



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

Distr: General  
UNEP/CMS/Raptors/MoS1/Report\*

10 December 2013

First Meeting of Signatories | Abu Dhabi, UAE, 9-11 December 2012

## REPORT OF THE FIRST MEETING OF SIGNATORIES OF THE RAPTORS MoU

### Agenda item 1. Opening of the Meeting

1. Mr Bert Lenten, Deputy Executive Secretary and Officer in Charge of the CMS Secretariat, opened the meeting. He welcomed the participants (see Annex I for List of Participants) to the meeting and thanked the hosts, the government of the United Arab Emirates, for their renewed commitment to support the Interim Coordinating Unit, and the government of the United Kingdom for its financial support to the meeting. This was the second meeting related to the Raptors MoU and the CMS Office - Abu Dhabi to be held in the UAE.
2. The Interim Coordinating Unit had undergone some personnel changes since it had been set up, and Lyle Glowka, the former CMS Agreements Officer and current Senior Legal Advisor to the Convention on Biological Diversity would be entering duty as Executive Coordinator of the CMS Office - Abu Dhabi in February 2013.
3. The MoU had been concluded in October 2008 and had entered into effect the following month. It now counted 40 signatories (39 countries and the European Union). The presence of a large number of non-signatory Range States was also noted and some NGOs had expressed an interest in associating themselves with the MoU.
4. Since the Tenth Conference of Parties to CMS (COP10) the previous year, when 29 Resolutions had been adopted, progress had been made on a number of issues, including the Resolution 10.28 on the Saker Falcon, a more detailed report on which would be presented later in the meeting.
5. The draft agenda for the meeting was ambitious, including the development of national strategies, adopting procedures for adding species to the MoU annex, the establishment of a Technical Advisory Group, and financial arrangements. The hunting and killing of raptors, in particular Amur Falcons in India, had been raised at the recent meeting of the CMS Standing Committee.
6. **Dr Shaikha Al Dhaheri**, the Executive Director of the Terrestrial and Marine Biodiversity Sector of the the Environment Agency - Abu Dhabi (EAD), made a welcoming statement on behalf of H.E. Mohammed Ahmed Al Bowardi, the Agency's Managing Director. A copy of the statement is attached as Annex II.

\* Document reissued for technical reasons.



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

Convention on Migratory Species Office - Abu Dhabi • United Nations Environment Programme  
c/o Environment Agency - Abu Dhabi • PO Box 45553 • Abu Dhabi • United Arab Emirates  
T +971 2 6934 437 • F +971 2 4997 252 • [cmsoffice.ae@cms.int](mailto:cmsoffice.ae@cms.int) • [www.cms.int/species/raptors](http://www.cms.int/species/raptors)



7. **Dr Salim Javed**, the Manager of Terrestrial Assessment and Conservation at EAD, gave a presentation focusing on birds of prey in the United Arab Emirates and on waterbirds of the Central Asian Flyway.

8. **Mr Lenten** introduced Nick Williams, the Programme Officer responsible for birds of prey at the Interim Coordinating Unit (ICU), who had been in post for just over a year and had reenergized the MoU after the departure of his predecessor.

9. **Mr Nick Williams** described his appointment as a “dream come true”. He then gave a short welcoming statement outlining the inception of the Raptors MoU almost exactly ten years ago. The text of Mr Williams’ remarks is attached as Annex III.

## **Agenda item 2. Signing Ceremony for New Signatories**

10. The representative of **Somalia**, Mr Ahmed Osman, Wildlife Director, Ministry of Fishery, Marine Resources and Environment, signed the Raptors MoU on behalf of his Ministry.

11. **Mr Williams** stated that this brought the total number of Signatories to 41, including 40 Range States, plus the European Union. There was a long list of potential Signatories and it was hoped that further Range States would become Signatories during the coming months.

12. On the afternoon of the second day, **Niger** became the 42<sup>nd</sup> Signatory to the MoU with the delegate, Mr Laoual Abagana Ali, giving a short speech explaining how his country intended to meet its obligations to conserve raptors.

## **Agenda item 3. Adoption of the Agenda and Meeting Schedule**

### **3.1. Provisional Agenda and List of Documents**

13. Mr Lenten referred participants to the following two documents: CMS/Raptors/MoS1/Doc.3.1/Rev.2 *Provisional Agenda and List of Documents* and CMS/Raptors/MoS1/Doc.3.1/Annex I *Key Tasks and Objectives of the 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting of Signatories to the Raptors MoU*.

### **3.2. Provisional Annotated Agenda and Schedule**

14. Mr Lenten then proceeded to refer participants to the following document: CMS/Raptors/MoS1/Doc.3.2/Rev.1 *Provisional Annotated Agenda and Schedule*.

15. Mr Lenten observed that much of the meeting’s work would probably need to be done in working groups. There would be opportunities in the schedule for working groups to meet as necessary. He invited comments on the Provisional Agenda and Provisional Annotated Agenda and Schedule.

16. There being no such comments, Mr Lenten turned to matters that might benefit from the establishment of a working group. One key area would be the proposed Technical Advisory Group (TAG) and associated issues. The early establishment of a working group on the TAG could be helpful. Participants were invited to comment on this suggestion and to identify any other issues that could be assigned to a working group.

17. **The UK** supported establishment of a Working Group on the TAG and felt that working group discussions around finance would also be helpful.

18. **Chad** asked where further discussion of the Rules of Procedure, adopted provisionally under Agenda item 4, would take place.

19. Mr Lenten proposed that a second Working Group should be established to take up a range of matters including Rules of Procedure (ROP), credentials and finance. The meeting indicated its acceptance of this proposal.

#### **Agenda item 4. Adoption of the Rules of Procedure**

20. **Mr Lenten** referred participants to document CMS/Raptors/MoS1/Doc.4/Rev.2 *Adoption of the Rules of Procedure* and invited the ICU to introduce this agenda item.

21. **Mr Williams** recalled that Article 13 of the MoU stated that MoS1 should adopt ROP. In drafting Doc.4/Rev.2, the ICU had striven to maintain CMS Family continuity by referring to the ROP used at CMS COP10 and also experience gained under the Sharks MoU. He stressed that the Raptors instrument was an MoU, not an Agreement and was therefore not legally binding, but instead relied on consensus and a voluntary approach. The meeting was asked to consider adopting the draft ROP contained in Doc.4/Rev.2 for this meeting and for future sessions of the MoS.

22. **Mr Lenten** invited comments. The **European Union (EU)** thanked the ICU for providing draft ROP, which the EU was in general able to support. However, the EU wished to propose the following amendments:

##### Rule 4 – Credentials

Replace the wording “...the Head of an executive body” with “Competent authority”.

##### Rule 12 – Voting

Add a sentence in line with Article I, paragraph 2 of the CMS text:

“Without prejudice to the provisions of Rule 2, paragraph (b), each representative duly accredited according to Rule 4 shall have one vote. Regional Economic Integration Organizations (REIOs) 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.”

23. **The United Kingdom (UK)** had examined the Agenda and noticed that it included a number of procedural items, notably items 13.3, 13.4 and 14.2. These might be addressed more appropriately through the ROP and the UK had a number of textual suggestions to propose. It might therefore be worth setting up a small working group to look at this issue.

24. **Mr Lenten** proposed provisionally adopting the ROP, as contained in Doc.4/Rev.2, then coming back later in the meeting with revised text following consideration by the working group as suggested by the UK. He invited the UK to take the lead in convening this group. The meeting indicated its concurrence with this proposal.

25. **South Africa** suggested that the Rule on credentials, sub-paragraph (c) should be amended by adding a timeframe for the latest acceptable submission of credentials if some participants were unable to submit them at the start of the meeting.

26. The Working Group then undertook its deliberations over the course of the meeting and reported back on the final day.

