



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

*Secretariat provided by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)*

## Report of the 19<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the CMS Standing Committee

*Bonn, 28-29 January 1999*

### Agenda Item 1. Opening remarks

1. Dr. Tatwany (Saudi Arabia) took the chair in the absence of Professor Abdulaziz H. Abuzinada and welcomed the delegates. He commented on the large number of participants (a list of which appears in Annex I), particularly the substantial number of observers from CMS Parties and also from UNEP/UNON.
2. Dr. von Websky, Head of the Nature Conservation Division of the German Federal Ministry of the Environment, thanked the Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs for providing the prestigious “Weltsaal” as a venue and simultaneous translation. He reconfirmed the commitment of the Ministry of the Environment to support CMS, which would continue after the majority of the Ministries, including the Foreign Office, moved to Berlin. He stressed that Bonn would remain an attractive venue for international meetings, and that many of the Ministry of the Environment’s main partners would be remaining in Bonn, including a number of other ministries and agencies. Bonn was also becoming an increasingly important centre of international activity, with the establishment of the Centre for International Cooperation and several UN bodies.
3. Dr. von Websky commented on the heavy work-load set out in the agenda for the next two days, including Agenda Item 7, the CMS Strategy. Conserving migratory species went hand-in-hand with international co-operation, and it was important to win the hearts and minds of ordinary people as well as the political decision-makers and the scientific experts. It was necessary to build on the positive image of species such as the White Stork, which ranged from the Baltic to the Sudan, to secure TV and media coverage. All players in all Range States had their role to play in this challenging but rewarding task. CMS’ aims could be achieved in co-operation with other treaties like the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), and every effort should be made to seek support from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and the European Commission. The most should be made of the opportunities presented by the 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of CMS and the Sixth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP6) to promote the Convention.
4. Ms. Bennemann of the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs welcomed the delegates on behalf of the Depositary. CMS had achieved a great deal since its signature on 23 June 1979 with a number of Agreements already in operation and others under development. There were currently 57 Parties, but it was important to bring as many countries on board as possible and to fill the gaps, as the entire migratory range of species needed to be protected. COP6 in South Africa would be a boost to the recruitment effort in that continent. She promised that the Depositary would continue to address Governments of non-Party countries about accession to the Convention.
5. The Executive Secretary, Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht, welcomed the participants and thanked the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for providing the venue and supporting efforts to recruit more

Parties. He reiterated that the most important discussion would centre around the Convention's strategic plan.

### **Agenda Item 2. Adoption of the agenda, work schedule and rules of procedure**

6. The Deputy Executive Secretary, Mr. Hykle, introduced the Agenda (reproduced in Annex II), the Schedule and the Rules of Procedure, all of which were adopted by the meeting without amendment. He further introduced the list of documents, and thanked the Argentinian delegate for having agreed in advance to work with English papers, which had saved the Convention substantial translation costs. He stated, though, that this was an exceptional situation, and that documents would continue to be prepared in Spanish on future occasions.

### **Agenda Item 3. Secretariat Report on Inter-sessional Activities**

#### Recruitment of new Parties

7. The Executive Secretary reported on the recruitment of new Parties to the Convention and noted with satisfaction that, as of 1 February 1999, CMS would have a membership of 57 Parties. Mauritania, Romania, Uzbekistan, Paraguay and Slovenia had become Parties to the Convention since the previous meeting of the Standing Committee. The Chairman welcomed the new Parties and he expressed a wish that they become active members.

#### Staffing situation of the Secretariat

8. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht reported on a number of staff changes that had occurred since the last meeting of the Standing Committee. Ms. Bothena Bendahmane had been appointed as Administrative Officer in charge of finance and personnel matters. Mr. Carles Carboneras had been appointed as Information Officer. Mr. Robert Vagg had been seconded by the United Kingdom as Special Projects Officer in place of Mr. Eric Blencowe, and Mr. Suhel Al-Janabi had been seconded from the City of Bonn to act as German Liaison Officer. With these appointments, virtually all the posts provided for in the budget had been filled, except for that of an Information Assistant which was in the process of being recruited. The Secretariat now showed a better regional and gender balance as well. Dr. Eugeniusz Nowak, the former Scientific Adviser seconded by the German Agency for Nature Conservation, had taken retirement. Finally, an attempt had been made to appoint a Junior Professional Officer for Africa to liaise with that region but had failed.

#### Species-related activities

##### *Siberian Crane*

9. The Deputy Executive Secretary reported on the Third Meeting of the Range States of the Siberian Crane, an Appendix I species which was subject of a Memorandum of Understanding. The meeting had taken place in Ramsar, Islamic Republic of Iran, and had been well-attended by delegates from all ten Range States (including China for the first time) as well as other participating organisations. A new MoU had been signed by seven delegations and the Conservation Plan reviewed and updated for the next two years. It was evident that the Conservation Plan was a very useful tool and had helped to structure the actions being considered. The meeting also took forward a proposed project to be submitted for GEF funding.

##### *Marine turtles*

10. Mr. Hykle also reported on a number of initiatives world-wide concerning marine turtles. A project for mapping important beaches for nesting turtles in the Indian Ocean was proceeding. Political unrest in West Africa had brought delays to work in that region. Two further projects were pending receipt of formal proposals. It was expected that a meeting would take place in West Africa in May 1999 co-sponsored by the French Government. The Secretariat had prepared a questionnaire on the conservation status of marine turtles and the Standing Committee representative for Africa, Mr. Bangoura (Guinea), had been instrumental in ensuring a high response rate from Range States; the replies had produced interesting results.

#### *Cetaceans*

11. The Technical Officer, Mr. Canevari, reported that planning for a meeting on West African cetaceans would proceed when consultations with Mr. Bangoura, the Scientific Council and other experts had been completed.

#### *Sahelo-Saharan ungulates*

12. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht reported that following the meeting in Djerba, Tunisia, the Secretariat had received a revised action plan on Sahelo-Saharan ungulates, and that it would be examined and circulated by the Secretariat in due course.

#### *Great Bustard*

13. A draft Memorandum of Understanding on the middle-European population of the Great Bustard had been circulated to Range States and replies were still awaited from some Governments. The representative of Europe, Dr. Boere (Netherlands), reported that a team from BirdLife International had found a population of 5,000 Great Bustard in a former military site in the Ukraine.

### **Agenda Item 4. Reports from Committee Members**

#### Africa

14. Mr. Bangoura (Guinea) reported that a number of activities had been undertaken in Africa to encourage membership of CMS and AEWA. Thirty letters had been issued by the Guinean Minister to non-Party countries. A similar number of letters concerning marine turtles had been sent mainly to Range States, seeking co-operation with CMS and informing them of the proposed meeting planned for May 1999 or thereabouts.

#### The Americas and the Caribbean

15. The alternate regional representative, Mr. Goldfeder (Argentina), announced that the Latin American & Caribbean region had produced a report on their recent progress, particularly in relation to Resolution 5.4, and that he would make it available to the meeting (reproduced in Annex III). A regional meeting had been held in Punta del Este, Uruguay, with representatives from Argentina, Chile, Panama, Paraguay and Uruguay (CMS Parties) and Bolivia, Ecuador, Costa Rica and Brazil (non-Parties). The creation of the Latin American Working Group had produced very positive results and a significant increase in CMS membership in the region. The number of Parties had risen from three to five, and Bolivia was about to join. The regional meetings helped consolidate CMS presence in the area, and a further meeting was planned for the year 2000 in Bolivia.

