



**Convention on the
Conservation of Migratory
Species of Wild Animals**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CMS/1997/L.1
9 April 1997

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

FIFTH MEETING OF THE
CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES

Geneva, 10-16 April 1997
INF.5.5

REPORT OF THE 7TH MEETING OF THE SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL

Item 1. Opening remarks of the Chairman and Secretariat

1. The Chairman opened the meeting by welcoming all participants. The Coordinator of the Secretariat also extended a welcome to the Councillors present as well as to official observers to the meeting: the observer representative of Italy, substituting for that Party's regular councillor; Mr. Michael Smart, the representative of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands and the representative of Wetlands International: Asia Pacific, Dr. Taej Mundkur.

Item 2. Adoption of the agenda

2. The agenda, as contained in document CMS/ScC.7/Doc.1, was adopted without amendment.

Item 3. Reports on intersessional activities

(a) Chairman

3. The Chairman began by stating that many points of the intersessional activities would be referred to during the discussion under the various points on the agenda. The appointment in February 1996 of Mr. Pablo Canevari as Technical Officer, who acts as the Secretariat's liaison officer with the Scientific Council, represented a major move forward to use the full potential of the Council as an advisory body for the Conference of the Parties.

4. The Chairman noted that concerted actions for the implementation of the Convention with respect to Appendix I species had been progressing well. He hoped that CMS would move towards more direct action rather than develop more Agreement texts. At the last meeting, funds had been allocated to a number of concrete actions and these would be reviewed under agenda item 4(a). It was the task of the Scientific Council to reflect on the funding for concerted action and to facilitate such action.

(b) Secretariat

5. The Coordinator drew attention to the most salient points enumerated in document UNEP/CMS/Conf.5.5.1, the report of the Secretariat. CMS currently had 49 members and Peru would become the 50th Party to CMS as of 1 June 1997. As a result of contacts made, internal procedures for ratification of CMS had already begun in a number of countries and it was expected that more instruments of accession would be deposited in the coming triennium. The question of accession to the Convention remained one of the priorities of the programme.
6. The Coordinator apologised for any communication problems that may have arisen between Parties and the Secretariat, which were due to its move to new premises provided by the Government of Germany, in early December 1996.
7. On the question of staffing, he said that the Secretariat continued to suffer from a shortage of long-term professional staff. Other staff members were only part-time or for a limited duration. That issue had to be addressed, as the workload to prepare for the present conference had been excessive. Partly as a result of workload constraints, the Secretariat had been unable to, *inter alia*, devote more attention to producing public information and publicity material. A new brochure was under preparation and it was hoped that it would be ready by the end of the year. In connection with information material, he expressed appreciation for the poster on CMS produced by South Africa.
8. The Coordinator highlighted the importance of the co-location of the secretariats of Europe-based Agreements with the CMS Secretariat, as outlined in the proposal of the Working Group of the Standing Committee and contained in documentation before the Conference of the Parties. Such co-location would help to concentrate the focus of work and provide impetus, while also bringing cost savings. It had already been decided that the permanent secretariat of the Agreement on the Conservation of Bats in Europe would be co-located with the CMS Secretariat, and that provided a good basis for others to follow suit. He stated that an upcoming meeting of the Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans of the Baltic and North Seas (ASCOBANS) would decide whether to move its secretariat to Bonn. As a matter of course, consultation with the secretariats of the Agreements under the Convention continued to be a priority activity.
9. On the subject of relations with international IGOs and NGOs, he pointed to the continued cooperation with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), mainly within the fields of personnel, finance and budget. He expressed a hope that cooperation could be extended to cover the implementation of the work programme, but pointed out that it had not been possible so far under the prevailing circumstances.
10. The Coordinator was happy to report that a memorandum of cooperation had been concluded with the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). In addition, the third meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the CBD had invited the Scientific Council to liaise with that Convention. A memorandum of cooperation had also been concluded with the Secretariat of the Ramsar Convention for the common implementation of the Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds (AEWA).
11. On the subject of Article IV Agreements concluded or under development, he called attention to document UNEP/CMS/Conf.5.9, prepared by the Secretariat, and gave a short review of the status and progress of the respective Agreements. He noted the names of those Councillors or Secretariat staff present to whom any questions or requests for information could be addressed. He concluded by expressing gratitude to the Governments of the Netherlands, Monaco and France for the work carried out and the funding provided to conclude and implement various Agreements. He urged all Councillors to encourage their own respective Governments to work towards the further preparation of Agreements.
12. The Deputy Coordinator added that a project had been initiated in Malaysia and the

Philippines for research and training on the status and distribution of cetaceans. Dr. Perrin had been instrumental in organizing that project. A report could be circulated on request. In addition, a consultancy was being set up to examine the status of cetaceans in the West African region and their interaction with fisheries. That project proposal was not yet finalized and could still benefit from input of the members of the Council.

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

(a) Concerted actions for selected Appendix I species/groups, according to Resolution 3.2

13. Document UNEP/CMS/Doc.5.8 : (Measures to improve the conservation status of Appendix I species) prepared by the Secretariat to summarize activities on concerted actions during intersessional activities was used as a reference paper for the discussion.

Marine Turtles

14. Dr. Limpus reported that two significant strategy and training workshops had been held during the past two years - the first in South Africa and the second in India - which the Convention had sponsored financially. Both had acted as tremendous catalysts by bringing together the countries concerned and enabling them to see the wider issues of marine turtle conservation. He had acted primarily as an information source and trainer at both meetings. He had also participated in late 1996 at a meeting in Bali, Indonesia. The host country and Australia in particular had endeavoured to develop regional involvement in future marine turtle conservation action. Those activities could be considered as the preliminaries to the development of Agreements.

15. At the Western Indian Ocean Workshop it had been decided to declare a "Year of the Sea Turtle for the Western Indian Ocean" in 1998, on the lines of the very successful one for the South Pacific, in order to raise awareness of the subject. Dr. Limpus believed that the concept was good but doubted whether the infrastructure was operating at the necessary speed in view of the time-scale.

16. In the Western Atlantic and Pacific Island States context, most activities were being conducted by other agencies and no initiative was needed under CMS auspices.

17. The Deputy Coordinator thanked Dr Limpus for his excellent contribution to the two seminars - the training, in particular, had been much appreciated by participants. He had had preliminary discussions about holding a similar South-East Asian regional workshop. Although the Secretariat had been unable to pursue the matter as actively as it would have wished, the Deputy Coordinator had also been in touch with a French researcher who had shown interest in working with countries in Western Africa.