27. On the final day of the Meeting, having thanked all members of the Working Group for their commitment, **the UK** said that two of the Group's sessions had been dedicated to consideration of the ROP. The resulting draft document had deliberately been kept as short as possible and every effort made to make it easy to follow. It drew on various sources, notably Doc 13.3 *Procedures for Amending the MoU Text and its Annexes*, with the intention of having a single composite document. It had however been decided to deal with Co-operating Partners separately as this seemed to be a discrete issue.

28. A series of recommendations were presented to the effect that the MoS should:

- encourage the Coordinating Unit to consider producing documents in other languages, such as Arabic, where resources were provided for that purpose;
- adopt the procedure for the association of Co-operating Partners with the MoU (see also item 13.4 below);
- decide to include within the Rules of Procedure, details on how the MoU text might be amended and the arrangements for convening the Meetings of the Signatories;
- decide to adopt the Rules of Procedure as detailed in the draft text provided by the Working Group.

29. Professor Galbraith, the Chair (see item 5), expressed his gratitude to the UK for having produced such a streamlined document. He then gave the Meeting the opportunity to comment on the proposals section by section.

30. The **CMS Secretariat** suggested that the wording of Rule 2.3 be broadened so that meetings could be convened at UN locations such as Bonn and not just at the seat of the Coordinating Unit if no Signatory came forward as host. This was agreed with the addition of text proposed by the UK concerning cost-effectiveness.

31. As a result of an intervention from **Chad** concerning the role of Ministries of Foreign Affairs in issuing Credentials, there was a short discussion concerning the status of the MoU. **Mr Williams** said that it was in order for Credentials to be issued by the Focal Ministry but he appreciated that in many countries this would not be possible. **The UK** said that the addition of the words "or a higher body" was intended to accommodate such circumstances.

32. Regarding Rule 14 on the languages used at the MoS, **Saudi Arabia** stressed the importance of having key meeting documents, and not just the text of the MoU, available in Arabic whenever resources allowed. The **Chair** agreed and asked that this point be specifically mentioned in the report of the meeting.

33. On Rule 15 and records of the MoS, **Switzerland** sought assurance that non-Signatory Range States would also receive copies of the reports, and similarly they should also be informed of the date and venue of meetings (Rule 2.4).

34. There being no further comments or proposals for amendments, the ROP were adopted for use at future sessions of the MoS, please see attached at Annex IV.

#### **Agenda item 5. Election of Officers**

35. On behalf of the CMS Secretariat, **Mr Lenten** invited the MoS to consider electing **Professor Colin Galbraith**, from the UK but acting in an independent capacity, as Chair and **Dr Shaikha Al Dhaheri**, Executive Director for Marine and Terrestrial Biodiversity, Environment Agency – Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, as Vice-Chair. The Meeting agreed and the two candidates were elected by acclamation.

36. **Prof Galbraith** recalled that he had had the honour of chairing the two negotiation meetings leading to the conclusion of the Raptors MoU. He stressed that he would be chairing the meeting in an independent capacity. He highlighted that birds of prey were indicators of environmental health, and a key part of our being and culture. MoS1 represented a real opportunity to bring life to the MoU, by setting up clear processes and functions that would lead to conservation action. Special thanks were due to the UAE and UK for supporting the MoS.

#### **Agenda item 6. Establishment of Credentials Committee**

37. **Mr Lenten** observed that the draft ROP included a formal process for the establishment of a Credentials Committee at each MoS. However, he wondered whether it would be preferable to set up a lighter process with Credentials being reviewed by a small group composed of the Chair, Vice-Chair and the Secretariat.

38. The **Chair** recalled that the MoU was not a legally binding instrument, and that Mr Lenten's suggestion therefore seemed a logical and streamlined way to proceed. He invited interventions from the floor.

39. There being no comments from participants, the **Chair** concluded that Credentials for the present meeting should be examined by the Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretariat and that the Working Group on the Rules of Procedure and related issues should consider the question further, with a view to future MoS.

#### Report of the Credentials Committee

40. The final report of the Credentials Committee indicated that all 21 Signatories present at the meeting had submitted Credentials and 19 had been found to be in order, although the documents presented by Burundi and Chad were only copies. Both of these Signatories were requested to send the original documents to the Coordinating Unit within a month of the closure of the meeting. The credentials of Romania and Slovakia were found not to be in order.

#### **Agenda item 7. Admission of Observers**

41. The two documents related to this Agenda Item were: CMS/Raptors/MoS1/Doc.7 *Admission of Observers* and CMS/Raptors/MoS1/Doc.7/Annex I *List of Observers for which permission to attend the Meeting is requested* (as at 8 December 2012).

42. The **Chair** underlined the fact that the MoU aimed to be open and inclusive, and it was important to involve non-Signatory Range States, IGOs and NGOs. At the invitation of the Chair, the Meeting approved the admission of the observers listed in Doc.7/Annex I.

#### **Agenda item 8. Statements from Signatories and Observers**

43. The **Chair** invited Signatories and Observers to contribute oral or written statements. He particularly encouraged statements from Observer Range States on the status of their preparations to sign the MoU.

44. **The EU** announced that it would provide a written statement to the Secretariat.

#### **Agenda item 9. Report of the Interim Coordination Unit (ICU)**

45. **Mr Williams** introduced CMS/Raptors/MoS1/Doc.9 *Report of the Interim Coordination Unit* and its four annexes: guidance for National Contact Points (NCPs); the designation form; a list of

those NCPs so far designated; and a summary of the main communications issued by the ICU since its establishment in 2009.

46. Document 9 described how the MoU had been concluded after two negotiation meetings (Loch Lomond, UK, October 2007 and Abu Dhabi, UAE, October 2008) and that the offer from the Environment Agency - Abu Dhabi, on behalf of the Government of the UAE to host the ICU had been received, and then discussed and agreed at CMS COP9. A three-year donor agreement had been signed in October 2009, and this had been extended for a further three years until 2015, with a promise of future funding beyond that.

47. The ICU had become operational in August 2009 but, when the first Programme Officer left suddenly, progress in implementing the MoU had ceased until the appointment of Mr Williams. Mr Williams was supported by an Associate Programme Officer (half time), two other staff and interns shared with the Secretariat of the Dugong MoU.

48. The twenty-eight original signatories had now grown to 42 (41 countries and the EU) and they were complemented by three Co-operating Partners, namely the CMS Secretariat, BirdLife International and the International Association for Falconry and Conservation of Birds of Prey.

49. The ICU had been working to recruit non-signatories and, to this end, had produced a document on benefits and obligations. Another 17 countries had expressed their interest in signing the MoU in due course.

50. Each Signatory should appoint a NCP and notify the name and contact details to the ICU. So far 23 Signatories had done so. Those that had not done so were urged to provide this information as soon as possible. A list of NCPs would be maintained by the ICU and posted on the web-pages of the MoU. Guidelines had been drafted by the ICU to advise NCPs on their role.

51. The ICU had been active in communicating regarding progress made and passing on information from signatories. A bilingual leaflet to promote the MoU had been published and dedicated web-pages created on the CMS website. The ICU was working closely with CMS on the planned major overhaul of the website. Unofficial courtesy translations of the MoU text had been published in Arabic and Russian.

52. The ICU had prepared a long list of the meetings attended by the Programme Officer since he had entered on duty. Key activities had included participation in an event jointly staged by the ICU and the French BirdLife partner for World Migratory Bird Day immediately prior to the AEWA MOP. He had also attended the Pan-African Vulture Summit held in Kenya. The ICU had celebrated Vulture Awareness Day and was poised to sign a contract with the Bulgarian BirdLife partner regarding a project on the Egyptian Vulture (*Neophron percnopterus*) in North Africa.

