



Memorandum of Understanding
on the Conservation of
Migratory Birds of Prey in
Africa and Eurasia

Distribution: General
UNEP/CMS/Raptors/MOS2/
Report
30 December 2015

Second Meeting of Signatories | Trondheim, Norway, 5-8 October 2015

REPORT OF THE SECOND MEETING OF SIGNATORIES TO THE RAPTORS MOU

Agenda Item 1. Opening of the Meeting

1. The Executive Coordinator of CMS Office - Abu Dhabi, Mr Lyle Glowka, welcomed the participants (see List of Participants in Annex IX) and introduced Ms Gunn Mari Paulsen, Head of the Species Section of the Norwegian Environment Agency (NEA) and invited her to open the meeting on behalf of the host country.

2. Ms Paulsen extended a warm welcome to Trondheim and the Second Meeting of Signatories (MOS2), and conveyed best wishes for a fruitful meeting from the Director General of the NEA, Ms Ellen Hambro who was unable to attend the MOS. Ms Paulsen underlined the interest that raptors held not only for scientists and conservation managers, but also the wider public. Strong population declines in the past had occurred as a result of persecution and incidental poisoning. However, some species had responded positively to conservation measures taken since the 1960s, though others still had low populations. The White-tailed Eagle was a Norwegian success story, as the population had grown to its current level of 8,000 individuals and was being used to supply birds for reintroduction in countries where the species had become extinct. There was a strong need for international cooperation for migratory species and the Raptors MOU had an important contribution to make. The concrete guidance developed to date by CMS and the Raptors MOU was invaluable. Norway noted with gratitude that Environment Agency - Abu Dhabi (EAD), on behalf of the Government of the United Arab Emirates, hosted the Coordinating Unit of the Raptors MOU and largely funded its core activities. However, support from other Signatories was encouraged. Norway also underlined the need for cooperation between relevant international initiatives and highlighted the scope for additional collaboration within the broader CMS Family. In closing, Ms Paulsen recalled that Trondheim was not only Norway's third largest and second oldest city, but also a centre for technology and nature conservation; she was sure it would provide the perfect venue for MOS2 and wished the meeting well with its deliberations.

3. Mr Glowka thanked the NEA for hosting the meeting and underlined Norway's longstanding history of working on collaborative approaches to international biodiversity conservation. He recalled that Norway had just celebrated its 30th anniversary as a Party to CMS. He extended thanks to the Governments of Germany and the Netherlands, which had provided critically important financial support for MOS2. He also extended thanks to EAD and the Government of the United Arab Emirates for hosting the CMS Office - Abu Dhabi, which accommodated the Raptors MOU Coordinating Unit (CU) and the Dugong MOU Secretariat. He acknowledged the efforts made by the CU and the CMS Secretariat in Bonn to prepare for MOS2. Unfortunately, the Head of the CU, Mr Nick Williams, was unable to attend MOS2 owing to illness.



4. Mr Borja Heredia, CMS Secretariat, presented the opening statement of the CMS Executive Secretary, Mr Bradnee Chambers, who had been unable to attend the meeting due to travel disruption, and who wished to convey his sincere apologies to the MOS.

5. On behalf of the CMS Secretariat, Mr Chambers wished to extend thanks to the Government of Norway for hosting MOS2, to all participating Signatories and to NGOs for their enthusiastic support and organization of side events. Raptors were iconic species which played an essential ecological role and had also fascinated humankind throughout history. They were now threatened by a number of factors across their range meaning that there was an urgent need for concerted international action. CMS was immensely grateful for the generous support, both financial and in kind, from Environment Agency - Abu Dhabi on behalf of the Government of the United Arab Emirates. EAD had hosted CMS Office - Abu Dhabi for the last six years, accommodating the Coordinating Unit for the Raptors MOU. He hoped that the UAE would become a Party to CMS in the not too distant future. The Eleventh Conference of Parties (COP11) to CMS held in Quito in November 2014 had adopted a number of Resolutions relevant to the Raptors MOU, including those addressing: the programme of work on flyways; poisoning, illegal killing and taking of migratory birds, and renewable energy. He welcomed the way in which the CU had reached out to work with the CMS Secretariat in Bonn to collaborate on cross-cutting issues; working together, it was possible to make a difference. He highlighted the proposal to add twelve species of vultures to Annex 1 of the MOU and noted particular concern about the continued licensing of Diclofenac, a veterinary medicine, in the European Union (EU). Mr Chambers had recently written to the EU Commissioner for Health and Food Safety requesting that Diclofenac be banned from European markets. However, poisoning was also an issue that needed to be addressed in Africa and so he welcomed the proposal for a multi-species action plan for African-Eurasian vultures. Signatories were also invited to implement the Saker Falcon Global Action Plan (SakerGAP) and to support the work of the Saker Falcon Task Force. The Interim Technical Advisory Group (TAG) of the Raptors MOU had provided valuable advice to Signatories and to the CU and Mr Chambers stated it was good to see that it would be renewed and consolidated in the intersessional period up to MOS3. Further collaboration between the TAG and the CMS Scientific Council was encouraged.

Agenda Item 2. Signing Ceremony for New Signatories

6. The signing ceremony was postponed until Day 2 of the Meeting, 6 October. At the beginning of the ceremony, which took place in the morning, Mr Glowka, thanked the Government of Norway for hosting the dinner held on the evening of 5 October.

7. He noted the opportunity to open the MOU for signature and expressed his pleasure in being able to invite Mr Mohamed Said Youssouf, Secretary General of the Ministry of Production and the Environment of Comoros to the podium. Comoros would now become the 53rd Signatory to the Raptors MOU.

8. Participants applauded Mr Youssouf's signature of the MOU on behalf of the Government of Comoros.

Agenda Item 3. Rules of Procedure

9. Mr Glowka referred participants to document UNEP/CMS/Raptors/MOS2/3/Rev.1 *Rules of Procedure*¹. He recalled that MOS1 had adopted Rules of Procedure to be tabled for adoption at future Meetings of Signatories. These were contained in Annex 1 to the document. He invited the Meeting to adopt the Rules of Procedure as approved by MOS1, noting that proposed amendments presented in Annex 2 would be dealt with later in the Meeting. There being no objections, the Meeting adopted the Rules of Procedure for MOS2.

¹ http://www.cms.int/raptors/sites/default/files/document/mos2_rules_of_procedure_rev1_e.pdf

10. After the Meeting had elected officers (Agenda Item 4) and adopted the agenda and meeting schedule (Agenda Item 5), it returned to consider the proposed amendments to the Rules of Procedure, presented in Annex 2 of document UNEP/CMS/Raptors/MOS2/3/Rev.1.

11. The Netherlands gave notice that it would be speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States during MOS2, unless otherwise stated. Referring to the Rules of Procedure, the EU and its Member States expressed their concern over the late arrival of documents for MOS2 and pointed out the key financial document only arrived on the Friday before the meeting. The EU urged the CU to have the majority of documents for future meetings available from two months before the meeting and the remaining documents 30 days prior to the meeting, at the latest, as stated in Rule 2 paragraph 5 of the Rules of Procedure.

12. Mr Glowka referred the Meeting to document UNEP/CMS/Raptors/MOS2/3/Rev.1 *Rules of Procedure* and to the proposed amendments presented in Annex 2 to that document. He noted that after MOS1 it had been realized that there was no reference to the Technical Advisory Group established at MOS1 in the Rules of Procedure, yet the Terms of Reference for the TAG included a mandate to make recommendations for potential amendments to the MOU and its Annexes. The CU was therefore inviting MOS2 to consider some amendments to Rule 16, paragraph 2, paragraph 3 (a) and paragraph 3 (c). There was also a typographical error in Rule 5, paragraph 4, which required correction by reinserting of some wording which had been inadvertently excluded. The Chair opened the floor to comments.

13. The Netherlands, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported adoption of the proposed amendments to the Rules of Procedure.

14. Norway suggested that the proposed amendment to Rule 16, paragraph 3 (c) be adjusted to establish the same deadline for the TAG to present proposals, as for Signatories, i.e. 60 days (not 40 days). The Netherlands speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States supported the proposal of Norway.

15. The Chair concluded that the proposed amendment to Rule 16 paragraph 3 (c) should be adjusted accordingly and Mr Glowka confirmed that the CU would make this change. The amended Rules of Procedure for Meetings of Signatories to the Raptors MoU adopted by the Meeting are in Annex I of this report.

Agenda Item 4. Election of Officers

16. Mr Glowka recalled that in accordance with Rule 7 the Meeting was invited to elect a Chair and Vice-chair. It was the tradition within the CMS Family that the host country should be invited to Chair the Meeting. As there were no objections, he was pleased to confirm that Norway would Chair MOS2, represented by Mr Øystein Størkersen of the Norwegian Environment Agency, who was also Chair of the CMS Standing Committee. He welcomed Mr Størkersen to the podium.

17. Assuming his function as Chair of MOS2, Mr Størkersen extended a warm welcome to all participants and thanked the Meeting for electing him. He invited nominations for Vice-chair of MOS2. Mali nominated Senegal as Vice-chair. Seeing no indications to the contrary, the Chair confirmed that the nomination made by Mali had been endorsed and that Senegal represented by Ms Ndeye Sene Thiam would serve as Vice-chair of MOS2.

Agenda Item 5. Adoption of the Agenda

18. At the invitation of the Chair, Mr Glowka introduced documents UNEP/CMS/Raptors/MOS2/1/Rev.2 *Provisional Agenda*² and UNEP/CMS/Raptors/MOS2/2/Rev.2 *Provisional Annotated Agenda and Schedule*³.

² http://www.cms.int/raptors/sites/default/files/document/raptors_mos2_prov_agenda_rev2_e.pdf

19. The Chair invited comments from the floor. There being no such interventions, the Chair concluded that both documents had been adopted by consensus.

Agenda Item 6. Credentials

20. On the first day of the MOS, the Chair noted that delegates were encouraged to submit their credentials at the registration desk as soon as possible. A report on credentials would be presented later in the Meeting.

21. Mr Glowka reported that credentials had been received and determined to be in order from the following Signatories: the Czech Republic, Finland, France, Ghana, Hungary, Kenya, Madagascar, Mali, Morocco, the Netherlands, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, Senegal and the United Arab Emirates.

22. On the final day of the MOS, Mr Glowka reported that one more Signatory had presented credentials determined as being in order, namely the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Agenda Item 7. Admission of Observers

23. At the invitation of the Chair, Mr Glowka introduced document UNEP/CMS/Raptors/MOS2/4 *Admission of Observers*⁴. He recalled the provisions of paragraph 13 of the text of Raptors MOU, which provided for admission of observers. Those observers registered for MOS2 by 30 September 2015 were listed in the Annex to the document.

24. In the absence of any comments, questions or objections, the Chair concluded that the Meeting had approved admittance of the Observers listed in the Annex of the document.

Agenda Item 8. Statements from Signatories

25. The Chair opened the floor to comments from Signatories and Range States that were not yet Signatories. Comments were also invited from Observers.

26. Israel reconfirmed its support for the Raptors MOU, expressing the hope that it would be in a position to become a Signatory during MOP6 of the African–Eurasian Migratory Waterbird Agreement (AEWA) in November 2015.

27. India noted that it hosted 47 species of birds of prey and was completely in support of conservation efforts for raptors, including particular measures for Amur Falcon and *Gyps* vulture species, the latter including conservation breeding. India was working towards signing the MOU and expected to participate in MOS3 as a Signatory.

28. Lebanon reported that it had become a Signatory to the MOU having been encouraged by staff at the CU to do so. Lebanon counted on the MOU to help promote awareness to combat the illegal killing of birds and to move towards elaboration and implementation of a modern hunting law. It would be important to ensure that proposals for amendments to the MOU and its Annexes be submitted in due time to enable countries to undertake the national consultations required.

29. The Netherlands, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, thanked the Government of Norway, Environment Agency - Abu Dhabi, the CMS Secretariat and the CU for their respective roles in hosting and preparing for MOS2. It was important for participants to learn from each other's successes and challenges and MOS2 would contribute to that. The Meeting would also

³ http://www.cms.int/raptors/sites/default/files/document/mos2_prov_annotated_agenda_schedule_rev2_e.pdf

⁴ http://www.cms.int/raptors/sites/default/files/document/mos2_admission_observers_e.pdf

serve to highlight the concrete contributions of the MOU towards the Aichi Targets and to implementation of CBD and CMS decisions. The EU Biodiversity Strategy provided the EU's framework on biodiversity matters. The Meeting was assured of the EU's full cooperation and support during the coming days.

30. Pakistan thanked the Government of Norway for the excellent arrangements for MOS2 and the CMS Secretariat and CU for their work. He asked colleagues to convey best wishes to Mr Nick Williams.

31. Saudi Arabia thanked the Government of Norway for its support and the people of Trondheim for their warm welcome. Thanks were also due to the Government of the UAE for its generous support in hosting the CU and funding most of its activities, as well as to the CU itself for its good work and to governments that had supported MOS2. Saudi Arabia supported the MOU and had been working with the CU to provide financial and scientific support to the SakerGAP. This support would continue as Saudi Arabia worked towards becoming a Signatory to the MOU and other CMS MOUs in the near future.

32. Oman thanked the Government of Norway for its generous hosting of MOS2. The Sultanate of Oman was working on migratory species, especially the International Single Species Action Plan for Sooty Falcon and the Flyway Action Plan for Egyptian Vulture. Oman hoped to become a Signatory to the MOU in the near future.

33. SEO/BirdLife Spain said that it was one of the oldest bird protection organizations in Spain and had been very active over the years in African-Eurasian migratory raptor conservation. Projects included those for Spanish Imperial Eagle, the designation of Special Protection Areas, protection from adverse impacts of windfarms, and the following of certain species by satellite tracking. Being on the flyway for many raptor species, Spain was an important country for the Raptors MOU and BirdLife International would continue to support implementation in Spain.

34. The Syrian Arab Republic recalled that it had signed the Raptors MOU in 2014. The current situation in the country meant that the Ministry of Environment was facing difficulties in implementing the MOU but hoped to be able to resume work again in future. There was a particular need for fieldwork and funding.

35. The Islamic Republic of Iran made the following statement:

“The Islamic Republic of Iran signed the Raptors MOU on March 2015 and currently is developing the National Conservation Strategy for Raptors, and also preparing National Action Plan for Saker Falcon and Egyptian Vulture. About the critical situation of ‘Diclofenac’ for the Vultures, the Iranian Department of Environment is proud to announce that right now, exporting, importing, producing and any veterinary use of this drug is prohibited within the country, and is not among the approved veterinary drug list. Iran is a vast country in the region with about 70 species of birds of prey. Control of bird trapping, chick and egg collecting and also smuggling are main challenges. We believe further achievements would not be possible without the cooperation between the governmental and also non-government institutes inside the country and also through the coordination and cooperation on regional and international levels. The Iranian delegation to the meeting would like to express its special thanks to the Bonn Convention (specifically the Raptors MOU Secretariat) and also for the generous host and hospitality of the Norwegian Government.”

36. The Chair welcomed the statements made, especially those from Range States considering becoming Signatories to the MOU.