16. A specialist group working on Andean flamingos had been set up in Argentina and this was being quite active in undertaking censuses with the support of the CMS Scientific Council and the Ramsar Convention. Two new meetings were planned, one on public use of high Andean wetlands, in April 1999 in Bolivia, and another one on the impact of mining and major public-works in the high Andean wetlands, in October 1999 in Chile. A proposal for the project on the conservation of the Huemul Andean Deer, agreed in principle by the Scientific Council, had been drafted and would be revised in detail. The current project on the Ruddy-headed Goose had completed its first phase; the proposal for the second phase would be signed soon. An important breeding area for this species had recently been discovered on the Chilean mainland. Local interest and concern about this bird had increased both in Argentina and Chile, thanks to the CMS-sponsored awareness campaigns and research conducted in the region. The meeting at Punta del Este had agreed that the Franciscana Dolphin needed greater attention and a GEF project was being worked up for the Black-necked Swan. The conservation of albatrosses was also discussed at the meeting in Uruguay; very good quality information was being obtained thanks to a greater than expected availability of observers on board fishing vessels. Albatrosses faced a severe threat and poor public perception. A proposal to revise the CMS Appendices to include additional mammals, birds and some fresh-water fish species was under consideration for submission to COP6. Another issue discussed in Punta del Este was the recognition of key sites for migratory species as CMS sites; the working group had agreed to pursue this idea as it would help promote CMS in the region.
17. Commitment in the region to conservation was high, which augured well for the potential growth of CMS, as demonstrated by Bolivia's impending accession, the fact that the new Minister of the Environment in Ecuador is the president of IUCN, and Brazil's active consideration of the question, before COP6. Progress in the development of a number of Memoranda of Understanding and Agreements was underway. A proposal for a GEF project on migratory waterbirds as indicators of sound management was being finalised.

#### Asia

18. The Chairman, speaking on behalf of the Asia region, welcomed the fact that an Arabic version of the Convention text would soon be circulated, as an official Arabic text would help recruitment efforts. Some further informal contacts had been made with countries in the region regarding accession.
19. A meeting had been held in Riyadh on the Houbara Bustard, bringing together scientific and legal specialists to prepare an outline action plan. A draft was about to be circulated among the working group and would later be submitted to the IUCN Environmental Law Centre for its consideration. A workshop on marine turtles was planned for the Gulf/Red Sea region in 1999 at the suggestion of the Scientific Council. The Scientific Council was also in favour of a meeting on Arabian ungulates.

#### Oceania

20. The alternate representative for Oceania, Mr. McNee (Australia), reported on recruitment efforts in the Oceania region. Discussions at the ministerial level between Australia and New Zealand gave a strong indication that New Zealand might accede to CMS soon. This was significant as New Zealand was a Range State to a large number of species listed in the Appendices and would also be able to bring to the CMS a wealth of expertise on migration. Australia reckoned that regional efforts should concentrate on Southeast Asia; they maintained close contacts with Papua New Guinea, but unfortunately some other likely candidates for recruitment in the region had gone cold.

21. Australia was actively promoting the proposed Albatross agreement, but was encountering some difficulties which might be solved with the intervention of the CMS. Chile had offered to host a first Southern-hemisphere Range State meeting (in late February or March). The Philippines were considering proposing an amendment to the Appendices regarding four cetacean species, and Australia was also consulting on the possible addition of a number of small cetaceans. The development of a project proposal for survey work in the Timor and Arafura Seas between Australia and Indonesia, endorsed by the Scientific Council, had been hampered by political and economic turmoil in Indonesia. Both Australia and the Philippines were actively involved in marine turtle work. Approval in principle for a genetics study had been granted but the project proposal was still to be finalised. The East Asian flyway work, a major regional initiative with strong Australian involvement, may be raised at COP6 to determine the next steps beyond the year 2000.

### Europe

22. Dr. Boere (Netherlands) reported that membership in Europe was growing slowly but surely. CMS was promoted widely and Eastern European states were joining as financial resources and parliamentary time allowed. While the Russian Federation was contemplating withdrawal from some conventions, a very positive meeting had taken place in Moscow, indicating interest in the African-Eurasian Waterfowl Agreement (AEWA). The hunting groups and various Ministries including Foreign Affairs were supportive, but the accession procedure would be slow as all 87 regional authorities needed to be consulted.
23. The Netherlands was actively promoting the AEWA, and the required seven ratifications in Europe had been secured, together with three in Africa, with two more close to completion. The summer should see the requisite seven African ratifications to make the Agreement effective by the time of the first Meeting of the Parties (MOP1). The European Commission, United Kingdom, Switzerland, France and Germany were all helping with financial support or in kind with aspects of MOP1 and associated workshops.
24. The Netherlands had offered financial support for a meeting planned for the Central Asian flyway in Kazakhstan. The meeting in Dakar of the World Conference of Wetlands International had included a workshop on the African-Eurasian flyway and much constructive input had been made by African representatives.
25. Bulgaria showed encouraging signs of acceding to CMS, and the Ministry there hoped to be able to put proposals to their Minister in July 1999 for accession to CMS and related Agreements. The process in the Ukraine might be slowed down by the recent resignation of the Vice-Minister for the Environment, Dr Movchan.
26. The Netherlands had produced some promotional postcards regarding the AEWA and a set of postage stamps were to be launched on 29 January 1999.

### Depositary

27. Mr. Adams (Germany) reported on the efforts of German Ministers both before and after the change of Government to encourage membership of CMS. Ms. Merkel had spoken to the Brazilian Ambassador about possible accession at a meeting concerning the TAMAR turtle programme and supporting documents had been sent to officials. Mr. Klinkert had spoken to the Colombian Environment Minister as well as to the Bulgarian Minister. Mr. von Websky

had received a delegation from the environment department of the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, but had not received any reaction. The activities of other German embassies would be reported to the COP6.

28. The German Government had offered the Secretariat a replacement Scientific Adviser following Dr. Nowak's retirement and was awaiting a response.
29. Work had been progressing on a comprehensive database for migratory species (GROMS) and the first results were expected soon. The project, which had been presented to the CMS Scientific Council, was being developed by the Koenig Museum, based in Bonn. Anyone interested in being included on the project sponsor's mailing list should contact Mr. Adams.
30. Intense work was being undertaken with regard to a proposal to add sturgeon species to the Appendices. After completion of procedures in Germany, the authorities would have to liaise with counterparts in the European Union (EU), other Range States and the Scientific Council (Dr. Perrin).
31. It was proposed to mark the twentieth anniversary of the signing of the Convention with a diplomatic reception on 23 June 1999. A film on migration was being prepared for transmission on German TV on World Environment Day (5 June 1999) and an English language version would also be prepared.
32. The German authorities had been unable to finalise internal consultations on the proposed MoU on the Great Bustard within the deadline stipulated by the Secretariat. The one remaining isolated population in Germany was only 65 individuals strong, spread over two states. There were questions over the viability of the population, even with captive releases. The population was subject to international efforts through the EU. There may also be legal reasons preventing German signature of the MoU without first ratifying it.
33. Germany's instrument of ratification of the AEWA had been deposited in The Hague on 9 December 1998.

#### Recruitment efforts among priority countries

34. The meeting assessed progress in recruiting the target countries listed in Annex 5 of document CMS/StC.19/Inf. 6 which were considered priorities for accession to CMS. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht thanked Mr. Bangoura for his recruitment efforts in Africa and expressed disappointment at the news from the Ukraine. The Executive Secretary was about to go on mission to East Africa, where he would try to speak to the relevant authorities in Kenya and the United Republic of Tanzania, both important for the Rift Valley flyway. The Kenyan cabinet was reported to have discussed and approved accession to CMS. Dr. Boere undertook to promote CMS with Canadian and American authorities again at the CAFF meeting in Yellowknife, Canada in April, where he would also represent the Convention. Mr. Hykle reported positive signs from some Asian countries. China had attended the recent Siberian Crane meeting and had expressed interest in CMS. The Islamic Republic of Iran had hosted that meeting but had made clear that financial constraints ruled out acceding to CMS unless it could enter a reservation with regard to payment of contributions for a number of years. The most recent contacts with Japan had taken place two years ago and staff changes in the relevant Ministry probably meant having to start over again. There was a similar position with regard to Turkey, which had however expressed an interest in ACCOBAMS. Co-operation with Kazakhstan in conjunction with Ramsar over the Central Asian flyway kept the door to

progress ajar. Little progress had been possible with the Republic of Korea, Indonesia and Thailand. Dr. Perrin (Scientific Council) had visited Vietnam and had passed details of the contact point to the Secretariat. Mr. Canevari met the Mexican contact at the Wetlands International meeting in Dakar and reported that accession was being discussed in the relevant Ministries. Brazil was known to be considering accession to various biodiversity-related Conventions.

