and the USA and the minutes of those meetings would be useful to have. Another task now that sites had been designated was to assess what value the IOSEA Site Network brought and how to maximize the benefits.
118. Ms Nel said that together with Ms Tiwari (AC) and Mr Hamann (AC) she had worked on the evaluation documentation so could explain what preparatory work had already been done. Ms Tiwari said that comments had already been sought and those received had been taken into account. She estimated that the whole process could be completed within twelve months.
119. Ms Frisch-Nwakanma said that one action point from MOS7 was the establishment of a Site Network Discussion Group to provide advice to site managers and raise funds. Neither this group nor the one considering the evaluation process had been active, and it was suggested that they could be merged but would require a fresh mandate and terms of reference.
120. It was decided to consider the proposal in the working groups and reflect the outcome in the Work Programme.

9.2. Proposal for Inclusion of Con Dao National Park, Viet Nam

121. Mr Binh (Viet Nam) made a presentation on the Con Dao National Park, which was being proposed by Viet Nam for inclusion on the IOSEA Site Network ([Document 9.2](#)). The national park was located in the south-east of Viet Nam, and covered 14 islands, one of which was inhabited, and had an area of nearly 20,000 hectares (14,000 marine and 6,000 terrestrial). It was owned and managed by the central government and the authorities of Ba Ria Vung Tau province.
122. The main island was mountainous, and its highest point was 577 metres above sea level. The islands were situated where a warm current from the south met cold currents from the north. In total, there were 14 turtle nesting beaches that were important for Green and Hawksbill Turtles. The islands also hosted 370 coral species and 1,323 species of other marine flora and fauna, 44 of which were on the national Red List. The Government had spent US\$16 million on conservation and research on the islands.
123. A fleet of 200 fishing vessels operated off the coast but there were no processing facilities on the islands. There was a growing number of visitors, with marine-related tourism activities including visits to the nesting beaches. There were some natural threats such as climate change, extreme weather and changes to water salinity.
124. Ms Tiwari (AC) had been leading the AC's evaluation of the proposal. She thanked Viet Nam for its well-written document and said that the candidate site scored above the threshold in all categories, so the recommendation of the AC was that Con Dao National Park be included in the IOSEA Site Network. The MOS endorsed the recommendation.

10. Partnerships and Collaboration

10.1. Illegal Take and Trade of Marine Turtles

125. Ms Orlinskiy (Secretariat) presented [Document 10.1](#), which informed of the status of the activities of the IOSEA working group, and drew attention to the outcomes of a recent study on illegal trade in marine turtles conducted by the CITES Secretariat in collaboration with the CMS/IOSEA Secretariat and the Inter-American Convention (IAC), which implemented CITES Decision 17.22.
126. IOSEA MOS7 had considered a thorough document on the issue prepared by the IOSEA Secretariat and had subsequently established a working group, which had started operating in 2015 and had presented the matter to CITES leading to CITES Decision 17.22. The working group had been almost dormant since then and needed new impetus.
127. The report developed by CITES (Information Document 10.1.a) showed that in all investigated sub-regions illegal trade was mainly destined for domestic markets. In South-east Asia international trade had a greater significance than in Africa and had an increasing online component. The CITES Animals and Standing Committees would examine the study at their next meetings. Initial recommendations had already been made and were summarized in Document 10.1, as far as relevant for the IOSEA region.
128. Mr Possardt (USA) advocated revitalizing the working group and noted that the Philippines had not been included in the study.
129. Ms Bartlett (Australia) welcomed the document as a good summary of a complex issue but noted that the submission of the report to CITES had been delayed. Australia had asked for the discussion to be deferred to ensure proper consideration and to broaden support. The issues would have to be raised again at the next CITES COP.
130. Mr Limpus (AC) said that the Philippines had not been covered because it would have been impossible to provide comprehensive coverage and a choice had had to be made over which countries to include. He had submitted a document on trade in the Solomon Islands (Information Document 10.1.b), where funds had been made available to support village-based monitoring, using methodology developed under the MIKE (monitoring of illegal killing of elephants) initiative. The project trained villagers to monitor turtle use, and the data provided were extrapolated to estimated national levels of trade in the Solomon Islands. The results were sound, and the Solomon Islands' Government was now addressing village-level take. Each village only took a few turtles, but the cumulative effect was significant.
131. Ms Nel (Vice-Chair / South Africa / AC) suggested that the working group continue to operate but noted that the African members of the working group were not from the countries in the study. Sarah Ferguson (TRAFFIC Vietnam) said that the three countries involved were important markets. Ms Bartlett suggested that destination countries be included on the working group. It was also suggested that Indonesia, Mozambique and Viet Nam be added, and confirmation sought from Iran, which was not present at the meeting, that it would be willing to continue. China and Japan had been approached but seemed reluctant to engage, and as non-Parties to CMS and non-Signatories to the MOU there were no direct channels, although indirect channels could be opened through NGOs operating there. The Secretariat was asked to contact the Chinese and Japanese authorities to draw to their attention the fact that the working group existed. TRAFFIC and WWF could serve as partner organizations. The CITES Secretariat should also be invited to join.

132. Ms Esteban (University of Swansea) said that new information from the Wildlife Conservation Society was available concerning the illegal trade in Green Turtles in the north of Madagascar. It was also noted that Madagascar was not represented at the MOS and could also not be asked about participating in the working group.
133. Mr Frazier (AC Chair) stressed the importance of learning from the experience in the Solomon Islands.

10.2. Ramsar Resolution XIII.24 on Marine Turtles

134. Ms Orlinskiy (Secretariat) introduced [Document 10.2](#) explaining that the Resolution encouraged Parties to the Ramsar Convention to nominate sites for turtles, develop management plans, integrate marine turtle considerations in existing management plans and enhance the protection of marine turtles in existing sites. She also noted that some IOSEA Network Sites were already designated Ramsar Sites. A list of sites and designation status was available in Document 10.2.
135. The Vice-Chair sought the views of the meeting on the need for capacity-building in Ramsar and IOSEA Network Sites, and whether where appropriate each site should have dual designation. She felt that given the different criteria applying to the Ramsar Convention and the MOU, there could be no short cuts in designating sites.
136. Ms Bartlett (Australia) suggested that fast tracking designation should be feasible, given that the Ramsar Convention had a very rigorous procedure and delays and duplication of effort could be avoided. Mr Frazier (AC Chair) suggested that the Site Network Working Group be asked whether it could devise ways of expediting the process. Ms Tiwari (AC) said that the AC had discussed IOSEA and Ramsar Sites and agreed that the Ramsar Convention did have a thorough process.
137. The Vice-Chair suggested that the IOSEA Site Network designation proposal could include a simple tick box relating to a site's Ramsar status, and where a candidate site was already a Ramsar Site relevant for turtles, supporting paperwork could simply be attached. This would virtually result in default acceptance of Ramsar Sites into the IOSEA network, but formal nomination by the Signatory State would still be required.
138. Ms Esteban (University of Swansea) said that there was a recently designated Ramsar Site on Diego Garcia in the British Indian Ocean Territory.

10.3. RFMOs and Bycatch Reduction

139. Ms Frisch-Nwakanma (Secretariat) introduced [Document 10.3](#), a compilation of various developments in Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs) since MOS7, with one section for each of the RFMOs within the IOSEA region. Various elements of the work programme referred to RFMOs. The document provided an overview of relevant resolutions and active conservation management measures of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC), which was the most active on turtle issues, the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC), the Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT) and the Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement (SIOFA).
140. Ms Bartlett (Australia) welcomed the document and commented that in Australia, the Fisheries Department led on RFMOs, but had different interests to the Environment

Ministry. Australia felt that relations and engagement with RFMOs should be made a high priority.

141. Ms Qwathekana (South Africa) said that South Africa took fisheries and turtle conservation seriously but was also having problems in making the two sides of government to talk to each other.
142. Ms Virtue (Secretariat) said that the experience in other parts of the CMS Family was that engaging with RFMOs was not easy. Sharks, for example, were commercially fished. The Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP) seemed to have found the right approach and was working closely with several RFMOs on bycatch mitigation and attended many meetings. The IOSEA Marine Turtle MOU had tried to enter a memorandum of cooperation with the IOTC, but some IOTC parties had vetoed it because the agreement would also have dealt with other species of relevance to CMS. The Secretariat relied on Signatory States agreeing internally on how to reconcile conservation and fisheries policies.
143. The Vice-Chair said that for avian species, BirdLife International was active in fora such as RFMOs. There was no NGO equivalent for turtles, so the onus fell on the MOU to represent turtle interests. This should be a very high priority both for Signatory States and for the Secretariat.
144. Ms Kelly (USA) said that the example of the Inter-American Turtle Convention (IAC) showed that much persistence was needed to work in RFMO fora with some success, but it could be done if all did their part.

10.4. CMS Work on Relevant Topics

145. Ms Frisch-Nwakanma (Secretariat) introduced [Document 10.4](#), which concerned synergies with the parent Convention, CMS, which had global coverage and dealt with a wider range of taxa. Many issues were of interest to both CMS and IOSEA.
146. Some Resolutions adopted at COP12 (Manila, 2017) were relevant to IOSEA and the CMS Secretariat was now in the final phase of preparing documents for COP13. The Sessional Committee of the CMS Scientific Council and the CMS Standing Committee were both meeting in Bonn in November 2019. Items of the CMS COP agenda of interest to IOSEA included climate change, skyglow, guidelines and codes of conduct relating to marine wildlife tourism, light pollution, environmental impact assessments relating to noise, or aquatic wild meat.
147. The CMS Scientific Council also had a mandate to develop a Single-Species Action Plan (SSAP) for Hawksbill Turtles in South-East Asia and the Western Pacific, which should be done in cooperation with the MOU. This work was foreseen to be completed in time for CMS COP14 in 2023. Since the area covered was foreseen to be part of the IOSEA range, but extend further east, the ownership of both instruments was vital.
148. Mr Limpus (AC) explained that he also served on the CMS Scientific Council. Marine turtles needed a voice, given the threats from climate change, tourism developments, wild meat and bycatch. He noted that there was a proposal within CMS to change the composition of the Scientific Council, and one of the posts to be replaced might be his. Parties would have to consider how marine turtle interests would be dealt with. Close cooperation with the IOSEA Marine Turtle MOU was one way how the required expertise could be made available to the Convention.

149. Ms Bartlett (Australia) asked how an SSAP would help, given that illegal trade was the main threat facing Hawksbill Turtles. The Secretariat said that domestic trade was as much a factor as international trade and CITES could not address the former. Hany Tatwany (Saudi Arabia) agreed that domestic consumption of protected species was an issue for CMS and saw scope for collaboration between CMS and CITES.
150. Ms Virtue (Secretariat) raised a note of caution, saying that CMS had many SSAPs such as the one for Loggerhead Turtles in the Pacific and the challenge was securing the engagement of non-Parties to CMS and non-Signatories to MOUs.
151. Mr Possardt (USA) welcomed the SSAP believing that it would help frame actions and provide focus.
152. Mr Limpus (AC) had been involved in the Loggerhead Turtle SSAP and from his experience urged that the focus should remain on the principal issues of the taking and use of Hawksbill Turtles, both domestically and internationally. Hawksbill Turtles deserved greater attention because they were the predominant species in trade. Tailored regional or local measures were needed. There were many distinct genetic stocks and many Range States were not Parties to CMS, making collaboration between CMS and the IOSEA Marine Turtle MOU essential to success.
153. Ms Nel (Vice-Chair / South Africa / AC) noted that the geographical scope foreseen for the SSAP was South-East Asia and the Western Pacific. She asked about the Indian Ocean. Mr Limpus said that he would need more information to judge whether a regional SSAP would be viable there.
154. Christine Madden Hof (WWF Australia) said that contact had been made with the Secretariat of the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) and it had been confirmed that SPREP was interested in engaging. She also voiced that WWF could support the development of the Hawksbill Turtle SSAP.
155. The Vice-Chair concluded that there was a role for CMS as well as CITES and it appeared that an SSAP was needed.

10.5. Other Opportunities for Collaboration

156. Ms Frisch-Nwakanma (Secretariat) introduced [Document 10.5](#) saying that an offer of collaboration with the Olive Ridley Project on ghost gear had been received. The NGO was based in the Maldives and had developed an online data portal to gather information on ghost gear. The organizers were keen to expand the area of their work to the whole Indian Ocean. The intention was to make an annual report to the MOU based on the data received. There were no cost implications for the MOU or the Signatory States, which would just have to volunteer their data. The AC had accepted in principle the idea of cooperating with the Olive Ridley Project.
157. Mr Possardt (USA) supported the proposal to collaborate on this key issue but stressed that bycatch in artisanal fisheries was a higher priority for Signatory States.
158. Mr Limpus (AC) wished to raise the question of the possible impending crisis with regard to marine debris. The Chair suggested raising this issue at the end of the session, time permitting.
159. The Chair invited WWF Australia to introduce the issue of DNA identification of tortoise shell products (Information Document 10.5), which would also be subject of a side event.