Agenda Item 9. Report of the Coordinating Unit

37. The Chair invited Mr Glowka to introduce this Agenda Item, who referred the Meeting to document UNEP/CMS/Raptors/MOS2/5 *Report of the Coordinating Unit*⁵ and its Annex.

38. He recalled that the Interim Coordinating Unit had operated from August 2009 until MOS1 in December 2012. The Coordinating Unit had been formally established at MOS1 and was located at CMS Office - Abu Dhabi, thanks to generous support from the Environment Agency - Abu Dhabi, on behalf of the Government of the United Arab Emirates.

39. Since MOS1, ten countries had become Signatories to the MOU and it was expected that one additional country would join the MOU during MOS2 (see Agenda Item 2 above). There were currently 52 Signatories, comprising 51 countries and the EU.

40. The CU had engaged proactively with non-signatory Range States throughout the last triennium and it was encouraging that 16 of them were pre-registered to attend MOS2.

41. The MOU stated that each Signatory should designate a National Contact Point (NCP). The CU had developed guidance for NCPs and a list of NCPs was contained in document UNEP/CMS/Raptors/MOS2/Inf.6⁶. Mr Glowka invited those Signatories yet to designate their NCPs to do so as soon as possible.

42. The CU had actively engaged in communications activities, especially in playing a leading role in the CMS Family Website Working Group established by the CMS Secretariat. The CU had also worked closely on the development, editing and publication of the SakerGAP and preparation of Summary Factsheets and the CMS National Focal Point Manual.

43. The CU had organized a number of international meetings since MOS1. Thanks were due for the financial and in-kind support provided by the governments and institutions listed in the document. Staff at the CU had also represented the MOU at many other international gatherings.

44. The CU's work programming and planning had been re-phased to run on the basis of calendar years. Paragraph 22. of the document outlined the CU's suggestions for core activities during 2016–2018. These included providing administrative support to the TAG (subject to resource availability); supporting Signatories in developing National or Regional Raptor Conservation and Management Strategies; supporting implementation of the SakerGAP (subject to resources for recruitment of a SakerGAP coordinator); finalizing the Flyway Action Plan for the Balkan and Central Asian Populations of the Egyptian Vulture and the International Single Species Action Plan for the Sooty Falcon (subject to availability of resources); and ensuring raptor issues were integrated with relevant initiatives led by the CMS Secretariat.

45. The Chair drew attention to the 'action requested' in the document and opened the floor for comment.

46. Saudi Arabia thanked the CU for its good work and accomplishments, especially in relation to the SakerGAP. The CU had done a good job but sometimes the work had not proceeded at the desired pace; faster progress was to be hoped for in future. Thanks were due to all those that had contributed to the SakerGAP, including the Government of the UAE, CITES and others. Point (c) of the 'action requested' in MOS2 document 5 focused on financial support. This was an important issue, but some Range States might choose to provide support in other ways. It was suggested that this action requested be amended to refer to "other support" or similar, therefore covering technical and

⁵ http://www.cms.int/raptors/sites/default/files/document/mos2_report_coordinating_unit_e.pdf

⁶ http://www.cms.int/raptors/sites/default/files/document/mos2_inf6_ncp_list.pdf

scientific support, as well as financial support. This could be achieved by inserting “other support such as technical and scientific” after “voluntary financial contributions”.

47. Mr Glowka thanked Saudi Arabia for its financial support during development of the SakerGAP and confirmed that the Meeting secretariat would bring forward revised text for approval on the final day of MOS2.

48. Hungary referred to its support for the points listed for inclusion in the CU’s Work Plan for 2016–2018 but wished to add as a general point an extensive fundraising effort by the CU. This would be needed to enable implementation of all the other activities.

49. Kenya suggested that the Meeting might wish to propose creating a vehicle or mechanism for Signatories to work together to mobilize resources. Otherwise it might not be possible to make progress with implementation. The Chair noted that this point would be taken up under another Agenda Item that the Meeting would therefore return to it later.

50. Norway agreed that the CU worked very well and efficiently with its small team but noted that the report mentioned a shortage of human and financial resources. The report also noted that the CU worked with the CMS Family Joint Communications Team to achieve more by working together. This illustrated the importance of liaising with others doing important work for the Raptors MOU, such as the Bern Convention in relation to powerlines, and the wider CMS Family on energy. There should be a strong and continuous focus on prioritization of work for species listed in Category 1 of Annex 3 Table 1 of the MOU. Such focus could help bring in funding support for getting things done.

51. Lebanon thanked the CU for an excellent and straightforward report. It was important to underline the value of motivating individual Signatories to develop National Action Plans by identifying species that were threatened in individual Range States or flyways and provision of model Action Plans that could be used by Signatories.

52. Mali underlined the impact of security issues for some countries. In Mali a number of migratory species were mostly to be found in areas over which the authorities no longer had control, causing difficulties in monitoring them. One third of the country was suffering from security challenges and the Meeting was invited to consider the implications of this.

53. The Netherlands speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States noted that the Work Plan 2016–2018 foresaw two face-to-face meetings of the TAG. The Terms of Reference for the TAG stated that electronic means should be used for meetings wherever possible. In view of resource constraints, the EU urged that the Terms of Reference be adhered to.

54. The Chair acknowledged the point raised by the EU, but noted this did not preclude the possibility of Signatories and others offering to host meetings of the TAG.

55. The Chair concluded that the four ‘actions requested’ had been addressed and that the Meeting had therefore:

- (a) Noted the contents of the report.
- (b) Urged Signatories listed with only a provisional National Contact Point on UNEP/CMS/Raptors/MOS2/Inf.6⁷, to officially nominate a NCP and to supply details to the CU as soon as possible and by 31 December 2015 at the latest.
- (c) Encouraged Signatories, Range States, partners and stakeholders to work collaboratively to mobilize resources, including by voluntary financial contributions and other support such as

⁷ http://www.cms.int/raptors/sites/default/files/document/mos2_inf6_ncp_list.pdf

technical and scientific, to enable implementation of the SakerGAP and other key initiatives highlighted in the report.

- (d) Alerted the CU to additional activities that may warrant inclusion in its Work Plan for the coming triennium, including allocating sufficient resources to implement it. (Hungary recommended that an extensive fundraising effort be undertaken. Kenya suggested that a specific mechanism for resource mobilization should be established. Norway recommended focusing through a strong prioritization of Category 1 species. The EU noted that the Work Plan 2016–2018 foresaw two face-to-face meetings of the TAG and urged the TAG to meet electronically whenever possible to reduce costs. The Chair noted that Signatories were free to host face-to-face meetings of the TAG. Lebanon suggested identifying the species most threatened in each country to encourage more national actions.)

56. The closure of the formal session was followed by a side event organized by BirdLife International on preventing poisoning of birds of prey.

Agenda Item 10. Report of the Interim Technical Advisory Group

57. Prof. Des Thompson of Scottish Natural Heritage, Chair of the Interim Technical Advisory Group (TAG), gave a report outlining the membership of the TAG, its tasks and activities, its achievements and the work that remained to be done⁸.

58. Pointing out that raptors were at the top of the food chain and therefore excellent indicators of wider environmental issues, Prof. Thompson said that birds of prey were a well-researched species group and many leading scientists had conducted studies. Birds of prey were also popular with the general public and therefore Governments were more likely to take an interest in their conservation.

59. The Interim TAG had first met in Edinburgh in January 2014 and its second meeting had taken place in March 2015 in Abu Dhabi. The Interim TAG had elected Prof. Thompson as its Chair and he was supported by Sálím Javed of the United Arab Emirates who was the Vice-chair. Prof. Thompson acknowledged with gratitude the engagement of the other members of the TAG and the assistance provided by the CU, and Nick Williams in particular.

60. The Signatories at MOS1 had requested the TAG to consider threats, awareness-raising, monitoring and research, mitigation and remedial measures and conservation support and to undertake some “horizon scanning” for emerging issues.

61. At the Edinburgh meeting, eight working groups had been established dealing with key issues (species listings, site protection, power grids and renewable energy, illegal killing, poisoning, awareness raising, monitoring, and reporting and supporting measures) and the meeting in Abu Dhabi had heard reports on 26 different activities that were being undertaken. It had become apparent that the TAG needed to set clearer priorities, with the identification of sites and reviewing the species listed under the MOU being the most important issues.

62. With regard to species, some amendments were being proposed primarily because of taxonomic changes, resulting in three species being deleted and two added. The migration status of species was being reviewed and more data were becoming available and this had led to the proposal to add a further twenty species to the annexes. Of the twenty proposed additions, the TAG had endorsed 18, there not being sufficient data for the remaining two to justify inclusion.

63. Radio telemetry was giving new insights into vultures’ migration movements, with differences becoming evident between the sexes and age groups and at different times of year. There were still

⁸ http://www.cms.int/raptors/sites/default/files/document/mos2_ai10_tag_report_thompson.pdf

major concerns regarding Asian species after their dramatic declines and the MOU provided a framework for global efforts to conserve the birds.

64. The list detailing all the potentially important sites for migratory raptors in the African-Eurasian region ran to over 700 pages given that for most Range States a number of sites had been identified. It was envisaged that the status of the sites would be reviewed at intervals of six years.

65. More clarity regarding threats was emerging as more information became available. The expansion of power grids had been recognized as an important issue and guidance had been prepared and issued. Illegal killing, taking and trade had been the subject of a Resolution at CMS COP11, and remedial measures were being proposed. Criminal elements however were proving to be inventive and were staying one step ahead of the authorities. It was necessary to mobilize more public support and to build alliances. One approach might be to form a “Friends of the MOU” association.

66. It was a grave concern that Diclofenac had been licensed in the European Union given its devastating impact on South Asian vulture populations. There were frequent calls for the establishment of common standards so consideration should be given to reviewing all the guidance currently available. Satellite tracking offered excellent opportunities to promote research and bring to wider public attention the importance and wonder of these birds.

67. Prof. Thompson concluded his remarks by thanking the Chair of the Meeting, the other members of the TAG and the staff at the Coordinating Unit for their support.

68. Mr André Botha (IUCN SSC Vulture Specialist Group) thanked Prof. Thompson for his leadership of the TAG. He noted the comments regarding the costs of face-to-face meetings of the TAG but stressed that such meetings had a different dynamic and drove the work of the MOU forward more effectively than teleconferences or email exchanges.

69. The Chair said that the rules of procedure for the TAG did not specify how frequently the TAG should meet or what form the meetings should take. Another factor in determining when the TAG should meet was the availability of a venue and the support of a host government or organization.

70. Israel noted that the benefits of using satellite telemetry had been mentioned. It should be stressed that this technology was being used for conservation science as it was a widely held misconception in the Middle East that it was being used for espionage.

71. Prof. Thompson said that sponsors should be found to fund the purchase of satellite transmitters. He was pleased to have seen in the *Journal of Applied Ecology* an article dispelling concerns of welfare implications of fitting equipment to birds. Those using the equipment needed to be properly trained in handling the birds. The technology was also improving rapidly and the transmitters were becoming so small that it would be impossible to see whether a bird was fitted with one from a distance which should solve the problem of birds being targeted under suspicion of them being used for spying.

72. Hungary said that an advantage of transmitters was that they served as a deterrent to illegal hunters who knew that tagged birds would be missed by those monitoring them.

73. The Chair said that the question of “horizon scanning” would be covered later in the agenda. Mr Glowka noted however that no document had been produced yet. He and Prof. Thompson undertook to prepare a revised list of tasks for the TAG for the MOS to endorse. The Netherlands speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States thanked the Interim TAG for the work undertaken since its inception but added that it was regrettable that no supporting document had been submitted.

74. The Chair said that the Signatories had made it clear to the CU that the deadlines for producing documents laid down in the Rules of Procedure had to be met. He however called for a degree of pragmatism to ensure that the important work of conserving raptors could continue and for recognition of the pressures on a small secretariat in the run-up to events such as the MOS.

Agenda Item 11. Report of the CMS Secretariat

75. Mr Borja Heredia (CMS Secretariat) referred participants to document UNEP/CMS/Raptors/MOS2/7 *Report of the CMS Secretariat*⁹. He presented highlights of the Report, focusing in particular on the CMS COP11 Resolutions most relevant to the Raptors MOU and giving suggestions of how the MOU might consider contributing to implementation of those Resolutions. The aim was to maximize synergies between the CMS and the Raptors MOU on overlapping and cross-cutting issues, notably those addressed by COP11 Resolutions:

- 11.2 Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023
- 11.13 Concerted and Cooperative Actions
- 11.25 Advancing Ecological networks to Address the Needs of Migratory Species
- 11.26 Programme of Work on Climate Change and Migratory Species
- 11.27 Renewable Energy and Migratory Species

And a number of bird-related Resolutions, including:

- 11.9 World Migratory Birds Day
- 11.14 Programme of Work on Migratory Birds and Flyways
- 11.15 Preventing Poisoning of Migratory Birds
- 11.16 The Prevention of Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds
- 11.17 Action Plan for Migratory Landbirds in the African-Eurasian Region
- 11.18 Saker Falcon *Falco cherrug* Global Action Plan (SakerGAP)
- 11.19 The Taxonomy and Nomenclature of Birds listed on the CMS Appendices

76. Mr Heredia updated the Meeting on progress on key issues since adoption of the Resolutions. He noted that the MOS had an opportunity to take decisions that would give a strong mandate to MOU Signatories to support implementation of relevant CMS Resolutions.

77. The Chair highlighted the roles of TAG in looking into synergies and identifying potential action points for the MOU to engage with.

78. Mr Olivier Biber, the Chair of the CMS African Eurasian Migratory Landbird Working Group also expressed his hope that MOS2 would mandate Signatories to look for synergies, especially as MOS2, the Migratory Landbird Working Group and AEWA MOP6 were all meeting within a few weeks of one another in October and November 2015.

Agenda Item 12. Conservation Initiatives under the Raptors MOU

12.1. Species

79. The Chair invited Mr Glowka to introduce participants to document UNEP/CMS/Raptors/MOS2/8 *Conservation Initiatives under the Raptors MOU*¹⁰. He briefly introduced the work undertaken by the CU in relation to a number of species, notably the Saker Falcon (*Falco cherrug*), Egyptian Vulture (*Neophron percnopterus*), Sooty Falcon (*Falco concolor*) and Amur Falcon (*Falco amurensis*). Full details were available in the document itself and several of the initiatives were the subject of presentations and side events during MOS2.

⁹ http://www.cms.int/raptors/sites/default/files/document/mos2_report_cms_secretariat_e.pdf

¹⁰ http://www.cms.int/raptors/sites/default/files/document/mos2_conservation_initiatives_e.pdf

80. Mr Glowka's summary was followed by a presentation on 'The Return of the Neophron: Egyptian Vulture Flyway Action Plan'¹¹ made by Mr Stoyan Nikolov, Bulgarian Society for Protection of Birds (BSPB/BirdLife Bulgaria). This summarized the results of an international EU LIFE Nature project coordinated by BSPB in collaboration with partners over a five-year period that would end in 2016. The aim was to halt and reverse the declining trend in the Balkan population of the Egyptian Vulture, which had undergone severe range fragmentation and an annual population decline of 7 per cent over the period from 1980 to 2012.