35. The observer from Monaco, Mr. van Klaveren, reported that active steps were being taken to recruit parties to ACCOBAMS, with progress in the cases of Morocco and Romania. Some of the other signatory countries had also started the ratification process. A more positive attitude from the European Commission might act as a stimulus for other southern and eastern Mediterranean countries to ratify. The existence of several Agreements and Protocols on closely related subjects in the area was acting as a disincentive to potential members to accede to ACCOBAMS.
36. The list of countries for which country profiles had been prepared and which were considered the top priority for recruitment was reaffirmed (Annex IV). At the proposal of the Chairman, members of the Standing Committee committed themselves to continue carrying out activities towards the recruitment of new Parties.

## **Agenda Item 5. Institutional Matters**

### **Agenda Item 5.1. Preparation of Certified Copies of the Convention text**

37. The representative of the Depository, Mrs. Bennemann, distributed a paper containing a table showing when the seven different language versions of the Convention had been circulated and approved (reproduced in Annex V). The Russian version had been circulated to Embassies and the Federal Environment Ministry, and this would also be approved if no objections were raised within the specified time limit. The only Appendices still under review were the Chinese version, where the scientific names had to be included. All language versions should be completed satisfactorily by COP6 and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs stood ready to assist in the event of further amendments. Dr. Tatwany expressed satisfaction with this development, noting that the latest Arabic text contained only a small number of typographical mistakes.
38. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht informed the meeting that it had been agreed by the Standing Committee at one of its previous meetings that as soon as the Depository had dealt with all the language versions of the Convention, the Secretariat would assume responsibility for updating the Appendices. He suggested that the Secretariat and the Depository needed to discuss procedures and ensure that all core documentation was handed over for the Secretariat to be able to assume this task.
39. Referring to the table supplied by the Depository, Mr. Hykle asked which version of the French and Spanish texts had been circulated in March 1995, and wondered whether these had been the original rather than the corrected versions. There followed a discussion about responsibility for producing certified copies of the current texts, as potential Parties frequently requested such documents. Ms. Bennemann stated that the Depository was in a position to issue certified copies of only the original 1979 text. Texts containing later amendments and corrections were not necessarily certified. It appeared to be the case that the certified texts were therefore not up-to-date and that the current texts did not bear any official authenticating stamp. It was pointed out that this could cause considerable confusion for any potential Party that might receive from the Depository uncorrected 1979 texts. The Depository insisted that

it had fulfilled its responsibilities with regard to the language versions, and it was not its role to certify the amended texts. It was agreed that the Depositary and the Secretariat would discuss the appropriate procedures and responsibilities bilaterally and report back to the Standing Committee, as appropriate.

### **Agenda Item 5.2. CMS Headquarters Agreement**

40. The Secretariat had reported progress on the draft Headquarters Agreement, which covered *inter alia* the status of visitors attending meetings of the Convention, at previous meetings of the Committee and to the COP. A draft text had been elaborated in conjunction with the German authorities and this had been submitted in May 1998 to the UN Office of Legal Affairs (UN/OLA) in New York, who raised some fundamental legal objections to the approach adopted. It had proved necessary to start the exercise from scratch. The Secretariat was in discussion with the legal services in UNEP and UN, but it was difficult to estimate when negotiations would be concluded.
41. Mr. Adams (Germany) thanked the Executive Secretary for explaining the current position, but expressed disappointment that despite all the efforts of the German authorities and the Secretariat a conclusion still seemed a distant prospect. He reassured the meeting that the existing Headquarters Agreement was still valid and all CMS meetings in Bonn continued to be covered by its terms.
42. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht recognised the hard work and cooperation of Mr. Adams and his colleagues in trying to complete this task, and stressed that the delays had not been caused by anyone present. He acknowledged that the existing headquarters agreement had served the Convention well but that UNEP/CMS, as the UN body with the longest presence in Bonn, was now not receiving equal treatment in comparison with other UN organisations. This would become particularly pressing in the case of one staff member whose spouse's work permit fell due for renewal in July.
43. The representative of the United Nations Office at Nairobi (UNON), Mr. van Dijck, having passed on the best wishes of Dr. Töpfer to the delegates, stated that he hoped that negotiations on the new Headquarters Agreement could be concluded within two to three months. Mr. Adams stressed that the German authorities were not able to grant exemptions to work permit regulations for staff members' families until the Headquarters Agreement was signed and pointed out that provisions in Germany were as generous, if not more so, than in other countries with UN organisations.
44. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht drew the attention of the meeting to another issue which had come to light during negotiation of the Headquarters Agreement, namely the legal personality and competence of the Secretariat and the Executive Secretary. UN/OLA claimed that the Secretariat had no legal competence and it was questionable therefore whether the Secretariat was able to enter into any contracts, placing all the transactions of the last fourteen years on dubious legal ground. Advice had been sought from UNON on the best way to address this problem, and if a reply was received in time, a draft resolution would be put to the meeting, with a view to conferring the appropriate powers on the Secretariat.
45. Mr. Adams expressed reluctance to decide on a legal issue without first having taken appropriate advice, but his initial view was that legal authority was vested in the UN, of which UNEP was a programme within which CMS operated. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht stated that the

view of the UN/OLA was that CMS was a convention body linked to UNEP by contract. The Chairman suggested that the discussion be deferred until the day after, when legal advice might have been received from Nairobi. In the event, a complex reply was received, but it was agreed that the issue be dealt with through correspondence.

### **Agenda Item 5.3. Developments concerning establishment of an Agreements Unit**

46. The Executive Secretary reminded the meeting that COP4 and, more specifically COP5, had resolved to set a strategic goal of concentrating the secretariats of regional Agreements in one place. As a starting point, the secretariats of European Agreements should be located in Bonn to form an integrated Agreements Unit within the parent Convention. ASCOBANS had decided to adopt a two-step approach, moving to the UN Premises in Bonn while still under the administration of the German Agency for Nature Conservation, prior to full integration. Similarly, the Eurobats Secretariat was co-located in Bonn, but the MOP2 of Eurobats had deferred a decision on full integration, pending the agreement of more European Secretariats to integrate, resolution of certain financial matters and clarification of the implications of the UN Task Force Report on the future of the biodiversity-related conventions. The principle of forming an Agreements Unit under the auspices of UNEP/CMS had been accepted by all parties concerned, and MOP3 of Eurobats would be held in conjunction with MOP3 of ASCOBANS in July 2000 to facilitate taking the proposal further. In any case, AEW MOP1 would have to take the first decision in this regard (in accordance with Article VI, paragraph 7(b) of the Agreement).
47. Mr. Goldfeder (Argentina) supported the idea of regional Agreements Units, and stated that the southern hemisphere would require its own unit as more Agreements came into being.
48. Mr. Adams responded to the issue of the Task Force Report and explained that the possibility of restructuring the biodiversity-related Conventions was a cause of concern to both Eurobats and ASCOBANS, both of whose Advisory Committees were meeting in the spring and would be discussing the issue. Mr. van Dijck (UNON) explained that the UN Task Force was under discussion in the General Assembly, and while there were pros and cons for restructuring the Conventions, no decision had been reached. The Executive Secretary explained that the Unit for European-based Agreements could easily receive a “stand-alone” status in the event that the Convention Secretariat were moved elsewhere.