Ms Madden Hof (WWF Australia) explained that they were collaborating with the US National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). It was evident that there was a need to establish a genetic database.

11. Emerging Issues

11.1. Light Pollution

160. Ms Bartlett (Australia) said that since MOS7 in 2014, Australia had completed its national recovery plan for marine turtles, and it was envisaged that it would be reviewed in five to ten years. Six of the seven marine turtle species were found in Australian waters and these were categorized as belonging to 22 distinct stocks. Light pollution was seen as a high to medium threat nationally affecting 14 of the 22 stocks.
161. Scott Whiting (Australia) presented the National Light Pollution Guidelines for Wildlife ([Document 11.1](#)). Western Australia accounted for 30 per cent of the country's coastline and there was a great deal of industrial activity along it. The State Government had received funding from industry to develop the guidance.
162. The Barrow Island development had been controversial and pre-dated the guidelines. It had affected key beaches for marine turtles, and in the end, there was a political call to proceed. Chevron had worked on the light issues, taking them into account alongside human safety considerations, while adhering to shipping regulations. Some beaches had some protection provided by dune systems and vegetation, which reduced the effect of light, but some hatchlings were being confused. There was also some discussion of offshore oilrigs and their effects on older animals.
163. The aim of the guidelines was to ensure that wildlife was neither displaced nor disrupted and was able to undertake critical behaviours. The guidance was aimed at an audience comprising government assessors and auditors, project managers, researchers, developers and local councils. The information would be valuable to other countries as well.
164. The Vice-Chair thanked Australia for taking the lead on this topic. Signatory States could adopt the guidelines or adapt them to tailor them to local circumstances and it was understood that Australia was proposing the guidelines at CMS COP13 for adoption.
165. Ms Al Sariri (Oman) asked whether application of the guidelines was mandatory, how local human populations were involved in implementation, and what the effects on other life stages of turtles were.
166. Mr Whiting said that the guidelines were expected to be applied to any project likely to have an impact on marine turtles. The planning authorities would assume that the guidelines were being followed when the regulatory assessment was undertaken. Local authorities covering settlements of 10,000 inhabitants and more would use the guidelines for industrial developments and renewal of street lighting. It was not clear how the guidelines would affect foraging grounds and areas out at sea.
167. The Vice-Chair asked whether there was any experience of success or difficulties in working with communities on this issue.
168. Mr Machumu (United Republic of Tanzania) said that low level tourist development near nesting beaches was having an impact resulting in marine turtles being driven away. These guidelines would be very useful.

169. Mr Limpus (AC) said that in Queensland problem coasts had been identified and the State Government was working with local councils on urban development, elaborating monitoring techniques within 3km of a project. 'Skycams' were quantifying spectral properties of light along arrays and trials were being undertaken to establish how hatchlings reacted.
170. Mr Whiting said that considerable work had gone into the guidelines and it would be gratifying if other countries used them.

11.2. Underwater Noise

171. Ms Frisch-Nwakanma (Secretariat) introduced [Document 11.2](#) which highlighted an important piece of work initiated by CMS. Originally noise was considered to be an issue primarily for cetaceans, but other taxa were also affected, including protected species and their prey.
172. Frequencies in the range 50-1,200 Hz could be heard by marine turtles, coinciding with the predominant frequencies of anthropogenic noise. The effects were unknown but there were likely to be some. Accordingly, this potential threat to turtles – and of course other marine life – should be taken into account when assessing the impact of any activities in the marine environment.
173. The CMS Family Guidelines on Environmental Impact Assessments for Marine Noise-generating Activities (annexed to Document 11.2) on underwater noise covered a range of activities and could be applied as appropriate in different circumstances. Many industries including shipping and oil exploration could generate damaging noise levels, as could the military.
174. Mr Ouk (Cambodia) raised the issue of the effects of missile tests by American and Chinese military. Ms Nel (Vice-Chair / South Africa / AC) said that she had personal experience of being exposed to military tests when she had been diving off Simonstown, South Africa. Efforts should be made to ensure that naval exercises should be timed to avoid nesting.
175. Ms Kelly (USA) said that noise was a factor considered in planning and expressed willingness to share the data on acoustics and the effects on marine turtles. There were indications that marine turtles did become accustomed to some levels of noise. The relevant papers could be shared on the MOU's website. Ms Kullai (India) expressed thanks to the CMS Secretariat for taking the lead on this issue and welcomed the offer by the USA to share its data. India was in the process of drafting a national plan for marine turtles.

11.3. Hatcheries

176. The Chair invited Andrea Phillott (FLAME University) to make a presentation on hatcheries. Ms Phillott said that different terms were used for 'hatcheries', which might also be known as 'incubation sites' in countries such as the United Republic of Tanzania. They were a secure location to which eggs were moved for incubation. The conservation aim was to ensure that at least 70 per cent of nests in any nesting location should hatch. If this level was being reached without intervention, there was no need to move eggs to hatcheries.

177. Threats included predators, which could be kept away from nests by fencing or predator control, illegal take, and erosion and tidal inundation. Only if other mitigation measures did not work should eggs be moved to a hatchery, given that there were usually some disadvantages. Removing a small percentage of nests to a hatchery could be justified for the purposes of ecotourism and awareness-raising, but the main motivation should be conservation. Hatcheries should have an equal or higher hatch rate than nests left in their original location on the beach and produce the same sex ratio of hatchlings as from natural nests for the population. Hatchlings should be healthy and demonstrate natural behaviours.
178. Many of the best practices for hatcheries had been compiled and were available online and in printed form, including guidance from the IUCN Species Specialist Group. Ideally hatcheries should be located close to a beach, the substrate should be made up of clean sand, and it should be determined in each case whether the site requires shading in order to maintain the temperatures for a natural sex ratios of the hatchlings and to minimise lethally high nest temperatures. Care should be taken not to prevent rain from reaching the nests as rainwater was a natural temperature control. Eggs should preferably be collected two or three hours after being laid (although six to twelve hours were acceptable, but advice should be sought if removal took place later). The eggs should be moved quickly and in such a way that they were not rotated as this could harm the embryos. Artificial nests should be one metre apart, at a depth appropriate for the species and the right shape to facilitate escape after hatching. Hatchlings should be able to reach sea unaided, but this was not always possible if predators were present. Keeping hatchlings in ponds or tanks to allow them to grow before release was not advised as they developed incorrect behaviours and could be slower to reach the sea than naturally hatched turtles which made them vulnerable to predators.
179. Monitoring and evaluation of eggs relocated to a hatchery should include recording the number of clutches, clutch size, incubation periods, the number of hatchlings produced, and an examination of failed eggs. Data such as the temperature of nests could be very helpful. Nests should be left alone where threats did not exist, and alternative measures such as stationing wardens could be used to deter illegal take of eggs.
180. Nahla Noobi (United Arab Emirates) said that hatcheries in the United Arab Emirates used material local to the area. Climate change was a key issue and eggs were moved or nests provided with shade in situ. Ambient air temperature was not a good indicator of the temperature of the nests.
181. Mr Sharif-ud-Din (Pakistan) asked whether differences in behaviour were observed between hatchlings from natural nests and those that had been relocated. Ms Phillott said that studies were comparing success rates of natural nests and hatcheries, examining hatchlings' speed, orientation towards the sea and ability to right themselves. There was little difference where hatcheries were carefully situated and managed, compared to favourable natural conditions. Success should be measured by the percentage of eggs being hatched, not by the raw number of hatchlings which could sound high but actually represented a low proportion of the total number of eggs incubated at a hatchery.
182. Focal Points were invited to approach Ms Phillott, Ms Tiwari, Mr Limpus or Mr Miller for advice. It was decided that the AC should develop guidelines on the management of beaches for successful hatchling production, including management of hatcheries if and when required.

12. Presentation and Adoption of Revised Draft Work Programme

183. The Secretariat had circulated a revised version of the draft work programme taking into account the comments of the working groups. The new version was projected on screen and Ms Frisch-Nwakanma (Secretariat) led the meeting through a detailed revision of the document, inviting further comments and the allocation of priority levels of each action, based on the prioritization of the sub-regional working groups.
184. The final Work Programme is attached as Annex 4.

13. Financial and Administrative Matters

13.1. IOSEA Secretariat Arrangements

185. Ms Virtue (Secretariat) described the current set-up at the Secretariat and some of the history ([Document 13.1](#)). Since MOS7, there had been a number of changes, and while the Secretariat had always been provided by CMS, Douglas Hykle had been based in Bangkok. When he had taken a sabbatical, Clara Nobbe had taken over, but she had been based at the CMS offices in Bonn. Mr Hykle had returned for one year before retiring in late 2016. The Secretariat moved back to Bonn, and the then Executive Secretary, Bradnee Chambers undertook consultations through which it had been agreed to have a lower grade coordinator (P3) integrated into the Secretariat's aquatic team. Ms Frisch-Nwakanma was appointed temporarily and confirmed in post after a competitive recruitment exercise attracting 100 candidates. When Ms Frisch-Nwakanma went on maternity leave, Ms Orlinskiy was appointed as a consultant to cover the post part time. Ms Frisch-Nwakanma had at first returned working part time and until the end of the month continued to job share with Ms Orlinskiy. Ms Frisch-Nwakanma had now resumed full time work.
186. Many issues and actions were of common interest to the IOSEA MOU and the parent Convention, so there were many benefits of synergies and cooperation.
187. Mr Frazier (AC Chair) asked about the MOU for the Atlantic Coast of Africa, which had been started before IOSEA, but which appeared to have become dormant. The Secretariat said that regrettably there were no funds to allow for a coordinator to be employed, and various attempts to take work forward had failed to result in concrete progress. There were no dedicated resources in the parent Convention's budget. The CMS Secretariat was pursuing the idea of cooperating with the Abidjan Convention, but its focus was more on pollution than species conservation.

13.2. Review of Income and Expenditures 2014-2019

188. Ms Frisch-Nwakanma (Secretariat) introduced [Document 13.2](#). Calls for funds had been made repeatedly as the response to requests for voluntary contributions had been low. The Secretariat had not been able to initiate many of the activities foreseen by MOS7, barely having the resources to cover staff costs.
189. MOS7 had agreed a budget for the period 2015-17. Since for financial reasons it had not been possible to organize MOS8 sooner, budgets for the years 2018 and 2019 had been agreed intersessionally, staying at the same level. Meetings required resources mainly to allow eligible delegates to attend the MOS and there were virtually no funds to support projects. Some savings had been achieved through downgrading the coordinator post

from P5 to P3. Funds had been accumulated over the years to provide resources to allow the MOS to proceed.

190. Thanks were expressed to those Signatory States that had made regular payments despite adverse economic conditions. Receiving regular payments made the task of planning much easier for the Secretariat. In addition, several ad hoc payments had been received. Invoices for 2019 had been issued somewhat later than usual.
191. Signatory States were urged to make their voluntary contributions, to avoid the situation faced by the Atlantic Turtles MOU, which had no regular funds and no coordinator and was therefore not achieving anything.
192. Mr Possardt (USA) asked whether reminders were being issued to Signatory States to try to elicit payments. The Secretariat said that invoices were indeed issued. As of this year, this was done from the Bonn Office, no longer from UNEP HQ in Nairobi, which made it easier to channel the invoices to the National Focal Points for onward transmission to the appropriate finance office.

13.3. Indicative Budget for 2020-2023

193. The Secretariat presented an indicative budget for the period 2020-2023 as outlined in [Document 13.3](#). This was divided into two parts, one outlining the proposed expenditure and the other with indicative voluntary contributions to be sought from the Signatory States. There were no major changes proposed to expenditure other than adjustments for inflation.
194. As discussed under the previous agenda item, the actual income in the past budgetary period had fallen significantly short of the projected amount. The Secretariat had worked within its means, but greater stability from the confidence that income was secure would be desirable. The implementation of the many activities foreseen in the Work Programme required funding beyond the bare minimum for staff costs that had been collected so far.
195. Staff costs accounted for the greater part of the expenditure, with the coordinator working 80 per cent of her time for IOSEA and 20 per cent for the CMS Secretariat. Some travel of experts was covered, and the other significant item was funding the MOS.
196. The table showing indicative contributions table was meant as guidance. There were no obligatory assessed contributions under the MOU. A minimum payment of US\$750, as agreed at the previous meeting, was again recommended and the contributions of the regular payers (India, South Africa and the USA) had been frozen at their previous levels. Other suggested contributions were based on the agreed UN scale.
197. The previous budget had run for three years, and the Secretariat had been obliged to seek two extensions. As a precaution, the new budget covered a period of four years.
198. There being no comments from the Signatory States, the Vice-Chair declared the draft budget to have been adopted. The agreed budget and indicative scale of contributions are attached as Annex 5.