81. Thanks to support of the Raptors MOU, BSPB had been able to engage in a Small Scale Funding Agreement for work in Africa to build capacity. An Egyptian Vulture Flyway Action Plan (EVFAP) meeting had been held in Sofia earlier in 2015 attracting more than 70 participants from 30 countries in the Balkans, the Middle East and Central Africa. The draft EVFAP was currently under development and would be completed in October 2015. A five-member EVFAP coordination group was led by the CU with representation from each sub-region to which the Action Plan applied. The draft EVFAP would be made available on the BSPB website and opened for expert comment. It was hoped the final version would be concluded in early 2016.

82. A subsequent presentation on the 'Saker Falcon Online Portal'¹² was made by Prof. Robert Kenward (IUCN Sustainable Use and Management of Ecosystems Group) and Mr Janusz Sielicki (International Association for Falconry and Conservation on Birds of Prey). Prof. Kenward presented a brief review of the history of raptor decline and conservation efforts, focusing on Saker Falcon (*Falco cherrug*). He noted *inter alia* that the issue of electrocution had been flagged as a concern as long ago as the early 1970s and the recognition that falconers had a positive role to play in developing captive breeding techniques and were not the primary cause of losses in the wild. In fact there was a direct positive correlation between the number of falconers in an area with the Peregrine falcon population. Illegal trade was something of a distraction. While such trade was a factor, it was overshadowed by losses to electrocution.

83. Under the SakerGAP a protocol for a trade control system had been designed and costed. Such a system could only be implemented effectively with the agreement and support of stakeholders. The first priority was therefore to reach out to those stakeholders. This was the reason behind the portal system which had been set up as the first flagship project of the SakerGAP.

84. The principal conclusions made by Prof. Kenward were that:

- CMS was treating falconers as part of the solution not the problem – a very welcome step forward;
- The targets of the Saker Online Information Portal project had been met;
- Survey data showed how an effective system could operate to manage legal trade, to monitor populations, and to raise funds for other flagship species;
- The introduction of the system needed to be coordinated with the process for down-listing species included on the IUCN Red List to encourage international adoption; and
- There was an urgent need to address the issue of electrocution of Saker Falcons.

12.2. Threats

85. Mr Glowka referred participants to the comprehensive summary contained in document UNEP/CMS/Raptors/MOS2/8 *Conservation Initiatives under the Raptors MOU*. This showed the high degree of engagement of the Coordinating Unit in CMS processes. CMS Office - Abu Dhabi was again thankful for the core funding from EAD that allowed the CU to engage in CMS processes at global level to ensure synergies.

¹¹ http://www.cms.int/raptors/sites/default/files/document/mos2_ai12_1_egyptian_vulture_fap_nikolov.pdf

¹² http://www.cms.int/raptors/sites/default/files/document/mos2_ai12_1_saker_portal_kenward_0.pdf

86. Ms Vicky Jones (BirdLife International) presented a 'Review of the Illegal Killing and Taking of Birds (IKB) in the Mediterranean'. This had revealed the issue to be one of growing concern, with many countries struggling to make significant progress. A key challenge was that there was very little quantitative data on either the key species, or the principal countries and key locations involved. The review, across 26 Mediterranean countries, had therefore sought to:

- Assess the scale, scope and impact of IKB by compiling information on the species, numbers of individuals, blackspots and illegal practices;
- Review legislation;
- Develop best practice guidelines on monitoring of IKB;
- Raise awareness of IKB; and
- Support prioritisation of action.

87. A communications-led summary of the review had already been published, while the full report and a scientific paper were in preparation. The next steps would include:

- A campaign on IKB;
- Piloting the use of IKB monitoring guidelines;
- Promoting conservation action by Mediterranean partners to address IKB at key sites;
- Ensuring BirdLife International was working effectively in a 'joined-up' manner with others;
- Gathering similar data from other regions of the African-Eurasian region to obtain a flyway-scale overview of IKB.

88. An action-oriented side-event on this topic would be held on Thursday, 8 October at 13:15 hrs.

89. The close of the formal session was followed by a side event on 'Electrocution of Birds of Prey – A Real Threat to the Saker Falcon'¹³ presented by Janusz Sielicki of the IAF, with additional inputs by Mátyás Prommer on work to reduce electrocution of Saker Falcons and other raptors in Hungary¹⁴.

12.3. Other Initiatives

90. Mr Glowka introduced the other initiatives undertaken by the CU in the triennium including the African Raptor DataBank and BirdLife Data Zone. Commenting that Africa had a high diversity of raptor species Mr Glowka introduced Rob Davies, the Director of Habitat INFO based in West Wales in the United Kingdom, to give a presentation on a "citizen science" project *African Raptor Databank*, which had developed a mobile phone application that was operable offline¹⁵.

91. Mr Davies explained that the gestation period of the project had been 15 years and had begun when he was working in Madagascar with the Fitzpatrick Institute at the University of Cape Town. The project had also been supported by the Peregrine Fund and André Botha was both a sub-regional coordinator and the largest contributor of data entries, another being Joost Brouwer in Niger. All parts of Africa had some coverage.

92. While Africa still contained some wilderness areas, there were growing pressures to accommodate the increasing human population and Mr Davies showed maps illustrating where crops are being grown and livestock raised. Pristine habitats were disappearing as they were totally transformed by human activities.

93. Birds of prey needed a holistic approach and single protected areas were no longer an adequate solution as many species were very mobile and ranged over distances of hundreds of kilometres. These species did however lend themselves to a study of this nature as they were rare

¹³ http://www.cms.int/raptors/sites/default/files/document/mos2_event3_electrocution_saker_sielicki.pdf

¹⁴ http://www.cms.int/raptors/sites/default/files/document/mos2_event3_saker_electrocution_prommer.pdf

¹⁵ http://www.cms.int/raptors/sites/default/files/document/mos2_ai12_3_african_raptor_databank_davies.pdf

and declining and had an important role in controlling irruptions of pest species and disease. They were good indicators of the health of the whole environment and were more visible than other predators because they tended to select prominent perches (as opposed to big cats which preferred to hide).

94. The aim of the African Raptor Databank was to compile current and historic information on the distribution of various species. The database was launched in October 2012 using information from the seminal Distribution Atlas by D.W. Snow with another peak of entries from Cameroon in August 2014. Data from mobile phones had begun to be received in May 2014 and now 1,000 records were entered in a typical month.

95. Donations from Kurt Eckerstrom and a grant from the Raptors MOU had enabled the app to be developed and the technological features now available included logging the movements of the observers and voice recording allowing users to leave messages when driving. Three screens allowed the observer to add answers to basic who, what, where and when questions. The observer was required to identify the species with options for describing what the bird was doing and adding photographs or sound recordings. Another crucial field was the record type, as the location of some nest sites should remain secret. There was already background information on various species such as locations where they were known to occur and local extirpations. More migration information could be added and, with some coordination, known bottleneck sites could be monitored as birds passed through.

96. Ms Jones gave a presentation on the Data Zone¹⁶ of the BirdLife International website and expressed her delight at being able to work closely with the Coordinating Unit on the MOU. The BirdLife International website was available to the public and attracted 200,000 visits every month and therefore could provide a platform to promote the profile of the MOU.

97. Ms Jones demonstrated the features of the Data Zone, which had a tailor-made search facility and links to other sources of information. It contained national and regional level information, which could be accessed through drop-down menus leading to country data pages and site maps with lists of the species present. The species pages already had a search facility and details of the status under the MOU would be added. The Important Bird Area (IBA) Factsheets would include whether the site had been included on Table 3 while the country data sheets would include whether a country was a Signatory or Range State to the MOU together with the species it hosted.

98. In response to a question from the representative of Mali, who found the site very useful, Ms Jones said that the site was currently only in English.

99. The actions requested were endorsed subject to minor changes to the wording contained in the Meeting documents.

Agenda Item 13. Review of Implementation of the MOU and Action Plan

13.1. National or Regional Raptor Conservation Strategies

100. The Chair acknowledged that many Signatory States were experiencing difficulties in developing their National Strategies. While some countries were making good progress and had functioning mechanisms in place, others were less advanced and still needed to include all relevant species in national legislation. At a regional level, a number of processes were under way within the European Union.

¹⁶ http://www.cms.int/raptors/sites/default/files/document/mos2_ai12_3_birdlife_datazone_jones.pdf

101. In introducing the document, Mr Glowka noted that the Coordinating Unit had published 'Guidelines for Preparing National or Regional Raptor Conservation and Management Strategies'¹⁷ in 2012 to assist Signatories with this task. At the time of MOS1, no strategies had been received by the CU. Signatories then agreed to aim to develop their strategies by June 2014. However, no final documents had yet been received.

102. The Chair proposed a revised timescale for producing these national strategies with a new deadline of 31 December 2016 for their submission to the CU. There were no comments from the floor and no objections were made to the proposed revised timetable so the Chair declared that it had been approved.

13.2. National Reporting

103. The Chair welcomed UNEP/CMS/Raptors/MOS2/10 *National Reporting*¹⁸ which described all the activities being undertaken at the national level. He invited the Meeting secretariat to highlight some of the main achievements reported.

104. Mr Glowka presented the document which contained a summary of the reports received from Signatories with some composite information depicted in pie charts. He stressed the importance of linking national reporting to the development of national strategies and reiterated the fact that most Signatories were struggling to make progress.

105. The CU had devised a brief questionnaire to Signatories in connection with National Reporting to inform the process being led by the TAG in designing a National Report form. Seventeen Signatories had responded. The TAG would also liaise closely with other members of the CMS Family to ensure compatibility of reporting formats and to maximize the benefits from using the CMS Online Reporting System. In view of the large number of tasks assigned to it, the TAG had not made progress with the National Report form.

106. The responses received from the 17 Signatories covering six activities (implementation of legal protection; protection and/or management of important sites and flyways; habitat conservation and sustainable management; raising awareness of problems faced by birds of prey and measures needed to conserve them; monitoring bird of prey populations, carrying out conservation research and taking remedial measures; and supporting measures) had been analyzed to indicate for instance what percentage of Signatories had afforded national protection to the sites in their country listed on Table 3 of Annex 3 of the MOU. Some European countries were waiting for the EU-wide strategy before drafting their national action plan (see UNEP/CMS/Raptors/MOS2/10 for the full report).

13.3. How Implementation of the Action Plan of the Raptors MOU Contributes towards Delivery of the CMS Strategic Plan for Migratory Species

107. Mr Glowka introduced UNEP/CMS/Raptors/MOS2/11 *How Implementation of the Action Plan of the Raptors MOU Contributes towards Delivery of the CMS Strategic Plan for Migratory Species*¹⁹ identifying correlations between the Action Plan of the MOU and the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species (SPMS) adopted at CMS COP11 through Resolution 11.2. The CMS Strategic Plan Working Group was due to meet the week following MOS2, immediately before the 44th Meeting of the CMS Standing Committee, to start consideration of the "companion volume" which would give guidance on implementation. The MOU had a large part to play in achieving the objectives of the Convention and would be able to contribute detailed sub-targets related to birds of prey.

¹⁷ http://www.cms.int/raptors/sites/default/files/document/mos2_inf3_guidelines_raptor_conservation_strategies_e.pdf

¹⁸ http://www.cms.int/raptors/sites/default/files/document/mos2_national_reporting_e.pdf

¹⁹ http://www.cms.int/raptors/sites/default/files/document/mos2_raptors_ap cms spms_e_0.pdf

108. There was a clear correlation between the higher level goals of the MOU's Action Plan and those of the SPMS. Effective implementation of the MOU Action Plan and the regional strategies would mean that Signatories would be directly contributing to achieving the objectives of the SPMS. The initial assessment by the CU indicated that there was no need to develop new targets and the gaps identified in the Action Plan relating to fundraising and poverty alleviation were relatively minor.

109. Signatories had agreed to a three-year reporting cycle and the TAG had received the task of devising a national report form., This should include a means by which the CU could evaluate progress against the targets of the both the MOU Action Plan and the SPMS. It had also originally been the intention that the Action Plan would be reviewed every seven years, and the first revision was now already overdue. The TAG could be tasked with reviewing the Action Plan before MOS3 and the revised text could address the gaps mentioned above.

110. The Meeting endorsed the action requested and recognized that the MOU and the Convention were already well aligned.

111. This Agenda Item was followed by a side-event at which Torgeir Nygård made a presentation on the Smøla wind farm plant in Norway and its impacts on the local white-tailed eagles and willow ptarmigans.

13.4. African Vulture Crisis

112. On the morning of day 4, the Chair introduced Agenda Item 13.4. on the African Vulture Crisis. A presentation was made by Mr André Botha of the Endangered Wildlife Trust, Co-Chair of the IUCN SSC Vulture Specialist Group and member of the Raptors MOU TAG. Among key points were the following:

- The drastic changes in IUCN Red List status of vulture species: by the end of October 2015 a majority would be listed as Critically Endangered;
- The main driver was poisoning – sometimes mass poisoning in association with poaching of elephants etc. Vultures were, by far the worst affected bird family;
- The precipitous decline in India and elsewhere in Asia since the late 1990s due to Diclofenac, though work was being undertaken to try and turn this around. Other factors, including habitat loss, also contributed to declines in Asia;
- Populations had recovered in parts of Europe, though the fact that Diclofenac was still licensed for sale in the EU remained a concern;
- Studies of the movement of vultures showed the need to work across the flyway. This required a broad approach and the buy-in of every Range State;
- Protection of key sites was important.

113. Chief among the many challenges were:

- The huge scope of the undertaking;
- Tremendous knowledge gaps in Africa;
- The need to obtain buy-in from as broad and representative a spectrum of stakeholders as possible, including non-signatory Range States and key decision makers.

114. The potential added value of an African-Eurasian Vulture Multi-Species Action Plan (MSAP) included:

- Agreeing priorities and a course of action among a wide range of stakeholders;
- Agreeing division of labour among stakeholders;
- Ensuring sharing of knowledge/experience;
- Promoting collaborative efforts between regions (e.g. with regard to Diclofenac);

- Raising the issue up the political agenda;
- Raising public awareness;
- Attracting donors (e.g. by putting together ‘mega bids’ for funding).

115. Mr Botha invited MOS2 to:

- Confirm the need for MSAP;
- Confirm that the MSAP should include a site-based approach;
- Support the identification and appointment of three regional coordinators – for Africa, Asia, and Europe – to take forward the work of the MSAP under the support and guidance of a Chair and Vice-chairs;
- Task the TAG with facilitating the development of MSAP and to take it forward for adoption at CMS COP12 and MOS3 of the Raptors MOU;
- Establish a CMS Vulture Task Force and develop Terms of Reference for that Group;
- Emphasize the MSAP as a partnership between the CMS Family, BirdLife International and the IUCN SSC Vulture Specialist Group.

116. In closing, Mr Botha reiterated the urgency of the situation saying that now was the time to act.

117. The Chair thanked Mr Botha for his presentation and noted that development of the MSAP was still at a very early stage. He felt that the concept was something that all participants would support; the question was how best to take it forward. He opened the floor for comments.