### **Agenda Item 5.4. UNEP/UNON Administrative Issues**

49. The Executive Secretary explained that there were three important issues under discussion with UNEP/UNON at the moment: the phasing out of *gratis personnel*, fund-raising activities by the Secretariat and the letterhead design used in all of CMS’ official documents and correspondence. Additionally, the question of nomenclature within United Nations offices would be dealt with under this agenda item.

#### *Gratis Personnel*

50. The reason why the Secretariat had not yet replied to the German authorities about the replacement for Dr. Nowak was because the United Nations General Assembly had passed a resolution restricting the use and terms of accepting *gratis personnel*, which, because they came primarily from industrialised countries, were causing distortions in the make-up of peace-keeping and tribunal personnel. The General Assembly had therefore resolved to phase

out all “type II gratis personnel” of the UN Secretariat by the end of February 1999, and despite an intervention from the Executive Director of UNEP, Dr. Töpfer, the Secretary General had decided that UNEP must implement the decision. According to UNEP’s understanding of this decision, Mr. Vagg’s secondment from the United Kingdom to the Secretariat was caught by the decision, as would be the secondment of a Scientific Adviser from the German Government.

51. The Chairman commented that the decision had serious implications for the ability of the Secretariat to carry out its work, as it depended on seconded staff to a significant degree. The observer from the United Kingdom, Mr. O’Sullivan, would report back to his Government and seek advice. Mr. Adams (Germany) regretted that a decision resulting from the field of peace-keeping operations was being applied across the board to the detriment of the work of CMS which was of benefit to all regions of the world. He also reported that the view of the legal department of the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs was that the General Assembly resolution applied only to activities funded by the UN’s core budget and did not apply to CMS, supported by its own Trust Fund. The Conference of the Parties, the governing body of the Convention, had urged Parties to make staff available to help the effectiveness of the Secretariat, and there appeared to be conflict with the General Assembly resolution.
52. Mr. van Dijck pointed out that the whole of UNEP was affected, as approximately 10% of its current staff were within the Type II gratis staff category and that the organisation faced major difficulties. He stressed that the decision came as the result of over five years’ consideration of the issue and it was therefore unlikely to be reversed easily. Representatives of countries worst affected by the decision also accepted the Resolution in the General Assembly. Mr. Adams was asked to let the Committee have sight of the legal opinion of the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He reported that he had spoken to the German Delegation which had participated in the General Assembly debate, and they were of the opinion that the decision applied to peace-keeping and war crimes tribunal activities only. It was suggested that the Committee should seek to have UNEP made exempt from the General Assembly resolution, or question the institutional link between the General Assembly and a Convention Secretariat affiliated to a UN programme. Mr. McNee (Australia) recognised that the decision had serious implications for the Secretariat, as seconded staff brought obvious benefits, and it would be difficult to assess the damage to the Secretariat’s work if they were lost.
53. The Chairman urged all delegates to contact their representatives at the UNEP Governing Council, meeting the following week, and in all relevant spheres of the UN to urge that the decision be reviewed insofar as it applied to UNEP. He was concerned that a decision of the COP was undermined as it placed in question the entire role of the body within the Convention. The Executive Secretary was placed in difficult position as he had tried to implement a resolution of the COP and was also bound to follow instructions from UNEP.

#### *Voluntary Contributions*

54. The Conference of the Parties had authorised the Secretariat to seek voluntary contributions for particular projects. However, a recent instruction from UNEP headquarters required that all appeals for additional financial resources had to be approved by the UNEP Deputy Executive Director. A draft appeal letter in relation to fund-raising for COP6 had been submitted to UNEP and approval had been given by the Deputy Executive Director, subject to the incorporation of some amendments.

#### *Letterheads*

55. In order to promote a corporate identity across the whole of UNEP, all Convention secretariats had been instructed to adopt a unified approach to achieve a coherent policy, including the use of a common letterhead. The Standing Committee did not raise any specific objections, as long as this provided for the CMS logo to be displayed prominently. It was agreed that the Secretariat would take the matter up with UNEP.

*Other UNEP/UNON administrative issues*

56. Mr. Van Dijk explained that because of Dr. Töpfer's multitude of roles within the United Nations, UNEP and in the UNON in Nairobi, some changes of organisational nomenclature had been effected, bringing together the various wings of the organisations for which he was responsible.

**Agenda Item 5.5. Implications of UN Reform vis-à-vis Environmental Conventions**

57. This subject was discussed under the agenda item covering the Agreements Unit (para. 46 to 48 above).

**Agenda Item 5.6. Collaboration with Other Organisations  
(Wetlands International; IUCN/ELC and WCMC)**

*World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC)*

58. The Deputy Executive Secretary introduced document CMS/StC.19/Doc.12 (Harmonisation of the Reporting System under CMS and Related Agreements), document CMS/StC.19/Inf.9 (Feasibility Study for a Harmonised Information Management Infrastructure for Biodiversity-related Treaties), document CMS/StC.19/Inf. 9.1 (Summarised Report of the Meeting of Convention Information/Technology Officers (Bonn, October 1998) and document CMS/StC.19/Inf. 9.2 (Draft Information Management Plan for the CMS).
59. With regard to document CMS/StC.19/Inf. 9, Mr. Hykle explained that the WCMC had been contracted to carry out a feasibility study of harmonising information resources, the streamlining of national reporting and the establishment of a "lessons learned" network for the five biodiversity-related Conventions (Ramsar, CBD, World Heritage, CITES and CMS). The CMS element of the study had been funded by the Belgian Government. CMS had hosted a meeting of Information Officers from the five conventions in October 1998 to discuss harmonisation of their information resources and the WCMC had been asked to develop project proposals to advance the work in relation to national reports and the lessons learned network.
60. Mr. van Klaveren (Monaco) asked whether the harmonisation of the information shared among the biodiversity Conventions would have implications for various regional conventions and agreements. The Deputy Executive Secretary explained that, indeed, document CMS/StC.19/Inf. 9 related only to the five global conventions but that a separate exercise was being conducted within CMS and its associated Agreements, the first fruit of which was document CMS/StC.19/Inf. 9.2. This approach was meant to ensure that the inputs of CMS into the broader scheme would be coherent.
61. Mr. van Klaveren expressed concern at the suggestion to develop a joint approach to listing species on the appendices of the conventions, which might not be appropriate given the

different criteria of the conventions. There was a danger that too much information would be sought and that the already strict criteria for the appendices should not be questioned unnecessarily. Mr. van Klaveren reserved his position on document CMS/StC.19/Inf. 9.2 pending consultation with the Parties to ACCOBAMS, once it has entered into force, and consideration of the implications for pooling data.

62. Introducing the draft CMS Information Management Plan, Mr Hykle explained that the World Conservation Monitoring Centre had started to draft the Plan in December, as the Convention's contribution to the wider harmonization strategy. The proposed standardisation of national reports to MOPs and COPs should save Parties time and effort. The consultant had already spoken with staff in the CMS Secretariat and with the two other Bonn-based Agreements and would consult AEWA and ACCOBAMS as the drafting process progressed, having drawn information on these two Agreements from the relevant texts and other documents. The current draft of the Plan had been copied to keep members of the Standing Committee informed with regard to progress. Much of the information was presented in tabular form and the document should be read in conjunction with the draft CMS strategic Plan. A final draft would be presented to COP6 in English, French and Spanish.
63. Mr. McNee (Australia) welcomed the draft Information Management Plan, which he had consulted with colleagues who generally welcomed its findings, but it was not clear what financial implications the report would have. Mr. O'Sullivan (UK) congratulated the Secretariat for having contributed to having the study carried out, but agreed that the financial implications needed to be explained.
64. Committee members were urged to provide their comments on the draft plan, in writing, within six weeks of the meeting, focussing on those aspects mentioned in the Annex to document CMS/StC.19/Doc. 12.