15. Institutional Matters

15.1. Advisory Committee Membership

199. Ms Bartlett (Australia) referred to [Document 14.1.a](#), saying that in preparing for the meeting the question of the terms of office of members of the AC had been raised in internal discussions. In the interests of good governance and to improve the prospects of securing funding, Australia proposed that in normal circumstances AC members should be restricted to serving two terms (one term spanning two intersessional periods). This was common practice in multilateral environment agreements with bodies analogous to the AC.
200. Mr Possardt (USA) asked what the turnover rate of membership of the AC had been since it had been established and whether the proposal was intended to address the perception of inertia, as reappointing incumbents was often the easiest option. Mr Limpus (AC) said that several experts had served and moved on for various reasons. He added that the current system did not create appointments for life, although two individuals had been reappointed for multiple terms by the Signatory States. Much depended on the willingness of the experts to serve.
201. Mr Machumu (United Republic of Tanzania) said that two terms meant that the AC would have several years benefitting from an expert's advice. Mr Kittiwattanawong (Thailand) suggested retaining some flexibility to allow appointments of more than two terms if necessary. Ms Bartlett confirmed that the proposal would allow a third term, where there were pressing operational needs.
202. Ms Nel (Vice-Chair / South Africa / AC) asked whether the changes proposed by Australia were intended to take effect at the current meeting and whether after a 'sabbatical', AC members could be re-elected. Ms Bartlett was open to the idea of allowing members to return to the AC after a break in service.
203. Mr Frazier (AC Chair) appreciated that Australia's proposal was made in good faith and was not aimed at any individuals. AC appointments were the prerogative of the Signatory States and they decided to appoint, renew or remove the members. Membership should be determined by scientific expertise and not political considerations. He added that the terms of reference of the AC set a maximum membership of ten, but that this complement had never been filled in the past, as it was not so easy to find experts willing to serve. He was concerned that institutional memory could be lost if terms were curtailed, especially bearing in mind that the Secretariat staff was still fairly new to the MOU.
204. Ms Qwathekana (South Africa) also raised the issues of retaining institutional memory and the need for a wider range of expertise on the AC. Lawyers and social scientists should be included as well as biologists. Ms Frisch-Nwakanma (Secretariat) confirmed that the terms of reference also reflected this.
205. Ms Frisch-Nwakanma suggested that while examining the constitution of the AC, consideration should also be given to the timing of its meetings and whether it was preferable to hold AC meetings in conjunction with the MOS or some time earlier to allow Signatory States time to consult on the advice received. The Secretariat had made some proposals concerning both frequency and timing in [Document 14.1.c](#).
206. On the final day of the meeting, after delegates had opportunity to reflect on the matter in the sub-regional working groups, the terms of reference were again discussed in plenary, with draft text amending the terms of reference displayed on screen. This text took account of Australia's initial proposal and suggestions from the floor made during

- the earlier discussions. Members of the AC and observers were requested to leave the room.
207. Mr Kittiwattanawong, having consulted other ASEAN members, favoured the limitation to two terms and proposed that the terms should only start counting from the current MOS. He pointed out that the period between two sessions of the MOS used to be one or two years, but it had been five years since MOS7. Limiting appointments to two intersessional periods could mean an individual serving two years or twenty. Incumbents could be retained if the full complement of places were not filled.
 208. Mr Machumu said that all subregions of the MOU should be represented on the AC and stressed that experience was essential, and the right mix of age groups and expertise was needed. Not all areas of expertise were necessarily scientific in the strict sense (e.g. poaching and trafficking).
 209. Mr Norungee (Mauritius) suggested that rather than making geographical representation a must, preference should be given to candidates from the sub-regions if more than one suitable candidate was under consideration for a vacancy.
 210. Mr Possardt understood the motives behind Australia's proposal but did not find the case compelling. The Signatory States could always decide not to reappoint a member of the AC and use the elections to address imbalances. Over the years there had been more vacancies on the AC than competition for places, and the proposed term limitations would reduce options. Reserved places for the regions increased the likelihood that candidates would be elected unopposed. There were other means of ensuring equitable geographic representation if necessary, but expertise was more important. Mr Possardt agreed that expertise in social sciences would also be valuable.
 211. Ms Benard (Kenya) supported the idea of limiting appointments to two terms. If the expertise of an individual ineligible for reappointment was required, then that person could be engaged as a special adviser.
 212. Ms Al Sariri (Oman), supported by Mr Tatwany (Saudi Arabia), said that an individual's knowledge and expertise was more important than his or her nationality.
 213. Mr Rasheed (Maldives) said that some AC members had better knowledge of marine turtles in the Maldives than local experts. Experienced, enthusiastic AC members, who were not paid, should not be shut out. He cautioned against making AC appointments political, rather than based solely on expertise and willingness to serve.
 214. Mr Kittiwattanawong said that having local knowledge and respecting local sensitivities were both important. One seat on the AC should be reserved for each of the four sub-regions. It was noted though that despite there being vacancies to fill, not all sub-regions had nominated a candidate.
 215. Mr Possardt said that the Inter-American Turtle Convention had a scientific committee and a consultative committee, the latter having geographic representation. There was no equivalent to the consultative committee under IOSEA, but Signatory States could air their geographic concerns at the MOS. The focus of the AC should be on providing the best advice for IOSEA, and the process for selecting members was open and democratic. He was also concerned that a consequence of some of the proposals would be the need to replace the entire AC at one meeting.
 216. Ms Frisch-Nwakanma pointed out that the sub-regional Focal Points were now invited to meetings of the AC, so geographic representation was ensured. The AC was technical

- and scientific, although not confined to biology, and not geared to provide advice on administration and political considerations. She referred to paragraph 6 of the MOU text and to the terms of reference for the AC, both of which provided an illustrative list of desirable areas of expertise to be represented on the AC and the aspiration to ensure an equitable balance of gender and regional representation.
217. Mr Tatwany suggested deferring the discussion to MOS9 when Signatory States could come better prepared.
218. In response to a question on observer participation at AC meetings, Ms Frisch-Nwakanma pointed to paragraph 7 of the terms of reference, which stated that sub-regional observers could be admitted if space allowed. No other observers were foreseen so far.
219. Mr Frazier said that he had always encouraged the participation of observers and the AC meeting the previous week had been the first where Sub-regional Focal Points had attended. It would be good to have chairs of the MTTFs present too.
220. Ms Bartlett expressed concern that NGOs might try to push their agendas, but Ms Virtue (Secretariat) said that experience of the Sharks MOU was that NGOs, which had to finance their own participation, did not attend in large numbers, and rules were in place to ensure that members were not outnumbered.
221. It was agreed that the wording in the terms of reference should be clear that the Sub-regional Focal Points would be funded if resources allowed and that the chairs of the MTTFs could attend but at their own expense. Regarding attendance of other observers, one option would be that they could attend only upon specific invitation by the Chair.
222. The Secretariat was requested to develop, in good time for the next meeting, revised draft terms of reference, giving the different feasible options with regard to terms and composition of the AC, attendance of observers and timing and frequency of the meetings. The accompanying paper should outline the advantages and disadvantages of the different options proposed. The Secretariat should consult with the AC in the process.

Nomination of New Members

223. Referring to [Document 14.1.b](#), Ms Frisch-Nwakanma explained that of the ten places on the AC, eight were currently filled but Ms Tiwari's first term was over, and she had been nominated to serve a second. There were therefore three vacancies and four candidates had been nominated (Ms Tiwari and three new ones). The Secretariat had solicited nominations with an indication of the required expertise and due consideration of gender and geographic balance.
224. Australia had re-nominated Ms Tiwari, who was well known to the MOS, and highlighted key aspects of her curriculum vitae (CV). She had been active for 29 years in South-East Asia and the Indian Ocean working on research and conservation. She was adviser to several countries working on behalf of the US Fish and Wildlife Service.
225. The USA had nominated Scott Whiting, whose CV covered 25 years working on large programmes, for NGOs, government and academia. Experience of working with him provided evidence that he was a thoughtful, skilled and impressive performer.
226. The UK had nominated Jarina Jani, who had a background in social sciences and expertise in areas currently underrepresented on the AC.

227. The UK had also nominated Madhuri Ramesh, who had a decade of experience working in India and the Bay of Bengal and also had a background in social science.
228. It was agreed to hold a single election with the four candidates competing for the three places. Signatory States had three votes to cast. All Signatory States present with accepted or pending credentials were entitled to vote.
229. Dr Tiwari, Dr Jani and Dr Whiting were the three candidates receiving most votes and were elected.
230. It was noted that at the next MOS, the current terms of four AC members (Mr Frazier, Mr Hamann, Mr Limpus and Mr Miller) would expire and these members would face re-election.

15.2. Sub-regional Focal Points

231. The Vice-Chair announced that the outcome of the regional meetings was the confirmation of the following countries as sub-regional focal points: Kenya (Comoros as alternate) for the Western Indian Ocean, Oman for the North-west Indian Ocean, the Maldives for the Northern Indian Ocean, and Thailand for South-East Asia +.
232. All Sub-regional Focal Points were thanked for their service in the past years and their willingness to continue.

15.3. Next Meeting of the Signatory States (MOS9)

233. The Chair invited Signatory States to offer to host the next MOS. There were at this stage no expressions of interest. The Secretariat stood ready to assist and advise and provide an updated list of requirements.

16. Closing of the Meeting

234. After the customary expression of thanks to the hosts, the organizers, the officers and all that had contributed to the success of the meeting, the Chair declared proceedings closed.

List of Participants

Representatives of Signatory States

Australia

Fiona Bartlett
Director, Migratory Species Section
Department of the Environment and
Energy
GPO Box 787
Canberra ACT 2601
Australia
Tel: +61 408421637
Email: fiona.bartlett@environment.gov.au

Scott Whiting
Principal Research Scientist
Dept. Biodiversity, Conservation and
Attractions
17 Dick Perry Avenue
Perth 6151
Australia
Tel: +61413375782
Email: Scott.whiting@dbca.wa.gov.au

Bahrain

Mohamed Sayah
Environmental Technician
Supreme Council for Environment
18233 Manama/bh,
Bahrain
Tel: +973 33599770
Email: msayyah@sce.gov.bh

Cambodia

Vibol Ouk
Director
Department of Fisheries Conservation
#186, Norodom Plvd / P.O. Box 582
Phnom Penh / 023
Cambodia
Tel: +855 12 908121
Email: ouk.vibol@online.com.kh

Vanna Nhem
Technical Officer
Department of Agriculture Forestry and
Fisheries
Preah Shanouk Province
Street O 1 Sankat 4 Krong Preah
Sihanouk Preah Sihanouk Province
Cambodia
Tel: +855 077444467
Email: vanna.ksfiac@gmail.com

Comoros

Anfani Msoili
National Focal Point IOSEA
Moheli
Comoros
Tel: +269332011
Email: amsoili@yahoo.fr

Egypt

Mohamed Said Abdelwarith Attea
Environmental Researcher
Ministry of Environment
30 Misr - Helwan Zyraee Rd. Maadi
Cairo
Egypt
Tel: +201007757864
Email: mohamed7j@hotmail.com

Eritrea

Yohannes Mebrahtu
Department Head (Director General)
Aredaib St. House No. 47 P.O.Box: 2857
Asmara
Eritrea
Tel: +2917667252
Email: ejohnsh@gmail.com

India

V L Roui Kullai
Deputy Inspector General of Forests
(Wildlife)
2nd floor Vayu Wing Indira Paryavaran
Bhawan Jor Bagh Road
110003 New Dehli
India
Tel: +911124695246
Email: roul.kullai@nic.in

Rawat Chandra
Technical Officer (Wildlife)
6st floor Vayu Wing Indira Paryavaran
Bhawan Jor Bagh Road
110003 New Dehli
India
Tel: +911124695432
Email: rowl.mef@gmail.com

Jordan

Buthainah Batarseh
Head of Water and Marine Conservation
Section
King Faisal Bin Abd AlAziz / 1408 Amman
11941 Jordan
Amman
Jordan
Tel: +962796756188
Email: beebe_batarseh@yahoo.com

Kenya

Jacquiline Benard
Research Scientist
Kenya Wildlife Service
PO BOX 82144
80100
Kenya
Tel: +254713720764
Email: jbernard@kws.go.ke;
jacquilineben@yahoo.com

Malaysia

Faizah Ismail
Fisheries Officer
Department of Fisheries Malaysia
Marine Park and Resources Management
Division, Wisma Tani, Level 3 Tower Block
4G2, Precinct 4,
Federal Government Administrative
Centre, Putrajaya 62628
Malaysia
Tel: +603 88704000
Email: faizah@dof.gov.my

Maldives

Saaif Mohamed Rasheed
Assistant Environment Officer
Green Building, Handhuvaree Hingun
Male
Maldives
Tel: +9607444114
Email:
saaif.rasheed@environment.gov.mv