118. Mr Heredia agreed with the concept of developing an MSAP but cautioned against making the MSAP too complicated procedurally. He confirmed the CMS Secretariat would like to be involved and would gladly work with TAG but it would be wise to avoid creating too many structures and he was not convinced of the need for a Task Force. A draft MSAP would have to be fed into the process for review by the CMS Scientific Council ahead of eventual tabling for adoption by the CMS COP. He would like to see a simple process that concentrated on developing the MSAP and, in parallel, immediately began implementing activities on the ground.

119. Pakistan urged that, in light of experience in Pakistan and India concerning Diclofenac, special efforts should be made to have veterinarians on board.

120. Kenya supported the call for an MSAP and felt that many other Signatories were also supportive. An MSAP would provide a rational framework and optimize use of resources, as well as providing a clear roadmap that would be helpful to drawing attention from potential donors and partners.

121. Senegal underlined the shortage of relevant expertise in French-speaking Africa, and the need for both capacity-building and wider public awareness. Vultures generally were not well-liked being seen as an omen of ill fortune. Everybody noticed the decline but few seemed to think it was worrying.

122. South Africa supported the development of an MSAP. There was a need to take into consideration the fact that some vulture Range States were neither Parties to CMS nor Signatories to the MOU and that this could be a challenge when it came to implementation. However, there might be good working relationships with partners or NGOs that could help in such countries. There were examples of existing MSAPs from which the Raptors MOU could learn – e.g. the AWEA MSAP for the Conservation of Benguela Current Upwelling System Coastal Seabirds.

123. Niger noted that the mystical and traditional medicine was contributing to the disappearance of vulture species, at least locally. In Niger, the Government’s wildlife conservation partners visited

weekly markets to raise awareness of the important ecological role of vultures. However, it had become clear that it was not local people that were hunting vultures, but rather hunters crossing the border from Nigeria. Traditional chiefs had been asked to raise the alert in such cases and Niger would continue to do what it could, while awaiting a more structured, large-scale MSAP.

124. Israel expressed full support for an MSAP and hoped to be able to offer financial and/or in-kind support for its development and implementation. Consideration should be given to inviting the Vulture Conservation Foundation to participate in the MSAP.

125. Mali added its voice to those supporting development of an MSAP and highlighted the cultural significance of vultures. The current situation was disastrous; vultures were not hunted or eaten in Mali, but numbers were declining rapidly. Capacity and expertise were seriously lacking in the Sahel region of Africa in general, not only in Mali.

126. France drew attention to the conservation work already being undertaken in several EU countries including France. The concept of an MSAP was very important since partnership was needed across the species' ranges, from breeding to wintering grounds and along migratory flyways.

127. Kenya drew attention to the pressing need to make space for vultures on the African conservation agenda. A great deal of time and energy was being devoted to conservation of mega-fauna species, such as the 'Big Five' mammals but such a narrow approach could inadvertently lead to the complete loss of other species and required very careful handling.

128. The Red Sea Association for Environment and Water Sport concurred that there was an urgent need for an MSAP, underlined by the rapid transfer of some species from 'Vulnerable' to 'Critically Endangered' on the IUCN Red List. The deteriorating Red List status of vultures would hopefully result in governments banning the hunting of certain species.

129. SEO/BirdLife Spain welcomed development of an MSAP and stressed the urgency of the situation. The CU should write to Signatories and non-signatory Range States urging them to take action to protect vultures and to participate in the MSAP without delay. It was vital to have implementation actions in place before the MSAP was complete.

130. BirdLife International reminded the MOS of the pressing need to identify and target vulture concentration sites. Donors were urged to support the additional data gathering required to pinpoint these areas.

131. The Netherlands agreed that filling knowledge gaps in Africa was a high priority and pledged to look favourably on any request for support that might be developed in this regard.

132. At the invitation of the Chair the Meeting approved the following wording, tabled by BirdLife International, as a MOS2 outcome:

"MOS2 tasked the TAG with facilitating the development of an African-Eurasian Vulture Multi-Species Action Plan for adoption at CMS COP12 in 2017 and MOS3 in 2018."

133. The Chair also confirmed that the CU should write to Signatories and non-signatory Range States with regard to the MSAP. He noted that funding was required to take the process forward, including the recruitment of potential regional coordinators and expert consultants. The process was at an early stage, but the CU, the CMS Secretariat and Signatories were clear on the direction to take and the urgency of the situation. Developments were likely to move considerably over the coming year with regard to the formal process, but this did not preclude taking action now, such as working more closely with the veterinary industry.

134. Mr Botha welcomed the Chair's summing up and looked forward to the support for the MSAP approach that had been expressed during the session being translated into tangible action.

13.5. TAG Work Plan, including Horizon Scanning

135. The Chair noted that during the excursion day, 7 October 2015, the Chair of the Interim TAG and the Meeting secretariat had prepared and circulated document UNEP/CMS/Raptors/MOS2/18 *Work Plan for the TAG until the 3rd Meeting of Signatories*²⁰.

136. Prof. Thompson, advised that preparation of the proposed TAG Work Plan up to MOS3 had taken account of the Action Plan of the MOU, tasks given to TAG1 and TAG2, and had also aimed to capture points arising from MOS2.

137. Six main activities had been identified:

- Activity 1 – Improvement of legal protection
- Activity 2 – Protect and/or manage important sites and flyways
- Activity 3 – Raise awareness of issues and guidance
- Activity 4 – Raise awareness of problems faced by birds of prey and measures needed to conserve them (with special reference to poisoning)
- Activity 5 – Monitor bird of prey populations, carry out conservation research and take appropriate remedial measures
- Activity 6 – Supporting measures and horizon scanning

138. After Prof. Thompson had briefly summarized each of the twenty tasks identified for the TAG under the six activities outlining indicative proposals on which it would be useful to have comments or feedback, the Chair opened the floor for comment.

139. The Islamic Republic of Iran suggested an additional element for the Work Plan, namely for the TAG to propose new raptor conservation projects and/or review current conservation projects.

140. In response to a question from Saudi Arabia, Prof. Thompson and Mr Glowka confirmed that there was no obligation on CMS Task Forces to seek technical and scientific advice from the TAG. The link between the Task Forces and the TAG should be based on establishing good, effective working relations. For example, there were issues relating to vulture conservation for which bodies established under both the CMS and the Raptors MOU would all have important roles to play. This would require close collaborative working between the CMS Secretariat and the CU.

141. Pakistan supported the earlier suggestion made by Iran and also recommended that the TAG should take on capacity-building work.

142. Prof. Thompson underlined that simply sharing information could achieve a great deal. Other forms of capacity-building might include offering advice on technical methods, or assisting particular individuals to undertake visits or attend meetings.

143. India called for development of an engagement strategy for working constructively with sectors that had a key role to play in reducing major threats to raptors, such as poisoning and power/energy infrastructure.

144. BirdLife International flagged the point that ahead of CMS COP12 there would be a need to cross-check the consistency between the CMS Appendices and the revised Table 1, Category 1 listing of raptor species agreed at MOS2.

²⁰ <http://cms.int/raptors/en/document/work-plan-technical-advisory-group-until-3rd-meeting-signatories-session>

145. At the invitation of the Chair, the Meeting took note of the TAG Work Plan up to MOS3 as well as the additional tasks suggested by participants. The Work Plan appears as Annex III to this Report.

Agenda Item 14. Institutional Arrangements

14.1. Proposals for Amendments to the Raptors MOU and/or its Annexes

146. The Chair introduced Agenda Item 14. Mr Glowka invited the Meeting to consider looking at changes proposed by TAG to (a) the list of species (b) the list of Range States and (c) the list of sites. Prof. Thompson and Ms Jones stood ready to answer questions.

147. As some delegations had raised the issue of needing more time to seek cabinet or parliamentary approval of the changes, and the documentation had arrived too late for full consultations to be carried out, the Chair proposed to convene a “Friends of the Chair” meeting to discuss possible solutions before the start of normal business on the second day of the Meeting.

Species List

148. Mr Glowka noted that Annex 1 of the MOU contained 76 species as it stood. The proposed changes were set out in UNEP/CMS/Raptors/MOS/13/Rev.1²¹ with Annex A of the document presenting proposals for the revised Annex 1 of the MOU and Annex B of the document containing a revised proposal for the species listed by category (Table 1 of Annex 3 of the MOU). The Interim TAG proposed adding further species to bring the total to 93. In August 2015 the CU had circulated the proposals to Signatories, asking for errors and omissions to be notified. Seven comments received none of which was major or substantive.

149. The review had been undertaken by BirdLife International, which was also IUCN’s lead authority for birds, and Ms Jones had also served on the Interim TAG Working Group.

150. Ms Jones explained that the original species listing was based on information compiled by BirdLife International. The list had been reviewed in the light of new information, particularly regarding the migration habits of many species that were now considered to be eligible for inclusion given the definitions of “migratory” used by CMS and the MOU. The CMS text and the clarifications of the terms “cyclical” and “predictable” contained in CMS Resolution 2.2 provided sufficient guidance to develop criteria for including raptor species in the MOU annexes.

151. The recommendation of the TAG was to increase the number of species listed from 76 to 93, with 18 species added because they were now considered migratory, including two species added and three species deleted as a result of changes in taxonomic classification. In addition to the Egyptian Vulture (*Neophron percnopterus*), the Cinereous Vulture (*Aegypius monachus*) and the Griffon Vulture (*Gyps fulvus*), all other African vulture species with the exception of the Palm-nut Vulture (*Gypohierax angolensis*), which was not a scavenger, were proposed for inclusion.

152. With regard to taxonomy and nomenclature, CMS Resolution 10.13 adopted at COP10 in Bergen, Norway in November 2011 recognized the advantages of harmonizing the nomenclature used across the CMS Family and MEAs and adopted the common English names used by BirdLife International. This issue was further discussed at a Workshop held in Formia, Italy in 2013. COP11 through Resolution 11.19 had adopted a new taxonomical reference for non-passerines. The Interim TAG had concluded that aligning with the BirdLife International taxonomical reference was the best option for the MOU.

153. The result of adopting the new taxonomical reference meant that *Milvus lineatus* should be removed from Annex 1 as it was no longer recognized as a separate species (from *Milvus migrans*),

²¹ http://www.cms.int/raptors/sites/default/files/document/mos2_proposals_species_list_rev1_e_0.pdf

Spizaetus nipalensis should be listed as *Nisaetus nipalensis* and *Nyctea scandiaca* as *Bubo scandiacus*. The splitting of *Buteo buteo* resulted in the creation of one non-migrant species as did the splitting of the Mountain and Forest Buzzard (*Buteo oreophilus* and *B. trizonatus*). *Falco peregrinus* (the Peregrine Falcon) now subsumed *Falco pelegrinoides* (the Barbary Falcon) which had previously been listed separately.

154. The allocation of the listed species across the three Categories contained in Table 1 of Annex 3 of the MOU had been reviewed in the light of new information from the 2015 European Red List of Birds and changes to the Global Red List that would be published in November 2015. Ms Jones highlighted those species which were recommended for inclusion under a different Category, explaining briefly the reasons for making each change.

155. Olivier Biber (Chair, CMS African-Eurasian Migratory Landbird Working Group) questioned the proposal to downgrade the Osprey from Category 2 to Category 3 given that its status was similar to that of the Lesser Kestrel which was to remain in Category 2. Ms Jones explained that the reason the Osprey was in Category 3, whereas the Lesser Kestrel in Category 2 was to do with the European Red List assessment, where the Lesser Kestrel was identified as ‘depleted’ and the Osprey ‘least concern, secure, with an increasing population’ – and the global population trend for the species is increasing as well. Ms Jones added that to keep the Raptors MOU species list coherent there needs to be a rationale to follow, and since there has been a European-level assessment this should be followed – unless there is a strong reason to deviate from it.

156. Israel questioned the proposals to downgrade the Griffon Vulture which was admittedly faring well in Europe but was no longer breeding in the Middle East. With regard to the Lesser Spotted Eagle, the text of other documentation presented to the Meeting was not consistent with the proposal to downgrade the species to Category 3. Ms Jones clarified that the Lesser Spotted Eagle was moved to Category 3, because according to the European Red List its status was secure and stable and the global population trend was stable on the whole. There was no change in categorisation of the Griffon Vulture: it remained in Category 3 as it did not have a declining global population.

157. The Chair thanked Ms Jones, the Working Group and the Interim TAG for all their work. He reported that a “Friends of the Chair” group had met earlier in the day to discuss the Rules of Procedure and the deadlines for submitting amendments to the species listing. These deadlines had not met been for a variety of reasons, but nonetheless the Chair proposed that exceptionally the Rules of Procedure should be waived and that the MOS should consider the changes being proposed.

158. The Netherlands said that the EU and its Member States were prepared in the interests of progressing the work of the MOU to consider the proposed amendments to the list of species and also the list of range states despite the contravention of the Rules of Procedure, but stressed that this should be considered an exception and not a precedent for future meetings.

159. Hungary recognized the large amount of work undertaken by the Interim TAG but would have appreciated more information to justify the changes of category as some of the changes were not consistent with trends identified in the 2013 review of the EU Birds Directive covering the then 27 Member States. He cited the case of the Lesser Spotted Eagle which was being killed in large numbers in the Middle East. He advocated a thorough review of the criteria for categorization. Ms Jones explained that in the European Red List of Birds there are two different population trends to look at: one within the 27 Member States of the EU as mentioned by Hungary, and the other within the whole of Europe. Because the geographic scope of the Raptors MOU is Africa and Eurasia, the whole of Europe-approach was most relevant. Ms Jones noted however that in a small region of the EU the trends could be different.

160. Norway too was prepared to consider the amendments but also stressed that this should not set a precedent.

161. The Chair said that a document would be submitted to the Meeting underlining the need to adhere strictly to deadlines for future sessions of the Meeting of the Signatories. The Meeting recognised that the documentation under Agenda Item 14.1. *Proposals for Amendments to the Raptors MoU and/or its Annexes* had been circulated late and not within the deadline foreseen in the MOU's Rules of Procedure for MOS. It approved as a one-off exception to the Rules of Procedure the amendments recommended by TAG to Annex 1 of the MOU *List of African-Eurasian Migratory Birds of Prey* and Annex 3 Table 1 *Categorisation of African-Eurasian birds of prey covered by the Action Plan*. The amended species list appears as Annex IV to this report, and the amended categorisation of species as Annex VI to this report.

Range State List

162. Mr Glowka explained that with regard to the list of Range States, since the adoption of the MOU, South Sudan had become independent and was now a member of the United Nations. It therefore needed to be added to the MOU's Range States. The Meeting approved as a one-off exception to the Rules of Procedure the amended geographical scope of the MOU to include South Sudan in the Range State list found in Annex 2 of the MOU. The amended list of Range States appears as Annex V to this report.

Sites List

163. Mr Glowka explained that since 2008 when the MOU had first entered into force considerably more information had come to light regarding sites of importance to raptor species. More IBAs and key bottleneck sites along migration routes had been identified and more Special Protection Areas (SPAs) designated under the EC Birds Directive. The revised list, which is Table 3 of Annex 3 of the MOU, had been circulated to all 52 Signatories in the beginning of August 2015 with a request for comments regarding errors and omissions. Minor comments from seven Signatories had been received (see UNEP/CMS/Raptors/MOS2/15/Rev.1²² for details).