#### *Wetlands International*

65. Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht introduced document CMS/StC.19/Doc 11, setting out the offer from Wetlands International of a permanent seat on their Board of Members to the Executive Secretary of CMS. The meeting agreed that the offer should be accepted and authorised the Executive Secretary to respond accordingly.

#### *IUCN / Environmental Law Centre*

66. The Memorandum of Understanding by which the IUCN/ELC undertook various legal tasks on behalf of CMS had expired and had not been renewed due to difficulties in its interpretation. Trilateral negotiations on a new agreement were being conducted, including UNON. Negotiations had been disrupted by the resignation of ELC's Director. A decision on whether or not to negotiate a new agreement would have to await the appointment of a successor. The meeting noted the position.

### **Agenda Item 6. Review of the Status of Contributions to the CMS Trust Fund, CMS Budget and Resources**

67. Introducing document CMS/StC.19/Doc 7 (Rev.), the Deputy Executive Secretary informed the meeting that, further to the data contained in the report, Saudi Arabia and Ireland were reported to have paid their contributions for 1998, and that 1999 contributions had already been received from Monaco, Slovakia, Denmark, Germany and Luxembourg. These early

payments for 1999 were encouraging and well appreciated. Most of the amounts still outstanding were attributed to a small number of Parties.

68. Mr. Goldfeder (Argentina) understood that his country's contribution had been paid and promised to follow it up. He understood that Uruguay's contribution was being delayed because of internal administrative reasons and communication problems with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, but that it was on the way to being solved; the focal point for Uruguay was committed to rectify this situation shortly. Mr. O'Sullivan (United Kingdom) said that the UK would pay its 1999 contribution in April at the start of the 1999-2000 British financial year. Ms. Herrenschmidt (France) stated that France had sent its contribution for 1998 and was surprised to see that it had not arrived; she said she would follow up on this matter.
69. The meeting was reminded of the Rules of Procedure adopted at COP5 concerning the voting rights of Parties whose payment of contribution were three or more years behind. The Standing Committee had a duty to report to the Conference if there were any exceptional circumstances accounting for countries not paying their contribution. Mr. Bangoura (Guinea) said that the question of the loss of voting rights as a result of long-standing unpaid pledges was discussed at length during COP5. The position of African countries was totally against such measures; mitigating circumstances would have to be taken into account, particularly for developing countries, and he requested some flexibility. Mr. Adams (Germany) recalled the discussion at COP5 vividly and believed that a working group had been established. He asked the Secretariat to report on the findings of the group. The Chairman stated that the outcome of the working group had been the text of Rule 14 passed by the Conference, which was somewhat less strict than the previous proposed text. The Chairman stressed that the Convention could not operate properly if the funds promised were not paid, while recognising that some parties might have good reasons for not paying.
70. Mr. Bangoura (Guinea) reported that every effort would be made to ensure that African contributions would be paid before COP6, but there were often administrative delays between the Foreign and Finance Ministries, and the cost of processing the payments often exceeded the amount to be paid. Mr. Botha (South Africa) commented that the accrued arrears of some countries were of little significance and their slate should be wiped clean. Mr. van Klaveren (Monaco), supported by Mr. O'Sullivan (United Kingdom) commented that writing off these debts would not be detrimental to CMS' financial position and he was more concerned about the African countries struggling to pay their contributions. The representative of UNEP, Mr. Kapiga, said that COP5 had passed its ruling as an incentive to improve cash-flow. CMS might consider finding out what the current practice was with other Trust Funds administered by UNEP, as in some cases it may be more economic to exempt some countries than to continue billing them for very small amounts. However, he considered it reasonable to ask for an explanation from countries regarding arrears of contributions and to act in the light of information received. The Chairman was concerned that writing off debts might give out the wrong message and he did not wish to risk encouraging one of the larger contributors to withhold funds.
71. It was agreed that Parties in arrears should be reminded that their contributions were due, drawing attention to the terms of Rule 14, when the next mailing concerning COP6 was despatched by the Secretariat.
72. The meeting also considered and endorsed the list of countries eligible for assistance in attending CMS meetings (CMS/StC.19/Doc 7, Annex V).

### State of the CMS Trust Fund

73. Mr. Kapiga (UNEP) reported that the state of the Trust Fund was healthy. CMS was benefiting from economies of scale through co-location with other UN organisations in Bonn. No problems were foreseen for the coming year, even with the current funds and taking account of the additional expense of the COP.

### State of expenditure

74. Mr. Hykle introduced the state of expenditure for the period January-November 1998 (CMS/StC.19/Doc 7, Annex IV). In virtually all lines, expenditure had been in accordance with the programmed budget, with the few exceptions of the salary for an Information Assistant (not yet recruited) and in underexpenditures for some projects and office equipment. There had also been substantial savings in communication costs as the Secretariat had benefited from lower telephone rates as a consequence of its co-location together with other UN agencies. This effect of economies of scale was also being enjoyed by the other Agreement Secretariats already co-located with CMS.
75. Mr Hykle also reported that the Secretariat had undergone its first routine internal audit from UNEP in September/October 1997. The exercise had been positive, as the Secretariat had received helpful advice on the right approach to follow on a number of issues. Most of these had already been addressed, and the follow-up had been assisted by the arrival of the Administrative Officer, Ms. Bothena Bendahmane.

### German Voluntary Contribution

76. The Deputy Executive Secretary reported that, unfortunately, a mistake in the presentation and treatment in the budget of the DM 100,000 voluntary contribution from Germany had not been noticed by the Secretariat or any of the Parties at the last COP. This amount, equivalent to \$58,000, had unwittingly been absorbed into the main budget, offsetting rather than augmenting the \$600,000 withdrawn extraordinarily from the Trust Fund to finance conservation projects, and resulting in a reduction of the amount of contributions requested from each of the contracting Parties. While this situation was favourable for the Parties, in terms of their contribution levels, it meant that the voluntary contribution of Germany for 1998 was presently being applied to some conservation projects which were agreed to be funded from the \$600,000 withdrawn from the Trust Fund, and not necessarily for all of the purposes identified originally. The same would apply for the entire budget period.
77. Mr. Adams (Germany) reported that he had discussed the situation with the Secretariat in September 1998 with a view to finding a solution. There was a clear indication in the preamble of Resolution 5.6 that the German voluntary contribution should be earmarked for measures to improve implementation of the Convention, including the operations of the Secretariat. However, it had been agreed that it would be absorbed into the general budget for the years 1998 and 1999. Mr. Goldfeder (Argentina) requested that all efforts be directed towards finding a way so that the voluntary contribution of Germany could be applied as it had been originally intended. Mr. Hykle proposed that COP6 be invited to reconsider the budget adopted for the year 2000 in addition to deciding on the budget for the next period. Mr. Goldfeder indicated that he would have to consult with his region and promised to let the Secretariat have their opinion. It was agreed that the German Government and the Secretariat

would continue their bilateral consultations and would come back to the Standing Committee with an acceptable solution.