18. The Deputy Coordinator reported on other activities undertaken in collaboration with the IUCN Marine Turtle Specialist Group (MTSG), particularly the production of a conservation techniques manual for sea turtle specialists, for which the CMS was providing a financial input. The final version, at least in English, should be ready during the current year. The MTSG had also been asked to review the implementation of CMS in respect to sea turtles in Party and selected non-Party States.

19. During the current triennium, the Deputy Coordinator stressed that prioritization would be needed as there were less funds to allocate and it might not be possible to make a special allocation from the Trust Fund as had been done in 1994. It was up to the Scientific Council to advise on how the remaining money should be used. The Secretariat had in addition prepared a summary of project proposals for which voluntary contributions would be sought.

20. The Chairman noted that \$175,000 had been allocated to the marine turtle conservation measures at the previous meeting and that some \$75,000 of that amount had been spent. Dr Galbraith (United Kingdom) asked whether the amounts unspent could be reassessed and perhaps be allocated to some of the new project proposals referred to. The Deputy Coordinator confirmed that \$100,000 had indeed not yet been committed formally, but drew attention to the activities already agreed in principle in West Africa and South-East Asia for which funding was needed.

21. Dr. Limpus gave reasons why, in practice, the budget allocated on the basis of recommendations by the Sixth Meeting of the Scientific Council had not been fully expended. In assessing priorities, he said that globally, most of the remaining sea turtles were in South-East Asia, which was also where the largest harvests - shown by projections to be far from sustainable - were taken.

22. A number of general observations followed. Mr. Dey (India) said that India would be happy to cooperate in a regional tagging programme for marine turtles. Dr. Pfeffer reported on a recent visit he had made to a turtle ranch in Reunion.

23. Making an observation relevant to all concerted actions, the observer for the Ramsar Convention approved fully of cooperation with CMS and announced that a small grants fund existed to which countries could apply for specific projects.

24. The Chairman stated that the remaining unspent funds for marine turtles and other concerted actions should be committed fairly rapidly, and indicated that Councillors would be asked to consider their reallocation.

Ruddy-headed goose (Chloephaga rubidiceps)

25. Dr. Schlatter-Vollmann reported that work had begun a year previously to assess the status of this species, which had declined to an estimated population of no more than 300 birds. The progress report from Chile indicated that 10 to 12 sites, where the species currently occurs, had been identified, including one on a disused oil-drilling platform in Tierra del Fuego. Around 170 birds were observed in total. He looked forward to continued implementation of the project, to extend knowledge of the species in order to promote a recovery of the species. He asked whether funding was available and whether there was a possibility of establishing protected sites under the Convention.

26. The Technical Officer of the Secretariat reported that the situation was less optimistic in Argentina where only 14 birds had been observed over 500 kilometres of roads and there were no signs of nest-building. A full report would be provided later but the situation was clearly critical and the reasons for the decline were not known.

27. The Chairman noted the quality of the concerted action so far, and the need for it to continue.

Siberian crane (Grus leucogeranus)

28. Mr. Dey reported on conservation activities which had taken place in India and other Range States of this species. He regretted that the flow of communication between Parties to the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) had not been as effective as it needed to be.

29. The Deputy Coordinator reported that a second workshop on Siberian cranes hosted by India had been very successful, with eight of the nine Range States participating. Three more Range States have signed the Memorandum of Understanding. The meeting had produced a detailed conservation plan, including a suggestion that the International Crane Foundation (ICF) play a more

active role in facilitating communication.

30. The role of the CMS had been to sponsor the workshops and a further one was planned for 1998. Such meetings were very productive and the Secretariat hoped that, out of the conservation plan, project proposals would be developed for submission to funding agencies. So far, only a very modest amount of money was available and much more was needed. The results of activities so far were very encouraging; there were very dedicated workers in the field. The Council might consider that some funds should be allocated from the core budget. Funding had been provided by CMS to the ICF for the production of an educational video intended to educate the general public and hunters on conservation needs, and was intended for wide distribution in all the Range States concerned.

31. The observer for Wetlands International - Asia Pacific said that, at a workshop in China, a North-East Asian Crane Site Network had been launched in the hope of conserving the falling population in the east. Similar action could be taken for the Central Asian and West Asian populations.

32. Making a general observation on document UNEP/CMS/Conf.5.8, Dr. Moser said that the lack of updated information on the current status of species was a weakness and suggested that a small data-base be set up to provide the Scientific Council with up-to-date information on the Appendix I species that were the object of concerted action. The Council agreed that regular update of the status data required by Resolution 3.2 was indispensable, and that focal point Councillors should play a key role in that respect.

33. In conclusion, it was agreed that action on the Siberian crane was a high priority, that CMS was the correct vehicle for that action, and that cooperation with the Ramsar Convention was appropriate. Funds were needed, either from the Trust reserves or from the core budget, for these concerted actions. Mr. Dey was designated as a focal point to keep the Scientific Council informed of ongoing activities.

Slender-billed curlew (Numenius tenuirostris)

34. Dr. Nowak (Germany) reported that 15 of the 29 Range States had signed the Memorandum of Understanding. Three more (Greece, Italy and Yemen) were ready to sign, but the Russian Federation has not yet signed. In 1995/1996, 12 countries had submitted reports and a consolidated preparatory report had been circulated to all countries concerned. Much information had been received on migration routes and was entered into a data-base in cooperation with BirdLife International. The European Community had financed a project in Greece for two-and-a-half years on migration routes and wintering sites. Three expeditions to Siberia had been undertaken, but the birds' breeding grounds had still not been identified.

35. The Secretariat intended to organize a workshop on the subject in late 1997. Dr. Moser asked whether funding was available for the workshop and for the proposed breeding survey. The Deputy Coordinator said that there was no allocation in the core budget for the workshop but that the Scientific Council could make such a recommendation to the Conference of the Parties.

36. In response to a comment by the Observer for the Ramsar Convention, a brief discussion on reliability of records was conducted by the Council.

37. The Council agreed that funding was needed both for an extra meeting and for the identification of breeding grounds. Dr. Nowak would provide an estimate of needs.

Houbara bustard (Chlamydotis undulata)

38. Mr Tatwany (Saudi Arabia) said that further steps had been taken by the Government of Saudi Arabia to reach consensus on an Agreement circulated in draft form at a meeting in Oman in

January 1996 and to Range States and some conservation organizations later in the year. Some countries were ready to sign, others not. A legal revision of the text had been suggested, which the Councillor hoped would be completed within a year. An expert group meeting would be held in 1997. He urged CMS Parties to report on the species.