164. Ms Jones explained the background to the development of the site list, which now had 7,518 entries with 3,014 IBAs, 4,500 SPAs, and four other sites meeting criteria of international importance in 103 Range States with sites on the proposed list.

165. The Chair said that the late submission of the list of sites and the fact that it was in need of correction in places had been discussed by the "Friends of the Chair" meeting earlier. He proposed that the Meeting could consider not endorsing the list but to note it as a work in progress. The TAG would be given the task of further reviewing the list which would then be submitted in accordance with the Rules of Procedure for consideration at the Third Meeting of the Signatories. In the meantime Signatories could make use of the provisional list when devising their national strategies.

166. Norway agreed with the Chair's proposal and expressed thanks to the Interim TAG. She sought clarification of the decision made at MOS1 regarding the process for establishing the list of sites. It was clarified that the MOS had endorsed the idea of a sites list and passed responsibility for overseeing it to the TAG.

167. The Netherlands said that the EU and its Member States noted the list of sites and the work of the Interim TAG. There were some overlaps in sites which led to errors in the list that needed to be addressed before the list could be adopted. Late submission of the list had been an impediment, but the list should be resubmitted at MOS3.

²² http://www.cms.int/raptors/sites/default/files/document/mos2_proposals_sites_list_rev1_e.pdf

168. Kenya welcomed the Chair's pragmatic approach but asked that care be taken to ensure that the administrative pitfalls that had befallen this meeting be avoided in future, given the precarious state of the species that the MOU sought to protect.

169. The Meeting took note of the proposals made by the TAG to amend Annex 3 Table 3 *Provisional list of Important Bird Areas that are currently known to be important congregatory bird of prey sites in Africa and Eurasia*. It further noted that the proposed amended list of sites could be used immediately by Signatories in the preparation of National or Regional Strategies or equivalent documents. It requested further review by TAG of the proposed amended list of sites taking into consideration the amendments to the MOU made to Annex 1 *List of African-Eurasian Migratory Birds of Prey* and the Range State List in Annex 2 *Map of the area included within this Memorandum of Understanding* as adopted by MOS2. It instructed the Coordinating Unit to circulate the revised proposed amended list of sites to Signatories for comment at least 150 days prior to the MOS to allow adequate consultation and feedback in anticipation of their consideration by MOS3 for adoption.

14.2. Establishment of the Technical Advisory Group

170. Mr Glowka introduced UNEP/CMS/Raptors/MOS2/16 *Establishment of the Technical Advisory Group*²³, describing the TAG's mandate and composition. The Interim TAG had been established at MOS1 and prior to MOS2 nominations had been invited for members. By the deadline 17 nominations had been received, which then had been reviewed by a panel made up of the Chair and Vice-chair of the Interim TAG, Executive Coordinator of CMS Office - Abu Dhabi, and Head of the CU.

171. The list of recommended candidates with their regional and organizational affiliation or area of expertise was endorsed by the Meeting. The list appears as Annex II to this report.

Agenda Item 15. Financial and Administrative Matters

15.1. Current Financial Status and Future Funding

172. Mr Glowka referred the meeting to document UNEP/CMS/Raptors/MOS2/17/Rev.1 *Current Financial Status and Future Funding*²⁴.

173. He reminded the meeting that the CU was located within the CMS Office - Abu Dhabi, hosted by Environment Agency - Abu Dhabi at its headquarters, on behalf of the Government of the UAE. In addition to receiving a generous financial contribution from EAD, the CU also greatly benefited from considerable in-kind support. For example, EAD provided office space and telecom/IT facilities. The CU was staffed by two Professional Officers and one General staff member (whose salary was covered by UNEP Programme Support Costs). In addition about one-third of the Executive Coordinator's time was allocated to the Raptors MOU.

174. Mr Glowka drew attention to:

- Annex 1, Table 1 of the document, which summarized the CU's expenditure for the period from 1 January 2012 to 31 August 2015.
- The listings of projects and consultancies contained in the document.
- Fundraising activities undertaken proactively by the CU with the aims of securing additional resources to enhance capacity, to implement international coordinated collaborative projects and programme activities to support implementation of the MOU. Additional voluntary contributions totalling USD 184,198 had been secured and these were listed in the document.
- Small Grants Programme (SGP) under the Raptors MOU – the proposal to establish an SGP had been deferred at MOS1, instead the CU had been asked to collate a list of project proposals.

²³ http://www.cms.int/raptors/sites/default/files/document/mos2_establishment_of_tag_e.pdf

²⁴ http://www.cms.int/raptors/sites/default/files/document/mos2_financial_status_rev1_e.pdf

These were outlined in UNEP/CMS/Raptors/MOS2/Inf.19 *Suite of Project Proposals*²⁵. The CU had circulated a Suite of Project Proposals in May 2014. The Saker Online Portal project had been selected by IAF, leading to the signature of a Small Scale Funding Agreement in November 2014. There was now a pressing need for funding for the SakerGAP Coordinator and for an action planning workshop to finalise the International Single Species Action Plan for Sooty Falcon.

- Summary of mechanisms to mobilize additional resources to enhance the capacity of the Coordinating Unit to implement the Action Plan. These included the possibility to request regular voluntary contributions from Signatories based on the UN Scale of Assessment. Annex 2 to the document provided a breakdown of the voluntary contributions that would be needed under such a mechanism to generate an additional USD 150,000 in total.
- Regarding future funding of the CU it had recently been confirmed by EAD, on behalf of the Government of the United Arab Emirates, which it would continue to fund CMS Office - Abu Dhabi for a further four-year period, 2016–2019. The CMS Secretariat and the Raptors MOU Coordinating Unit extended their grateful thanks to EAD, to the Abu Dhabi Executive Council, and to His Highness Sheikh Mohammed bin Zayed Al Nahyan, Crown Prince of Abu Dhabi.

175. The Chair echoed these thanks to EAD and the Government of the UAE. He opened the floor to comments and especially wished to hear Signatories' views on the proposal for the CU to request regular voluntary contributions (as set out in paragraph 13. b. of the document).

176. Pakistan urged that requests for voluntary contributions under CMS MOUs be transmitted to Signatories at the same time as invoices for mandatory contributions under the Convention. This would make a favourable response to such requests more likely in the case of countries that were both a Party to CMS and a Signatory to the MOU.

177. The Chair confirmed that this suggestion had been noted, but that advice would need to be sought from the Executive Secretary of CMS.

178. Kenya felt that there would be a better chance of favourable responses to requests for voluntary contributions if these could be seen in the context of a broader fundraising strategy for the MOU.

179. The Chair felt that development of such a strategy, though desirable, would itself take time and resources. This should not preclude seeking voluntary contributions to support implementation activities in the meantime.

180. In response to a question from Iran, Mr Glowka confirmed that there was a typographic error in the heading of Annex 1 Table 2 *Indicative Budget for the Coordinating Unit* in the document. This should have stated "1 January 2016" (not 2015).

181. The Chair sought guidance from the floor as to whether Annex 2 *Estimated voluntary assessed annual contributions by Signatories to generate US\$ 150,000* to the document should be used for the basis of seeking voluntary contributions.

182. Mali suggested that voluntary contributions might be sought for the collective suite of CMS Family MOUs, based on a banding system reflecting the UN Scale of Assessment. Contributions received could then be shared between the various MOUs.

183. Senegal and Niger both supported in principle the mechanism outlined in the document and in Mr Glowka's summary presentation but underlined the inherent challenges.

²⁵ http://www.cms.int/raptors/sites/default/files/document/mos2_inf19_project_proposals_e.pdf

184. The Chair concluded that the mood in the room was to support the proposed approach to voluntary contributions based on Annex 2 of the document. There had been no opposition to the proposal, though it was unlikely that all Signatories would be able to contribute the amounts indicated. The CU was asked to consult with the CMS Secretariat with regard to possible inclusion of the request for voluntary contributions at the same time as mandatory CMS contributions were invoiced. If this proved not to be possible, the CU would send a separate letter requesting voluntary contributions.

185. The Meeting concurred with the Chair's summing up and proposed way forward.

Agenda Item 16. Adoption of Outcomes

186. The Chair introduces Agenda Item 16. Draft MOS2 outcomes prepared by the Meeting Secretariat, in consultation with the Chair, were projected on the screen in the meeting room and read out one by one by Mr Glowka.

187. MOS2 adopted the outcomes as proposed, subject to inclusion of the following amendments:

- Deletion of square-bracketed text cross-referencing to the TAG Work Plan and included in the draft outcomes purely as an aide-memoire;
- Correction of a minor typographical error in relation to Agenda Item 9;
- Insertion of "to the Rules of Procedure" after "a one-off exception" in two places under Agenda Item 14.1;
- Correction of "Annex 3 Tables 1-3" to read "Annex 3 Table 1" under Agenda Item 14.1.

188. A summary list of key outcomes of the Meeting is found in Annex VIII of this Report. The Meeting also noted the comment of the Czech Republic that it might be helpful for Signatories to identify a scientific advisor at national level, as well as the formally required National Contact Point.

Agenda Item 17. Date and Venue of the Third Meeting of Signatories

189. The Chair noted that invitations to host MOS3 would be welcomed, adding that the CU would assist any host in preparing the MOS. The CU would circulate a call for invitations at least 18 months ahead. Precise dates would need to be fixed in collaboration with any potential host.

Agenda Item 18. Any Other Business

190. The Agenda Item was combined with the Closure of the Meeting at Agenda Item 19.

Agenda Item 19. Closure of the Meeting

191. The Chair asked participants to take the Agenda Items *Any Other Business* and *Closure of the Meeting* together and invited interventions from the floor.

192. Lebanon underlined the value of regional preparatory events and hoped that such events could be arranged ahead of MOS3.

193. The Chair agreed that it was desirable to prepare proactively, including engagement of key sectors such as the veterinary industry, power companies etc.

194. Kenya confirmed that its offer to host a future meeting of the TAG remained open.

195. South Africa, Pakistan and the EU all expressed thanks to the Government of Norway and especially the Norwegian Environment Agency (NEA), for hosting MOS2 and to the people of

Trondheim for their hospitality. While recognizing the CU's hard work and capacity constraints, it was to be hoped that the documentation for MOS3 would be circulated in due time, as provided for by the Rules of Procedure, to allow for adequate preparation of the meeting.

196. Mr Glowka pledged that the flow of documentation for MOS2 would be reviewed and that the CU would be looking at the lessons learned from MOS2. He expressed sincere appreciation to Norway for hosting the meeting and for providing significant financial and in-kind support. Thanks were also due to the Governments of Germany and the Netherlands, as well as Environment Agency - Abu Dhabi for their support. Special thanks were due to colleagues from the NEA who had helped behind the scenes, as well as to the interpreters, report writers and Earth Negotiations Bulletin team.

197. The Chair stated that it had been a pleasure for the NEA, representing Government of Norway to host the meeting and to work with the CU and CMS Office - Abu Dhabi in the preparatory phase. On behalf of the meeting he wished Nick Williams a speedy recovery. Norway had tried to ensure that the conditions for effective work were as good as possible. Norway had also noted the scope to improve the timeliness of document production. He echoed the earlier call for engagement with other sectors and people not involved in conservation and engaged in activities detrimental to the species that the MOU sought to protect, and to avoid only 'preaching to the converted'. In closing, he wished all participants a safe trip home.

198. The closure of the formal meeting session at mid-day was followed by two side events: *Conservation issues of Malagasy migratory birds of prey, organized* by the Ministry of Environment, Madagascar (presented by Mr Amyot Felix Kofoky); and *Quantifying, monitoring and tackling illegal killing and taking of birds in the Mediterranean and beyond*, organized by BirdLife International with contributions from Salim Hamadeh, Borja Heredia, Vicky Jones, Janusz Sielicki and Mátyás Prommer. The presentations were followed by a discussion on how to maximize benefits for raptors from the CMS IKB Task Force including through engagement of the Raptors MOU.

Annex I

**RULES OF PROCEDURE
FOR MEETINGS OF SIGNATORIES TO THE RAPTORS MOU**

(as amended by and adopted at MOS2)

Rule 1 – Purpose

1. These Rules of Procedure shall apply to the Meeting of Signatories to the Memorandum on the Conservation of Migratory Birds of Prey in African and Eurasia, hereinafter referred to as the “MoU”, convened in accordance with Paragraph 13 of the MoU.
2. Insofar as they are applicable, these Rules shall apply *mutatis mutandis* to any other meeting held in the framework of the MoU that does not have its own terms of reference or rules of procedure.

Rule 2 – Meetings of the Signatories

1. Meetings of the Signatories (MoS) shall take place once every three years, unless the MoS decides otherwise.
2. At each meeting, the MoS shall decide on the date, venue and duration of its next meeting.
3. Unless there is an offer from a Signatory, the MoS shall take place at the seat of the Coordinating Unit or another United Nations duty station taking into consideration cost-effectiveness.
4. The Coordinating Unit shall notify the venue and the dates of each MoS at least six months before the meeting is due to commence. The notification shall include a deadline for submission of proposals to be discussed at the meeting.
5. Documents for MoS shall be made available at least thirty days before the start of the meeting.

Rule 3 – Signatories

1. Each Signatory to the MoU, hereinafter referred to as a “Signatory”, shall be entitled to be represented at the meeting by a delegation consisting of a Head of Delegation and such Alternative Representative(s) and Advisers as the Signatory may deem necessary.
2. The Representative of a Signatory shall exercise the voting rights of that Signatory. In their absence, an Alternative Representative of that Signatory shall act in their place over the full range of their functions.
3. Logistical and other limitations may require that no more than three delegates of any Signatory be present at the meeting. The Coordinating Unit shall notify Signatories of any such limitations in advance of the meeting.

Rule 4 – Observers

1. The United Nations, its Specialized Agencies, and any State not a Signatory to the MoU may be represented at the meeting by Observers who shall have the right to participate but not to vote.
2. Co-operating Partners that have signed the MoU shall have the right to participate but not to vote.

3. Any agency or body technically qualified in the protection, conservation and management of migratory birds of prey, and which has informed the Coordinating Unit of its desire to be represented at the meeting by Observers, shall be permitted to be represented unless at least one-third of the Signatories present object. Once admitted, these Observers shall have the right to participate but not to vote.
4. Bodies and agencies desiring to be represented at the meeting by Observers shall submit the names of their representatives to the Coordinating Unit prior to the opening of the meeting.
5. Logistical and other limitations may require that no more than two Observers from any non-Signatory State, body or agency be present at the meeting. The Coordinating Unit shall notify Observers of any such limitations in advance of the meeting.

Rule 5 – Credentials

1. The Head of Delegation, any Alternative Representative(s) or other members of the delegation of a Signatory shall have been granted permission by, or on behalf of, an appropriate authority, being the Minister of the focal Ministry for the MoU or a higher body, or the competent authority of any Regional Economic Integration Organization (REIO), enabling the delegation to fully represent the Signatory at the meeting and to vote.
2. The credentials shall include: the full title and date of the meeting; a full list of representatives authorized to represent the Signatory and to transact all such matters with an indication of who is the Head of Delegation; a full signature of the appropriate authority as indicated above and printed on official letterhead, preferably with a seal, clearly indicating that the credentials have been issued by the appropriate authority. Prior to the Meeting, the Coordinating Unit shall provide a credentials template as an example.
3. The credentials shall be submitted in their original form to the Coordinating Unit within 24 hours of the start of the meeting. If credentials are presented in a language other than one of the two working languages of the MoU they shall be accompanied by an official translation into English or French.
4. The secretariat, in consultation with the Chair or the Vice-Chair, shall examine the credentials submitted and report to the MoS thereon for final approval. Pending a decision on their credentials, delegates may participate provisionally at the meeting.