53. The Bulgarian BirdLife Partner (BSPB) had received LIFE+ funding to undertake conservation work on the Egyptian Vulture in the Balkan Region. The ICU had contracted BSPB to undertake a project relating to enhancement of fieldwork capacity in the wintering areas in Chad and Sudan. Mr Stoyan Nikolov would be making a comprehensive presentation on the project later in the agenda (see 11.1.b below).

54. The annual work cycle began in July and was primarily funded through the grant from the UAE. Much of the current year had been taken up with planning the MoS, where it was hoped the Signatories would agree to establish the Coordinating Unit. Subject to resources being available, capacity building workshops were being considered to support Signatories with their national or regional strategies.

55. The Saker Falcon Task Force had been created after CMS COP10. The Task Force's main activities were centred on developing the Work Plan over the summer and fundraising for the planned Stakeholders' Workshop in 2013.

56. In October 2012 a call was made to recruit a consultant for an International Single Species Action Plan for the Sooty Falcon (*Falco concolor*), a species listed as Near Threatened on the IUCN Red List and about which more information was needed. It was expected that the consultant would be appointed in the New Year and would be able to start work in March 2013.

57. At CMS COP10 the issue of combating poisoning had been discussed and a Working Group established. Poisoning affected a large range of species, but raptors, as carrion and insect eaters, were particularly vulnerable. Mr Williams from the ICU was serving on the steering committee and the Working Group was in the process of recruiting a coordinator. A report on the Group's findings would be submitted to CMS COP11.

58. Together with Dugong MoU, the ICU was working on a fundraising initiative to seek additional sources of finance to enable more work to be done.

59. There was no mention in the MoU text of a Technical Advisory Group (TAG) but the ICU strongly recommended that one be established to provide sound scientific information upon which to base the Signatories' decisions.

60. Every effort was made to ensure that the online presence of the MoU hosted on the CMS website was kept up to date. The ICU was working closely with the CMS Secretariat on plans for a revamped website which would be even better.

61. The ICU would also continue to collaborate with CMS and AEWa concerning World Migratory Bird Day and would participate in the International Vulture Awareness Day.

62. **Mr Williams** concluded his oral report by urging Signatories that had not already done so to nominate their National Contact Point and to make suggestions for further items for inclusion in the Work Plan.

63. **France** congratulated all those involved in the preparation of the meeting and particularly welcomed the translation of documents into French. It was noted that the ICU had become very dynamic since Mr Williams' arrival. The French NCP had just been appointed and the name and contact details were not therefore on the list most recently circulated.

64. **Senegal** endorsed the comments made by France and noted the high percentage of documents available in both languages. Senegal proceeded to ask about the selection criteria for the interns working at the ICU and how they were looked after. With regard to national strategies, Senegal recalled that before Mr Williams' arrival, Signatories had been asked whether they needed financial or technical assistance. Senegal had responded but had received no further communication.

65. Regarding interns, **Mr Williams** replied that the CMS Office - Abu Dhabi followed UN rules and CMS processes. Interns were largely recruited locally as there was no funding available to cover travel or accommodation costs. Over recent months, five interns from various academic backgrounds had received placements. **Mr Lenten** added that CMS had been operating an intern programme for over five years. Candidates were interviewed in advance and had to spend a minimum of three months at the Secretariat. The majority of interns came from Europe but all regions were represented.

66. **Mr Williams** was unaware of the call for requests for financial and technical assistance. He thought that the MoS could provide guidance on whether funds should be concentrated on

international collaboration and on criteria for funding individual countries. He stated that with 130 Range States resources could be spread too thinly if each country were to receive support.

67. **The Chair** suggested that the question of funding Signatories should be referred to the Budget and Procedural Working Group. He thought that international work should be the priority.

68. **Chad** intervened in support of Senegal recalling that at the second negotiation meeting the sum of US\$5,000 had been mentioned and undertook to search his documents for the correspondence. The **Chair** suggested that the Programme Officer speak to Senegal and Chad during the break to clarify the issue.

69. After thanking the UAE for supporting the MoU, **Equatorial Guinea** added its voice in support of Senegal and Chad and reported that the nomination of its NCP had been sent to the Minister and should be confirmed shortly.

70. The **Chair** called upon the MoS to note the report and commend Mr Williams and his colleagues for their dynamic and productive approach, and for breathing life back into the ICU. He was confident that the good work would continue.

#### **Agenda item 10. CMS COP10: Outcomes Relevant to Raptors MoU**

71. The **Deputy Executive Secretary of CMS** (Mr Lenten) introduced documents CMS/Raptors/MoS1/Doc.10 *CMS COP10: Outcomes Relevant to Raptors MoU* and CMS/Raptors/MoS1/Doc.10 Annex I *CMS Statement Process for developing the future Strategic Plan for Migratory Species Report of the 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting of the Strategic Plan Working Group, 5-6 Nov 2012*.

72. **Mr Lenten** drew participants' attention to the following CMS COP10 Resolutions and briefly summarized current and planned activities concerning the implementation of these decisions:

- Resolution 10.3 *The Role of Ecological Networks in the Conservation of Migratory Species*
- Resolution 10.5 *CMS Strategic Plan 2015–2023 new Strategic Plan*
- Resolution 10.6 *Capacity Building Strategy (2012-2014)*
- Resolution 10.7 *Outreach and Communication Issues*
- Resolution 10.9 *Future Structure and Strategies of the CMS and CMS Family*
- Resolution 10.10 *Guidance on Global Flyway Conservation and Options for Policy Arrangements*
- Resolution 10.11 *Power Lines and Migratory Birds*
- Resolution 10.13 *Standardized Nomenclature of Birds Listed on the CMS Appendices*
- Resolution 10.18 *Guidelines on the Integration of Migratory Species into National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) and Other Outcomes from CBD COP10*
- Resolution 10.19 *Migratory Species Conservation in the Light of Climate Change*
- Resolution 10.22 *Wildlife Disease and Migratory Species*
- Resolution 10.26 *Minimizing the Risk of Poisoning to Migratory Birds*
- Resolution 10.28 *Saker Falcon Falco cherrug*

73. Referring in particular to Resolution 10.5 and document CMS/Raptors/MoS1/Doc.10 Annex I, **Mr Lenten** stated that the aim was to develop a common agenda and overarching framework for all those working on migratory species. He recalled that the current CMS Strategic Plan had been extended (by COP10) to 2014 and that the new Strategic Plan would run from 2015 to 2023. Particular emphasis would be given to achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets as they related to migratory species. A Working Group with diverse regional representation had been established to take forward the process of developing the new Strategic Plan and a draft document would be submitted for consideration by the Parties at CMS COP11 in 2014. An intensive process of

consultation was underway and a first consultation draft would be ready for review by the Working Group in 2013. Meetings of the Working Group were open to Observers and the Raptors MoU was warmly welcomed to become involved in the process. The aim was to produce a short, focused document that identified long-term, high-level outcomes capable of bringing CMS to a higher level and generating political support and visibility. The new Strategic Plan would be complemented by a 'Companion Guide', which would include implementation guidance to CMS instruments and Parties. The CMS website would include a page dedicated to the Strategic Plan process.

74. **Hungary** recalled that Saker Falcon (*Falco cherrug*) and Red-footed Falcon (*F. vespertinus*) had been added to CMS Appendix 1 at COP10, following an initiative of Hungary and supported by the EU. However, Activity 1.1 in Table 2 of the Raptors MoU Action Plan (Activities to be done under paragraph 5 [Implementation Framework] of the Action Plan) required inclusion of all Category 1 species under the Raptors MoU in CMS Appendix 1 and this was not yet the case. Hungary therefore urged Signatories to take the steps necessary for including in CMS Appendix I species such as Red Kite (*Milvus milvus*) and Pallid Harrier (*Circus macrourus*).

75. The **Chair** noted that any proposal to amend Appendix I should first be submitted to the CMS Scientific Council for its consideration and that a final decision would be a matter for the Parties. He thanked Mr Lenten for highlighting issues of relevance, especially the forthcoming consultation on the new CMS Strategic Plan; the Raptors MoU stood ready to participate.