**Item 7: Review and Updating of the  
*Strategy for the Future Development of the Convention***

78. Mr. Hykle introduced document CMS/StC.19/Doc 8, which consisted of two parts, a review of activities undertaken in relation to Resolution 5.4 (Geneva 1997) and a five-year strategic plan. Parties had been asked to provide a brief report on the actions they had undertaken to meet the requirements of Resolution 5.4 (in addition to their full national report for the COP). Most replies were still outstanding. Some Parties which had taken a lead in specific tasks (such as Australia) were also asked to contribute in greater detail to the report. Mr. McNee welcomed the report as a useful review of past activities but felt that an executive summary would be helpful. The UK apologised for missing the deadline for contributions on Resolution 5.4 actions and undertook to respond as soon as possible. Saudi Arabia had written to all other countries in Asia and would forward information to the Secretariat as soon as possible. The observer from the European Commission, Mr. Weissenberger, said the EU would not be able to respond to the request but would issue a report for COP. The Committee agreed that all contributions should be forwarded to the Secretariat by mid-March.
79. The German delegation welcomed the new draft strategy as it clearly built on what had gone on before and new ideas had been incorporated. The Strategy was generally well structured but the additional points had made the document slightly unwieldy. The financial implications were not apparent, and this information was required for a full understanding of the consequences. This view was supported by both the UK and Australia. The representative of the European Commission thought it preferable to identify the resources required for each activity to ensure that the Strategy remained realistic and achievable. The Secretariat agreed that a prioritisation and costing exercise still needed to be conducted, but that the Secretariat was waiting for the Committee's views on the approach taken so far. The Secretariat's proposal to open up the consultation process to include focal points, Scientific Councillors and interested IGOs and NGOs was endorsed by the Committee. After receiving comments from all the Committee members in mid-March, the Secretariat would revise the Strategic Plan and send it out to this constituency. A Working Group would then be formed from those interested Parties and organizations to finalise the document.
80. Germany and Guinea volunteered to serve on the Working Group and the United Kingdom was sympathetic to the idea of taking part before making a firm commitment. The representatives from Oceania and Latin America undertook to liaise with their regional members.

**Agenda Item 8. Arrangements for the Sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP6)**

**Agenda Item 8.1. Update from Host Country**

81. The representative of the host country of COP6, Mr. Botha (South Africa) reported that arrangements for COP6 were advancing satisfactorily. The venue had been secured and it would be able to accommodate the majority of the delegates. A conference organiser was about to be appointed. Delegates arriving at Cape Town airport would be met and transported to the venue, 60km to the east in the wine producing region. The conference would take place in late summer when the southern right whales should be off the coast. Arrangements were

also in hand for a one-day symposium on migration. The South African authorities were determined to make it a memorable conference and looked forward to welcoming the delegates to Cape Town.

82. Mr. Adams announced that Germany would like to hold a reception for heads of delegation during the course of the conference and asked the organisers to try to accommodate this event into the schedule. Mr. Lenten (Netherlands/AEWA) reminded the meeting that the conference would be held in conjunction of the MOP1 of the AEWA. He was confident that the required ratifications from Africa would be achieved over the summer and preparations for MOP1 were also advancing well. Mr. Hykle had visited the venue again in the summer after the initial visit in January, and the facilities had been modernised and improved. Registrations had already been received from about thirty Governments (half from Parties, half from non-Parties), and a second mailing was in the pipeline.
83. The Earth Negotiation Bulletin (ENB) had shown interest in reporting the conference, where it would be able to provide a service in disseminating widely news from the conference. Mr. van Klaveren reported that he had found ENB very helpful and supportive in the past. The Secretariat sought the views of the meeting about whether the Global Biodiversity Forum, an NGO gathering should be encouraged to convene to coincide with COP6, as was their usual practice with major conventions. The meeting agreed that this should be investigated.
84. Parties and NGOs would also be welcome to arrange parallel meetings and use the COP as a launch for other initiatives, subject to advanced planning.
85. Mr. Botha asked whether there was likely to be any interest in post-conference tour packages for delegates wishing to remain in South Africa after the Conference. In view of the favourable views of many participants, it was agreed that South Africa would try to provide that service too.

### **Agenda Item 8.2. Review of provisional agenda for COP6**

86. The Deputy Executive Secretary introduced document CMS/StC.19/Doc 10, which had been distributed in October 1998 together with the invitation for COP6 with the reservation that it was pending approval by the Standing Committee. A discussion then followed, in which the representative for Germany suggested that discussion of the issue of the correction of the texts of the Convention (agenda item 16) be taken up as part of the report of the Depositary (agenda item 9.d). The Committee agreed that any substantive discussion of the item could take place under agenda item 9.d.
87. Mr. Hykle introduced document CMS/St.C19/Doc.10.1, which described the foreseen activities on the occasion of COP6 and gave an indication of the timing of activities and room requirements. He added that the most suitable time for scheduling the symposium now appeared to be Saturday, 13 November 1999, as this would be more convenient than Sunday for travel purposes.
88. There was adequate provision of rooms to allow for EU co-ordination meetings and for the Scientific Council and Standing Committee to meet. Mr. Goldfeder asked whether there was another event being held at the venue which would restrict the availability of rooms, and also asked whether provision would be made for regional co-ordination meetings other than the EU. The Secretariat thought it might be difficult for each region to meet simultaneously in different rooms, but that one or more rooms could be made available for consecutive meetings.

### **Agenda Item 8.3. Cost estimate for the provision of Arabic as a working language of COP6**

89. The Secretariat had received from UNEP Conference Services an estimate of the cost of providing interpreters (including travel, accommodation and subsistence) for COP6 amounting to US\$41,000, for which provision had not been made in the core budget.
90. Mr. van Klaveren (Monaco) suggested that wherever possible UN languages should be provided and the amount needed to be viewed in relation to the other costs of the meeting. The Secretariat reported that, based on its preliminary figures, US\$41,000 represented about one quarter of the direct conference servicing costs. Mr. Bangoura (Guinea) had not yet had the opportunity to consult other African countries about the desirability of providing Arabic. It was suggested, as an alternative, that delegations bring their own interpreters and for translation booths to be provided. The Chairman offered to consult with other Arabic speaking Parties about this possibility.

### **Agenda Item 8.4. Preliminary Budget Proposal for the next Triennium**

91. Mr. Hykle introduced document CMS/StC.19/Doc9. He said a detailed budget proposal would be dependent on the elaboration of the new Strategy and had yet to be developed. At this point, the Secretariat was interested in seeking comments from the members of the Standing Committee on the general approach. Thereafter a detailed budget would be distributed in due course. For the time being the action points from the Strategy had been reproduced and re-ordered in the table to demonstrate more clearly the 4 or 5 different categories of activities, and their implications for the Secretariat's work.
92. Mr. O'Sullivan (United Kingdom) suggested renaming document CMS/StC.19/Doc. 9 so that readers would not be misled into believing it contained a budget with actual figures. In response to a query from the observer from the European Commission, the Deputy Executive Secretary said that there was no indication yet as to the percentage increase in the budget implied by the new strategy.
93. Mr. Hykle also pointed out that the COP and the triennial budget had fallen out of synchronisation, and proposed that this should be addressed by preparing a budget for two years (2001 and 2002), in which year the COP7 would be held. Mr. Kapiga (UNEP) said that his organisation was used to dealing with different cycles, so it was entirely a matter for CMS to decide. The meeting agreed with the Secretariat's proposed approach.

### **Agenda Item 9: Working Group Report on preparations for CMS 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary celebrations in 1999**

94. Mr. Botha reported that there had been no formal liaison by the group since the last Standing Committee meeting, but a number of countries had undertaken or would be undertaking special activities, e.g. Germany, the Netherlands and South Africa.
95. The Chairman hoped that the members of the working group would use the opportunity presented by the Standing Committee to co-ordinate. The Secretariat asked whether a theme had been fixed for the Symposium and called upon representatives to consider how to make the use of the anniversary to publicise the CMS' achievements and to promote the Convention and its work in the developing and transitional economies. It was particularly important to ensure that the AEWA was launched on a sound footing.

96. Mr. Weissenberger pointed out that it was also the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the EC Birds Directive, and this occasion would also be marked. Many of the species protected under the Directive were also listed in the CMS Appendices.
97. The Working Group was asked to report back to the Standing Committee by the end of April 1999.