Rule 6 – Secretariat

The Coordinating Unit shall service and act as secretariat for the meeting.

Rule 7 – Officers

At its first plenary session the meeting shall appoint a Chair and a Vice-Chair.

Rule 8 – Seating

Delegations shall be seated in accordance with standard United Nations practice which uses the alphabetical order of the full official names of the Signatories in the English language.

Rule 9 - Quorum

No MoS shall take place in the absence of a quorum. A quorum for a MoS shall consist of one quarter of the Signatories. A quorum for plenary sessions shall consist of one-half of the Signatories having delegations at the MoS.

Rule 10 – Speakers

1. The Chair shall call upon speakers in the order in which they indicate their desire to speak, with precedence given to Signatories, followed by non-Signatory Range States, Co-operating Partners and other Observers, in that order. A Representative of a Signatory or an Observer may speak only if called upon by the Chair, who may call a speaker to order if the remarks are not relevant to the subject under discussion.
2. The Chair may, in the course of discussion at the meeting, propose to the meeting *inter alia*:
 - (a) Time limits for speakers;
 - (b) Limitations on the number of times members of a Signatory's delegation or Observers may speak on any subject;
 - (c) The closure of the list of speakers;
 - (d) The adjournment or the closure of the debate on the particular subject under discussion;
 - (e) The suspension or adjournment of the meeting.
3. The Chair, in the exercise of the functions of that office, remains under the authority of the MoS.

Rule 11 – Procedural Motions

During the discussion of any matter, a delegate representing a Signatory may make a point of order. The point of order shall be immediately decided by the Chair. A delegate representing a Signatory may appeal against any ruling of the Chair. The appeal shall immediately be put to a vote, and the Chair's ruling shall stand unless a majority of the Signatories present and voting decides otherwise.

Rule 12 – Voting

1. The Signatories shall make every effort to reach agreement on all matters of substance by consensus. If all efforts to reach consensus have been exhausted and no agreement reached, subject to paragraph 4 below, the decision shall, as a last resort, be taken by a two-thirds majority vote of the Signatories present. Votes on procedural matters shall be decided by a simple majority of votes cast.
2. Without prejudice to the provisions of Rule 3, paragraph 2, each Representative duly accredited according to Rule 5 shall have one vote. Regional Economic Integration Organizations that are Signatories to this MoU shall, in matters within their competence, exercise their voting rights with a number of votes equal to the number of their Member States which are Signatories to the MoU. An REIO shall not exercise its right to vote if its Member States exercise theirs, and vice versa.
3. The meeting shall vote by a show of hands. The Chair may in an exceptional case request a roll-call vote. The roll-call vote shall be taken in the seating order of the delegations.
4. Decisions on financial matters and on amendments to the MoU shall be taken by consensus.

Rule 13 – Committees and Working Groups

1. The MoS may establish such Committees and Working Groups as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions.
2. Unless otherwise decided, each Committee and Working Group shall elect its own officers. As a general rule, sessions of Committees and Working Groups shall be open to Signatories and Observers, unless the Chair of the Committee or Working Group, on request of a Signatory, determines otherwise.

Rule 14 – Languages

1. English and French, the working languages of the MoU, shall be the working languages of the meeting. Interventions made in one of the working languages shall be interpreted into the other working language. The official documents of the meeting shall be produced in both working languages.
2. A delegate may speak in a language other than a working language. They shall be responsible for providing interpretation into a working language, and interpretation into the other working language may be based upon that interpretation. Any document submitted to the Coordinating Unit in any language other than a working language shall be accompanied by an appropriate translation into one of the working languages.
3. Interpretation shall not be provided during meetings of the Committees or Working Groups, unless resources are made available for that purpose

Rule 15 – Records

Summary records of the MoS in English and French shall be circulated.

Rule 16 – Amendments to the MoU

1. The MoU (including the Annexes thereto) may be amended at any session of the MoS.
2. Proposals for amendment may only be made by one or more Signatories or by the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) to the Raptors MoU.
3. The process and timing for submission of proposals for amendment is as follows:
 - (a) The text of any proposed amendment, with supporting rationale included, and if appropriate, supporting scientific evidence, shall be provided by Signatories to the Coordinating Unit at least 150 days before the MoS or by the TAG at least 90 days before the MoS at which it is to be considered.
 - (b) The Coordinating Unit shall, within 14 days of receipt, communicate the proposal to all Signatories, and, in the case of technical amendments, to the TAG.
 - (c) Comments on the proposed amendment may be provided to the Coordinating Unit by Signatories or by TAG up to 60 days before the MoS.
 - (d) The Coordinating Unit shall communicate any comments received to the Signatories as soon as possible after receipt.

Rule 17 – Procedure

These Rules of Procedure shall enter into effect immediately after their adoption. Amendments to these Rules shall be adopted by consensus by the MoS.

Rule 18 – Authority

In the event of a conflict between any provision of these rules and any clause of the MoU, the MoU shall prevail.

Annex II

MEMBERS OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY GROUP OF THE RAPTORS MOU

Regional Representatives:

Africa

Mr. André Botha
Dr. Neil Deacon
Dr. Lily-Arison René de Roland

Asia

Mr. Nyambayar Batbayar
Mr. Umeed Khalid

Europe

Mr. Mátyás Prommer
Prof. Des Thompson
Dr. Jari Valkama

Middle East & North Africa

Dr. Sàlim Javed
Mr. Sadegh Sadeghi Zadegan

Experts:

Mr. Fernando Feás
Dr. Vibhu Prakash
Prof. Mohammed Shobrak
Dr. Jean-Marc Thiollay
Dr. Munir Virani

BirdLife International (IUCN nominated Red List authority on birds):

Dr. Vicky Jones

Annex III

WORK PLAN FOR THE TAG UNTIL THE THIRD MEETING OF SIGNATORIES

Task
MoU – Activity 1: Improvement of legal protection
1. Consider amendments adopted by MoS2 to Annex 1 (species) and amend Table 3 (sites) of the Action Plan, and in particular:
a) consider further possible candidate Annex 1 species in light of changes to their status as placed under Categories 1, 2 and 3 on basis of global population trends, and categorisation of existing Annex 1 species;
b) consider further comments from the Signatories, make recommendations as to the updating of Table 3 of the Action Plan;
c) consider any further changes to the geographic coverage of Annex 2 of the MoU.
2. Consider any further changes on raptor taxonomy and nomenclature in relation to species listings within the MoU, having regard to CMS Resolution 11.19.
Threats – Activity 2: Protect and/or manage important sites and flyways
3. Assess and review threats to Annex 1 species and make recommendations on appropriate measures to alleviate these problems prioritising work on the most threatened species and exploring funding and other avenues to stimulate the development of international species action plans.
4. Consider the need for guidance on species re-introduction measures specific to raptors, and in particular:
a) advise on any opportunities for international co-operation related to possible re-introduction programmes; and,
b) advise the Saker Falcon Task Force, as appropriate.
5. Advise on gaps in current information on key breeding areas, stop-over, refuelling, bottleneck, other congregational and non-breeding sites along raptor flyways, and:
a) make recommendations on how these might be filled, and
b) advise on appropriate approaches for the conservation and management of critical areas.
6. Building on existing reviews and exchanges of information with Signatories concerning the negative impacts on raptors arising from collision and electrocution from power-lines, make recommendations to Signatories as to the best means of engaging with the power generation and distribution sectors to address these impacts.
7. Exchange guidance related to the mitigation of negative impacts of other energy generation sectors (e.g. wind and solar), and make recommendations to Signatories to address impacts.

Task
8. Provide recommendations on approaches to tackling the issue of illegal persecution including:
a) the value of technologies such as electronic tracking methods as means of assessing the extent and location of persecution hotspots, x-ray monitoring, and DNA techniques;
b) possible approaches to conflict resolution – where conflicts with other interests may be an ultimate driver for illegal killing; and,
c) possible approaches to addressing persecution where illegal killing may be a long-standing practice with cultural elements.
Habitat conservation and management – Activity 3: Raise awareness of issues and guidance
9. Contribute scientific and technical advice on issues and good practice brought to attention of TAG by Signatories to support (a) conservation and management activities and promulgation of guidance, and (b) capacity building to develop guidance, practices and other activities.
Poisoning – Activity 4: Raise awareness of problems faced by birds of prey and measures needed to conserve them
10. Contribute technical expertise on raptors and their poisoning to the work of the CMS Preventing Poisoning Working Group and CMS Energy Task Force.
11. Make recommendations on priorities for raising awareness of raptor conservation needs in different regions.
Guidance – Activity 5: Monitor bird of prey populations, carry out conservation research and take appropriate remedial measures
12. Make recommendations as to the crucial needs for common standards for methods, drawing from a review of national experiences and good practices, to:
a) estimate the size of raptor populations;
b) undertake monitoring of populations and migratory patterns; and,
c) assess the threats, current conservation actions (including existing protective designations at sites), condition of habitats, and thus consequent need for further management and protection measures at important sites.
13. Develop further appropriate mechanisms for the sharing of data on raptors for the better implementation of the MoU's objectives.
Reporting – Activity 6: Supporting measures and horizon scanning
14. Advise the MoS and CU on the perilous state of vultures, noting MoS2 concerns, and provide inputs to multi-species action planning.
15. Report on issues of concern and for action relating to conservation, management, science and awareness-raising on the horizon, and advise on new conservation practices.

Task
16. Develop an interim National Reporting Form, linked to the CMS Online Reporting System.
17. Advise on the integration of national reporting with strategic planning processes.
18. Review the MoU's Action Plan (Annex 3 of the MoU) in advance of MoS3.
19. Support and advise the various CMS Task Forces, as appropriate.
20. Support other relevant scientific and technical actions for the Raptors MoU listed in the Programme of Work on Migratory Birds and Flyways (CMS Resolution 11.14).

Annex IV

ANNEX 1 OF THE RAPTORS MOU

LIST OF AFRICAN-EURASIAN MIGRATORY BIRDS OF PREY

(as amended by the Second Meeting of Signatories in 2015)

*Effective: 6 October 2015***FALCONIFORMES*****Pandionidae****Pandion haliaetus* Osprey***Accipitridae***

<i>Chelictinia riocourii</i>	Scissor-tailed Kite
<i>Pernis apivorus</i>	European Honey-buzzard
<i>Pernis ptilorhynchus</i>	Oriental Honey-buzzard
<i>Aviceda cuculoides</i>	African Cuckoo-hawk
<i>Aviceda jerdoni</i>	Jerdon's Baza
<i>Aviceda leuphotes</i>	Black Baza
<i>Gypaetus barbatus</i>	Bearded Vulture
<i>Neophron percnopterus</i>	Egyptian Vulture
<i>Circaetus gallicus</i>	Short-toed Snake-eagle
<i>Circaetus beaudouini</i>	Beaudouin's Snake-eagle
<i>Circaetus pectoralis</i>	Black-chested Snake-eagle
<i>Circaetus cinereus</i>	Brown Snake-eagle
<i>Sarcogyps calvus</i>	Red-headed Vulture
<i>Trigonoceps occipitalis</i>	White-headed Vulture
<i>Necrosyrtes monachus</i>	Hooded Vulture
<i>Gyps himalayensis</i>	Himalayan Griffon
<i>Gyps bengalensis</i>	White-rumped Vulture
<i>Gyps africanus</i>	White-backed Vulture
<i>Gyps indicus</i>	Indian Vulture
<i>Gyps tenuirostris</i>	Slender-billed Vulture
<i>Gyps coprotheres</i>	Cape Vulture
<i>Gyps rueppelli</i>	Rüppell's Vulture
<i>Gyps fulvus</i>	Griffon Vulture
<i>Aegypius monachus</i>	Cinereous Vulture
<i>Torgos tracheliotos</i>	Lappet-faced Vulture
<i>Nisaetus nipalensis</i>	Mountain Hawk-eagle
<i>Clanga pomarina</i>	Lesser Spotted Eagle
<i>Clanga clanga</i>	Greater Spotted Eagle
<i>Aquila rapax</i>	Tawny Eagle
<i>Aquila nipalensis</i>	Steppe Eagle

<i>Aquila adalberti</i>	Spanish Imperial Eagle
<i>Aquila heliaca</i>	Eastern Imperial Eagle
<i>Aquila chrysaetos</i>	Golden Eagle
<i>Hieraaetus wahlbergi</i>	Wahlberg's Eagle
<i>Hieraaetus pennatus</i>	Booted Eagle
<i>Hieraaetus ayresii</i>	Ayres's Hawk-eagle
<i>Circus aeruginosus</i>	Western Marsh-harrier
<i>Circus spilonotus</i>	Eastern Marsh-harrier
<i>Circus maurus</i>	Black Harrier
<i>Circus cyaneus</i>	Hen Harrier
<i>Circus macrourus</i>	Pallid Harrier
<i>Circus melanoleucos</i>	Pied Harrier
<i>Circus pygargus</i>	Montagu's Harrier
<i>Accipiter badius</i>	Shikra
<i>Accipiter brevipes</i>	Levant Sparrowhawk
<i>Accipiter soloensis</i>	Chinese Sparrowhawk
<i>Accipiter gularis</i>	Japanese Sparrowhawk
<i>Accipiter virgatus</i>	Besra
<i>Accipiter ovampensis</i>	Ovambo Sparrowhawk
<i>Accipiter nisus</i>	Eurasian Sparrowhawk
<i>Accipiter gentilis</i>	Northern Goshawk
<i>Haliaeetus leucoryphus</i>	Pallas's Fish-eagle
<i>Haliaeetus albicilla</i>	White-tailed Sea-eagle
<i>Haliaeetus pelagicus</i>	Steller's Sea-eagle
<i>Milvus milvus</i>	Red Kite
<i>Milvus migrans</i>	Black Kite
<i>Butastur rufipennis</i>	Grasshopper Buzzard
<i>Butastur indicus</i>	Grey-faced Buzzard
<i>Buteo lagopus</i>	Rough-legged Buzzard
<i>Buteo auguralis</i>	Red-necked Buzzard
<i>Buteo buteo</i>	Eurasian Buzzard
<i>Buteo japonicus</i>	Japanese Buzzard
<i>Buteo trizonatus</i>	Forest Buzzard
<i>Buteo rufinus</i>	Long-legged Buzzard
<i>Buteo hemilasius</i>	Upland Buzzard
<i>Falconidae</i>	
<i>Falco naumanni</i>	Lesser Kestrel
<i>Falco tinnunculus</i>	Common Kestrel
<i>Falco alopex</i>	Fox Kestrel
<i>Falco vespertinus</i>	Red-footed Falcon
<i>Falco amurensis</i>	Amur Falcon
<i>Falco eleonora</i>	Eleonora's Falcon
<i>Falco concolor</i>	Sooty Falcon
<i>Falco columbarius</i>	Merlin

<i>Falco subbuteo</i>	Eurasian Hobby
<i>Falco cuvierii</i>	African Hobby
<i>Falco severus</i>	Oriental Hobby
<i>Falco biarmicus</i>	Lanner Falcon
<i>Falco cherrug</i>	Saker Falcon
<i>Falco rusticolus</i>	Gyrfalcon
<i>Falco peregrinus</i>	Peregrine Falcon

STRIGIFORMES

Strigidae

<i>Ninox scutulata</i>	Brown Boobook
<i>Surnia ulula</i>	Northern Hawk-owl
<i>Aegolius funereus</i>	Boreal Owl
<i>Otus scops</i>	Eurasian Scops-owl
<i>Otus brucei</i>	Pallid Scops-owl
<i>Otus sunia</i>	Oriental Scops-owl
<i>Asio otus</i>	Northern Long-eared Owl
<i>Asio flammeus</i>	Short-eared Owl
<i>Asio capensis</i>	Marsh Owl
<i>Strix uralensis</i>	Ural Owl
<i>Strix nebulosa</i>	Great Grey Owl
<i>Bubo scandiacus</i>	Snowy Owl

Annex V

ANNEX 2 OF THE RAPTORS MOU

Map of the area included within this Memorandum of Understanding

(as amended by the Second Meeting of Signatories in 2015)

Effective: 6 October 2015



Only those Range States and territories listed below, and shown in black on this map, are included within the scope of this MoU.