39. The Coordinator informed the meeting that the Agreement text would be revised by Saudi Arabia with the assistance of the Secretariat and the IUCN Environmental Law Centre. The comments of the Range States, expected by mid-May, would be taken into consideration. The IUCN Houbara bustard Working Group would assist Saudi Arabia in the development of an Action Plan to be annexed to the Agreement. The work programme would be discussed by next week when all those involved were gathered at the meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

40. Replying to a comment from Mr. Dey (India) concerning hunting and falconry, Mr. Tatwany said that hunting, economic aspects and cultural values would be taken into account in the Agreement. In response to a question from Mr. Ngog Nje (Cameroon), the Chairman said that the factors affecting the species were set out in documents before the meeting.

41. The Council noted the progress made in the concerted action.
Great bustard (Otis tarda)

42. Dr. Bankovics (Hungary) reported that the dramatic decline in numbers of this species over the past 20 years had decreased and there was now a slow increase of the population in some areas. Nevertheless, protection was still needed in the Middle-European range. The meeting held in Hungary in June 1996 had focused on conservation in natural habitats and all participants had agreed on the need for a Memorandum of Understanding and an action plan. A draft Memorandum had been sent to the Secretariat and the first part (general conservation and management) of the draft Action Plan prepared in collaboration with Dr. Kollar from Austria was ready, while the rest (conservation requirements by Range States) was nearing completion.

43. The Coordinator said that the memorandum needed legal revision, with which the IUCN Environmental Law Centre had been requested to assist. When it was completed, the draft action plan could be considered in conjunction with the revised memorandum.

44. The Council noted that the concerted action was proceeding satisfactorily.

White-headed duck (Oxyura leucocephala)

45. The necessity of concerted action on the species was reviewed. Several Councillors expressed concern at the status of the species, and particularly at its hybridization with the imported *Oxyura jamaicensis*. Dr. Heredia (Spain) reported that 900 *Oxyura leucocephala* had been recorded recently in Spain, but unless the situation was corrected, urgent concerted action would be required. Dr. Galbraith (United Kingdom) said that research had been completed in the United Kingdom into the control of *Oxyura jamaicensis*. He stressed the importance of coordinated action across Europe if the control of *Oxyura jamaicensis* was to be effective. The observer for the Ramsar Convention suggested that the European Union, a Party to the Convention, should be urged to ensure that the decisions it had taken were translated into action through its Ornis Committee. The Council endorsed that proposal.

46. The Council agreed on the suggestion of Dr. Moser that the species should be retained on the list of species in need of concerted action, and that implementation would be better conducted under the Waterfowl Agreement.

Sahelo-Saharan ungulates

47. Dr. Beudels (Belgium) reported in detail on the activities undertaken using the funds allocated

by the CMS, drawing attention in particular to the completion of comprehensive status reports in the Range States on six species, the update and extension of the draft Action Plan submitted to the fourth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, the preparation of a workshop on the conservation of Sahelo-Saharan ungulates. In addition, funds had been sought from a variety of sources to cover activities concerning the implementation of priority projects identified in the revised Action Plan and assistance in the development of a regional conservation agreement under the auspices of CMS. Very positive results had been achieved with the various activities and she believed that CMS should continue to give strong support to the work.

48. The Council endorsed the proposal.

49. Mr. Tatwany (Saudi Arabia) said that there were captive populations of some species, originating from wild animals, in the Arabian peninsula which might prove a valuable addition to the gene pool. Mr. Zampaligre (Burkina Faso) referred to the importance of adequate preparation of sites for the release of captive animals. The Council thanked the Councillor from Saudi Arabia for his proposal, and agreed with the comments from the Councillor from Burkina Faso.

Mediterranean monk seal (Monachus monachus)

50. At its sixth meeting, the Scientific Council had allocated \$30,000 to concerted action on this species. The Secretariat had received no information from the focal point Councillor. The Council would therefore have to reconsider the allocation of the funds.

(b) Review of proposals for amendments to Appendices I and II of the Convention

(i) Discussion and evaluation of proposals

51. The Chairman introduced document UNEP/CMS/Conf.5.11 for comments by the Councillors. There was no objection to any proposal, except Dr. Moser said that he believed the proposal to incorporate Chilean and Uruguayan populations of the Black-necked swan, *Cygnus melanocorypha*, was inappropriate as it referred only to individual country populations of the species, which was not recognised as being globally threatened.

52. In reply, Dr. Schlatter pointed to the problem of macro-regional drought which drove part of the Argentinian population of the species to other countries. No data were available on numbers or breeding behaviour of these individuals, which also called into doubt assessment of the Argentinian numbers. Listing in Appendix I would oblige countries to study and evaluate the effects of drought on these populations.

53. Prof. Torres Navarro (Chile), commenting on the problem of drought-induced dispersal of the species, noted the disparate locations in which he himself had observed the birds, sometimes as far south as the Antarctic. Prof. Vaz Ferreira (Uruguay) described the decline in the swan's numbers in specific areas of Uruguay and pointed to the need to monitor the birds' movements and protect those parts of the population that reached the country. The Technical Officer said that in Argentina no threat to the species was perceived since a population of some 100,000 was estimated. There was a problem concerning lack of data and of research work on the species.

54. After an exchange of views on the subject involving interventions by a number of Councillors, it was agreed that Dr. Moser, Dr. Schlatter and Mr. Canevari would hold informal consultations and report back to the meeting of the Council. Reporting on the outcome of the consultations, Dr. Schlatter said that it had been agreed that listing of the species in Appendix I would constitute an inappropriate precedent for CMS. However, it was considered that the listing of *Cygnus melanocorypha* in Appendix II was appropriate and a draft recommendation could be

transmitted to the Conference of the Parties to the effect that the countries of the Southern Cone should conduct research on the species to clarify its status and migration behaviour, with a view to the possible future conclusion of an Agreement between Chile, Uruguay, Argentina and perhaps, also Brazil.

(ii) Conclusions and recommendations for the Conference of the Parties

55. Having considered all of the amendment proposals for Appendices I and II, the Council concluded that, with the exception of the proposals for *Cygnus melanocorypha*, it endorsed all of them.

56. For *Cygnus melanocorypha*, the Council agreed that the threats to some populations of the species had been well documented in the proposals submitted, but the inclusion of national populations in Appendix I was inappropriate. A draft recommendation along the lines proposed by Dr. Schlatter-Vollman, and also taking into account the populations in Argentina and Brazil, could be transmitted to the Conference of the Parties.