76. The **Chair** invited the Meeting to adjourn so that the two Working Groups (one on the proposed Technical Advisory Group; one on financial issues, Rules of Procedure, Credentials and other processes) established earlier in the day could meet for a period of one hour to identify key issues.

77. Referring to document CMS/Raptors/MoS1/Doc.13.2/Annex I *Draft Terms of Reference for the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) to the Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation of Migratory Birds of Prey in Africa and Eurasia (Raptors MoU)*, the Programme Officer (Birds of Prey), **Mr Williams**, briefly introduced the background to the issues to be discussed by the Working Group on the TAG.

## **Agenda Item 11. Conservation Initiatives by the ICU under the Raptors MoU**

### **11.1. Species**

#### **11.1.a. Saker Falcon Task Force**

78. The **Chair** of the meeting, speaking in his capacity as Chair of the Saker Falcon Task Force, described the challenges of the role and the fascinating qualities of the species. Discussions at CMS COP9 in Rome and COP10 in Bergen had led to Resolutions and the establishment of a time-limited Task Force. COP10 had also adopted the listing on Appendix I of all populations of the Saker Falcon except that in Mongolia.

79. The Task Force had a clear mandate and had first met in March 2012 in Abu Dhabi. Its membership included government agencies, non-governmental organizations and interested parties. The Saker Falcon was a wide-ranging species and was affected by many issues across its range and at different stages in its lifecycle. The Task Force was compiling population statistics as well as reviewing survey and monitoring needs, conservation action and sustainable use; and scoping the research required to understand the species' ecology better. Importantly, it was also documenting the engagement of people in the management of the species, as the human element was of utmost importance.

80. It was planned to develop a Global Action Plan, with a holistic approach, covering geographic and seasonal issues. Resources had so far been secured via an ENTRP Cooperation Agreement (SCA) between the European Commission (DG Environment) and UNEP, and promised by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

81. The next steps included the development of stakeholder involvement; the establishment of working groups to review key issues; organizing a Workshop to develop the Global Action Plan during 2013; and preparation of a report to CMS COP11 in 2014.

#### **11.1.b. Egyptian Vulture**

82. **Mr Stoyan Nikolov**, the Project Manager for the Bulgarian LIFE+ project on the Egyptian Vulture, categorized as endangered on the IUCN Red List, explained that the global population of the species was from 21,900 to 30,000 mature individuals.

83. Most of the European breeding population was found in Spain with small numbers in France, Italy and the Balkans. The European population had declined by 50 per cent in the last 50 years and it had gone extinct in nine countries. Egyptian Vultures migrated in small groups and juveniles needed adults to guide them. Juveniles often died because they were unable to find the correct migration route. In the Balkans, populations had declined by more than 50 per cent over the last ten years. The wintering grounds of the Balkan population were not known and investigations using satellite tagging had started, beginning with the first bird tagged in the Eastern Rhodope Mountains in 2010; it had migrated to Chad. Originally under the LIFE+ project it was foreseen to tag 40 vultures, but in the end only nine birds were fitted. One of these died in the Mediterranean after attempting to cross the sea at its widest point. Another was too weak to complete the migration, but the rest were still alive and were wintering in Chad and Sudan. A project was being executed in conjunction with the Raptors MoU for capacity building in Chad, Sudan, Djibouti and Ethiopia, running from September 2012 to August 2013. It would entail a training seminar in Ethiopia (January 2013), small grants research projects (2013) and another training seminar in Bulgaria (July/August 2013).

84. **Pakistan** commented that there was no evidence of diclofenac affecting the Egyptian Vulture in Pakistan, where it was the most common vulture species. **Mr Nikolov** said that there were indications of this substance being used in India where very high concentrations of it were being reported in the birds. **Bangladesh** stated that use of this drug was banned in that country.

#### **11.1.c. Sooty Falcon**

85. The Sooty Falcon (*Falco concolor*) was the subject of an International Single Species Action Plan and, in addition, one of the successful projects submitted to the recent call for applications under the revived CMS Small Grants Programme (SGP) focused on the species in Madagascar and Oman. **Mr Lily Arison Rene de Roland** (Madagascar) gave a presentation on raptors in that country, known to be a biodiversity hot spot hosting 24 species of birds of prey.

86. A small grant had been received from the CMS Office - Abu Dhabi in 2010-2011 and a further €14,978 had been awarded from the CMS SGP in 2012. The project involved exchanges of personnel between Madagascar and Oman, the southern and northern extremes of the species' migration.

### **11.2. Threats**

#### **11.2.a. Minimizing Poisoning**

87. As this topic had been subject of a dedicated side event, **Ms Melanie Virtue** (Agreements Officer, CMS Secretariat) gave a brief summary for the benefit of those who had been unable to attend.

88. Poisoning both deliberate and incidental was a global problem affecting a great many birds and needing regulation. CMS COP Resolution 10.26 led to the establishment of a Working Group to review the scope of the problem, both geographic and taxonomic, with the aim of developing guidelines. The Raptors MoU and BirdLife International were jointly contributing funding for a coordinator post, and the deadline for applications expired that day.

89. In May 2013 the Working Group would meet in conjunction with the Bern Convention and it was intended to develop a draft Resolution for eventual adoption at the CMS COP11 in 2014.

90. The **Chair** summarized by saying that poisoning affected both humans and wildlife (and in particular birds of prey). It was a problem that was becoming worse and was certainly an issue for the TAG to consider, alongside the CMS Working Group, as a matter of importance and urgency.

#### **11.2.b. Power Grids**

91. **Mr Sergey Dereliev** (Technical Officer, AEWA) gave a presentation on behalf of the four members of the consortium behind the project funded by RWE AG, the German energy company.

92. Millions of birds were killed by power grids each year representing a major threat. Poor visibility was a major factor leading to collisions and some birds were electrocuted as a result of causing short circuits when they perched on the cables and stanchions. Medium voltage lines had been shown to be the worst in terms of the number of birds killed. One hundred species listed on the CMS, AEWA and Raptors MoU Appendices were susceptible to electrocution or collision.

93. There was a great deal of information available related to electrocution, especially from Europe and South Africa, but few studies were compatible in their approaches. Many European countries were laying cables underground, while India alone had over seven million kilometres of transmission lines.

94. Recommendations included finding inclusive solutions engaging all key stakeholders by, for example, developing formal agreements through which to implement practical action, identifying key problem areas and key species, and finding effective mitigation measures. A model that might be emulated was the case of Hungary where the Environment Ministry, electricity companies and the BirdLife International partner had signed a memorandum. The modifications agreed to the overhead cables were costing just one tenth as much as laying them underground.

95. In the next five years the extent of transmission lines globally was expected to increase by five million kilometres. Appropriate Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and project-level Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) should be applied and state of the art technical specifications should be used. More data were also required especially from Asia and Africa to secure a clearer overall picture.

96. **Mr Williams** said that electrocution rather than collision with power lines was the major problem for raptors because of their propensity to perch on poles. The ICU was eager to disseminate the guidelines and for that reason had prepared Arabic and Russian translations. At the Pan-African Vulture Summit a projection was shown of the new electricity grids being built in Africa, involving many thousands of miles of overhead cables. The construction companies would have to be persuaded to build them in such a way as to reduce collisions and electrocutions, which made sense economically, because it removed the costs of outages associated with birds.

97. **Pakistan** suggested that the Signatories approach the donor community, including the World Bank to ask them not to fund grid or transmission projects that were not bird-friendly.

98. The **Chair** pointed out the actions requested in the Meeting documentation, namely that the Signatories endorse the CMS COP Resolution, urge that it be implemented and adopt the guidelines.