Mauritius

Devanand Norungee
Director of Fisheries
L.I.C Building John Kennedy Street
Port Louis
Mauritius
Tel: +230 52510774
Email: dnorungee@gmail.com

Mozambique

Henriques Balidy
Head of the Documentation and
Information Bureau
Praia de Xai-Xai, Edificio do MICOA. CP
66. Gaza.
Xai-Xai
Mozambique
Tel: +258842747130; +258877530067;
+258846168830
Email: balidy.balidy@gmail.com

Myanmar

Maung Maung Lwin
Director
Department of Fisheries, Ministry of
Agriculture, Livestock and Irrigation,
Office No. 36, Panita Road,
Nay Pyi Taw,
Myanmar
Tel: +9595680764
Email: akthar.mgmglwin@gmail.com

Oman

Thuraiya Al Sariri
Assistant Director General of Nature
Conservation
Muscat
Oman
Tel: +968 99435775
Email: thuraya.alsareeri@meca.gov.om

Pakistan

Baloch Sharif-ud-Din
Chief Conservator Wildlife
Ahmedzai Colony, Awan-i-Kalat, Sariab
Road,
Quetta
Pakistan
Tel: +923343930849
Email: sharifuddinbaloch@yahoo.com

Saudi Arabia

Hany Tatwany
Vice President
Saudi Wildlife Authority
P.O.Box 61681
Riyadh 11575
Saudi Arabia
Tel: +966505201757
Email: hany.tatwany@swa.gov.sa

Ahmed Alzahrani
Marine Studies and Research-Sea Turtle
Project Manager
Saudi Wildlife Authority
Imam Faisal bin Turki bin Abdullah/61681
Riyadh/12742
Saudi Arabia
Tel: +966552225537
Email: ahrz1@hotmail.com

Seychelles

Ashley Dias
Director
Ministry of Environment, Energy and
Climate Change,
Botanical Garden, Mont Fleuri,
P.O Box 445
Victoria/361
Seychelles
Tel: +248 4670541/ +248 2727006
Email: a.dias@env.gov.sc

South Africa

Malta Qwathekana
Senior Policy Adviser: International
Advisory Services
473 Steve Biko Street,
Arcadia, Pretoria
South Africa
Tel: +27780936266
Email:
mqwathekana@environment.gov.za

Ronel Nel
Associate Professor
Department of Zoology,
Nelson Mandela University
PO Box 77000
Port Elizabeth 6031
South Africa
Tel: +27415042335
Email: Ronel.Nel@mandela.ac.za

Sudan

Mustafa Abuamna
Director Marine Reserves
30 Street, Almamora
Khartoum
Sudan
Tel: +249919755651
Email: wildlife_sudan33@yahoo.com

Thailand

Kongkiat Kittiwattanawong
Director
Department of Marine and Coastal
Resources/ Phuket Marine Biological
Center
51 Sakdides RD
Phuket 83000
Thailand
Tel: +66846298803
Email: kkongkiat@gmail.com

United Arab Emirates

Nahla Noobi
Biologist
Ministry of Climate Change and
Environment
P.O. Box. 1509
United Arab Emirates
Tel: +971505795094
Email: nanoobi@moccae.gov.ae

Wadima Ali
Assistant Scientist – Marine Species
Terrestrial and Marine Biodiversity
Khalifa City A
Abu Dhabi
United Arab Emirates
Tel: +971505055888
Email: wadima.alahbabi@ead.gov.ae

Jaishinimol Santhamma Bharghavan
Researcher
Marine Environment Research
Department
Ministry of Climate Change and
Environment
Al Ruwayyah 2 Area †Beside Zayed
University †Al Thuraya Street
Dubai
United Arab Emirates
Tel: 971556629511
Email: jbharghavan@moccae.gov.ae

Himansu Das
Unit Head
Marine Threatened Species and Habitats
Environment Agency Abu Dhabi, PO BOX
45553
Abu Dhabi
United Arab Emirates
Tel: +971504465125
Email: hdsas@ead.gov.ae

Fadi Yaghmour
Scientific Researcher
Scientific Research Dept./ Environment
and Protected Areas Authority
Soyoh Subereb, Sharjah / 29922
Sharjah/00000
United Arab Emirates
Tel: +971507958751
Email: fadi.moht@epaa.shj.ae

United Republic of Tanzania

Milali Machumu
Principal Tutor
Fisheries Department
P.O. Box 83
Bagamoyo
United Republic of Tanzania
Tel: +255 784 471 521
Email: milalimachumu@gmail.com

United States of America

Earl Possardt
Marine Turtle Program Officer
Division of International Conservation
MS:IA
5275 Leesburg Pike
Falls Church, VA 22041

United States of America
Tel: +122041-3803
Email: earl_possardt@fws.gov

Joseph Fette
Section 609 Manager
Office of Marine Conservation
U.S. Department of State
2201 C St NW
Washington DC 20520
United States of America
Tel: +12026473263
Email: fetteja@state.gov

Irene Kelly
Sea Turtle Recovery Coordinator
1640 Paula Dr.
Honolulu, Hawaii 96816
United States of America
Tel: +18087255141
Email: Irene.Kelly@noaa.gov

Viet Nam

Nguyen Thanh Binh
Deputy Director of Conservation and
Aquatic Resource Development
Directorate of Fisheries
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural
Development
No.10
Ha Noi
Vietnam
Tel: +842437712652
Email: ntbinh@mard.gov.vn

Chu The Cuong
Vice Head of Department
Department of Marine Conservation and
Biodiversity/Institute of Marine
Environment and Resources
246 - Da Nang
Hai Phong
Vietnam
Tel: +84934676636
Email: ctcuong@gmail.com

Huu Tuan Anh Le
Officer
Directorate of Fisheries
No 10, Nguyen Cong Hoan street, Ba Dinh
Ha Noi
Vietnam
Tel: +84983930478
Email: tuananhlh@gmail.com

Lai Hung
Senior Official of Planning and Finance
Department
Directorate of Fisheries
No 10, Nguyen Cong Hoan street, Ba Dinh
district
Ha Noi
Vietnam
Tel: +84327776582
Email: laithehung@mard.gov.vn

Ngo Thi Thanh Huong
Official
Department of Science Technology and
International Cooperation
Directorate of Fisheries
10 Nguyen Cong Hoan street, Ba Dinh
Ha Noi
Vietnam
Tel: +84948618699
Email: thanhhuong383@gmail.com

Nguyen Mai Huong
Official
Department of Science Technology and
International Cooperation
Directorate of Fisheries
10 Nguyen Cong Hoan Street, Ba Dinh
Ha Noi
Vietnam
Tel: +84913533581
Email: huongseaprodex@gmail.com

Nguyen Manh Cuong
Head of Planning Division
Administration Office, Directorate of
Fisheries
10 Nguyen Cong Hoan
Ha Noi
Vietnam
Tel: +84982287299
Email: cuongnm.vp@mard.gov.vn

Nguyen Thi Kim Tu
Official
D-FISH/ MARD
No 10, Nguyen Cong Hoan street, Ba Dinh
Ha Noi
Vietnam
Tel: +84977728626
Email: kimtu08@gmail.com

Tran Dinh Luan
Director General
Directorate of Fisheries
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural
Development
10 Nguyen Cong Hoan
Ha Noi
Vietnam
Tel: +84913043532
Email: tdluan.dah@gmail.com

Vo Van Tho
Official
D-FISH/ MARD
No 10, Nguyen Cong Hoan street, Ba Dinh
Ha Noi
Vietnam
Tel: +84901606345
Email: hoangthoktd@gmail.com

Non-Signatory Range States

Qatar

Ali Al-Marri
Head of the Department of Wildlife
Ministry of Municipality (MME) &
Environment/Wildlife & Protection
Dafnn, P.O.227.
Doha
Qatar
Tel: +974 55515117
Email: ashmarri@mme.gov.qa

Singapore

Hor Yee Tong
Senior Manager
Coastal and Marine
National Biodiversity Centre, 1 Cluny
Road, Singapore Botanic Garden, 259569
Singapore
Tel: +65 98555775
Email: Tong_hor_yee@nparks.gov.sg

Advisory Committee Members

Jack Frazier (Chair)
Research Associate
Smithsonian Institution
Tel: +1593098610039
Email: kurma@shentel.net

Colin Limpus
Chief Scientist
Queensland Department of Environment
and Science
GPO Box 2454
Brisbane
Australia
Tel: +61 427 002 633
Email: col.limpus@des.qld.gov.au

Jeff Miller
Marine Turtle Specialist
Biological Research and Education
Consultants
446 Dearborn Avenue
Missoula
Montana 59801
United States
Tel: +14064931572
Email: jmillerar@gmail.com

Ronel Nel
Associate Professor
The Nelson Mandela University (NMMU)
Department of Zoology
P.O. Box 77000
Port Elizabeth 6031
South Africa
Tel: +27415042335
Email: Ronel.Nel@mandela.ac.za

Manjula Tiwari
NOAA Fisheries
Southwest Fisheries Science Center
Marine Turtle Ecology and Assessment
Program
3333 N Torrey Pines Court
La Jolla, CA 92037
United States
Tel: +1858546-5658
Email: manjula.tiwari@noaa.gov

Intergovernmental Organizations

ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity

Claudia Binondo
Programme Officer
ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity
Domingo Lantican Ave., College, UPLB,
Los Banos
Laguna
Philippines
Tel: +639271789609
Email: cbbinondo@aseanbiodiversity.org

Kyle Esperanza Zuleta
Project Management Officer
ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity
Domingo Lantican Ave., College, UPLB,
Los Banos,
Laguna
Philippines
Tel: +63 956 885 8624
Email: kerzuleta@aseanbiodiversity.org

International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)

Bui Thi Thu Hien
Programme Coordinator
Marine and Coastal Program
IUCN Vietnam Office
268A Nam Ky Khoi Nghia, District 3
Ho Chi Minh City
Vietnam
Tel: +84903217960
Email: hien.buithithu@iucn.org

Non-Governmental Organizations / Academic Institutions

Change VN

Thoi Thi Chau Nhi
Email: nhithoi@changevn.org

Education for Nature Vietnam

Bui Thi Ha
Vice Director
Education For Nature Vietnam
No 1701, Building 17T5, Hoang Dao Thuy
street
10000, Hanoi
Vietnam
Tel: +840989880212
Email: habui.env@gmail.com

Emirates Nature-WWF

Clara Jimena Rodriguez Zarate
Marine Turtle Conservation Project
Manager
Emirates Nature-WWF
Street 4th the greens & the views
Dubai
United Arab Emirates
Tel: +971505123093
Email: jrodriguez@enwwf.ae

Swansea University

Nicole Esteban
Lecturer in Marine Biology
Swansea University
Swansea SA2 8PP
United Kingdom
Tel: +447713088362
Email: n.esteban@swansea.ac.uk

Terra Marine Research Institute

Annie Kurian
Co-founder and Director of Programs-Sea
Turtles, Marine and Coastal Resource
Conservation
Terra Marine Research Institute
1,R.B.I Colony
560024
India
Tel: +919845649353
Email: annpix@gmail.com

TRAFFIC International

Nguyen Cuong
Marine Turtle Illegal Trade Monitoring
Project Coordinator
N0 1, Lane 95, Giang Van Minh Streets
Ba Dinh District
Hanoi
Vietnam
Tel: +840904164243
Email: cuong.nguyen@traffic.org

TRAFFIC Vietnam

Sarah Ferguson
Director
TRAFFIC Vietnam
1 Lane 95 Giang Van Minh
Hanoi
Vietnam
Tel: +84376362164
Email: sarah.ferguson@traffic.org

University of Papua

Fitryanti Pakiding
Researcher
University of Papua
Perumahan Dosen UNIPA, D-65, Amban
Pantai
Manokwari, Papua Barat, 98314
Indonesia
Tel: +62 81381912350
Email: fitryanti@yahoo.com

WWF-Australia

Christine Madden Hof
Marine Species Program Manager
World Wildlife Fund for Nature (WWF-
Australia)
Level 4, 340 Adelaide Street
Brisbane
Australia
Tel: +61404421172
Email: chof@wwf.org.au

Invited Experts

Lindsey West
Vice-Chair WIO-MTTF
Technical Adviser
Sea Sense
324/D Msasani Village
Dar es Salaam
United Republic of Tanzania
Tel: +255783965380
Email: lindsey@seasense.org

Muralidharan Manoharakrishnan
Chair NIO-MTTF
Field Director
Dakshin Foundation
301 Jana Jeeva Castle, 8th Cross Canara
Bank Layout, Kodigehalli
560097
India
Tel: +918861750457
Email: murali@dakshin.org

Andrea Phillott
Professor of Environmental Studies
FLAME University, Gate NO. 1270, Lavale,
Off Pune-Bangalore Highway, Pun
412115
India
Tel: +919158056123
Email: andrea.phillott@gmail.com

