



# Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals

Secretariat provided by the United Nations Environment Programme



UNEP/CMS/Inf.10.14.4

*Inter-Sessional Working Group on Future Shape  
Langer Eugen, 27 February 2009*

## **Attendance**

Oliver Biber; Robert Hepworth, Lahcen El Kabiri; Marco Barbieri, Francisco Rilla, Bert Lenten, Laura Cerasi, Veronique Herrens Schmidt, Robert Vagg, Andreas Streit

## **1. Composition of the Working Group**

The Secretariat reported that Alfred Yeboah (Ghana), Vice-Chair of the Standing Committee had been contacted to secure progress on the appointment of a third representative from Africa. [He has since sent a communication nominating South Africa.]

Olivier Biber to be asked to inform South Africa of their nomination
--

## **2. Modus operandi**

Oliver Biber stated a preference for operating, at least initially, through e-correspondence and sought advice on the reliability of connections to some countries. The website could also be used. His initial contact point in the Secretariat would be Francisco Rilla with Laura Cerasi and Robert Vagg as deputies. The first stage of the process appeared to be mechanical, requiring the compilation (primarily by the Secretariat Support Team) and assessment of factual material. The WG had limited resources (€15,000 contributed by Germany) which should be held in reserve in the event of a face-to-face meeting of the WG or the appointment of a consultant being considered necessary at a later stage. [note: the Secretariat has approached other donors for voluntary contributions towards the WG]

As the WG was required to present stage one of the report to the 2009 meeting of the Standing Committee scheduled for early October, the process of compiling the report needed to start soon, as first drafts would be needed in the early summer (June) so that the report would be ready in August for distribution in September.

The WG's TORs were contained in COP Resolution 9.13 addendum and set out a framework schedule of reports and their timings. The resolution itself contained a checklist of issues to be considered, although the wording of the checklist was not entirely clear in places. Parties not on the WG (and Non-Parties which had expressed an interest) would be kept informed by their regional representatives. Selected organisations would be contacted for their input as required.

At COP9 Olivier Biber had pressed for a clear mandate assigning responsibility for devising the next Strategic Plan 2012-17, however the paragraph 3bis from the earlier draft had been deleted from the resolution adopted, and it was not clear whether the Intersessional Working Group on Future Shape was in fact charged with drafting the new Strategic Plan. The third preambular paragraph of Res 9.13 did however make it clear that no fundamental review was necessary and the ambition and objectives of the Plan were reaffirmed. The Strategic Plan was however a core document for the WG's consideration.

The WG would have to liaise with the Scientific Council's WG on Flyways. The Council WG was in the process of being set up, and Olivier Biber had already expressed his interest in participating as the Swiss representative.

Olivier Biber, and if necessary the Secretariat to write to the Chair of the Scientific Council to start the dialogue between the two groups

It was also not entirely clear why the TOR prescribed the preparation of three options when there was a possibility that the group could find a consensus on one option.

Taking paragraphs 17-21 of the Addendum as the basis for the first step of the process, the Secretariat undertook to prepare a factual catalogue of core data and source documents, including an updated or edited version of Standing Committee Doc. 32/7, the COP9 resolutions, an adapted set of Agreement Summary Sheets, the Family Guide and other key CMS facts and figures (staffing and budgets) so that a Gap analysis of (a) instruments/mandates, (b) resources and (c) actions/potential actions could be drawn up.

Marco Barbieri stressed the importance of establishing a systematic approach to ensure information was filtered in a compatible way. The WG had to ensure that it was comparing like with like, and had to establish objective means of measuring success and achievement so that informed recommendations on synergies, clustering and deployment of resources could be made.

The meeting considered all the bullet points listed under paragraph 3 of Resolution 9.13.

1) The multi-species initiative concept had been taken from Pierre Devillers' "Operational Instruments" paper Conf 9.16 and elsewhere.