(c) Review of composition of Appendices I and II

57. The Chairman introduced the item by noting that WCMC had been contacted in May 1996 concerning its agreement to conduct a review of Appendices I and II. He asked what had become of that review. The Deputy Coordinator replied that the contractual arrangements with WCMC needed to be fine-tuned, and that work on the review would begin after the meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

58. Dr. Wolff (Netherlands) presented a study carried out by his institute (made available to the meeting as document UNEP/CMS/ScC.7/Inf.2) on whether certain marine mammals qualified for inclusion in the Appendices. He agreed with the Chairman's suggestion that the study be communicated to WCMC for incorporation into its review.

(d) Draft resolutions and recommendations

59. The Council was asked to express its opinion on a number of draft resolutions and recommendations prepared for the Conference of the Parties, or arising from its work.

Updating of Resolution 3.2

60. Resolution 3.2 is intended to be updated at each meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The Chairman suggested to use for that purpose the same basic text as for Resolution 4.2, and he opened the discussion on the list of species for addition or deletion. It was agreed that the following species should be included: *Falco naumanni*, *Phoenicoparrus andinus*, *Phoenicoparrus jamesi* and *Anser erythropus* - subject to their inclusion in Appendix I by the Conference of the Parties. In addition, although the Range States of *Ciconia boyciana* (China, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation) were not Parties to CMS, it was agreed that the species should be included as a species for which concerted action should be taken, subject to at least one of them becoming a Party.

61. The Co-ordinator asked the Council to consider recommending to the Conference of the Parties that, in light of the particularly critical situation surrounding the events in Zaire, it formulate a statement or resolution on the status of the Mountain gorilla, *Gorilla gorilla beringei*. Mr. Kabemba (Zaire) described in detail the grave problems facing the habitat of the species and supported the suggestion of the Coordinator. The observer for the Ramsar Convention pointed out that CMS activity with regard to the Mountain gorilla offered a good opportunity for CMS cooperation with other conventions involved

in protecting its habitat in Zaire. The Scientific Council agreed to the inclusion of the Mountain gorilla in the list of species in document UNEP/CMS/Res.5.1.

62. It was further decided that no species should be deleted from the lists included in Resolutions 3.2 and 4.2.

Cormorants

63. Dr. Wolff (Netherlands) stated that Germany and Netherlands/Denmark had prepared informal drafts of a resolution/recommendation, outlining a plan of action on the Great cormorant, and these were before the Council. He personally considered that the references to “Contracting Parties” in the drafts should read “Range States”. The drafts also called for the establishment of an expert group to provide advice on management of the species. Dr. Wolff proposed that the Scientific Council agree to provide the requested advice on the Great Cormorant and also set up, under the Council, a sub-group along the lines set out in the drafts. He added that, eventually, the work of the sub-group might be taken over by the Technical Committee of AEWA, once that Committee had been established.

64. An observer from Germany, recalling Recommendation 4.1 (Nairobi, June 1994) on the conservation and management of cormorants in the African-Eurasian area, pointed to the problems facing some countries in Europe and to the potential negative impact that inappropriate management methods could have on the favourable status of the European populations of the Great Cormorant.

65. Dr. Galbraith (United Kingdom) considered it important to examine the ecology of the species in Europe to assess whether control of numbers alone was adequate to solve the problem. He believed that there should be very detailed consideration of the terms of reference of the proposed sub-group and its relations to the needs of individual Governments.

66. It was decided that the Scientific Council would set up an open-ended group, with a core membership comprising Dr. Wolff (Netherlands), Dr. Nowak (Germany), Dr. Lebeau (Switzerland), Dr. Galbraith (United Kingdom), Mme. Bigan (France) and the Conference-appointed Councillor for waterfowl issues, to draft a resolution, containing references to a sub-group to be set up under the Council and reporting to it. It was also agreed that the draft would address itself to the Range States of the Great Cormorant, and not the Contracting Parties.

67. Dr. Lebeau said that, while he was prepared to accept the consensus of the Council and to take part on the group, he wished to state that he did not agree to the Scientific Council devoting time or resources to the issue, which was not a priority for CMS.

Globally Threatened Birds in Europe - Action Plans

68. On this subject, the Chairman drew the attention of the Council to draft Recommendation 5.1, prepared by the Secretariat, as an information document. The Council endorsed the principle of a recommendation or resolution supporting the action plans on globally threatened birds in Europe prepared by BirdLife International and Wetlands International.

Interpretation of Certain Terms Used in the Convention

69. In connection with the above issue, the Chairman drew attention to document UNEP/CMS/Conf.5.16 and to draft Resolution 5.3, both prepared by the Secretariat. Noting that the definition of the term “endangered” was proposed under a mandate given by the Conference of the Parties, whereas the definition of “taking” represented an opinion of the Scientific Council given in reply to a request of the Secretariat, the Council endorsed the draft resolution.

Strategy for the Future Development of the Convention

70. The Council gave its support to the Strategy for the Future Development of the Convention, set out in the annex to document UNEP/CMS/Conf.5.12, prepared by the Secretariat.

Global Warming and Migratory Species

71. Introducing the report of the Secretariat on the subject, contained in document UNEP/CMS/ScC.Inf.5.4, the Coordinator asked the Council to consider whether CMS should play a role in the international discussion on whether migratory species of animals are a good indicator of climate change phenomena and the extent to which actions should be taken by the Conference of the Parties and the Parties themselves. He noted that draft Resolution 5.11 on climate change and its implications for CMS could be revised to take into account what was decided on this issue.

72. Mr. Dey (India), while agreeing that global warming represented an important issue for all conventions dealing with animals, considered that CMS, with its limited resources, should not divert attention to the issue of migratory species as indicators of global warming.

73. Dr. Perrin said that, while global warming would affect migratory species, it was unreliable to use them as an indicator, since many other factors affected trends in migration behaviour. However, he did consider it important for CMS to cooperate with other bodies to keep abreast of developments on the subject of global warming.

74. It was agreed that, considering the importance of global warming, a working group of Councillors would be set up, with Mr. Dey (India), Dr. Moser, Dr. Perrin and Dr. Limpus as members, to help the Secretariat draft a paper for the Conference of the Parties, focusing on liaison and cooperation with other bodies on the subject of global warming.

75. Reporting back to the Council on the work of the informal group, Dr. Perrin said the group had discussed the document prepared by the Secretariat and suggested that it be forwarded to the Conference of the Parties with an amendment proposed by the group. The Council endorsed that proposal.