Secretariat

UNEP/CMS Secretariat
UN Campus
Platz der Vereinten Nationen 1
53113 Bonn
Germany

Melanie Virtue
Head Aquatic Species Team
Tel: +49 228 8152462
Email: melanie.virtue@un.org

Heidrun Frisch-Nwakanma
IOSEA Marine Turtle MOU Coordinator
Aquatic Species Team
Tel: +49 228 8152491
Email: heidrun.frisch-nwakanma@un.org

Tine Lindberg-Roncari
Conference Services
Tel: +49 228 8152493
Email: tine.lindberg-roncari@un.org

Polina Orlinskiy
Consultant
Tel: +49 228 8152491
Email: polina.orkinskiy@un.org

Robert Vagg
Report Writer
Tel: +49 228 8152476
Email: robert.vagg@cms.int

Agenda

1. Welcoming Remarks
2. Signature of the Memorandum by Additional States
3. Election of Officers, Adoption of the Agenda and Schedule
4. Report of the Secretariat
5. Report of the Advisory Committee Chair
6. Reports of the Chairs of the Marine Turtle Task Forces and of Sub-regional Focal Points
7. Review of Implementation
 - 7.1. National Reports
 - 7.2. Review of Implementation of Action Points Arising from MOS7
 - 7.3. Results of the Hawksbill Assessment
 - 7.4. Priority Projects: Casuarina Trees
 - 7.5. Environmental Impact Assessments
8. Introduction, Review and Prioritization of Draft Work Programme
 - 8.1. Synthesis of Existing Recommendations
 - 8.2. Draft Work Programme
9. IOSEA Site Network
 - 9.1. Status Updates
 - 9.2. Proposal for Inclusion of Con Dao National Park, Viet Nam
10. Partnerships and Collaboration
 - 10.1. Illegal Take and Trade of Marine Turtles
 - 10.2. Ramsar Resolution XIII.24 on Marine Turtles
 - 10.3. RFMOs and Bycatch Reduction
 - 10.4. CMS Work on Relevant Topics
 - 10.5. Other Opportunities for Collaboration
11. Emerging Issues
 - 11.1. Light Pollution
 - 11.2. Underwater Noise
 - 11.3. Hatcheries
12. Presentation and Adoption of Revised Draft Work Programme
13. Financial and Administrative Matters
 - 13.1. IOSEA Secretariat Arrangements
 - 13.2. Review of Income and Expenditures 2014-2019
 - 13.3. Indicative Budget for 2020-2023
14. Institutional Matters
 - 14.1. Advisory Committee Membership
 - 14.2. Sub-regional Focal Points
 - 14.3. Next Meeting of the Signatory States (MOS9)
15. Closing of the Meeting

Statement by the Republic of Mauritius

Mr. Chairperson,

The Republic of Mauritius reiterates its rejection of the signature of the Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation and Management of Marine Turtles and their Habitats of the Indian Ocean and South-East Asia by the United Kingdom on 27 March 2002 in respect of the Chagos Archipelago.

The Republic of Mauritius also strongly objects to any document purportedly submitted by the United Kingdom in respect of the so-called “British Indian Ocean Territory” (“BIOT”) to this meeting and to any reference to the so-called “BIOT” or to the Chagos Archipelago as a British territory in any document which has been circulated for this meeting.

The Government of the Republic of Mauritius further strongly objects to the participation of the United Kingdom delegation in this meeting and in any future meetings of Signatory States to the Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation and Management of Marine Turtles and their Habitats of the Indian Ocean and South East Asia.

My delegation wishes to draw the attention of this meeting to the Advisory Opinion rendered by the International Court of Justice on 25 February 2019 on the legal consequences of the separation of the Chagos Archipelago from Mauritius in 1965.

The Advisory Opinion confirms that the Chagos Archipelago is and has always formed an integral part of the territory of Mauritius. In this Opinion, the International Court of Justice also concluded, *inter alia*, that:

- (a) the process of decolonization of Mauritius was not lawfully completed when it acceded to independence in 1968, in view of the unlawful excision of the Chagos Archipelago from the territory of Mauritius;
- (b) the United Kingdom’s continued administration of the Chagos Archipelago constitutes a wrongful act entailing the international responsibility of that State, and is an unlawful act of a continuing character;
- (c) the United Kingdom is under an obligation to bring to an end its administration of the Chagos Archipelago as rapidly as possible;
- (d) all Member States are under an obligation to cooperate with the United Nations to complete the decolonization of Mauritius.

It follows that under the rules and principles of international law, the Republic of Mauritius is the sole State lawfully entitled to exercise sovereignty and sovereign rights over the Chagos Archipelago and its maritime zones. This position has been consistently maintained by the Republic of Mauritius.

Resolution 73/295 which the United Nations General Assembly adopted on 22 May 2019 by an overwhelming majority of 116 votes to 6 reaffirmed the conclusions of the International Court of Justice and demanded that the United Kingdom withdraw its colonial administration from the Chagos Archipelago unconditionally within a period of no more than six months, that is, by 22 November 2019.

Resolution 73/295 also called upon the United Nations and all its specialized agencies as well as all other international, regional and intergovernmental organizations to recognize that the Chagos Archipelago forms an integral part of the territory of Mauritius, to support the

decolonization of Mauritius as rapidly as possible, and to refrain from impeding that process by recognizing, or giving effect to any measure taken by or on behalf of, the so-called “British Indian Ocean Territory” (“BIOT”).

The United Kingdom purported to sign the Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation and Management of Marine Turtles and their Habitats of the Indian Ocean and South-East Asia on the purported basis of its colonial administration of the Chagos Archipelago. That administration has been authoritatively determined to be a continuing internationally wrongful act and one that has to be ended. As such, it cannot be relied upon for any purpose. The United Kingdom is accordingly not lawfully entitled to be a signatory to the Memorandum of Understanding in respect of the Chagos Archipelago.

It is clear, therefore, that the signature of the Memorandum of Understanding by the United Kingdom should be rejected and the United Kingdom should not be allowed to participate in this and any future meetings as a signatory. In that respect, the Republic of Mauritius requests that procedures be initiated to determine the United Kingdom’s status as a signatory.

The Republic of Mauritius further reserves all its rights under international law. Nothing discussed or agreed at this Meeting should be construed as implying that the United Kingdom is in any way entitled to exercise sovereignty and sovereign rights over the Chagos Archipelago and its maritime zones or to be a signatory to the Memorandum of Understanding in respect of the Chagos Archipelago.

Moreover, the Republic of Mauritius reiterates that the Island of Tromelin forms an integral part of its territory, and rejects the sovereignty claim of France over the Island of Tromelin as well as France’s claim to any sovereign right or jurisdiction over the Exclusive Economic Zone adjacent to the Island of Tromelin.

Further, the Republic of Mauritius does not recognize the validity of the inclusion of the Island of Tromelin in the French Southern and Antarctic Lands (TAAF) or the Scattered Islands/Iles Eparses. The Republic of Mauritius reaffirms that it has full and complete sovereignty over the Island of Tromelin, including its maritime zones.

Any consideration of any document which purports to refer to the Island of Tromelin as a French territory as well as any action or decision that may be taken on the basis of any such document, cannot and should not be construed in any way whatsoever as implying that France has sovereignty or analogous rights over the Island of Tromelin or that the Island of Tromelin is part of the French Southern and Antarctic Lands (TAAF) or the Scattered Islands/Iles Eparses or is a French territory.

This statement is applicable to all agenda items and all documents of this meeting.

WORK PROGRAMME 2020-2024

CMP¹	Measures to be taken	Subject	Actors²	Overall Priority	SEA+	NWIO	NIO	WIO
Section 1: Measures that Implement CMP Objectives and Programmes								
Objective 1: Reduce direct and indirect causes of marine turtle mortality								
1.1	Identify and document the threats to marine turtle populations and their habitats							
	1. Determine population-specific threats to be used as a basis for monitoring and management: a) collect samples to perform genetic analysis on bycaught, stranded and confiscated specimens and record results systematically; b) using genetic markers identified for nesting populations, determine population structure of marine turtle bycatch, and stranded and confiscated turtles; c) investigate potential overlaps of fishing activities and turtle/dugong distribution.	Genetics, Fisheries Interactions, Take and Trade	Sigs	High	High	High	High	High
	2. Assess vulnerability of turtles to marine debris, including ghost nets and plastic pollution, heavy metals and chemical pollutants a) investigate transport and abundance of marine debris, marine debris ingestion rates, and vulnerability b) investigate impact on each genetic stock / population / management unit	Marine Debris, Genetics	Sigs	High	High	High	Med	High
	3. Encourage the review and investigation of longer-term impacts of underwater noise on turtles.	Underwater Noise	Sigs	Low	Low	Low	Low	High

¹ Number of the Programme (indicated by a number) or a specific activity (indicated by a number and a letter) from the CMP

² **AC** = Advisory Committee, **Cons** = specialized project consultancy, **Exp** = in-country or external experts, **Fleets** = nations with fleets in the region, **IGO** = Intergovernmental Organizations, **ITWG** = IOSEA Illegal Trade Working Group, **MTTF** = IOSEA Marine Turtle Task Forces, **Nat St** = national stakeholders, **NGO** = Non-governmental Organizations, **NRWG** = IOSEA National Report Working Group, **Res** = research institutions, **RFMO** = Regional Fisheries Management Organizations, **RS** = Range States, **Sec** = Secretariat, **Sigs** = Signatory States, **SRFP** = IOSEA Sub-regional Focal Points

CMP ¹	Measures to be taken	Subject	Actors ²	Overall Priority	SEA+	NWIO	NIO	WIO
	4. Collect data on light pollution and its impact on nesting turtles and their hatchlings	Light Pollution, Nesting Sites	Sigs	Medium	High	Med	Med	Med
	5. Identify nesting beaches that are vulnerable to climate change in the IOSEA region, using beach height data, temperature profiles, and distribution maps.	Climate Change	Sigs, AC	High	High	Med	High	High
	6. Compile information on the status of on-board observer programmes and the status of marine turtle bycatch recording within those observer programmes and share with the Advisory Committee.	Fisheries Interactions	Sigs, AC	Medium	Med	Low	Low	High
	7. Conduct surveys with fishing communities to estimate catch and motivations behind that catch to identify solutions to mitigate bycatch, e.g. making use of and adapting as appropriate the questionnaire developed by the CMS Dugong MOU	Fisheries Interactions	Sigs	High	High	High	High	High
	8. Collaborate with the Olive Ridley Project by regularly submitting available data and/or linking to existing databases on ghost nets and entanglement of turtles in ghost nets to the online data portal. ³	Marine Debris, Cooperation	Sigs, AC	Medium-Low	Med	Low	Low	Med
	9. Establish and/or continue a reliable nesting beach monitoring programme ⁴ for nesting and hatching, with a specific focus on suitable index sites for each species (e.g. taking into account gaps identified in the species assessments). Ensure that data are standardized.	Nesting Sites	Sigs, AC	High	Very high	High	High	High

³ <https://oliveridleyproject.org/report-a-ghost-net>

⁴ Signatories in the NWIO sub-region to consult PERSGA manuals (available [here](#))

CMP ¹	Measures to be taken	Subject	Actors ²	Overall Priority	SEA+	NWIO	NIO	WIO
	10. Provide input to the CMS Scientific Council review of relevant scientific information on conservation and threats to marine turtles, such as climate change and sky glow, and to the development of corresponding recommendations.	Climate Change, Light Pollution, Cooperation	AC, Sec	Medium	Med	Med	High	-
	11. Identify or establish and maintain long-term, secure data management systems.	Information Sharing	Sigs	High	High			
	12. Send out the draft Hawksbill Assessment to other experts in the region for their comments and provide a final report to the Secretariat by 30 June 2020 for publishing.	Species: Hawksbill	AC	High	High	High	-	-
	13. Initiate the next species assessment for Olive Ridley Turtles with a view to tabling a draft at IOSEA MOS9.	Species: Olive Ridley	AC	High	Med	High	High	-
	14. Prepare a brief document on the conservation status of Flatback Turtles with a view to tabling a draft at IOSEA MOS9.	Species: Flatback	AC	Low	Low	-	-	-
1.2	Determine and apply best practice approaches to minimising those threats to marine turtle populations and their habitats							
	15. Develop guidelines on the management of beaches for successful hatchling production, including management of hatcheries if and when required ⁵ . The Advisory Committee to provide these documents to the Secretariat by 31 October 2020 for circulation to the Signatories for their comments within two months. The Secretariat to circulate to Signatories the final proposals for intersessional adoption by correspondence in order to enable their use in the run-up to MOS9.	Hatcheries Nesting Sites	AC, Sec	High	High	High	Low	-
	16. Organize workshops to disseminate best practice information for the management of hatcheries. Secretariat to invite countries to nominate to participate in the training.	Hatcheries	Sigs, AC, Sec	Medium	High	Low	High	Low