Secretariat to produce maps of the world showing species coverage in Agreements, MOUs and other initiatives

Secretariat to produce a bibliography of key documents, including:

- CMS/StC32/7 "Secretariat Manpower and Organisation: Towards the Future Shape of CMS",
- UNEP/CMS/Conf.9.16 "Operational Instruments of the Convention on Migratory Species",
- UNEP/CMS/Resolution 9.13 "Intersessional Process Regarding the Future Shape of CMS" and UNEP/CMS/Resolution 9.13/ Addendum "Terms of Reference for the Intersessional Working Group Regarding the Future Shape of CMS", UNEP/CMS/Resolution 9.02 "Priorities for CMS Agreements",
- Res. 8.2/Rev 1 "CMS Strategic Plan for 2006-2011";
- UNEP/CMS/Conf.9.5 "CMS - a Convention that works" - Overview of CMS Secretariat Activities 2006-2008" and its Addendum

Secretariat to draw up a catalogue of material to be produced and a scoping schedule indicating when the material will become available

2) It was agreed to concentrate on Agreements and MOUs. The adapted Agreement Summary Sheets for the 7 Agreements, 17 MOUs and a number of well advanced draft

instruments (Houbara bustard, sharks, Pacific turtles, Indian Ocean cetaceans, Antelopes, African bats and the CAF Action Plan) would provide the factual background. A brief activity status could be added using a three star rating system if required.

Secretariat to complete preparation of adapted Agreement Summary Sheets including sheets for “pipeline” agreements

Olivier Biber suggested that the TOR should be taken at face value as far as possible and only where the meaning was unclear should further interpretation be attempted. The information gathered by the secretariat should be released as it became available to make it more easily digestible.

The “various types of activity” referred to in the TOR should be drawn from the Strategic Plan.

3) It was not clear how the phrase “which might be affected by the future shape” was intended to add to the meaning of the bullet point. It was agreed that cooperation with CITES and the various outposts of CMS should be considered along with their fundraising capability. The Washington DC, Bangkok and Abu Dhabi presence should be mentioned alongside collaborative arrangements such as the one with the Senegal office. The CMS family should include CAF and EAAF (recognised by some of its parties as an Article IV initiative) and agreements in the pipeline as mentioned in 2) above. The status of the Inter-American Turtle Convention and WHMSI was less clear.

4) The science base of the Convention and Agreements should be assessed, primarily targeting the CMS Scientific Council and the Advisory and technical bodies of Agreements insofar as they existed as separate entities.

Secretariat to develop the “Other meetings” section of the Adapted ASS forms to cover explicitly Technical Committee meetings and the expertise they provide

Secretariat to write to Agreement secretariats to ascertain this information

5) In addition to the list of partners of the mother convention, similar lists should be compiled for the Agreements.

Secretariat to write to Agreement Secretariats to compile list of collaborating partners

6) Core financial data for the Convention, agreements and MOUs was required, using the years 2005-8 for uniformity. It should differentiate between administrative (staff and meetings) and conservation and project work. It should list voluntary contributions separately.

7) The Strategic Plan could be assessed using the annual work plan of CMS with indications of whether targets had been achieved and how complete tasks were. Agreements and MOUs should provide equivalent information where available, covering the same period.

Secretariat to start to compile information concerning the status of implementation of Agreement and MOU Action Plans

8) The ISWGFS and the Scientific Council WG (SCWG) on flyways needed to cooperate and determine their respective remits. Overlaps of various bird initiatives and flyways should

be examined, with the SCWG concentrating on science and the ISWGFS considering instrumental issues.

*Review of Species Agreements*

In parallel to the Future Shape process, the Secretariat was to undertake a review of existing Agreements, clustered together as terrestrial mammals, marine species and birds. The Terms of Reference for the review would be drawn up at an estimated cost of €5,000-€10,000 each. An informed but independent consultant would be engaged, probably after the Scientific Officer entered duty.

Andreas Streit listed a series of meetings concerning Eurobats (Standing Committee and Advisory Committee in March and May respectively) and a proposed date for an exploratory meeting of “Afrobats” in September in Nairobi.

The Secretariat to write to Agreement Secretariats for dates of subsidiary body meetings and to compile list of CMS Family subsidiary body meetings. Olivier Biber had received the latest “Dates of Interest” sheet
--