Harmonization of the Reporting System Under CMS and Related Agreements

76. The Coordinator said that, as it could have implications for the work of the Scientific Council, he wished to draw the Council's attention to the issue of harmonization of reporting (document UNEP/CMS/Conf.5.7.1), to be discussed by the forthcoming meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The Council took note of the subject.

Appendix II Species that could Profit from Cooperation Between Parties, without necessarily being the Subject of a Formal Agreement

77. It was agreed that the Scientific Council would draft a recommendation to the effect that certain species in an unfavourable part of their range required special cooperation and could be the object of a separate recommendation of the Conference of the Parties. The Conference of the Parties should, at each of its meetings, identify species for inclusion in such a list. The species could then be the object of an action plan, with a focal point to provide reporting on their status. It was agreed that *Crex crex* and *Coturnix coturnix coturnix* would be recommended for inclusion in such a list.

(e) Other matters

78. No other matters were raised under this agenda item.

Item 5. Progress on other matters requiring Scientific Council advice

(a) Small cetaceans and other threatened marine animals in South Atlantic and Western Africa

79. Dr. Schlatter-Vollman presented information document UNEP/CMS/ScC Inf.5 reviewing the southern South American area. The success of the activity could be attributed largely to the fact that many experts from Chile, Argentina and Brazil had contributed to the review. Further information from the Falkland Islands (Islas Malvinas) and Uruguay would follow when available from national sources. The status of most of the species covered in the review was unknown and he advocated that the work should continue, stressing the importance of concluding a regional conservation agreement on small cetaceans in southern South America. He welcomed the recent decision of Peru to accede to CMS and encouraged other countries concerned to do likewise.

80. Dr. Perrin said that some southern South American countries considered that certain species should be included in Appendices I and II. The Council noted the success of the work to date and the wish that it be continued. It approved Dr. Perrin's proposal to include further information, when available, and to have the review published by the Secretariat for information.

81. In regard to his offer made at the previous meeting to compile information on West African marine mammals, Dr. Perrin reported that a text had already been compiled for the francophone countries (UNEP/CMS/ScC/Inf.7) by Mr. Bangoura (Guinea) and that one for the anglophone countries would follow. The next logical step, to establish a consultancy to carry out research, had already been taken by the Secretariat. The meeting took note of the progress and of the information document.

(b) Albatrosses

82. Professor Vaz Ferreira (Uruguay) noted that Australia had proposed the inclusion of most albatross species in Appendix II and of *Diomedea amsterdamensis* in Appendix I. Further action to reduce albatross mortality must be sought, including legislation and educational programmes, and a study of the circumstances of mortality for five species would be conducted in Uruguay in 1998.

83. Professor Torres Navarro (Chile) suggested that CMS should maintain contact with CCAMLR which had a programme incorporating measures to avoid death to albatrosses caused by demersal fishing and had also published a booklet to increase awareness of the problem. He also stressed the importance of education programmes in the implementation of the Convention.

84. Mr. McNee (Australia) said that there was very strong interest from international organizations in albatross conservation, particularly in relation to their interaction with fisheries. He was keen that CMS should make a significant contribution on the subject in view of the paucity of information available on their conservation status.

(c) Sandgrouse

85. Dr. Botha (South Africa) reported that a study committee had been formed by South Africa, Botswana and Namibia to work on conservation measures. The Scientific Council noted with satisfaction the progress of the work.

(d) Follow-up to the CMS South American workshop (Valdivia, Chile, December 1996)

86. Dr. Schlatter reported that considerable progress had been made in a year. Three member countries in the region wished to arrange a technical meeting for member countries and neighbouring non-member countries to the north. Most of those concerned were developing countries. Therefore, the necessary resources must be sought. For the past period, \$500,000 had been allocated for concerted action and he hoped that the same amount would be made available for the forthcoming period to act as a stimulus to potential new members and to make possible the establishment of sites for migratory

species, especially those listed in Appendices I and II.

87. Mr Canevari added that the workshop had been organized by the University of Valdivia the Direction of Natural Resources of Uruguay and the Secretariat; it had been attended by three member countries and four non-members and had been very successful. The Scientific Council extended its congratulations on the success of the meeting and endorsed its conclusions.

(e) Bats

88. Professor Wołoszyn (Poland) reported on the institution of “International bat night”, to be celebrated for the third time on 23 September 1997, which had the aim of increasing public awareness of bats. Limited resources meant that activities in that connection were restricted to Europe at present, but it was hoped to extend them in the future. A symposium would be held in Poland in 1997 on the importance of buildings, such as churches, for the conservation of wildlife, including bats. Professor Vaz Ferreira (Uruguay) said it was important to seek ways of providing appropriate finance for bat conservationists.

89. The Scientific Council agreed that more action should be taken to the benefit of bats, especially in regions other than Europe, for which no agreements exist for the time being.

(f) Other

90. Dr. Perrin expressed concern that the whale shark, which had considerable economic and tourist value, was being over-exploited. He proposed to submit a paper on the subject to the next Scientific Council meeting. The Scientific Council welcomed that proposal.

91. Mr. Tatwany (Saudi Arabia) submitted three proposals for possible financing: first, for a meeting of experts on marine turtles in the Arabian seas, secondly, for assessment of the status of indigenous marine mammals in the region; and, thirdly, for a workshop on the development of a Memorandum of Understanding on ungulates in the region.

92. Mr. Zampaligre (Burkina Faso) pointed out that most West African States were hosts to migrating birds in winter. He noted that a lack of knowledge on how to return bird rings to their origin was a problem. He requested that CMS assist in solving this problem. It was agreed that the Secretariat would look into possible solutions in cooperation with other relevant organizations and prepare an information sheet.

93. Mr. Dey (India) considered that there should more support for the Strategy for waterbird conservation in Asia-Australasia. It was agreed that the support given hitherto would continue.

94. The Chairman invited proposals for the use of uncommitted funds from the Trust Fund reserve set aside by the Conference of the Parties, which he estimated amounted to some \$150,000 or \$160,000. Agreement had already been expressed on the need to support further work on marine turtles, Sahelo-Saharan ungulates, the Siberian crane and the search for Slender-billed curlew breeding grounds. He suggested that further concerted actions for these species should be considered.

95. With regard to marine turtles, Dr. Limpus suggested the financing of projects to complete the strategic planning workshops: for the ASEAN-Australasian region including Papua New Guinea (\$30,000), the West African region (\$20,000) and the Arabian region (\$20,000), and a single research project on marine turtle genetics (\$40,000).