⁵ Relates also to CMP Programme 1.6 Develop nesting beach management programmes to maximize hatchling recruitment

CMP ¹	Measures to be taken	Subject	Actors ²	Overall Priority	SEA+	NWIO	NIO	WIO
	17. Provide input to the CMS Scientific Council development of draft tourism guidelines and recommended code of conduct for operators on recreational in-water interactions with CMS-listed species.	Tourism, Cooperation	AC, Sec	Medium	Med	High	Low	-
	18. Utilize the <i>Light Pollution Guidelines for Wildlife Including Marine Turtles, Seabirds and Migratory Shorebirds</i> ⁶ nationally and engage with CMS in any further work to be done on the subject. Ensure that the document reaches the relevant authority/department.	Light Pollution, Cooperation	Sigs, AC, Sec	High	High	High	Low	High
	19. Utilize the CMS Family <i>Guidelines on Environmental Impact Assessments for Marine Noise-generating Activities</i> ⁷ and disseminate them to all national departments involved in deciding on noise-generating activities	Underwater Noise	Sigs	Medium	Med	Med	Low	High
1.3	Implement programmes to correct adverse economic incentives that threaten marine turtle populations							
	20. Compile information on available tools and mechanisms that incorporate all stakeholders to evaluate and address socio-economic issues.	Socio-economics	Cons, MTTF, NGO	Low	Low	-	-	High
	21. Investigate human dimensions that underpin the use and trade of marine turtles and turtle products.	Socio-economics, Take and Trade	Sigs, MTTF, NGO	High	High	-	-	High

⁶ See [MOS8/Doc.11.1](#)

⁷ See [MOS8/Doc.11.2](#)

CMP ¹	Measures to be taken	Subject	Actors ²	Overall Priority	SEA+	NWIO	NIO	WIO
1.4	Reduce to the greatest extent practicable the incidental capture and mortality of marine turtles in the course of fishing activities							
	22. Continue national and/or regional bycatch mitigation programmes for industrial and artisanal fisheries (including gear modification, TEDs, and improved fishing practices to reduce bycatch).	Fisheries Interactions	Sigs, Fleets	High	High	High	High	High
	23. Identify high priority areas, stocks and fisheries for establishing additional bycatch mitigation programmes.	Fisheries Interactions	Sigs, Fleets	High	High			
	24. Establish national observer, assessment and quantification programmes to assess the impact on different turtle life stages and populations.	Fisheries Interactions	Sigs, Fleets, RFMO	Medium	High	Med	Low	High
	25. Ensure that concerns related to sources of turtle mortality are presented at IOTC Meetings/ especially WPEB (e.g. including FADs and gill nets, based on new information that comes to light): a) initiate dialogue on current issues of concern among Signatories and IOTC members in advance of each IOTC meeting (including subsidiary bodies) b) continue to contribute to the IOTC Executive Summary on marine turtles c) AC Members and National Focal Points to communicate important issues to members of national delegations attending IOTC in advance of each IOTC meeting d) Signatories (especially if FPs are the same) to promote the cause of turtles in IOTC meetings, and to communicate issues with Secretariat and others for information.	Fisheries Interactions, Cooperation	Sigs, AC, Sec	High	High	Low	High	High

CMP ¹	Measures to be taken	Subject	Actors ²	Overall Priority	SEA+	NWIO	NIO	WIO
1.5	Prohibit the direct harvest (capture or killing) of, and domestic trade in, marine turtles, their eggs, parts or products, whilst allowing exceptions for traditional harvest by communities within each jurisdiction provided that: such harvest does not undermine efforts to protect, conserve and recover marine turtle populations and their habitats; and the marine turtle populations in question are able to sustain the harvest							
	26. Request inclusion of an AC member in the CMS Aquatic Wild Meat Working Group and provide opportunities to the Advisory Committee to comment on draft documents.	Take and Trade, Cooperation	AC, Sec	High	High	High	High	Med
	27. Improve enforcement of national legislation on exploitation of turtles: a) identify and articulate actual resource needs and raise funds to increase human and material resources, b) build field-level capacity at national and regional levels, and c) identify weaknesses in the judicial process and address these	Take and Trade, Cooperation	Sigs, CITES	High	High	High	Low	High
	28. Consider applying innovative techniques (e.g. the Community Voice Method (CVM)) to ensure that concerns of subsistence resource users are incorporated in decision-making.	Stakeholder Engagement	Sigs	Medium	-	High	Low	Med/High
	29. In consultation with local communities, develop culturally acceptable management agreements on the sustainable level of legal traditional harvest.	Socio-economics	Sigs	Low	Low	-	Low	-
Objective 2. Protect, conserve and rehabilitate marine turtle habitats								
2.1	Establish necessary measures to protect and conserve marine turtle habitats							
	30. Define criteria for identifying habitats critical for marine turtles (e.g. proportion of population, core areas).	Habitat Protection	AC	Medium	High			
	31. Geographically identify critical habitats for each turtle stock and life stage, such as nesting beaches, inter-nesting habitats, migratory corridors, foraging habitats and oceanic dispersal areas.	Habitat Protection	Sigs	High	High	High	High	High

CMP ¹	Measures to be taken	Subject	Actors ²	Overall Priority	SEA+	NWIO	NIO	WIO
	32. Protect and adequately manage already identified critical habitats.	Habitat Protection	Sigs	High	High	High	High	High
	33. Create marine protected area networks to provide management and connectivity across different habitats, for example by completing development and implementation of an effective network / list of sites of importance for marine turtles	Habitat Protection	Sigs, AC, Sec	High	High	-	High	High
	34. In any beach management measures, consider the potential impact of planting non-native vegetation (e.g. Casuarina trees) along their coastline ⁸ and evaluate which native plants could serve the purposes of providing shading and beach protection without the negative side effects of Casuarina plantations outside of their native range.	Habitat Protection	Sigs	Medium	Med	Med	Med	Med
Site Network								
	35. The Site Network working group ⁹ established by MOS8 should develop 1) revised Site Information Template, 2) refined evaluation criteria and scoring instructions, and 3) a simplified post-scoring process. The working group to provide these documents to the Secretariat by 31 October 2020 for circulation to the Signatories for their comments within two months. The Secretariat to circulate to Signatories the final proposals for intersessional adoption by correspondence in order to enable their use in the run-up to MOS9.	Site Network	Sigs, AC, Sec	High	High	High	High	-

⁸ See [MOS8/Doc.7.4](#)

⁹ Membership: Saudi Arabia, UAE, Seychelles, Pakistan, Viet Nam, M. Hamman (AC), M. Tiwari (AC), R. Nel (AC), J. Frazier (AC)

CMP ¹	Measures to be taken	Subject	Actors ²	Overall Priority	SEA+	NWIO	NIO	WIO
	36. Revive the Site Network Discussion Group (composed of the members of the WG established above and Site Managers) established by MOS7 to provide advice to Site managers, identify funding sources, discuss how the designation can add value to the accepted Sites, and consider whether OECMs ¹⁰ are a helpful concept.	Site Network	Sigs	Low	-	-	Low	-
	37. Consider nominating IOSEA Network Sites as Ramsar Sites and/or CBD OECMs (if not nominated yet) to achieve additional support and recognition.	Site Network, Cooperation	Sigs	Medium-Low	Med	Low	-	
	38. Explore the possibility of introducing certification schemes through multinational companies and organizations involved in coastal tourism and development to reduce impact on turtle habitat	Habitat Protection, Tourism	Sigs, Cons	Low	Low	Low	Low	-
Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs)								
	39. Consider incorporating progress updates on EIA implementation in national reporting; and possibly analyse how EIA processes are implemented in each country.	Environmental Impact Assessment	NRWG, AC, Sec	Medium-High	Med	High	High	Med
	40. Utilize the EIA guidelines regarding impacts on sea turtles and their habitats ¹¹ and incorporate turtle conservation needs into EIA / risk assessment of new developments and into Integrated Coastal Zone Management processes. The key emerging issues may include: energy sector (e.g. oil refineries, nuclear power energy plants), desalination infrastructure development and effluent, harbour development and dredged channels, industrial and domestic wastewater, light pollution (residential and tourism development and industrial activities).	Environmental Impact Assessment	Sigs	High	High	High	Low	High

¹⁰ OECMs = other effective area-based conservation measures, as defined in [CBD Decision 14/8](#)

¹¹ See [MOS8/Doc.7.5](#)

CMP ¹	Measures to be taken	Subject	Actors ²	Overall Priority	SEA+	NWIO	NIO	WIO
2.2	Rehabilitate degraded marine turtle habitats							
	41. Identify key areas for habitat restoration, e.g. coral reefs, beaches, mangrove, seagrass, and intertidal habitats, and start removing threats using best practice guidelines.	Habitat Protection	Sigs	Medium-High	High	Med	Med	High
Objective 3. Improve understanding of marine turtle ecology and populations through research, monitoring and information exchange								
	42. Promote a list of IOSEA-endorsed research projects to help to leverage funding for scientific research to investigate the conservation biology of marine turtles.	Biological Research, Funding	AC, Sec, Res	High	High	-	-	High
3.1	Conduct studies on marine turtles and their habitats targeted to their conservation and management¹²							
	43. Improve understanding of the biological structure of marine Turtle populations through scientific and traditional knowledge: a) prioritize major gaps in each sub-region b) quantify key demographic parameters (e.g. reproductive output, clutches per season, remigration interval, growth rates, and annual survivorship) c) map the breeding distributions and assess population size and status d) determine foraging distributions, migration path-ways, habitat use etc, using appropriate technology, (e.g. flipper tagging, satellite telemetry and genetic sampling) e) collect data on hatchling production including sex ratios and health and survivorship f) improve understanding of the dispersal mechanisms and routes for marine turtle hatchlings and post-hatchlings, and migration routes for adults of each of the management units	Biological Research	Sigs, Res	High	High	High	High	High

¹² Relates also to CMP Programme 3.2 Conduct collaborative research and monitoring, and CMP Programme 3.3 Analyse data to support mitigation of threats and to assess and improve conservation practices

CMP ¹	Measures to be taken	Subject	Actors ²	Overall Priority	SEA+	NWIO	NIO	WIO
	44. Conduct genetic analyses to identify genetic stocks (management units) for Marine Turtles in the IOSEA region: a) compile and assess available information to identify needs and opportunities for regional analyses to inform genetic stock assessment, starting with nesting beach sampling b) develop maps for each genetic stock indicating rookery locations and habitat use in pelagic and benthic environments, rather than relying on the Regional Management Unit (RMU) maps given in Wallace et al. (2011) ¹³ c) incorporate genetic sampling into ongoing monitoring activities (subject to budget and resources available) d) standardize protocols for collection and storage of samples to ensure they will remain usable in the long term e) address capacity building needs to enable in-country analyses, upon request f) AC and Secretariat to facilitate contacts with laboratories and CITES permits to conduct genetic analyses, upon request	Genetics	Sigs, AC, Sec	High	High	High	Med	High
	45. Periodically update the list of genetic studies in the IOSEA region ¹⁴ and publish it on the IOSEA website.	Genetics	AC, Sec	Medium	Med	High	High	Low

¹³ Wallace et al. (2011) Global Conservation Priorities for Marine Turtles. PLoS ONE 6(9): e24510. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0024510>

¹⁴ (link to be provided in due course)

CMP ¹	Measures to be taken	Subject	Actors ²	Overall Priority	SEA+	NWIO	NIO	WIO
3.4	Exchange Information							
	46. Apply guidelines and protocols recommended by the Advisory Committee for data collection and management of sea turtles and their habitats. ¹⁵	Method Standardization	Sigs, AC	High	High	High	High	High
	47. Review data collected to assess gaps and needs for the sub-regions in terms of research and monitoring methodology	Method Standardization	AC	High	Med	High	High	High
	48. Facilitate capacity building in applying best practice/standard methods	Method Standardization	AC, Sec	High	High	High	High	High
	49. Prepare an overview of scientific information available on effects of underwater noise on turtles, supported by the USA, and place it on the MOU website.	Underwater Noise	Sec	Medium	-	-	-	-
Objective 4. Increase public awareness and public participation								
4.1	Establish public education, awareness and information programmes							
	50. Promote high profile events such as World Sea Turtle Day for the purpose, <i>inter alia</i> , of raising public and political awareness of turtle conservation and IOSEA's role. Develop media materials to raise the profile of marine turtle conservation issues.	Outreach and Communication	Sigs, AC, Sec, NGO	High	High	High	High	High

¹⁵ Citations to useful and accepted guidelines and protocols for data collection and management will be provided on the IOSEA website (link to be provided in due course).