99. The Meeting noted the discussion and the related documents.

### **11.3. Other Initiatives**

#### **11.3.a. Soaring Birds in the Rift Valley**

100. **Mr Marcus Kohler**, Senior Programme Manager at BirdLife International gave a presentation on the project on migratory soaring birds in the Rift Valley, which was being funded by UNDP-GEF and implemented by BirdLife International. The project covered 37 species, 32 of which were raptors; the others included pelicans, storks and the Northern Bald Ibis. The project also covered 23 IBAs identified as important bottle-necks on the Red Sea/Rift Valley flyway in eleven countries and territories (Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Jordan, Lebanon, Palestine, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic and Yemen).

101. Targeted sectors included agriculture, energy, hunting, waste management and tourism. One example of project activity was in the Lebanon where the project had established a strategic partnership with the Higher Hunting Council to lay the foundations for a new hunting law. This was a long-term process. Tools under development by the project included a regional sensitivity map for use in strategic assessment highlighting areas of peak migration activity and best practice guidelines. There were a series of common goals with the Raptors MoU and synergies with its Action Plan, where the Migratory Soaring Birds Project contributed to implementing seven of the nine priority activities.

#### **11.3.b. EURAPMON – European Raptor Monitoring Network**

102. **Mr Janusz Sielicki** (EURAPMON) drew the Meeting's attention to a side event organized by EURAPMON where extensive information would be made available so he therefore confined his comments at this juncture to a brief overview. EURAPMON is a programme of the European Science Foundation (ESF) dealing with raptor research and monitoring, which is running from May 2010 until May 2015. Founded by institutions from 15 countries, the programme's coverage extends across the whole of Europe.

#### **11.3.c. EURING – European Union for Bird Ringing**

103. **Dr Fernando Spina** (Chair, CMS Scientific Council) conveyed the best wishes of Wolfgang Fiedler of the Max Planck Research Centre for Ornithology at Radolfzell, Germany, the Secretary of EURING.

104. Cooperation between EURING and the Raptors MoU dated from a meeting between Mr Spina and Mr Williams at the CMS COP in Bergen. Bird ringing depended on a large number of volunteers capable of ringing lots of individual birds. The idea had begun in Denmark in the late nineteenth century as a means of discovering migration routes.

105. Data gathered revealed the phenology of migration and the various migration routes used by a range of species across different countries on a flyway. Many data recovered came from birds that had been shot.

106. EURING had been set up in 1963 and now included 38 organizations with thousands of volunteers at their disposal. The organization was able to coordinate and set common standards (the

models developed for birds had proven to be applicable to other taxa such as salmon) as well as maintain a databank. The EURING databank with entries dating back over 120 years included 187,000 recoveries from 41 different raptor species, and was useful as a mapping tool.

107. A quick analysis of two kite species – one short-range migrant (the Red Kite *Milvus milvus*) and one long distance migrant (the Black Kite *Milvus migrans*) – had been undertaken. This review had shown causes of death – electrocution, deliberate killing, and traffic accidents. Pie charts representing the cause of death indicated that fewer birds were being shot but more were being electrocuted, especially in Africa.

108. The data showed that some Black Kites did not cross the Sahara on migration, raising the question of whether they were physically incapable of making the journey.

109. **Mr Williams** said that one of the major challenges for the Raptors MoU was lack of data and EURING had large quantities of unanalyzed material of great value for the MoU, so the cooperation with EURING was potentially very fruitful.

110. The **Chair** agreed that EURING had provided fascinating data which established a basis for identifying first the principal problems and then the priorities for action. It was vital to have conservation issues accepted into the mainstream of policy development and to have a prioritized Action Plan, based on robust evidence to implement. He drew the meeting's attention to the requested actions, namely that note was taken on the various species and thematic initiatives and that they should be supported to the extent possible.

111. The Meeting noted the issues raised.

## **Agenda Item 12. Review of the MoU and Action Plan implementation**

### **12.1. National and Regional Strategies**

112. The **Chair** referred participants to the following documents: CMS/Raptors/MoS1/Doc.12.1 *National and Regional Strategies*, the associated Annex I *Replies received from Signatories concerning the development of National or Regional Raptor Conservation and Management Strategies* and CMS/Raptors/MoS1/Inf.12.1 *Guidelines for Preparing National or Regional Raptor Conservation and Management Strategies within the Framework of the Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation of Migratory Birds of Prey in Africa and Eurasia (Raptors MoU)*.

113. The **Chair** observed that national and regional strategies essentially served to give effect to the terms of the Raptors MoU Action Plan in individual countries. There had been varying levels of progress so far and there was a need to look at both the timetable for the years ahead and also the development of common standards and practice across the Range States where possible. He invited the ICU to introduce the agenda item in greater detail.

114. **Mr Williams** recalled that Article 12 of the MoU stated that: "*Within two years of this Memorandum of Understanding becoming effective, Signatories will aim to prepare and submit to the Interim Coordinating Unit where appropriate a national or regional (e.g. EU) strategy or equivalent documents (e.g. Single Species Action Plans) for category 1 and, where appropriate, category 2 species in Table 1 in the Action Plan.*" The first ICU Programme Officer had compiled draft guidelines on the preparation of national and regional strategies that had been circulated to Parties for comment.

115. When Mr Williams had joined the ICU in autumn 2011, he had reviewed the draft guidelines, as well as the comments received from Signatories. He had then worked with a consultant to prepare revised Guidelines, which had been circulated to Signatories in July 2012, though owing to technical

difficulties, there had been a slight delay in distribution of the French text. The ICU had also written to Signatories noting that no National or Regional Strategies had been received by that date (July 2012) and requesting Signatories to report on their progress, any support required and whether any strategies were likely to be ready for presentation to MoS1.

116. **Madagascar** confirmed that it had completed its national strategy, which had now been received by the ICU and would soon be posted on the MoU website. Other countries had confirmed that development of strategies was currently underway. The EU had stated that it was preparing a Regional Strategy, while Congo, Guinea, Mongolia and Senegal had requested technical and financial assistance for the preparation of national strategies.

117. The measurable outcomes in national and regional strategies would serve to underpin the National Reporting process. The MoU Action Plan was effectively a high-level strategic document, while national and regional strategies were really implementation plans. Mr Williams noted that national or regional reporting documents providing updates on the progress with implementation were useful and allowed the ICU to compile a picture of progress on the overall strategic Action Plan.

118. Four years after the MoU had entered into effect, there were now 41 Signatories but only one or two strategies had been compiled. The ICU had included a number of questions at the end of document 12.1 for the consideration of Signatories, with the aim of understanding better the reasons for the limited progress to date.

119. The **Chair** invited comments from participants.

120. **Chad** noted that it had submitted a national strategy to the ICU but that this was not mentioned in document 12.1. **Mr Williams** offered apologies on behalf of ICU, but confirmed that he had not personally seen a copy of Chad's strategy, which he hoped might be resubmitted. **Chad** confirmed that the strategy would be resubmitted electronically.

121. The **EU** observed that completing its strategy by a 2013 deadline (i.e. within two years of entry into effect of the Raptors MoU for the EU) would be very challenging. Preparation of the strategy had to be done in a meaningful way, reflecting the diversity of habitats and approaches in the EU. It was likely that EU representatives would be in regular contact with the ICU during 2013 to discuss various matters.

122. **France** confirmed that it would be co-operating in the development of the EU's regional strategy and therefore did not consider a national strategy to be relevant.

123. The **League of Arab States** recalled that Ministers responsible for environmental matters in Arab countries would soon be meeting in Iraq, where they would discuss MEAs related to biodiversity and desertification. The League invited the CMS Secretariat to enhance its contribution to implementation in Arab States, notably through recognizing the importance of Arabic and the fact that language issues constituted a major barrier to implementation of CMS in the region. Arab States were also seeking support from the international community to take forward ideas relating to the "green economy" among the outcomes of Rio+20.