Afrotropical realm		
Angola	Ethiopia	Rwanda
Benin	Gabon	São Tomé and Príncipe
Botswana	Gambia	Senegal
Burkina Faso	Ghana	Seychelles
Burundi	Guinea	Sierra Leone
Cabo Verde	Guinea-Bissau	Somalia
Cameroon	Kenya	South Africa
Central African Republic	Lesotho	South Sudan
Chad	Liberia	Sudan
Comoros	Madagascar	Swaziland
Congo	Malawi	Togo
Côte d'Ivoire	Mali	Uganda
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Mauritius	United Republic of Tanzania
Djibouti	Mozambique	Zambia
Equatorial Guinea	Namibia	Zimbabwe
Eritrea	Niger	
	Nigeria	

Palaearctic realm		
Afghanistan	Israel	Serbia
Albania	Italy	Slovakia
Algeria	Jordan	Slovenia
Andorra	Kazakhstan	Spain, including the Canary Islands
Armenia	Kuwait	Sweden
Austria	Kyrgyzstan	Switzerland
Azerbaijan	Latvia	Syrian Arab Republic
Bahrain	Lebanon	Tajikistan
Belarus	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
Belgium	Liechtenstein	Tunisia
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Lithuania	Turkey
Bulgaria	Luxembourg	Turkmenistan
China	Malta	Ukraine
Croatia	Mauritania	United Arab Emirates
Cyprus	Moldova	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, including the Bailiwick of Guernsey, the Bailiwick of Jersey, the Isle of Man, Gibraltar and the Sovereign Base Areas in Cyprus (Akrotiri and Okeheia)
Czech Republic	Monaco	Uzbekistan
Denmark, including Faroe Islands and Greenland	Mongolia	Vatican City
Egypt	Montenegro	Yemen
Estonia	Morocco	
Finland, including Åland Islands	Netherlands	
France, including Mayotte and Réunion	Norway, including Svalbard and Jan Mayen Islands	
Georgia	Oman	
Germany	Palestinian Authority Territories	
Greece	Poland	
Hungary	Portugal	
Iceland	Qatar	
Iran	Romania	
Iraq	Russia	
Ireland	San Marino	
	Saudi Arabia	
Indo-Malayan realm		
Bangladesh	India	Pakistan
Bhutan	Nepal	Sri Lanka

Annex VI

TABLE 1 OF ANNEX 3 OF THE RAPTORS MOU

Table 1: Categorisation of African-Eurasian birds of prey covered by the Action Plan²⁶**Category 1**

Scientific name	Vernacular name	Global Red List status ²⁷
<i>Gypaetus barbatus</i>	Bearded Vulture	NT
<i>Neophron percnopterus</i>	Egyptian Vulture	EN
<i>Circaetus beaudouini</i>	Beaudouin's Snake-eagle	VU
<i>Sarcogyps calvus</i>	Red-headed Vulture	CR
<i>Trigonoceps occipitalis</i>	White-headed Vulture	CR
<i>Necrosyrtes monachus</i>	Hooded Vulture	CR
<i>Gyps himalayensis</i>	Himalayan Griffon	NT
<i>Gyps bengalensis</i>	White-rumped Vulture	CR
<i>Gyps africanus</i>	White-backed Vulture	CR
<i>Gyps indicus</i>	Indian Vulture	CR
<i>Gyps tenuirostris</i>	Slender-billed Vulture	CR
<i>Gyps coprotheres</i>	Cape Vulture	EN
<i>Gyps rueppelli</i>	Rüppell's Vulture	CR
<i>Aegypius monachus</i>	Cinereous Vulture	NT
<i>Torgos tracheliotos</i>	Lappet-faced Vulture	EN
<i>Clanga clanga</i>	Greater Spotted Eagle	VU
<i>Aquila nipalensis</i>	Steppe Eagle	EN
<i>Aquila adalberti</i>	Spanish Imperial Eagle	VU
<i>Aquila heliaca</i>	Eastern Imperial Eagle	VU
<i>Circus maurus</i>	Black Harrier	VU
<i>Circus macrourus</i>	Pallid Harrier	NT
<i>Haliaeetus leucoryphus</i>	Pallas's Fish-eagle	VU
<i>Haliaeetus pelagicus</i>	Steller's Sea-eagle	VU
<i>Milvus milvus</i>	Red Kite	NT
<i>Falco vespertinus</i>	Red-footed Falcon	NT
<i>Falco concolor</i>	Sooty Falcon	NT
<i>Falco cherrug</i>	Saker Falcon	EN

²⁶ Based on Annex 1 as amended by the Second Meeting of Signatories in 2015 and effective on 6 October 2015.

²⁷ Globally threatened and Near Threatened species according to the Global Red List (2015) defined by IUCN and listed on BirdLife International's World Bird and Biodiversity Database (CR =Critically Endangered, EN = Endangered; VU = Vulnerable; NT = Near Threatened).

Category 2²⁸

Scientific name	Vernacular name
<i>Chelictinia riocourii</i>	Scissor-tailed Kite
<i>Pernis apivorus</i>	European Honey-buzzard
<i>Aviceda jerdoni</i>	Jerdon's Baza
<i>Aviceda leuphotes</i>	Black Baza
<i>Nisaetus nipalensis</i>	Mountain Hawk-eagle
<i>Aquila rapax</i>	Tawny Eagle
<i>Circus cyaneus</i>	Hen Harrier
<i>Circus melanoleucos</i>	Pied Harrier
<i>Circus pygargus</i>	Montagu's Harrier
<i>Accipiter badius</i>	Shikra
<i>Accipiter soloensis</i>	Chinese Sparrowhawk
<i>Accipiter virgatus</i>	Besra
<i>Milvus migrans</i>	Black Kite
<i>Butastur rufipennis</i>	Grasshopper Buzzard
<i>Butastur indicus</i>	Grey-faced Buzzard
<i>Falco naumanni</i>	Lesser Kestrel
<i>Falco tinnunculus</i>	Common Kestrel
<i>Falco subbuteo</i>	Eurasian Hobby
<i>Falco cuvierii</i>	African Hobby
<i>Falco severus</i>	Oriental Hobby
<i>Falco biarmicus</i>	Lanner Falcon
<i>Ninox scutulata</i>	Brown Boobook
<i>Otus scops</i>	Eurasian Scops-owl
<i>Otus brucei</i>	Pallid Scops-owl
<i>Asio otus</i>	Northern Long-eared Owl
<i>Asio flammeus</i>	Short-eared Owl
<i>Bubo scandiacus</i>	Snowy Owl

²⁸ Species that are considered to have Unfavourable Conservation Status at a regional level within the area (defined in Annex 2) of the MoU. Effectively this comprises Annex 1 species which are Least Concern on the Global IUCN Red List, but are either:

- Listed as threatened or Near Threatened on the European Red List of Birds (2015); or,
- On the basis of BirdLife International data 2015, would meet criteria to be considered as Species of European Conservation Concern -SPEC1, SPEC2 or SPEC 3 (as in BirdLife International (2004) Birds in Europe: population estimates, trends and conservation status. Cambridge, UK: BirdLife International Conservation Series No. 12); or,
- Have a declining global population trend according to the Birdlife International database 2015.

Category 3²⁹

Scientific name	Vernacular name
<i>Pandion haliaetus</i>	Osprey
<i>Pernis ptilorhynchus</i>	Oriental Honey-buzzard
<i>Aviceda cuculoides</i>	African Cuckoo-hawk
<i>Circaetus gallicus</i>	Short-toed Snake-eagle
<i>Circaetus pectoralis</i>	Black-chested Snake-eagle
<i>Circaetus cinereus</i>	Brown Snake-eagle
<i>Gyps fulvus</i>	Griffon Vulture
<i>Clanga pomarina</i>	Lesser Spotted Eagle
<i>Aquila chrysaetos</i>	Golden Eagle
<i>Hieraaetus wahlbergi</i>	Wahlberg's Eagle
<i>Hieraaetus pennatus</i>	Booted Eagle
<i>Hieraaetus ayresii</i>	Ayres's Hawk-eagle
<i>Circus aeruginosus</i>	Western Marsh-harrier
<i>Circus spilonotus</i>	Eastern Marsh-harrier
<i>Accipiter brevipes</i>	Levant Sparrowhawk
<i>Accipiter gularis</i>	Japanese Sparrowhawk
<i>Accipiter ovampensis</i>	Ovambo Sparrowhawk
<i>Accipiter nisus</i>	Eurasian Sparrowhawk
<i>Accipiter gentilis</i>	Northern Goshawk
<i>Haliaeetus albicilla</i>	White-tailed Sea-eagle
<i>Buteo lagopus</i>	Rough-legged Buzzard
<i>Buteo auguralis</i>	Red-necked Buzzard
<i>Buteo buteo</i>	Eurasian Buzzard
<i>Buteo japonicus</i>	Japanese Buzzard
<i>Buteo trizonatus</i>	Forest Buzzard
<i>Buteo rufinus</i>	Long-legged Buzzard
<i>Buteo hemilasius</i>	Upland Buzzard
<i>Falco alopex</i>	Fox Kestrel
<i>Falco amurensis</i>	Amur Falcon
<i>Falco eleonora</i>	Eleonora's Falcon
<i>Falco columbarius</i>	Merlin
<i>Falco rusticolus</i>	Gyrfalcon
<i>Falco peregrinus</i>	Peregrine Falcon
<i>Surnia ulula</i>	Northern Hawk-owl
<i>Aegolius funereus</i>	Boreal Owl
<i>Otus sunia</i>	Oriental Scops-owl
<i>Asio capensis</i>	Marsh Owl
<i>Strix uralensis</i>	Ural Owl
<i>Strix nebulosa</i>	Great Grey Owl

²⁹ All other migratory species.

Annex VII

**ESTIMATED VOLUNTARY ASSESSED ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS BY SIGNATORIES
TO GENERATE US\$ 150,000**

Signatory	Current UN Scale	Fixed Contributions	Revised Scale (adjusted to 100%)	Assessment Scale	Average annual contribution (USD)
Angola	0,01		0,028	0,028	42
Armenia	0,007		0,019	0,019	29
Belgium	0,998		2,778	2,778	4.166
Burundi	0,001		0,003	0,003	4
Chad	0,002		0,006	0,006	8
Congo	0,005		0,014	0,014	21
Congo, Democratic Republic of the	0,003		0,008	0,008	13
Czech Republic	0,386		1,074	1,074	1.611
Denmark	0,675		1,879	1,879	2.818
Djibouti	0,001		0,003	0,003	4
Egypt	0,134		0,373	0,373	559
Equatorial Guinea	0,01		0,028	0,028	42
European Union	-	2,5	0,000	2,500	3.750
Finland	0,519		1,444	1,444	2.167
France	5,593		15,566	15,566	23.349
Gambia	0,001		0,003	0,003	4
Germany	7,141		19,874	19,874	29.811
Ghana	0,014		0,039	0,039	58
Guinea	0,001		0,003	0,003	4
Hungary	0,266		0,740	0,740	1.110
Iran	0,356		0,991	0,991	1.486
Italy	4,448		12,379	12,379	18.569
Kenya	0,013		0,036	0,036	54
Lebanon	0,042		0,117	0,117	175
Libya	0,142		0,395	0,395	593
Luxembourg	0,081		0,225	0,225	338
Madagascar	0,003		0,008	0,008	13
Mali	0,004		0,011	0,011	17
Monaco	0,012		0,033	0,033	50
Mongolia	0,003		0,008	0,008	13
Morocco	0,062		0,173	0,173	259
Nepal	0,006		0,017	0,017	25
Netherlands	1,654		4,603	4,603	6.905
Niger	0,002		0,006	0,006	8
Norway	0,851		2,368	2,368	3.553
Pakistan	0,085		0,237	0,237	355
Portugal	0,474		1,319	1,319	1.979
Romania	0,226		0,629	0,629	943
Senegal	0,006		0,017	0,017	25
Slovakia	0,171		0,476	0,476	714
Somalia	0,001		0,003	0,003	4
South Africa	0,372		1,035	1,035	1.553
Spain	2,973		8,274	8,274	12.411
Sudan	0,01		0,028	0,028	42
Sweden	0,96		2,672	2,672	4.008
Switzerland	1,047		2,914	2,914	4.371
Syrian Arab Republic	0,036		0,100	0,100	150
Togo	0,001		0,003	0,003	4
Tunisia	0,036		0,100	0,100	150
United Arab Emirates	0		0,000	0,000	0
United Kingdom	5,179		14,414	14,414	21.620
Yemen	0,01		0,028	0,028	42
TOTAL	35,033	2,5	97,5	100,000	\$ 150.000

Annex VIII

**SUMMARY LIST OF KEY OUTCOMES
OF THE SECOND MEETING OF SIGNATORIES TO THE RAPTORS MOU**

1. Welcomed Comoros as 53rd Signatory to Raptors MOU.
2. Amended Rules 5 (Credentials) and 16 (Amendments to the MOU) of the Rules of Procedure.
3. Urged Signatories to nominate a National Contact Point and supply details to the Coordinating Unit by 31 December 2015.
4. Encouraged Signatories, Range States, partners and stakeholders to work collaboratively to mobilize resources, including by voluntary financial and in-kind contributions such as technical support, to implement SakerGAP and other key initiatives.
5. Recognised CMS Resolutions (11.15 (Poisoning); 11.16 (Illegal killing, taking and trade); 11.18 (SakerGAP); 11.27 (Renewable Energy)) and urged Signatories to support implementation of their related guidelines and task forces.
6. Urged Signatories, Range States, partners, stakeholders and other interested parties to actively engage in and support MOU Action Plan implementation, including by developing National or Regional Strategies or equivalent documents by no later than 31 December 2016.
7. Recognised that the Raptors MOU Action Plan's 34 sub-Activities contribute directly to all five Goals and almost comprehensively support the 16 Targets established in CMS Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015–2023.
8. Endorsed the CMS Strategic Plan for Migratory Species and resolved to take action to raise awareness and to promote its implementation.
9. MOS2 asked the TAG with facilitating the development of an African-Eurasian Vulture Multi-species Action Plan for adoption at CMS COP12 in 2017 and MOS3 in 2018. The CU was asked write to Signatories and non-signatory Range States with regard to the MSAP.
10. Took note of the TAG Work Plan until MOS3.
11. Recognised that the documentation under Agenda Item 14.1. (Proposals for Amendments to the Raptors MoU and/or its Annexes) had been circulated late and not within the deadline foreseen in the MOU's Rules of Procedure.
12. Approved as a one-off exception to the Rules of Procedure the amendments recommended by TAG to Annex 1 of the MOU (List of African-Eurasian Migratory Birds of Prey) and Annex 3 Table 1 of the Action Plan (Categorisation of African-Eurasian birds of prey covered by the Action Plan).
13. Approved as a one-off exception to the Rules of Procedure the amended geographical scope of the MoU to include South Sudan in the Range State list found in Annex 2 of the MOU.
14. Took note of the proposals made by the TAG to amend Table 3 of the Action Plan (Provisional list of Important Bird Areas that are currently known to be important congregatory bird of prey sites in Africa and Eurasia).