CMP ¹	Measures to be taken	Subject	Actors ²	Overall Priority	SEA+	NWIO	NIO	WIO
	51. To address consumptive use and domestic trade: a) work with local communities to reduce poaching b) raise awareness of turtle consumers, highlight existing regulations, conservation and possibly health issues involved (e.g. tourists, vendors, egg consumers) c) engage religious leaders, as appropriate, in awareness campaigns d) educate youth and women e) enhance transboundary cooperation in education and awareness campaigns	Outreach and Communication, Take and Trade	Sigs, NGO, Nat St	High	Very High	High	Low	High
	52. Develop and document lessons learnt from successful campaigns about turtle conservation issues: a) use examples and lessons learnt from previous campaigns to develop successful approaches, b) evaluate and document lessons learnt from your campaigns based on evaluation criteria to be developed by the Advisory Committee c) share lessons learnt publicly, for example, through IOSEA Secretariat	Outreach and Communication	Sigs, AC, NGO, Nat St	Medium	Med	Med	Med	High
4.2	Develop alternative livelihood opportunities for local communities to encourage their active participation in conservation efforts							
	53. Develop alternative livelihoods, such as ecotourism and/or livestock keeping, using examples of good practice to ensure genuinely sustainable approaches, which will be beneficial in the long run for both humans and turtle populations.	Alternative Livelihoods	Sigs, NGO	High	High	High	Low	Med/High
	54. Assess available knowledge on best practice approaches compiled from national reports and consultations to produce a best practice guide for alternative livelihood projects that ensure that all stakeholders are fully involved. Follow these best practices to develop alternative livelihoods tailored to local conditions.	Alternative Livelihoods	Sigs, AC, Cons	Medium	High	Med	Med	Med

CMP ¹	Measures to be taken	Subject	Actors ²	Overall Priority	SEA+	NWIO	NIO	WIO
4.3	Promote public participation							
	55. Train organizers and (potential) participants of citizen science activities about species identification and data collection techniques.	Stakeholder Engagement	AC, Exp	Medium	High	Med	-	Med
	56. Collaborate with local communities to engage stakeholders in data collection and monitoring.	Stakeholder Engagement	Sigs	Medium	Med	Med	High	Med/High
	57. Showcase exemplary work through the IOSEA Newsletter and website to highlight successes to multiple stakeholders: a) periodically recognize and acknowledge noteworthy contributions to IOSEA implementation (by Signatory States, organizations, corporate sector, individuals etc.) b) enhance appreciation / recognition of NGO/IGO partners	Stakeholder Engagement	Sigs, Sec	High	High	Med	High	High
Objective 5. Enhance national, regional and international cooperation								
5.1	Collaborate with and assist Signatory and non-Signatory States to regulate and share information on trade, to combat illegal trade, and to cooperate in enforcement activities relating to marine turtle products							
	58. Strengthen internal, bilateral and international cooperation in enforcement, collaborating with IGOs and NGOs, such as CITES, ASEAN Wildlife Enforcement Network (WEN), South Asia Wildlife Enforcement Network (SAWEN), and TRAFFIC, to ensure the issue of marine turtle trade is on the agenda of future meetings	Take and Trade, Cooperation	Sigs, Sec, ITWG, IGO, NGO	Medium-High	Very high	Med	High	Med
	59. Cooperate with CITES to ensure synergies and identify supply and demand areas and trade routes for the international trade in marine turtles and their products and develop targeted strategies to address these issues.	Take and Trade, Cooperation	Sigs, ITWG, NGO	Medium	High	Low	High	Low

CMP ¹	Measures to be taken	Subject	Actors ²	Overall Priority	SEA+	NWIO	NIO	WIO
	60. Extend an invitation to Signatories not present at MOS8, non-Signatory Range/consumer States, CITES, as well as relevant NGOs active in consumer states to join the Illegal Trade Working Group (ITWG) ¹⁶ . The ITWG will choose its chair and update its task list ¹⁷ .	Take and Trade, Cooperation	Sigs, Sec	High	High	Med	High	-
	61. Take further steps to understand and reduce use and domestic trade and to develop awareness campaigns to target online illegal trade.	Take and Trade	Sigs, ITWG	Medium	Med	High	Low	Med
5.2	Assist Signatory and non-Signatory States, upon request, to develop and implement national, sub-regional and regional action plans for the conservation and management of marine turtles and their habitats							
	62. Encourage development and implementation of national action plans, where needed, in collaboration with local communities and other stakeholders: a) compile/provide examples of National Action Plans for review and possible adaption by Signatory States to other contexts b) prioritize countries that need National Action Plans and offer additional assistance to Signatory States in their development (e.g. using expertise within the Advisory Committee, Focal Points, external expertise) c) assist in the implementation and review of such plans, if requested.	Capacity Building	AC, Exp	High	High	High	High	High
	63. Cooperate with CMS in the joint development of a draft Single Species Action Plan (SSAP) for the conservation of the Hawksbill Turtle to address the trade, use and other threats to the conservation of hawksbill turtles in South-east Asia, and the adjacent western Pacific.	Take and Trade, Cooperation, Species: Hawksbill	Sigs, AC, Sec	Medium-High	Med	-	High	-

¹⁶ Members: Australia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Kenya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Philippines, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Viet Nam, C. Limpus (AC), J. Miller (AC), InterAmerican Sea Turtle Convention (IAC)

¹⁷ Tasks as set by MOS7 are available [here](#); to be updated.

CMP ¹	Measures to be taken	Subject	Actors ²	Overall Priority	SEA+	NWIO	NIO	WIO
5.3	Enhance mechanisms for cooperation and promote information exchange							
	64. Encourage more sub-regional interactions (e.g. by organizing intersessional sub-regional meetings, training, task forces, etc.)	Sub-regional Coordination	Sigs, SRFP, AC, MTTF Chairs	High	High	High	High	High
	65. Encourage the participation of RFMOs and other relevant bodies (e.g. IOTC, ASCLME, IOC, SWIOFP, SEAFDEC, CTI) in the Marine Turtle Task Forces (MTTF) or other sub-regional meetings.	Sub-regional Coordination , Fisheries Interactions, Cooperation	RS, MTTF	Medium-High	High	High	Med	Med
	66. Engage with other relevant initiatives, such as International and regional Sea Turtle Symposia, global and regional Newsletters and Regional Seas Programmes.	Cooperation	Sec	Medium	Low	High	High	-
	67. Encourage cooperative research and management of marine turtle management units that are shared across international boundaries.	Sub-regional Coordination	Sigs, SRFP, AC	High	High	High	High	High
	68. Organize with a host country in the region a SEA+ sub-regional meeting to facilitate coordination and discuss the establishment of a Marine Turtle Task Force (MTTF).	Sub-regional Coordination	Sigs, Sec	High	High	-	-	-
	69. Organize with a host country in the region a NWIO sub-regional meeting to facilitate coordination and discuss the establishment of a Marine Turtle Task Force (MTTF).	Sub-regional Coordination	Sigs, Sec	High	-	High	-	-
Area-based measures								
	70. Liaise with counterparts in neighbouring countries regarding possibilities for developing transboundary MPAs or other forms of transboundary collaboration, where applicable considering EBSAs.	Sub-regional Coordination	Sigs	High	High	Low	High	High

CMP ¹	Measures to be taken	Subject	Actors ²	Overall Priority	SEA+	NWIO	NIO	WIO
	71. When developing MPAs, get sound scientific advice so as to ensure boundaries are based on ecological criteria, where applicable considering EBSAs.	Sub-regional Coordination , Habitat Protection	Sigs	High	High	Low	High	High
	72. Ensure that ecological information on marine turtles is considered in the identification of new EBSAs.	Sub-regional Coordination , Habitat Protection	Sigs	High	High	High	High	High
RFMOs								
	73. Request RFMOs to gather information and report on the occurrence, distribution and take of marine turtles in oceanic areas.	Stakeholder Engagement , Fisheries Interactions, Cooperation	Sigs, AC, Sec	High	High	High	High	High
	74. Revive efforts to conclude a cooperation agreement with IOTC on marine turtles.	Fisheries Interactions, Cooperation	Sec	High	High	High	High	High
	75. Engage with WCPFC to identify options for collaboration.	Fisheries Interactions, Cooperation	Sec	High	High	-	-	-
National reporting								
	76. Continue to improve the quality of information provided in national reports and encourage integration in National Reports of positive substantive contributions from NGO/IGO partners and universities.	National Reports, Information Sharing	Sigs	High	High	High	High	Med
	77. Include in the analysis of the National Report matrices indicating which countries reported implementation of different activities outlined in the reporting questionnaire.	National Reports	Sec	High	High	High	High	Med

CMP ¹	Measures to be taken	Subject	Actors ²	Overall Priority	SEA+	NWIO	NIO	WIO
	78. The working group established by MOS8 to revise the format for National Reports ¹⁸ should seek feedback from Signatory States and the Advisory Committee. It will deliver its outputs to the Secretariat by 31 October 2020 for circulation to the Signatories for their comments within two months. The Secretariat will circulate to Signatories the final proposals for intersessional adoption by correspondence in order to enable their use in the run-up to MOS9.	National Reports	Sigs, AC, Sec	High	High	High	High	High
	79. IOSEA Focal Points are encouraged to work directly with MTTF members and relevant stakeholders to complete and improve the quality of data in national reports, for example, in relation to identifying specific resource needs and improving data on fisheries and fisheries interactions, in particular.	National Reports, Information Sharing	Sigs	Medium-High	Med	Med	High	High
	80. Provide training or webinars or any further technical help, when requested, to prepare and submit national reports and available IOSEA online tools.	National Reports, Capacity Building	AC, Sec	Medium-Low	Med	Med	Low	Low
	81. Encourage and facilitate online communications between Signatories and the Secretariat (e.g. submit reports through online system and use online tools).	National Reports, Capacity Building	Sec	High	High	High	High	Low
Online Tools								
	82. Provide up-to-date lists of flipper tag series used in the countries to the IOSEA Secretariat for inclusion in and management of the existing IOSEA online database of tag series.	Information Sharing	Sigs, Sec, Res, NGO	Medium-High	Med	High	High	Med

¹⁸ Membership: Comoros, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, J. Miller (AC), N. Esteban (Swansea University) and the Secretariat

CMP ¹	Measures to be taken	Subject	Actors ²	Overall Priority	SEA+	NWIO	NIO	WIO
	83. Submit information on satellite tracking studies (location, species, number of tags, contact information) to the IOSEA Secretariat for inclusion in and management of the Satellite Tracking Meta-database.	Information Sharing	Sigs, Sec, Res, NGO	Medium-Low	Low	High	Low	Med
	84. Develop page on EIA guidance based on MOS8 Documents 7.5 and 11.2 on the IOSEA website.	Information Sharing, Environmental Impact Assessments	AC, Sec	High	High	High	High	Med
5.4	Build capacity to strengthen conservation measures							
	85. Adopt a proactive process for identifying needs and providing training within the IOSEA region: a) offer Signatory States training topic options b) develop an over-arching structure for training to be based on the Objectives of the CMP and activities in the Work Plan c) structure training to address identified 'needs' of the Signatory States through tailoring content d) develop skills of country representatives in the preparation and revision of country reports e) develop skills of Sub-regional and Country representatives and researchers in (1) collecting, analyzing, and presenting biological data, (2) defining foraging populations, and (3) conservation management techniques (interactions with fisheries, coastal development). In addition, training should emphasize communication and coordination techniques that can be used among various levels (local, province, country, sub-region, region) to coordinate conservation activities f) organize follow-up visits to assess the effectiveness of the transfer of information and skills	Capacity-building	Sigs, Sec, AC	High	High	High	High	High

CMP ¹	Measures to be taken	Subject	Actors ²	Overall Priority	SEA+	NWIO	NIO	WIO
	86. Promote regional exchange of expertise and utilize the MTTFs to identify and plan opportunities for exchange.	Capacity-building, Sub-regional Coordination	Sigs, MTF	High	-	-	High	High
	87. Encourage organization of sub-regional capacity building / technical workshops, including involvement of Advisory Committee. Topics could include: a) management of nesting beaches, hatchery management, lighting etc. b) identification of threatening processes c) rescue and rehabilitation d) training on site network management e) socio-economic and cultural aspects f) training and technology-transfer needs to reduce mortalities in fisheries operations, in particular by providing training for: i. observers particularly for small-scale fisheries (separate for trawlers/ gill nets, smaller outboard fisheries in large quantities) ii. proper recording of turtle interactions in a harmonized and standard way, inter alia, to assist IOTC member countries in meeting their reporting requirements iii. safe release of bycaught turtles iv. enhancing use of bycatch reduction technologies	Capacity-building, Fisheries Interactions, Habitat Protection, Site Network, Hatcheries	SRFP, AC, MTF, Sec	High	High	High	High	High

CMP ¹	Measures to be taken	Subject	Actors ²	Overall Priority	SEA+	NWIO	NIO	WIO
	88. Conduct sub-regional capacity-building workshops on bycatch assessment methods and engagement strategies with key government authorities and stakeholders a) develop a concept note and send a formal proposal to potential hosting countries b) government and NGOs in the region to investigate potential opportunities for organizing the workshops and identify the role that each party can play c) conduct follow-up workshops to address specific issues at country level following regional capacity building workshops, involving fishers associations and communities. ¹⁹	Capacity-building, Fisheries interactions	Sigs, AC, MTF, Sec	High	High	High	High	High
	89. Consider a) activities to address capacity-building needs to integrate marine turtle considerations into existing Ramsar Site management plans, b) cooperating with the Ramsar Secretariat to raise funds for implementing these activities, c) soliciting capacity-building support to conduct coordinated or joined activities for sites that are both IOSEA Network Sites and Ramsar Sites, from the IOSEA and Ramsar Secretariats.	Capacity-building, Cooperation, Funding	Sigs, AC, Sec	Medium	Med	Med	-	High
	90. Identify relevant Agreements and provide an overview of membership of IOSEA Signatory States to MOS9.	Cooperation	Sec	Medium	Med	Med	High	Med

¹⁹ Note: The involvement of experts, policy/administrative government officials and fishermen is important to be considered at different stages of engagement and during these workshops - the role of NGOs providing the links between government and fishermen associations/communities should be considered.