124. The **Chair** thanked countries from the Arabic-speaking region for their support to the Raptors MoU to date and concurred that language was a key issue for implementation across the geographical scope of the MoU. He invited the Secretariat to comment on the future timetable and how some of the barriers identified could be addressed.

125. **Mr Williams** suggested that those Signatories that had missed the two-year deadline might be given another year to complete their work on national/regional strategies. In order to understand

better the key challenges or barriers and which actions needed to be taken by whom to address such challenges, it would be useful to hear more about the experience of Signatories.

126. **Norway** reported that there had been a delay in development of its national strategy owing to financial and capacity constraints. The Norwegian authorities had recently contracted out the work to a consultant with a view to issuing a draft by April 2013 for finalization and sign-off in May 2013.

127. The **Chair** underlined the importance of drawing experience and 'lessons learned' from the development of the first few strategies under the MoU and making those lessons available to other Signatories.

128. **Mr Williams** noted that the ICU's Work Plan included the possibility of it hosting regional capacity-building workshops if technical capacity was identified as something that would be of assistance to any Signatories yet to produce their national or regional strategic plans.

129. **South Africa** confirmed that it was currently in the process of developing its national strategy, but that this had been delayed due to work on other national processes, including a legislative review and preparation of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP).

130. The **Chair** invited comments on the suggestion made by the ICU that the deadline for completion of national and regional strategies be extended by a year and asked whether this timescale allowed time for the submission of National Reports.

131. **Senegal** sought clarification of what was meant by 'deadline'. States were sovereign; if they did not have sufficient technical and financial capacity, they could not be compelled to meet a specific timeframe.

132. The **Chair** concurred that it was up to individual countries to contribute according to their national circumstances.

133. **South Africa** stressed that effective strategy development was a multi-stakeholder process – not something that could necessarily be completed easily.

134. The **Chair** agreed with the need to recognize that this was a relatively complex process that might take longer than one year. The main thing was to ensure that work got underway intersessionally.

135. **The UAE** confirmed that its national strategy was in preparation, but it might not be possible to complete the process within one year, given the special requirements of working within a federative structure.

136. In conclusion, the **Chair** suggested that the meeting should note:

- The relative complexity of the process of national/regional strategy development
- The need for common standards
- The need to engage stakeholders meaningfully and that that takes time.
- That the ICU would need time to assess the information from national and regional strategies and for an iterative process between the ICU and the Signatories ahead of MoS2, and that an 18-month timeframe from the time of this Meeting might therefore be appropriate.
- The need to learn from the experience of Signatories as the process of strategy development continued.
- The ICU's offer to hold a technical capacity building workshop.

137. The Meeting signalled its agreement with these points.

138. **BirdLife International** suggested that it would be worthwhile looking at CBD deadlines for NBSAPs and the possibilities for integrating development of strategies under the Raptor MoU to add value and efficiency.

139. The **Chair** concurred and felt that it might also be useful to look at the CMS reporting cycle with a view to feeding information from the Raptor MoU strategies into the next CMS COP in 2014.

## 12.2. National Reporting by Signatories

140. **Mr Williams** introduced Document 12.2 and its four annexes. He said that all MEAs were facing the challenge of gathering up-to-date information, which was of absolutely vital importance for the implementation of conservation actions. CMS Resolution 10.9 “Future Structure and Strategies of the CMS and CMS Family” called for the harmonization of reporting systems across the CMS Family and beyond, and paragraph 15 of the MoU required MoS1 to adopt a format and schedule for reports. AEWA had been in the lead in developing an online reporting system (ORS) and CMS was committed to adopting such a system.

141. **Mr Dereliev** gave a presentation based on the experience of AEWA and its Parties which had used the ORS for the reports submitted to the AEWA MOP5 in May 2012. The response rate at MOP5 had been 70 per cent, relatively high for MEAs, but the quality of reports varied. He said that similar presentations had been given at recent meetings of the CBD, Ramsar Convention and the Bern Convention and other MEAs were expressing interest in adopting the ORS.

142. The ORS had been designed with three languages but further languages could be added. It was also possible to attach files and web-links to reduce the amount of text that had to be directly added. This should spread the burden and enable the principal respondent to delegate responsibility to others. There was at present no analytical tool to process and collate data, and for MOP5, WCMC had been contracted to draw the reports together. An analytical tool would allow for graphs and composite data to be generated automatically, thus saving a significant amount of staff time and resources.

143. The **Chair** thanked AEWA for sharing its experiences.

144. **The UK** representative said that he had used the system to compile his country’s national report to AEWA and had found it straight-forward. It was possible to add data as and when required, and it would be beneficial if more MEAs used similar systems, as often the data requested were the same. The estimated cost of the analytical tool seemed high, but might be shared among all the MEAs interested in having the system to make it more cost effective.

145. The representative of the **EU** said that the member states had not had the opportunity of consulting, but pointed out that the MoU was unlike AEWA because it was not legally binding and recalled that it had been agreed to make the MoU report requirements as simple as possible. The European Commission and many national administrations had finite resources and were facing reductions in staff, and having to report on activities as well as the status of species could be onerous.

146. **The EU** made a statement to the effect that its Member States that were present at this meeting and Croatia, were of the view that National Reporting should be limited, simple and, insofar as possible, in line with other reporting obligations. This would avoid additional financial and administrative burdens and pressure on human resources and would avoid duplication of work and data submission requirements. This was particularly important given the significant financial and time constraints all were facing.

147. This general principle should be clearly communicated to the TAG, which should take these principles into consideration when drafting the reporting format of this legally non-binding MoU.

148. **Mr Williams** cited paragraph 18 of the MoU, where it stated that where signatories were also Parties to CMS, their national reports to CMS should include information on the implementation of the MoU. This provision aimed at eliminating duplication and enhancing harmonization. AEWA sought similar information for different species, but nonetheless there were potential synergies.

149. The representative of **France** highlighted the fact that he faced considerable demands to submit reports to MEAs and therefore welcomed the idea of the MoU adopting a similar system to AEWA, as this had worked well and would help save time and effort in compiling data.

150. **Mr Lenten** pointed out that UNEP had been working on harmonization of reporting for MEAs for ten years and progress had been slow. AEWA had broken new ground in helping develop an ORS, and he felt that countries such as France, which were Parties to CMS and several of its instruments, would benefit if there was a similar reporting system across the CMS Family. The **Chair** expressed the view that CMS as the parent convention had a responsibility for ensuring that the CMS Family adopted common and coherent practices.

151. For the sake of clarity, **Mr Dereliev** reiterated some of the salient points from his presentation. He recognized that Parties were putting pressure on secretariats to reduce the reporting burdens and to enhance harmonization, and this had to be done through the coordinating clusters of related instruments. The AEWA system would require less work in future rounds of the cycle as data entered when the system was set up would remain in place, and Parties would only have to provide updated information, as and when changes occurred and the new system allowed continuous reporting. Reporting was in his view not only vital for the monitoring of progress in implementation, but was also an integral part of the planning process.

152. The **Chair of the CMS Scientific Council** speaking of his experience of the AEWA system for Italy wholeheartedly recommended that the MoU adopt and adapt it.

153. The **International Association for Falconry and Conservation of Birds of Prey** asked how it was foreseen that Co-operating Partners could contribute to the reporting process. Mr Williams cited document 13.4 where a separate, less formal reporting mechanism for Co-operating Partners was mentioned.

154. The meeting noted the need for a coherent approach to be adopted in relation to National Reporting to the MoU, and recognised the value of the system developed by AEWA for reporting to that Agreement. The meeting requested that the TAG continue its deliberations and inform the Signatories through the Coordinating Unit of the format to be adopted for future reports.

## **Agenda Item 13. Institutional Arrangements/Matters**

### **13.1. Establishment of the Coordinating Unit**

155. The **Chair** said that the establishment of a coordinating unit was essential for the proper functioning of the MoU and recent experience had shown that a small, dynamic team could achieve a great deal.