**Agenda Item 10: Matters of the Scientific Council  
relating to the work of the Standing Committee**

98. The Chairman of the Scientific Council, Dr. Devillers, introduced document CMS/StC.19/Inf. 7, the Report of the Eighth Meeting of the CMS Scientific Council, and gave a brief oral summary, thanking the Secretariat for its support. Important areas of work included the allocation of funds to projects, Siberian Cranes, Arabian antelopes, and GEF. Experts on five key taxonomic groups had been appointed to the Council.
99. The Secretariat sought the input of the Scientific Council Chairman into Part II of the Strategy document and requested that any proposals to add species to the Appendices be referred to the Council. Some project proposals needed fresh impetus to ensure that they progressed before COP6.
100. Australia and Germany reiterated their proposals for additions to the Appendices. Australia was also liaising with Dr. Perrin regarding the Whale Shark, but there was no indication of any Party supporting its inclusion on the Appendices yet. The observer from the European Commission stressed the importance of receiving documentation as early as possible to enable its internal co-ordination to be set in train.

**Agenda Item 11: Date and Venue of the Next Meeting of the Standing Committee**

101. The next meeting of the Standing Committee would take place on Tuesday, 9 November, from 14.00 to 17.00 in Cape Town. The agenda would include *inter alia*: COP6 arrangements, integration of the Agreement Secretariats, and the Headquarters Agreement.

**Agenda Item 12: Any Other Business**

102. There being no other business, the Chairman closed the meeting at 15.00 after delegates had expressed their thanks to the host government, the Chairman and the Secretariat for a successful meeting.

**19<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the CMS Standing Committee  
Bonn, 28-29 January 1999**

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

**Chair:**

Saudi Arabia (Asia)

Dr. Hany Tatwany

**Vice-Chair:**

Netherlands (Europe)

Dr. Gerard Boere (part time)

**Members:**

Germany (Depositary)

Mr. Gerhard Adams  
Ms. Gabriela Bennemann (part time)  
Ms. Hannelore Mönch (part time)

Guinea (Africa)

Mr. Joachim Schmitz  
Mr. Abdel Kader Bangoura

Australia (Alternate for Oceania)

Mr. Andrew McNee

South Africa (Host country, COP6)

Dr. Pieter Botha

Argentina (Alternate for Americas/Caribbean)

Sr. Sergio D. Goldfeder

**Observers:**

European Community

Mr. Jean Weissenberger

Finland

Mr. Esko Jaakkola

France

Ms. Véronique Herrenschildt

Israel

Ms. Avidar-Walzer Zipora

Monaco

Mr. Patrick van Klaveren

United Kingdom

Mr. Mark O'Sullivan

Chairman, Scientific Council

Dr. Pierre Devillers (part time)

UNON - Nairobi

Mr. Rudy van Dijck

UNEP-Nairobi

Mr. Theodor Kapiga

AEWA Interim Secretariat

Mr. Bert Lenten

**UNEP/CMS Secretariat:**

Executive Secretary

Mr. Arnulf Müller-Helmbrecht

Deputy Executive Secretary

Mr. Douglas Hykle

Technical Officer

Mr. Pablo Canevari

Special Project Officer

Mr. Robert Vagg

Information Officer

Mr. Carles Carboneras

Administration Officer

Ms. Bothena Bendahmane

**19<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the CMS Standing Committee  
Bonn, 28-29 January 1999**

AGENDA

1. Opening remarks
2. Adoption of the agenda, work schedule and rules of procedure
3. Secretariat report on intersessional activities
4. Reports from Committee members
5. Institutional matters
  - 5.1 Preparation of certified copies of the Convention text
  - 5.2 CMS Headquarters Agreement
  - 5.3 Developments concerning establishment of an Agreements Unit
  - 5.4 UNEP/UNON administrative issues
  - 5.5 Implications of UN reform vis-à-vis environmental conventions
  - 5.6 Collaboration with other organizations -Wetlands International, IUCN/ELC, WCMC
  - 5.7 Any other institutional matters
6. Review of current status of contributions to the CMS Trust Fund, CMS budget and resources
  - 6.1 Use of additional voluntary contribution from Germany: DM100,000
7. Review and updating of the *Strategy for the Future Development of the Convention*
8. Arrangements for the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP6)
  - 8.1 Update from Host Country
  - 8.2 Review of provisional agenda for COP6
  - 8.3 Cost estimate for the provision of Arabic as a working language of COP6
  - 8.4 Preliminary budget proposal for next triennium
9. Working Group report on preparations for CMS 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary celebrations in 1999
10. Matters of the Scientific Council relating to the work of the Standing Committee
11. Date and venue of the next meeting of the Standing Committee
12. Any other business

**Latin America's Regional report to the 19<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Standing Committee,  
Bonn, Germany, January 28 and 29, 1999**

This report is presented to the participants of the 19<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Standing Committee by the Alternate Representative for the Region, and to fulfil the mandate of Resolution 5.4. It is a summary of the discussions held during the recent meeting in Punta del Este, Uruguay, which brought together all the Parties of the region (Argentina, Chile, Panama, Paraguay, Peru and Uruguay) and representatives from non Parties (Brazil, Bolivia, Costa Rica and Ecuador). It summarizes the activities of the Latin American Parties to CMS. These activities are relevant to the following objectives of Resol. 5.4 (1: Enhance Membership in CMS through targeted promotion of the Convention aims; 2: Intensify conservation initiatives in regions under represented in CMS; 3: Facilitate and improve implementation of the Convention; 4: Develop Agreements according to Regional priorities; 5: prioritize conservation actions for migratory species and 8: Strengthen institutional linkages).

Paraguay was welcomed as a new CMS Party. The Bolivia representative, announced that Bolivia is in the process of completing the accession documents and will join the CMS soon.

Concerted Actions (Resol. 3.2, 4.2 and 5.1)

*Andean Flamingos*

Dr. Sandra Caziani from the University of Salta, Argentina and main player with this group of birds was invited to provide a summary of the present situation. There is group constituted (*Grupo para la Conservación de Flamencos Altoandinos*, GPCA). They have been active conducting censuses and organizing and attending various meetings to coordinate activities. This is the group which will receive the CMS support approved by the Scientific Council in Wageningen. The group has also received support from Wetlands for the Future (Ramsar) to organize two new meetings:

- \* Public use of high Andean wetlands, in Laguna Colorada, Bolivia, in April 1999
- \* Impact of mining and major public-works in the high Andean wetlands, Chile, October 1999

They have two action plans in advanced stages of development, one for each species.

*Huemul Andean Deer*

No major news in relation to the situation described during the Scientific Council Meeting. A first draft of a project approved by the Scientific Council and to be financed by CMS is under review.

*Ruddy-headed Goose*

Argentina's Scientific Councillor spoke about this species. The first phase of the CMS project has been completed and the signature for the new one is advanced. The species was previously known only as breeding in Tierra del Fuego island but the most important breeding area has been found now in mainland Chile. Local interest and concern about the species has increased both in Argentina and Chile, thanks to the awareness campaigns and the research conducted in the region, both supported by CMS.

*Franciscana Dolphin*

The knowledge about the situation with this species is similar to what was presented during the Scientific Council Meeting in Wageningen. There is still the need to collect hard data to confirm the supposedly declining trends of the population. Local interest continued to be high and three experts on the species attended this meeting. Dr. Crespo from Argentina, Dr. Praderi from Uruguay and Marila Lazaro from the Montevideo University. Dr. Crespo is developing the project which was approved by the Scientific Council.

## **Appendix II species for co-operative actions**

### *Black-necked Swan*

Cravino and Schlatter highlighted the importance of the species, and it was agreed that it will receive priority attention during the GEF project.