96. On the subject of Sahelo-Saharan ungulates, Dr. Beudels (Belgium) suggested that priority be given to preparation and holding of a workshop. Given the wide geographical coverage of some 17 countries, \$50,000 would be needed.

97. For the Siberian Crane, Mr. Dey (India) proposed that \$10,000 be devoted to the supply of electronic and satellite tracking devices and a further \$10,000 to holding the third meeting of Range States. The Deputy Coordinator said that \$15,000 would be required for the International Crane

Foundation to prepare the project proposals requested.

98. For the Slender-billed curlew, Dr. Nowak (Germany) said that the expedition planned for the Siberian taiga/steppes area in mid-May would involve six researchers in two groups at a minimum cost of \$7,000, although \$10,000 would be more appropriate.

99. The Coordinator said that the Secretariat was planning to hold a workshop for Range States in the autumn of 1997, provided that the necessary funds could be collected. An amount of at least \$20,000 to \$25,000 would be needed in addition to any external funding obtained, and he hoped that it could be made available from the core budget of the Trust Fund.

100. The Council endorsed these priorities. Since the total of amounts requested exceeded the amount available, the Scientific Council decided to establish an open-ended group with a core membership of the Councillors acting as focal points and the Councillors appointed by the Conference of the Parties along with the Chairman and the Secretariat in order to finalize the allocations as far as possible.

Item 6. Institutional arrangements

(a) Draft Rules of Procedure

101. The Chairman pointed out that the draft Rules of Procedure set out in document UNEP/CMS/Conf.5.14.3 merely formalized the rules which had been followed in meetings of the Scientific Council to date. If there were no objections to the text as set out in the document, he would request the Secretariat to read out some amendments it wished to make to the text. There were no objections.

102. The Deputy Coordinator proposed a few amendments to the draft text prepared by the Secretariat. In Rule 7, the words “ and shall inform the Secretariat accordingly” should be added to the end of the text. In Rule 4, “who shall have the right to participate in meetings of the Council” should be inserted at the end of the first sentence and a new sentence should be added at the end of the text reading “Except as provided for in Rule 7, attendance at meetings of the Scientific Council shall be limited to members of the Scientific Council or their alternates”. The Council should consider whether it wished Councillors appointed by the Conference of the Parties to be entitled to take part in voting.

103. In regard to liaison with comparable bodies established under other Conventions, as referred to in Rule 3, the Deputy Coordinator hoped that it would be possible to identify Councillors willing to act as focal points.

104. The Chairman said that it was his understanding that all Councillors were entitled to vote on all matters. He suggested that the Secretariat make the necessary amendments to the draft rules in order to make this explicit. The Council agreed with the Chairman’s suggestion and adopted the draft Rules of Procedure, as amended orally by the Secretariat and subject to amended wording to clarify voting rights.

105. On the question of liaison with other bodies, the Council requested the Secretariat to negotiate with other Conventions, as appropriate, to facilitate mutual representation. Regarding Councillors nominated for liaison in this triennium on behalf of CMS, the Council designated Dr. Wolff (Netherlands) and Dr. Schlatter-Vollmann for the Ramsar Convention and Dr. Beudels (Belgium) and, subject to his acceptance, Dr. Sylla for the Convention on Biological Diversity. Dr. Perrin offered to report to the Council after he had attended the next meeting of the Scientific Committee of the International Whaling Commission, and agreed to act as a liaison Councillor. Professor Torres Navarro (Chile) would report on albatrosses after the CCAMLR meeting. It was agreed that the Councillors nominated for liaison purposes would be expected to prepare a brief written report to the Council.

(b) Conference appointees to the Scientific Council

106. The Council recommended the reappointment of the present five members, namely, Dr. Colin Limpus, Dr. Michael Moser, Dr. William F. Perrin, Dr. Pierre Pfeffer and Dr. Roberto P. Schlatter-Vollmann.

(c) Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

107. The Scientific Council moved to the election of its Chair and Vice-Chair. The incumbent Chairman, Dr. Pierre Devillers (Belgium) handed over the Chair to the former Chairman, Dr. Wolff (Netherlands), for the conducting of the elections.

108. Dr. Wolff announced that there were two candidates for the post of Chairman: the incumbent, and Mr. Andrew McNee (Australia). After the candidates had left the meeting room, Dr. Wolff invited statements from the floor. Several Councillors expressed their views on the two candidates, after which the meeting proceeded to a vote by secret ballot. The counting of the ballots was conducted by the Deputy Coordinator and Technical Officer of the Secretariat, with the assistance of Dr. Botha (South Africa) and Dr. Beudels (Belgium). As a result of the voting procedure, Dr. Pierre Devillers was elected Chairman of the Scientific Council.

109. Turning to the election of the Vice-Chair of the Scientific Council, Dr. Wolff reported that there were two candidates for that post: the incumbent, Dr. Jean Ngog Nje (Cameroon) and, in the event of his failing to be elected Chairman, Mr. Andrew McNee (Australia).

110. Dr. Wolff invited statements from the floor. Several Councillors offered their opinion on the candidates. Mr. Dey (India) wanted the record to show that he considered that there was a need to ensure that there was a balance between developed countries and developing countries in the election of Officers for the meetings of the Council.

111. The meeting proceeded to a vote by secret ballot. The counting of the ballots was conducted by the Deputy Coordinator and Technical Officer of the Secretariat, with the assistance of Dr. Botha (South Africa) and Dr. Beudels (Belgium). As a result of the voting procedure, Dr. Jean Ngog Nje was elected Vice-Chair of the Scientific Council.

Item 7. Preparation for the Symposium on Animal Migration

112. The Technical Officer of the Secretariat announced that the Symposium would take place on Sunday, 13 April 1997, and would offer a valuable opportunity for representatives to make contact with the many different groups taking part. He invited all present to attend.

Item 8. Date and venue of the eighth meeting of the Scientific Council

113. It was announced that the Secretariat would organize the date and location of the next meeting of the Council, ensuring that the meeting was held within the requisite time-frame.

Item 9. Any other business

114. Dr. Perrin said that he proposed to modify the content of document UNEP/CMS/ScC/Inf.1 (“Needs for International Joint Research on Marine Mammals in South-East Asia”) and include it in the list of projects for which voluntary funds were sought. His proposal was approved.