156. **Mr Williams** cited paragraph 16 of the MoU requiring the establishment of a Coordinating Unit to be based in an appropriate office and setting out the range of its tasks. He gave a resume of the history of the CMS Office - Abu Dhabi, which had been set up in 2008 after CMS COP9 had accepted the offer of the Environment Agency - Abu Dhabi (EAD) on behalf of the Government of the

UAE. Work had started but had been interrupted by the departure of the first Programme Officer, and momentum had been regained after Mr Williams' entry on duty in 2011. The donor agreement had been signed in October 2009 under which the UAE provided US\$3.6 million for the triennium 2009-2011, and an extension had been agreed for US\$4 million to be paid for the period 2012-15, with the promise of a second extension to 2018, subject to a review in 2014. No other offers had been received.

157. The Meeting of the Signatories was invited to accept the generous offer from the EAD.

158. The representative of the **UAE** said that he was personally extremely happy that the collaboration between UNEP, CMS and the EAD had been most fruitful and hoped that it would continue and that the MoU would continue to flourish.

159. The representative of **Norway** expressed his appreciation of the offer from the UAE and strongly advocated that it be accepted. **France** and the **United Kingdom** responded in similar terms.

160. The offer from the UAE was therefore accepted and the Coordinating Unit was accordingly established. The Chairman thanked the Government of the UAE for its generous support of the MoU and of related activities.

### **13.2. Establishment of a Technical Advisory Group for the Raptors MoU**

161. Reporting on the deliberations of the temporary Working Group which convened to consider the proposed establishment of a Technical Advisory Group (TAG), **Mr Stroud** (UK) referred the meeting to the draft Terms of Reference (see Doc CMS/Raptors/MoS1/13.2 and its Annex). The potential tasks of the TAG were set out in sub-paragraphs 4 a-e. With respect to the size and composition of the TAG, it would be primarily made up of regional representatives nominated by Signatories supplemented by five thematic experts and a standing representative of BirdLife International (the IUCN Red List authority on birds) and observers from AEWA and the CMS Landbirds Action Plan. A nomination and selection process was proposed with some initial deviations required to establish an Interim TAG to operate intersessionally until the Second Meeting of Signatories (MoS2). Nominations would close on 28 February 2013 for members of the interim TAG. After MoS2, signatories would be invited to nominate candidates and a panel would compile a shortlist. The Chair and Vice-Chair would be elected from among the regional representatives of the signatories. The TAG would mainly operate through e-mail with some teleconferences, but physical meetings were also foreseen where funding was available.

162. The Annex to the Terms of Reference ("Priorities for the Interim TAG until the Second MoS") set out priorities and 13 main actions: the first two related to the MoU, the third to eighth dealt with threats and the ninth and tenth poisoning. Guidance was covered by the eleventh and twelfth, and the thirteenth dealt with reporting. The Terms of Reference for TAG, including priority tasks, are attached as Annex V to this report.

163. **The Chair** thanked the UK and France for having led the Working Group and asked the floor whether there were any comments.

164. **Norway** sought clarification on the status of the regional members and in particular whether they would be national representatives or serving in a personal capacity.

165. The **UK** emphasized that either the Terms of Reference or the Report of the Meeting should stress the importance of finding synergies with other MEAs and avoiding duplication between the work of the TAG and other technical and advisory groups, particularly within CMS.

166. Some minor drafting changes were agreed including the suggestion from the **International Falconry Association** that Co-operating Partners should also be added to those advised of vacancies on the TAG (paragraph 12). The section on officers was accepted as presented and there was general agreement that the *modus operandi* of the TAG should be kept simple and as inexpensive as possible.

167. The **UK** described the task list as an ambitious programme for the TAG to implement, stressing that it was for the MoS to set the agenda rather than the TAG, and while it was important that the TAG reviewed Annex I and Table III of the MoU, there should be no expectation that changes would have to be made following any such examination. A further drafting change removing the word “legal” from the heading dealing with protection was agreed.

168. There being no further comments and all delegations indicating that they were content, the **Chair** declared that the establishment of an interim TAG had been agreed, and that it should operate until the MoS2.

### **13.3. Procedures for Amending the MoU text and its Annexes**

169. **Mr Williams** noted that most of the issues regarding the mechanics of amending the Annexes had been comprehensively covered in the Rules of Procedure. Nonetheless, it would still be useful to understand the scientific background to the composition of the species and site lists annexed in the MoU.

170. To supplement the information contained in Document CMS/Raptors/MoS1/Inf 13.3 *Update of scientific data underpinning the Raptors MoU*, **Ms Vicky Jones** of BirdLife International presented additional facts and figures.

#### **BirdLife International Presentation**

171. The data for the feasibility study in 2005 was the scientific basis for negotiating the MoU and had been provided by BirdLife International. There had, however, been changes during the last six years that had generated a need to update this information in time for the MoS1. Accordingly, the ICU had commissioned BirdLife International to prepare revised and up-to-date data drawing on their own databases, the IUCN Species Information Service (SIS) and BirdLife International’s World Bird Database. One complication was that the definitions of “migration” and “migratory” used by BirdLife International differed from those used by CMS. Some taxonomic changes had been adopted since 2005, with the Black-eared Kite no longer recognized as a separate species now being included under *Milvus migrans* and the Snowy Owl (*Bubo scandiacus* formerly *Nyctea scandiaca*) and Mountain Hawk-eagle (*Nisaetus nipalense* formerly *Spizaetus nipalense*) listed under different genera.

172. Table I divided the species listed into three categories: those of global concern, those of regional concern, and others. On the positive side, due to population increases the Lesser Kestrel (*Falco naumanni*) was now qualified to be moved from the first group to the third. This good news was offset by a number of species with negative trends requiring them to be moved from the third category to the second. Details were contained in the report.

173. The global population trends for Annex I species indicated that 41 per cent were decreasing, 44 per cent stable and only 12 per cent increasing. The main threats were agro-industrial farming, persecution, hunting and trapping, and herbicides and pesticides.

174. Proposed changes to the sites in Table III were being suggested based largely on Important Bird Areas (IBAs) at key migration bottlenecks. There were large regional variations with regard to the level of protection being afforded IBAs with the position better in Europe and Africa than in the Middle East. The importance of site monitoring was emphasized and as the situation was constantly changing, scientific information underpinning the MoU was likely to need regular updates.

175. **Hungary** expressed caution about being too optimistic about the TAG being able to recommend the down-listing of species such as the Lesser Kestrel. The Natura 2000 network was nearly complete and EU Member States had obligations to report; so Special Protection Areas (SPAs) rather than IBAs should be used in EU.

176. **France** said that the IUCN Red List criteria aimed at pinpointing the degree of threat, but many species that were not considered to be threatened with extinction were now known to have highly depleted populations in the Range States. A distinction needed to be made between the risk of extinction and that of serious depletion threatening the long-term survival of species in parts of their range.

177. The **International Falconry Association** pointed out that hunting *per se* is a legal activity, and suggested that, where appropriate, references to hunting should either be qualified with the term “illegal” or replaced by the term “poaching”.

178. **Bangladesh** was co-operating with BirdLife International but was finding that with a changing environment as a result of climate change it was difficult to identify appropriate sites as IBAs. Ms Jones said that this very issue had been addressed as BirdLife tried to project the changes of birds found in IBAs. IBAs remained important “oases” in an inhospitable “desert”, but the range of species frequenting them altered. In response to the point made by France, she felt that a study of species in the Least Concern category but experiencing a steep decline would be useful.

179. **Mr Williams** thanked BirdLife International for its assistance and willingness to be flexible when the specifications for the revision of the report had to be changed relatively late in the process.