CMP ¹	Measures to be taken	Subject	Actors ²	Overall Priority	SEA+	NWIO	NIO	WIO
5.5	Strengthen and improve enforcement of conservation legislation							
	91. Improve enforcement of compliance with regulations, relating to activities such as fishing, tourism, coastal and offshore development, industrial development, international trade restrictions.	Fisheries interactions, Tourism	Sigs	High	High	Med	High	High
Objective 6. Promote implementation of the MOU including the Conservation and Management Plan								
6.1	Broaden membership in the MOU, and ensure continuity of MOU activities							
	92. Approach non-Signatory States in the IOSEA region and other countries with a view to securing IOSEA membership	Recruitment of New Signatory States	Sigs, Sec	High	High	-	High	High
	93. Engage with the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission, the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission, and the FAO Committee on Fisheries (COFI), as well as other RFMOs relevant to the IOSEA, to reach out to non-Signatory States with fleets fishing in the IOSEA region (e.g. China / Taiwan, Japan, Republic of Korea, Spain etc).	Cooperation, Fisheries Interactions, Stakeholder Engagement	Sigs, Sec	High	High	High	Med	High
6.2	Promote the role of the Secretariat and the Advisory Committee of the MOU in ensuring the objectives of the Conservation and Management Plan are met							
	94. Periodically review the appropriateness of the size and composition (skill sets) of the Advisory Committee.	Institutional	Sigs, AC	Medium-High	Med	Med	High	High
	95. Arrange two intersessional meetings of the Advisory Committee, the first one within the first 18 months after a MOS. The timing of the second one (either three or four months before, or immediately prior to the next MOS) is to be agreed between the Advisory Committee and the Secretariat.	Institutional	Sec	High	Med	High	High	High

CMP ¹	Measures to be taken	Subject	Actors ²	Overall Priority	SEA+	NWIO	NIO	WIO
	96. Develop revised draft terms of reference for the AC, giving the different feasible options with regard to terms and composition of the AC, attendance of observers, and timing and frequency of the meetings. The draft should be ready for MOS9 and be prepared in consultation with the AC.	Institutional	Sec	High	-	-	-	-
	97. Review, comment, and provide guidance on advances and new and emerging issues related to species and habitat management.	Evaluation	AC, MTTF	High	High	Med	High	High
	98. In advance of each MOS, provide advice on a new Work Programme to implement the CMP.	Institutional	AC	High	High	High	High	High
6.3	Seek resources to support the implementation of the MOU							
	99. Secure adequate resources for the Advisory Committee (and MTTFs) to function effectively (increased frequency of meetings, strengthened capacity to respond to requests from Signatory States, etc.)	Institutional	Sigs, MTTF	High	High	High	High	High
	100. Provide adequate resources for the attendance of Sub-regional Focal Points and Chairs of the sub-regional Marine Turtle Task Forces as observers at Advisory Committee Meetings to provide advice on core issues to be addressed at Signatory State meetings.	Institutional	Sigs	High	High	High	High	High
	101. Assist countries to seek available counterpart funding (e.g. by helping with national or regional project proposal development, offering guidance on "packaging" of proposals, facilitating links to potential donors, providing letters of support, etc.).	Capacity Building, Funding	AC, Sec	High	High	High	High	High
	102. Compile and disseminate information on available funding opportunities.	Funding	AC, Sec	High	High	High	High	High

CMP ¹	Measures to be taken	Subject	Actors ²	Overall Priority	SEA+	NWIO	NIO	WIO
6.4	Improve coordination among government and non-government sectors in the conservation of marine turtles and their habitats							
	103. Establish formal and/or informal inclusive national committees/networks in order to develop synergies among governments and NGO partners.	National Networks, Stakeholder Engagement	Sigs	High	High	Med	High	High
	104. Engage with relevant international bodies to address the problem of ghost nets, plastic debris, oil pollution, etc. and undertake direct dialogue with relevant local industries and stakeholders.	Cooperation	Sigs	High	High	High	High	High
Other matters								
	105. Provide guidance to Signatory States on implications of the idea to offer opportunity to designate administrative, technical or other additional Focal Points ²⁰	Institutional	Sigs, Sec	High	High	High	High	Med
	106. Organize sub-regional working groups more effectively during Signatory State meetings, by engaging Sub-regional Focal Points more actively in pre-meeting organization ²¹ .	Institutional	SRFP, Sec	High	High	High	High	Med

Section 2: Measures Related to MOU Administration and Coordination²²							Actors²	
Meetings, Working Groups and Workshops								
107. Ensure Advisory Committee Meetings are organized as scheduled, with documents circulated at least two months in advance of the meetings.							Sec, AC	
108. Facilitate conference calls with the Advisory Committee on a quarterly basis to discuss and facilitate progress in the implementation of the WP							Sec	

²⁰ Secretariat to lead

²¹ Ideally Sub-regional Focal Points should be individuals who are likely to be in the post for a longer period of time, to provide continuity, and be knowledgeable / experienced in key IOSEA matters.

²² If not yet included in Section 1

109. Ensure Meetings of Signatory States (MOS) are organized as scheduled, with key documents circulated at least two months in advance of the meetings	Sec
110. Organize meetings of sub-regional groups and assist with organization of the meetings of Marine Turtle Task Forces (NIO, WIO MTTF, NWIO and SEA+ sub-regions) at intervals defined in each group's terms of reference.	Sec
111. Support intersessional correspondence (Illegal Trade Working Group, Site Network Discussion Group, Advisory Committee) as needed.	Sec
112. Organize workshops if agreed by MOS8 and subject to available funding.	Sec
113. Secure a host for MOS9 and correspond with the host to ensure all necessary arrangements are met for next MOS.	Sec
Website	
114. Maintain and develop the IOSEA website, post news items and other material as appropriate. Reach out to Signatories and stakeholders to solicit their input and publish relevant information in the website news section.	Sigs, AC, Sec, MTTF, NGO
115. Restore selected functions on IOSEA website: a) continue work to restore and update IOSEA bibliography and library in collaboration with the AC and set up the electronic bibliography on the IOSEA Website b) restore and update flipper tag database in collaboration with government authorities, research institutions, MTTF members and other relevant stakeholders c) as time and resources allow, address restoring of: project database, satellite tracking database, genetic directory.	Sec
Budgetary and Administrative Matters	
116. Administer the MOU's Trust Fund in collaboration with the CMS Administrative and Fund Management Unit and report on budgetary and administrative issues to each meeting of the Signatory States, and inter-sessionally as required.	Sec
117. Prepare a draft budget for consideration by MOS9.	Sec
118. Encourage Signatories to pay agreed voluntary contributions and encourage voluntary contributions for projects and initiatives prioritized by the AC and MOS9	Sec
119. Develop funding agreements for projects prioritized by the Meeting of Signatories.	Sec
120. Advertise consultancies, select and supervise candidates as required for the implementation of the WP.	Sec

**Budget for the Financial Period 2020 to 2023
and Indicative Scale of Voluntary Contributions**

Budget estimates 2020-2023 (in USD) for 32MRL - Technical Cooperation Trust Fund on the Conservation and Management of Marine Turtles and their Habitats of the Indian Ocean and South East Asia (IOSEA)					
Budget Line	2020	2021	2022	2023	Total
<u>Personnel</u>					
Professional Staff					
Coordinator (P-3 80%)	132,700	135,354	138,061	140,822	546,937
Consultants & individual contractors					
Consultancies	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	40,000
Administrative Support					
Team Assistant (G-4 50%)	31,324	31,950	32,589	33,241	129,105
Travel on official business					
Staff travel	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	56,000
Expert travel	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	16,000
Personnel Subtotal	192,024	195,304	198,651	202,064	788,043
<u>Sub-contracts</u>					
Project activities / SSFA	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	80,000
Sub-contracts Subtotal	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	80,000
<u>Meetings & conferences</u>					
Meeting of Signatory States (MOS)	0	0	0	120,000	120,000
Advisory Committee Meetings (AC)	0	20,000	0	20,000	40,000
Meetings Subtotal	0	20,000	0	140,000	160,000
<u>Equipment and Premises</u>					
Expendable equipment					
Office automation services (printers and faxes)	500	500	500	500	2,000
Non-expendable equipment					
Office equipment (computers, peripherals)	2,000	0	2,000	0	4,000
Premises					
Rent, maintenance costs	0	0	0	0	0
Equipment and Premises Subtotal	2,500	500	2,500	500	6,000
<u>Miscellaneous Costs</u>					
Operation and Maintenance costs					
IT. Services & Websites	550	561	572	584	2,267
Operation/maintenance computers	6,000	6,120	6,242	6,367	24,730
Reporting costs					
External production of info material	1,000	0	1,000	0	2,000
Sundry					
Communication & Courier services	400	400	400	400	1,600
Miscellaneous supplies	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	6,000
Miscellaneous Costs Subtotal	9,450	8,581	9,715	8,851	36,597
Sub-total	223,974	244,385	230,865	371,414	1,070,639
UNEP programme support costs (13%)	29,117	31,770	30,012	48,284	139,183
Build-up of Working Capital	12,500	12,500	12,500	12,500	50,000
Grand-total	265,591	288,656	273,378	432,198	1,259,822

Indicative Scale of Voluntary Contributions , applying a minimum contribution of US\$ 750, and fixing the following contributions at the same levels as in the previous budgetary period: United States: US\$ 80,000, South Africa: US\$ 25,000, India: US\$ 15,000					
	Signatory	UN Scale (2019-2021)	Scale Adjusted to 100%	Amended Scale Adjusted to 100%	Indicative Voluntary Contribution in USD
1	Australia	2.21	5.723	8.33	26,253
2	Bahrain	0.05	0.129	0.24	750
3	Bangladesh	0.01	0.026	0.24	750
4	Cambodia	0.006	0.016	0.24	750
5	Comoros	0.001	0.003	0.24	750
6	Egypt	0.186	0.482	0.70	2,210
7	Eritrea	0.001	0.003	0.24	750
8	France	4.427	11.464	16.69	52,589
9	India	0.834	2.160	4.76	15,000
10	Indonesia	0.543	1.406	2.05	6,450
11	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	0.398	1.031	1.50	4,728
12	Jordan	0.021	0.054	0.24	750
13	Kenya	0.024	0.062	0.24	750
14	Madagascar	0.004	0.010	0.24	750
15	Malaysia	0.341	0.883	1.29	4,051
16	Maldives	0.004	0.010	0.24	750
17	Mauritius	0.011	0.028	0.24	750
18	Mozambique	0.004	0.010	0.24	750
19	Myanmar	0.01	0.026	0.24	750
20	Oman	0.115	0.298	0.43	1,366
21	Pakistan	0.115	0.298	0.43	1,366
22	Papua New Guinea	0.01	0.026	0.24	750
23	Philippines	0.205	0.531	0.77	2,435
24	Saudi Arabia	1.172	3.035	4.42	13,922
25	Seychelles	0.002	0.005	0.24	750
26	South Africa	0.272	0.704	7.94	25,000
27	Sri Lanka	0.044	0.114	0.24	750
28	Sudan	0.01	0.026	0.24	750
29	Thailand	0.307	0.795	1.16	3,647
30	United Arab Emirates	0.616	1.595	2.32	7,317
31	United Kingdom	4.567	11.826	17.22	54,252
32	United Republic of Tanzania	0.01	0.026	0.24	750
33	United States of America	22.00	56.970	25.40	80,000
34	Viet Nam	0.077	0.199	0.29	915
35	Yemen	0.01	0.026	0.24	750
		38.617	100	100	315,000



**Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation and Management of
Marine Turtles and their Habitats of the Indian Ocean and South-East Asia**