Closure of the Meeting

115. The meeting was formally closed by the acting Chairman at 1.30 p.m. on Tuesday, 8 April 1997.

Provisional Agenda

1. Opening remarks of the Chairman and Secretariat
2. Adoption of the agenda
3. Report on intersessional activities
 - a) Chairman
 - b) Secretariat
4. Scientific Council tasks arising from resolutions of the Conference of the Parties and other recommendations
 - a) Concerted actions for selected Appendix I species/groups, according to Resolution 3.2: Marine turtles, Sahelo-Saharan ungulates, Ruddy-headed geese, Siberian crane, Slender-billed curlew, Houbara bustard, Great bustard, Monk Seal
 - b) Review of proposals for amendments to Appendices I and II of the Convention
 - i) Discussion and evaluation of proposals
 - ii) Conclusions and recommendations for the Conference of the Parties
 - c) Review of composition of Appendices I and II
 - d) Draft resolutions and recommendations
 - e) Other matters
5. Progress on other matters requiring Scientific Council advice (e.g. with respect to development of new Agreements or funding of small-scale projects)
 - a) Small cetaceans and other threatened marine mammals in South Atlantic and Western Africa
 - b) Albatross (Uruguay project)
 - c) Sand grouse (southern Africa)
 - d) Follow-up to the CMS South American workshop (Valdivia, Chile, December 1996)
 - e) Bats
 - f) Other
6. Institutional arrangements
 - a) Draft rules of procedure (for application to future meetings)
 - b) Conference appointees to the Scientific Council
 - c) Election of Chair and Vice-Chair
7. Preparations for the Symposium on Animal Migration
8. Date and venue of the eighth meeting of the Scientific Council
9. Any other business

7th Meeting of the CMS Scientific Council
List of Participants

MEMBERS:

Mr. Rana Rafiq Ahmad
Ministry of Environment,
Local Govt. and Rural Dev.
UBL Building, 7th Floor
Jinnah Avenue, Blue Area
Islamabad 44000
PAKISTAN

Tel.: (+92 51) 920 3726 / 5289
Fax: (+92 51) 920 2211 / 7282

M. Abdel Kader Bangoura
Correspondant National,
Chargé des Ecosystèmes Humides
Ministère des Travaux Publics
et de l'Environnement
Division Protection de la Nature
et de ses Ressources
B.P. 4665
Conakry
GUINEA

Tel.: (+224) 46 48 50
Fax: (+224) 46 36 54

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

Tel.: (+36 1) 31 30 035
Fax: (+36 1) 117 1669

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

Tel.: (+32 2) 627 43 54
Fax: (+32 2) 649 48 25

Mme. Martine Bigan
Ministère de l'environnement
20, avenue de Ségur
F-75302 Paris 07 SP
FRANCE

Tel.: (+33 1) 42 19 20 21 / 18 70
Fax: (+33 1) 42 19 19 77

Dr. Pieter Botha
Dep. Director, Species Conservation

Dept. of Environmental Affairs
Pretoriusstraat 315 Privaatsak X447
Pretoria 0001
SOUTH AFRICA

Tel.: (+27 12) 310 3575
Fax: (+27 12) 322 6287
E-mail: ombpb@ozone.pwv.gov.za

Mr. Carlo Custodio
Ecosystems Management Specialist
Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau
Department of Environment. and
Natural Resources
Quezon Avenue, Diliman
Quezon City 1100
PHILIPPINES

Tel.: (+6 32) 924 6031-35
Fax: (+6 32) 924 0109

Dr. Pierre Devillers
Institut Royal des Sciences
Naturelles de Belgique
29, rue Vautier
B-1000 Bruxelles
EUROPEAN UNION

Tel.: (+32 2) 627 43 54
Fax: (+32 2) 649 48 25

Subhash Chandra Dey
Addl. Inspector General of Forests
Min of Environment and Forests
Paryavaran Bhawan, CGO Comp.,
Rm. 416 Lodhi Road
New Delhi 110003
INDIA

Tel.: (+91 11) 436 2285
Fax: (+9111) 436 3232/3918/0678

Ph. D. Torbjörn Ebenhard
Scientific Research Director
The Swedish Biodiversity Centre
Biologisk Mångfald - CBM
P.O. Box 7007
S-75007 Uppsala
SWEDEN

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

M. Abdellah El Mastour
Ingenieur Agronome
Ministère de l'Agriculture
et de la Mise en Valeur Agricole

Administration de Eaux et Forêts
et de la Conservation des Sols
Rabat-Chellah
MOROCCO

Tel.: (+2127) 762694/762565/763166
Fax: (+212 7) 76 44 46

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

Tel.: (+420 438) 28 52 12
Fax: (+420 438) 23095
E-mail: jflousek@krnap.cz

Dr. Colin A. Galbraith
Head of Vertebrate Ecology
and Conservation Branch
Joint Nature Conservation Committee
Monkstone House City Road
Peterborough PE1 1JY
UNITED KINGDOM

Tel.: (+44 1 733) 6 26 26
Fax: (+44 1 733) 55 59 48

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

Tel.: (+34 1) 347 5983
Fax: (+34 1) 347 63 01

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

Tel.: (+227) 73 33 29 / 73 40 69
Fax: (+227) 73 27 84 / 75 55 91

M. Muembo Kabemba
Directeur de la Recherche Scientifique
l'Institut Zairois pour la Conservation de
la Nature IZCN
c/o Ministère de l'Environnement,
Conservation de la Nature et Tourisme

13, Av. Des Cliniques Zone de la
Gombe
BP 868 Kinshasa 1
ZAIRE

Tel.: (+243 12) 33250/33251 Ext 263
Fax: (+243 12) 3769355

Dr. Ján Kadlečík
Slovak Environment Agency
Coordination Unit
Čachovský rad 7
038 61 Vrútky
SLOVAKIA

Tel.: (+421 842) 283 337 / 284 503
Fax: (+421 842) 283 337

M. Jalel Laabidi
Chef de service de la chasse
Ministère de l'agriculture
Direction générale des forêts
30, rue Alain Savary
1002 Tunis
TUNISIA

Tel.: (+216 1) 89 14 97
Fax: (+216 1) 80 19 22

M. Raymond Pierre Lebeau
Office fédéral de l'environnement,
des forêts, et du paysage (OFEFP)
Division principale Protection
de la nature et du paysage
CH-3003 Berne
SWITZERLAND

Tel.: (+41 31) 322 8064 / 322 9389
Fax: (+41 31) 324 7579

Dr. Colin J. Limpus
Manager, Research and Monitoring
Queensland Department of
Environment & Heritage
P. O. Box 155
Brisbane 4002
AUSTRALIA