15. Further noted that the proposed amended list of sites could be used by Signatories to prepare national or regional strategies or equivalent documents.
16. Requested further review by TAG of the proposed amended list of sites taking into consideration the amendments to the MoU made to Annex 1 (List of African-Eurasian Migratory Birds of Prey) and the Range State List in Annex 2 (Map of the area included within this Memorandum of Understanding) as adopted by MOS2.
17. Instructed the Coordinating Unit to circulate the revised proposed amended list of sites to Signatories for comment at least 150 days prior to the MOS to allow adequate consultation and feedback in anticipation of their consideration by MOS3 for adoption.
18. Approved a new TAG membership proposed by the selection panel.
19. Thanked Environment Agency - Abu Dhabi for its generous financial and in-kind contribution on behalf of the Government of the United Arab Emirates.
20. Accepted a scale of assessment for voluntary contributions. Invoicing will be reviewed by the CU in consultation with the CMS Secretariat in Bonn.

Annex IX

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

SIGNATORIES / SIGNATAIRES

ANGOLA

Mr. Miguel Xavier
 Technician
 Instituto Nacional da Biodiversidade e Areas de
 Conservação (INBAC)
 Luanda
 Email: miguel_xavier2003@yahoo.com.br

CHAD / TCHAD

M. Mahamat Hassane Idriss
 Point Focal Rapace
 Direction Générale de l'environnement
 Ministère de l'Agriculture et de l'Environnement
 Ndjamena
 Email: mhthassane@hotmail.fr

CZECH REPUBLIC / RÉPUBLIQUE TCHÈQUE

Ms. Libuše Vlasáková
 Department of Species Protection and
 Implementation of International Commitments
 Unit of International Conventions
 Ministry of the Environment
 Prague
 Email: libuse.vlasakova@mzp.cz

Mr. Václav Beran
 Manager
 Muzeum města Ústí nad Labem
 Ústí nad Labem
 Email: lutra@email.cz

**DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO /
RÉPUBLIQUE DÉMOCRATIQUE DU CONGO**

M. Mike Ipanga Mwaku
 Head of Division
 Directorate of Sustainable Development
 Ministry of Environment and Sustainable
 Development, Biodiversity Division
 Kinshasa
 Email: mikeipanga@yahoo.fr

FINLAND / FINLANDE

Dr. Esko Hyvärinen
 Senior Environmental Adviser
 Ministry of the Environment
 Helsinki
 Email: esko.o.hyvarinen@ymparisto.fi

FRANCE

M. Philippe Constantin
 Chargé de mission
 MEDDE/DREAL Aquitaine
 Bordeaux
 Email: philippe.constantin@developpement-durable.gouv.fr

GHANA

Mr. Nana Kofi Adu-Nsiah
 Executive Director
 Wildlife Division of Forestry Commission
 Accra
 Email: adunsiah@yahoo.com

HUNGARY / HONGRIE

Mr. András Schmidt
 Deputy Head Department for Nature Conservation
 Ministry of Agriculture
 Budapest
 Email: andras.schmidt@fm.gov.hu

Mr. Mátyás Prommer
 Conservation Expert
 Ministry of Agriculture
 Budapest
 Email: prommerm@hoi.hu

**IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF) / IRAN (RÉPUBLIQUE
ISLAMIQUE D')**

Mr. Sadegh Sadeghi Zadegan
 Head of Ornithology Unit
 Department of Environment, Biodiversity &
 Wildlife Bureau
 Tehran
 Email: sadegh64@hotmail.com

KENYA

Dr. Charles Musyoki Mutua
 Senior Scientist
 Kenya Wildlife Service Training Institute
 Naivasha
 Email: cmusyoki@kws.go.ke

LEBANON / LIBAN

Dr. Salim Hamade
 Coordinator
 Ministry of Environment
 Beirut
 Email: saleem.hamadeh@gmail.com

MADAGASCAR

Mr. Amyot Felix Kofoky
 General Direction of Environment, Ministry In
 Charge Of Environment
 Antananarivo
 Email: kofoky.dgp@mef.gov.mg

MALI

M. Alfousseini Semega
 Chef de la Division Aménagement des Aires de
 Conservation de la Faune et de son Habitat
 Ministère de l'Environnement, des Eaux et Forêts
 Email: foussemega@yahoo.fr

MOROCCO / MAROC

Ms. Hayat Mesbah
 Chef de Service de la Conservation de la Flore et de
 la Faune Sauvages
 Haut-Commissariat aux Eaux et Forêts et à la Lutte
 Contre la Désertification
 Rabat
 Email: mesbah_ef@yahoo.fr

NETHERLANDS / PAYS-BAS

Ms. Wilmar Remmelts
 Senior Policy Officer
 Ministry of Economic Affairs
 The Hague
 Email: w.j.remmelts@minez.nl

Mr. Marcel van Nijnatten
 Policy Advisor
 Ministry of Economic Affairs
 The Hague
 Email: m.j.h.vannijnatten@minez.nl

Dr. Ralph Buij
 Researcher
 Alterra Wageningen University
 Wageningen
 Email: ralph.buij@gmail.com

NIGER

Mr. Hamissou Halilou Malam Garba
 Chef de Division des Aires Protégées
 Direction de la Faune, de la Chasse et des Aires
 Protégées
 Ministère de l'Environnement, de la Salubrité
 Urbaine et du Développement Durable
 Niamey
 Email: hamissou66@yahoo.fr

NORWAY / NORVÈGE

Mr. Øystein Størkersen
 Principal Advisor
 Norwegian Environment Agency
 Trondheim
 Email: oystein.storkersen@miljodir.no

Ms. Gunn Paulsen
 Head of Division
 Norwegian Environment Agency
 Trondheim
 Email: gunn.paulsen@miljodir.no

Mr. Nils Kristian Grønvik
 Principal Advisor
 Norwegian Environment Agency
 Trondheim
 Email: nils.kristian.gronvik@miljodir.no

Mr. Jo Anders Auran
 Senior Adviser
 Norwegian Environment Agency
 Trondheim
 Email: jo.anders.auran@miljodir.no

Mr. Arild Espelien
 Senior Adviser
 Norwegian Environment Agency
 Trondheim
 Email: ares@dirnat.no

Ms. Linda Lund
 Senior Adviser
 Department for Nature management
 Ministry of Climate and Environment
 Oslo
 Email: linda.lund@kld.dep.no

Ms. Kristin Sundal
 Executive officer
 Norwegian Environment Agency
 Trondheim
 Email: kristin.sundal@miljodir.no

PAKISTAN

Mr. Umeed Khalid
 Conservator Wildlife
 Ministry of Climate Change
 Islamabad
 Email: umeed_khalid@yahoo.com

PORTUGAL

Mr. João Loureiro
 Head of Unit
 Institute of Nature Conservation and Forests
 Lisbon
 Email: loureiroj@gmail.com

SENEGAL / SÉNÉGAL

Mme Ndeye Sene Thiam
 Conservateur
 Direction des Parcs Nationaux
 Dakar
 Email: ndeyesenethiam2003@yahoo.fr

SOUTH AFRICA / AFRIQUE DU SUD

Ms. Humbulani Mafumo
Deputy Director Conservation Management
National Department of Environmental Affairs
Pretoria
Email: hmafumo@environment.gov.za

Ms. Tebogo Mashua
Department of Environmental Affairs
Pretoria
Email: tmashua@environment.gov.za

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC / RÉPUBLIQUE ARABE SYRIENNE

Ms. Roba Alserhan
CMS National Focal point
Ministry of State for Environmental Affairs
Department of Biodiversity and Protected Area
Damascus
Email: alserhanroba@yahoo.com

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES / ÉMIRATS ARABES UNIS

Mr. Obaid Alshamsi
Biologist - Biodiversity Department
Ministry of Environment and Water
Dubai
Email: oaalshamsi@moew.gov.ae

NON-SIGNATORY RANGE STATES / ÉTATS DE L'AIRE DE RÉPARTITION NON-SIGNATAIRES

COMOROS* / COMORES*

M. Mohamed Saïd Youssouf
Secrétaire Général
Ministère de la Production, de l'Environnement, de l'Energie, de l'Industrie et de l'Artisanat
Moroni
Email : naidoussouf@hotmail.fr

Mr. Waheed Al Fazari
Wildlife Biologist
Office for Conservation of Environment
Diwan of Royal Court
Al Khuwair
Email: waheed.alfazari@gmail.com

INDIA / INDE

Mr. Shakti Kant Khanduri
Inspector General of Forests
Ministry of Environment Forest and Climate Change
New Delhi
Email: igfwl-mef@nic.in

Mr. Azan Al-Kalbani
Environmental Researcher
The National Field Research Center for Environmental Conservation-Diwan of Royal Court
Muscat
Email: al-kalbani@hotmail.com

ISRAEL / ISRAËL

Mr. Ohad Hatzofe
Avian Ecologist
Science Division, Israel Nature & Parks Authority
Jerusalem
Email: ohad@npa.org.il

SAUDI ARABIA / ARABIE SAOUDITE

Mr. Mohammad Sulayem
Advisor on International Cooperation
Saudi Wildlife Authority
Riyadh
Email: msulayem2@yahoo.com

OMAN

Mr. Khalifa Al Higgi
Environmental Specialist
National Field Research Centre for Environmental Conservation
Muscat
Email: almitc@yahoo.com

Mr. Bandar Alfaleh
Director of Permits Department
Saudi Wildlife Authority
Riyadh
Email : alfaleh@swa.gov.sa

* Signed the Raptors MOU at MOS2.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS / ORGANISATIONS INTERGOUVERNEMENTAL**KALBA BIRD OF PREY CENTRE**

Mr. Gerard Whitehouse-Tedd
Operations Manager
Kalba, United Arab Emirates
Email: kalbabirdofpreycentre@gmail.com

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE

Prof. Des Thompson
Principal Adviser on Biodiversity
Chair of the Raptors MOU TAG
Edinburgh, Scotland, United Kingdom
Email: Des.thompson@snh.gov.uk

INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS / ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES**BIRDLIFE INTERNATIONAL (BLI)***

Dr. Vicky Jones
Senior Flyways Officer (Science)
Cambridge, United Kingdom
Email: vicky.jones@birdlife.org

Prof. Robert Kenward
Chair for Sustainable Use and Management of
Ecosystems
Wareham, United Kingdom
Email: reke@ceh.ac.uk

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR FALCONRY & CONSERVATION OF BIRDS OF PREY (IAF)*

Mr. Janusz Sielicki
IAF Conservation Officer
Warsaw, Poland
Email: janusz.sielicki@gmail.com

ROYAL SOCIETY FOR THE PROTECTION OF BIRDS (RSPB)

Ms. Nicola Crockford
International Species Policy Officer
Sandy Bedfordshire, United Kingdom
Email: nicola.crockford@rspb.org.uk

INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR CONSERVATION OF NATURE (IUCN)

Mr. André Botha
IUCN SSC Vulture Specialist Group
Roodepoort, South Africa
Email: andreb@ewt.org.za

NATIONAL ORGANISATIONS / ORGANISATIONS NATIONALES**BUGARIAN SOCIETY FOR PROTECTION OF BIRDS (BSPB / BirdLife Bulgaria)**

Mr. Stoyan Nikolov
Project Manager
Sofia, Bulgaria
Email: stoyan.nikolov@bspb.org

SPANISH ORNITHOLOGICAL SOCIETY (SEO / BIRDLIFE)

Dr. Juan Carlos Atienza
Head of Conservation Unit
Madrid, Spain
Email: jcatienza@seo.org

RED SEA ASSOCIATION FOR ENVIRONMENT AND WATER SPORTS

Mr. Mohamed Habib
Committee Co-coordinator
Hurghada, Egypt
Email: mrhydro35@hotmail.com

OTHERS / AUTRES**CMS AFRICAN EURASIAN MIGRATORY LANDBIRDS WORKING GROUP**

Dr. Olivier Biber
Chair of the Working Group
Bern, Switzerland
Email: olivier.biber@nooiseaux.ch

HABITAT INFO: AFRICAN RAPTOR DATABANK

Mr. Rob Davies
Director
Solva, United Kingdom
Email: rob.davies@habitatinfo.com

INTERPRETERS / INTERPRÈTES

Ms. Ingrid Catton
Email: ingrid.catton@wanadoo.fr

Ms. Starr Pirot
Email: s.pirot@aiic.net

Ms. Odile Montpetit
Email: odile.montpetit@gmail.com

REPORT WRITERS / RÉDACTEURS DU RAPPORT

Mr. Tim Jones
DJEnvironmental
Email: tim.jones@djenvironmental.com

Mr. Robert Vagg
CMS Secretariat
Email: robert.vagg@cms.int

IISD REPORTING SERVICES (ENB)

Ms. Jennifer Lenhart
Team Leader
Email: jenniferl@iisd.org

Mr. Bradley Vincelette
Digital Editor
Email: brad@iisd.org

Ms. Tasha Goldberg
Writer
Email: tasha@iisd.org

CMS

Mr. Lyle Glowka
Executive Coordinator
CMS Office - Abu Dhabi
Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates
Email: lyle.glowka@cms.int

Ms. Maite Rios Noya
Team Associate
Coordinating Unit of the Raptors MOU
CMS Office - Abu Dhabi
Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates
Email: maita.rios@cms.int

Mr. Borja Heredia
Head of Avian Species Team
CMS Secretariat
Bonn, Germany
Email: borja.heredia@cms.int

Ms. Yasaman Akbarzadeh Yazdi
Team Associate
Coordinating Unit of the Raptors MOU
CMS Secretariat
Bonn, Germany
Email: yasaman.yazdi@cms.int

Ms. Jenny Renell
Associate Programme Management Officer
Coordinating Unit of the Raptors MOU
CMS Office - Abu Dhabi
Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates
Email: jenny.renell@cms.int