## **Other species**

### *Albatrosses*

Adrian Stagi from the University of Montevideo provided an update of the CMS project which is being implemented in Uruguay. It is progressing as expected with observers on board of local fishing vessels. They have been able to have more observers than expected, with no increase in cost. Albatross deaths continue in Uruguay and they are addressing this issue not only collecting the information about the problem, but working to change the mentality of the fishermen who still see the seabirds as a source of problems, hampering fishing success.

## **Potential inclusion of new species in the CMS Appendices**

The country representatives from CMS Parties presented potential species to be included in CMS appendices according to the national and or regional interest.

After extensive discussions a list with potential species was finalized including some countries which might be willing to take the lead in the preparation of the proposal.

## **Appendix I**

### Mammals

*Pteronura brasiliensis*- Giant Otter (Arg. )

*Blastocerus dichotomus* - Marsh Deer (Arg. )

*Mazama rufina* - Brocket Deer (Par.)

### Birds

*Pterocnemia pennata* - Puna Rhea (Chile)

*Anodorhynchus hyacinthinus* - Hyacinthinus Macaw (Par.)

*Ara ararauna* - Blue and Yellow Macaw (Par.)

*Ara chloroptera* - Red and Green Macaw (Par.)

*Ara glaucogularis* - Blue-throated Macaw (Par.)

*Fulica cornuta* - Horned Coot (Arg. )

*Tryngites subruficollis* - Buff-breasted sandpiper (Arg. )

*Alectrurus tricolor* - Cock-tailed Tyrant (Arg.)

*Alectrurus risora* - Strange-tailed Tyrant (Arg.)

*Sporophila* spp. - group of small grassland seed eaters (Arg.)  
*Sturnella defilippi* - Lesser Red-breasted Meadowlark (Arg.)  
*Xanthopsar flavus* - Saffron-cowled Blackbird (Arg.)

## **Appendix II**

### **Mammals**

*Trichechus manatus* - Manatee (C.Rica, supported by Panama)  
*Otaria byronia (flavescens)* - Sea Lion  
*Arctocephalus australis* - Sea Lion  
*Mirounga leonina* - Southern Elephant Seal (Chile)

### **Birds**

*Puffinus creatopus* - Pink-footed Shearwater (Chile)  
*Brotogeris pyrrhopterus* - Grey-cheeked Parakeet (Peru)

It was also proposed to include migratory river fish, but without specifying the species.

### **CMS Sites**

This idea, which was proposed during the previous meeting in Valdivia, was brought up to discussion again. The point is to identify sites of critical importance for migratory species (marine turtle nesting beaches, bat caves, critical stopovers for birds, etc.) and provide them with special CMS recognition. The recognition of these areas aims to maintain migratory phenomenon according to the definition provided during the CMS Symposium in Geneva. There was consensus that it is a good idea to follow and that it has plenty of potential to improve the conservation of species and to increase the visibility of CMS at least in the Latin America and Caribbean region. A group was formed to write up the conclusion of this consideration and in summary they defined this as (AIM - Áreas de Importancia Migratoria) areas critical for one or more migratory species' requirements such as feeding, resting or reproduction. A critical area is such that it is of strategic value for the long term conservation of the species. The Group is planning the more appropriate follow-up for this idea.

### **Increase of the number of Parties in the region.**

Each of the non-Parties representatives make an statement of the situation in his country in relation to joining CMS.

#### **Brazil**

The country is signatory of all the other biological conventions and there is no reason to sign a new one unless it will become actively involved. The representative consider that by the next CMS COP the country will make a decision.

#### **Ecuador**

The political situation in the country is stable now, after a prolonged period of turmoil. Yolanda Kakabadse, IUCN President is the New Ministry of Environment of Ecuador and the Ecuador Representative sees good possibilities for the country to join now. He will continue pressing for this

and hope to succeed in bringing in Ecuador as a CMS member.

#### Bolivia

The representative announced that Bolivia will join CMS soon and he expect the country to send the official notification to the Depositary in February 1999.

#### Costa Rica

Costa Rica's Representative spoke about the importance that Costa Rica has traditionally given to conservation and about the high number of protected areas, and he expressed the potential interest in his country to join CMS.

There follows a general discussion on what can be done regionally to increase the number of parties, and the representatives demonstrated commitment to promote CMS in different mediums and fora. It was clear in any case that the best way to promote CMS regionally is to have an active local group and various CMS supported projects under implementation in the region, meaning that there is consensus on the present approach.

### **Development of MoUs and Agreements**

The situation of the albatross agreement and the lead Australia has taken towards its development was described. The critical situation with these species was already discussed during the presentation of the albatross project being developed by Uruguay, and no further discussions conducted here, but there was general support for the development of the agreement and a clear understanding of the urgency to solve the problem the birds are facing.

In the case of the Ruddy-headed Goose and Andean Flamingos MoUs, drafts are being circulated to local authorities for a first revision.

Another potential agreement for the region is ones with small cetaceans in southern South America, which has to do with the document prepared by Rodrigo Hucke-Gaete and Roberto Schlatter, *Review of the Conservation of Small Cetaceans in Southern South America*. This document, once published will encourage more follow up with this issue. Another potential regional agreement is included in the GEF concept proposal that was sent to Nairobi, and was discussed and finalized recently.

In summary all the participants agree on the importance to continue with the development of the MoUs and agreements described and agree to provide support to them in their respective countries.

A list of conclusions and recommendations was approved and are included in the Report of the Meeting in Spanish. Of relevance is the agreement to continue with these meetings and the next one is planed in Santa Cruz de la Sierra, Bolivia in the year 2000, the participants' support the MoUs and agreements in preparation, the request to stimulate Parties to send proposals for inclusion in the appendices as well as Country Reports on time and the support to the projects being developed in the region.

### **GEF project concept**

The revision and preparation of a final version of the concept proposal *Migratory Waterbirds as Indicators of Sound Wetland Management and Conservation in Southern South America* done after the Regional Meeting in Uruguay.

Participants of this part of the meeting were: Argentina, Daniel Blanco and Sergio Goldfeder, Brazil, Joao Luiz do Nascimento and Joao Menegethi, Uruguay, Jorge Cravino and Marcel Calvar. Unfortunately Roberto Schlatter could not participate because of an important meeting in Chile, but a final version was sent to him immediately after the meeting.

Ian Davidson from Wetland International Americas was also present as well as Robert G. Streeter from Ducks Unlimited Inc. Latin American Program, a USA organization that has demonstrated interest in becoming involved in the project and which may provide expertise and possibly economic support.

**List of Non-Party States for which profiles have been prepared  
by WCMC, representing the highest priority for recruitment  
by the Standing Committee and Secretariat**

<b>Country</b>	<b>Regional Standing Committee Member(s) who will lead the initiative</b>
Algeria	Africa
Brazil	Americas/Caribbean
Bulgaria	Europe
China	Asia
Indonesia	Oceania, Asia
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Asia
Japan	Asia
Kazakstan	Asia, Europe
Kenya	Africa
Korea (Republic of)	Asia
Mexico	Americas/Caribbean
Malaysia	Oceania, Asia
New Zealand	Oceania
Russian Federation	Europe
Thailand	Oceania
Turkey	Europe, Asia
Vietnam	Oceania
Canada*	Americas/Caribbean
USA*	Americas/Caribbean

---

\* Also priorities for recruitment. However, no profiles have been prepared since sufficient information is available from other sources.

19 <sup>th</sup> Meeting of Standing Committee 28-29.01.99
---

**Language Version of Convention Text  
and Annexes I and II**

German	certified copy circulated and approved 10.6.1196
English	certified copy circulated and approved 23.8.1995
French	certified copy circulated and approved 14.3.1995
Spanish	certified copy circulated and approved 14.3.1995
Arabic	certified copy circulated and approved 12.10.1998
Russian	certified copy circulated 08.1.1999
Chinese	convention text circulated and approved 25.3.1997
Chinese	Annexes circulated, not yet approved, modified text version of Annexes will be circulated in due time