Tel.: (+61 7) 32 27 77 18
Fax: (+61 7) 32 27 63 86

Dr. Jesper Madsen
Senior Research Biologist
Coastal Zone Ecology
Nat'l Environmental Research Institute
Grenåvej 12, Kalø
DK-8410 Rønne
DENMARK

Tel.: (+45) 89 20 17 00
Fax: (+45) 89 20 15 14
E-mail: jm@dmu.dk

Dr. Armando R. Martínez Valdés
Presidente
Fundación Interoceánica Tropical
Via Israel
Plaza Balboa Local #13
Apartado Postal 55-2173
Panamá
PANAMA

Tel.: (+507) 223 5038 / 4315 / 4317
Fax: (+507) 223 4487
E-mail: pegasus@sinfo.net

Mr. Andrew McNee
Director
Biodiversity Group
Environment Australia
G.P.O. Box 636
Canberra ACT 2601
AUSTRALIA

Tel.: (+61 6) 2500 317
Fax: (+61 6) 2500 314
E-mail: andrewmcnee@dest.gov.au

Dr. Michael Moser
Director
Wetlands International
Marijkeweg 11
Postbus 7002
NL-6700 CA Wageningen
NETHERLANDS

Tel.: (+31 317) 47 47 24
Fax: (+31 317) 47 47 12
E-mail: moser@wetlands.agro.nl

Mr. Ian Muchmore
Global Wildlife Division
Department of the Environment
Tollgate House, Room 815
Houlton Street
Bristol BS2 9DJ
UNITED KINGDOM

Tel.: (+44 117) 987 8295
Fax: (+44 117) 987 8688 / 987 8317

Dr. Jean Ngog Nje
Directeur
Ecole de Faune de Garoua
B.P. 271
Garoua
CAMEROON

Tel.: (+237) 27 31 35 / 27 11 25
Fax: (+237) 273135/272022/271800

Dr. Eugeniusz Nowak
UNEP/CMS Secretariat
Martin-Luther-King-Str. 8
D-53175 Bonn
GERMANY

Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2414
Fax: (+49 228) 815 2449

Dr. William F. Perrin
Senior Scientist
Southwest Fisheries Science Center
P.O. Box 271
La Jolla CA 92038
United States of America

Tel.: (+1 619) 546 7096
Fax: (+1 619) 546 7003
E-mail: wperrin@ucsd.edu

Dr. Pierre Pfeffer
Directeur de Recherche
CNRS Muséum de Paris
55, rue de Buffon
F-75005 Paris
FRANCE

Tel.: (+33 1) 40 79 38 74
Fax: (+33 1) 40 79 30 63

Mr. Gerald Ajongbah Punguse
Chief Wildlife Officer
Department of Wildlife
P.O. Box M 239
Ministry Post Office
Accra
GHANA

Tel.: (+233 21) 666 129 / 664 654
Fax: (+233 21) 666 476

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

Tel.: (+56 63) 21 13 15 / 22 14 08
Fax: (+56 63) 21 29 53 / 22 13 15
E-mail: rschlatt@valdivia.uca.uach.cl

Dr. Hany M. A. Tatwany
Wildlife Biologist
National Commission for Wildlife
Conservation and Dev. (NCWCD)
P.O. Box 61681
Riyadh 11575
SAUDI ARABIA

Tel.: (+966 1) 441 8700
Fax: (+966 1) 441 0797

Prof. Daniel Torres Navarro
Jefe Departamento Científico
Instituto Antártico Chileno
Luis Thayer Ojeda No. 814, Correo 9
Santiago
CHILE

Tel.: (+56 2) 232 2617
Fax: (+56 2) 232 0440
E-mail: inach@reuna.cl

M. Namory Traoré
Direction Nationale de l'Amenagement
et de l'Equipement Rural
B.P. 275
Bamako
MALI

Tel.: (+223) 22 59 73 / 58 50
Fax: (+223) 22 11 34

Prof. Raúl Vaz Ferreira
Universidad del Uruguay
Facultad de Ciencias
Dept. de Zoología Vertebrados
Calle Tristán Narvaja No. 1674
11200 Montevideo
URUGUAY

Tel.: (+598 2) 48 86 22
Fax: (+598 2) 40 99 73

Prof. Dr. Wim J. Wolff
Department of Marine Biology
Groningen University
Postbus 14
NL-9750 AA Haren
NETHERLANDS

Tel.: (+31 50) 363 2260
Fax: (+31 50) 363 2261
E-mail: w.j.wolff@biol.rug.nl

Prof. Bronisław Wołoszyn
Inst. of Animal Systematics -Evolution
Polish Academy of Sciences
ul. Sławkowska 17
31.016 Kraków
POLAND

Tel.: (+48 12) 22 19 01 / 22 80 00
Fax: (+48 12) 22 42 94
E-mail: woloszbr@isez.pan.krakow.p

M. Issa Zampaligre
Directeur de la Faune et des chasses

Min. de l'Environnement et du l'Eau
B.P. 7044
Ouagadougou 03
BURKINA FASO

Tel.: (+226) 36 75 43
Fax: (+226) 36 03 53

Official Observers:

Gerhard Adams
Regierungsdirektor
Ministry of Environment
Division N I 3
P.O. Box 12 06 29
D-53048 Bonn
GERMANY

Tel.: (+49 228) 305 2631
Fax: (+49 228) 305 2697
E-mail: ni3-3001@wp-gate.bmu.de

Mr. Alessandro Andreotti
Istituto Nazionale per la Fauna Selvatica
Via Ca'Fornacetta 9
I-40064 Ozzano Emilia (BO)
ITALY

Tel.: (+39 51) 65 12 111
Fax: (+39 51) 79 66 28

Mr. Mike Smart
Senior Policy Advisor
Ramsar Bureau
28, rue Mauverney
CH-1196 Gland
SWITZERLAND

Tel.: (+41 22) 999 0171
Fax: (+41 22) 999 0169
E-mail: mis@hq.iucn.org

Ms. Montserrat Carbonell
Regional Coordinator Neotropics
Ramsar Bureau
28, rue Mauverney
CH-1196 Gland
SWITZERLAND

Tel.: (+41 22) 999 0170
Fax: (+41 22) 999 0169
E-mail: moc@hq.iucn.org

Dr. Taej Mundkur
Coordinator - Waterbird Conservation
Wetlands International Asia Pacific

Institute for Postgraduate
Studies & Research
University of Malaya, Lembah Pantai
50603 Kuala Lumpur
Malaysia

Tel.: (+60 3) 757 2176/756 6624
Fax: (+60 3) 757 1225
E-mail: taej@wiap.nasionet.net

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

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