180. The **Chair** thanked Ms Jones for a very informative presentation.

#### **13.4. Co-operating Partners**

181. **Mr Williams** introduced document CMS/Raptors/MoS1/Doc.13.4 *Cooperating Partners*. He noted that according to Article 27 of the Raptors MoU: “Inter-Governmental and international and national non-governmental organisations may associate themselves with this Memorandum of Understanding through their signature as co-operating partners, in particular with the implementation of the Action Plan in accordance with Article VII, paragraph 9 of CMS”.

182. At the Meeting to Conclude the Raptors MoU in October 2008, the intersessional working group on administrative and financial matters recommended that “Co-operating Partners” (i.e. Signatories to the MoU that were not Range States or REIOs) indicate the type of contribution, whether financial or other, they would make to the implementation of the MoU when signing the agreement. It also reported that the role of NGOs “in helping to implement the agreement could not be underestimated”, because they “played a key role in delivering action at local and regional scale, providing vital information on the status of species and providing expert advice”.

183. Currently, the signature sheet in the original Raptors MoU document listed a number of Co-operating Partners that could potentially become signatories to the MoU. That list had been generated on the basis of the organizations that had attended the final MoU negotiation meeting held in Abu Dhabi in 2008.

184. The purpose of Doc.13.4 was to agree a procedure for accepting new Co-operating Partners to sign the Raptors MoU. The ICU proposed the following procedure:

- a) An expression of interest to sign the Raptors MoU should be sent to the Coordinating Unit, signed by the Head of the organization, containing information about the organization’s aim

and work. It should also indicate the type of contribution, whether financial or other, to be made to the implementation of the MoU. Expressions of interest could be sent at any time.

- b) The Coordinating Unit would review each complete expression of interest and circulate a recommendation to Signatories within 30 days of having received it. If no objections were forthcoming from any Signatory within 30 days of sending out the communication, the organisation would be invited to sign the MoU and the Coordinating Unit would make the necessary arrangements.
- c) If, however, any objections were received from one or more Signatories, the Coordinating Unit would collect and collate these up to the end of the 30 day consultation period. Within a further 30 days from that point, the Coordinating Unit would reconsider the case and circulate a further recommendation to Signatories, including full details of the objection(s) received. If no objections were forthcoming from any Signatory within 30 days of sending out the communication, the organization would be invited to sign the MoU and the Coordinating Unit would make the necessary arrangements. If, however, any objections were received from any Signatory within the 30-day period, the Coordinating Unit would advise the organization that their application had been rejected.

185. **Mr Williams** confirmed that the ICU proposed the following role for Co-operating Partners, as set out in Doc 13.4:

- To actively support and promote the implementation of the MoU and its objectives, and in particular, the Action Plan. This could be achieved via, for example, publications, outreach activities, conservation projects, research and/or promotion of the MoU in relevant fora.
- To report back to each MoS on activities carried out in collaboration and/or support of the MoU, and in particular the Action Plan.
- To consider establishing joint or collaborative work plans or projects with Signatories and/or the Coordinating Unit.
- To attend and participate at sessions of the Meeting of Signatories as an Observer.

186. The **Chair** invited comments on either the proposed procedure or the role of Co-operating Partners.

187. **Norway** noted that the MoS1 Working Group on Procedures had discussed the relationship between the Rules of Procedure (ROP) and the text of the MoU. Before the end of the meeting the Working Group would bring forward a suggested text to be annexed to the ROP an explanation of the difference between a Range State Signatory (upper-case 'S') and a Co-operating Partner signatory (lower-case 's'). There would be minor proposed adjustments to the text of the draft ROP in this regard.

188. The **Chair** concluded that final plenary consideration of this matter should await the outcomes of the Working Group.

189. The **International Association for Falconry and Conservation of Birds of Prey** suggested that Co-operating Partners should be able to nominate technical experts to serve on the TAG.

190. The **UK** noted that the Working Group on the TAG was suggesting that Co-operating Partners would be invited to attend TAG meetings as Observers.

191. The **Chair** concluded that the meeting was broadly in agreement with the proposals contained in Doc.13.4 but that further consideration and a final decision should be postponed to the following day, once the conclusions of the Working Group were available in writing.

192. The Meeting subsequently agreed the text submitted by the Working Group. The text agreed by the Meeting following consideration of the recommendations made by the Procedures and Finance Working Group is attached as Annex VI to this report.

193. The Working Group had considered combining its recommendations regarding Co-operating Partners with those concerning the Rules of Procedure for the MoS, but decided that the issues were sufficiently distinct to merit separate treatment.

## **Agenda Item 14. Financial and Administrative Matters**

### **14.1. Current Financial Status and Future Funding**

194. The **Chair** asked the Coordinating Unit to introduce CMS/Raptors/MoS1/Doc 14.1 *Current Financial Status and Future Funding* and the four associated annexes (*Financial Statement of the ICU for Raptors MoU, Summaries of project proposals submitted to the CMS Small Grants Programme 2012, Estimated voluntary assessed annual contributions by Signatories to generate US\$ 200,000 per year and Estimated voluntary assessed annual contributions by Signatories to generate US\$ 650,000 per year*) before the Meeting took the reports of the Working Group.

195. At the Meeting to Conclude the Raptors MoU in October 2008, the Intersessional Working Group on Administrative and Financial Matters reported (UNEP/CMS/AEBOP/2/8/Rev.11) that '*an indicative level of contributions should be agreed at the first Meeting of the Signatories after the MoU comes into force*', and that '*this could be based on a methodology linked to the UN Scale of Assessments*'. The Working Group also noted, however, that '*the extent of contributions could be heavily affected by a decision by one or more Range States to substantially fund the agreement*'. Accordingly two scenarios had been elaborated generating US\$200,000 and \$650,000 per annum and these were presented in Annexes III and IV of the paper respectively.

196. The EAD, on behalf of the Government of the UAE, had funded the CMS Office - Abu Dhabi from the outset with a contribution for the first triennium 2009-2012 of US\$ 3.6 million. The current agreement with an increased amount of financial support would run until to 2015 and was anticipated to be extended further to 2018, subject to a review in 2014.

197. Some requests had been received from signatories seeking financial assistance to help develop national and regional strategies. To date, the ICU had applied a rule that funds from the EAD should be used exclusively for international rather than national activities, primarily to avoid the resources being spread too thin. Voluntary contributions however might be sought to fund such work.

198. CMS had a Small Grants Programme (SGP) and associated guidelines for its operation had been set by COP10. AEWA had a similar facility. The most recent call for applications under the CMS SGP had produced eight proposals of good quality concerning raptors, but as the call was oversubscribed, only one – on the Sooty falcon – was successful.

199. Over last 12 months, the ICU had conducted various proactive fundraising efforts to raise additional resources. To date some US\$216,000 had been secured. With still a small number of proposals under consideration, this figure might yet increase further.

200. Since there had clearly been much interest in presenting raptor-related projects under the CMS Small Grants Programme, Signatories could consider establishing a similar mechanism specifically for the Raptors MoU. This would not conflict with the CMS programme, but be complementary. In the paper four possible means for resourcing such a mechanism had been identified: (i) *ad hoc* Voluntary Contributions from Signatories; (ii) Regular Voluntary Contributions from Signatories based on an indicative scale; (iii) Concerted programme of fundraising; and (iv) in-

kind contributions. The Raptors MoU could consider recruiting a fund-raising expert in conjunction with the Dugongs MoU, drawing on the expertise of people familiar with the region given the cultural significance of particular raptor species in the Middle East.

201. The **UK** which had chaired the Procedures and Finance Working Group reported on its two sessions. The continuing generous support of EAD, on behalf of the Government of the UAE, was noted with deep appreciation and gratitude. The summary of the Working Group's conclusions and recommendations was that the Signatories:

- *decided* to continue the current system of *ad hoc* voluntary contributions for implementation of the MoU;
- to enable funding to be sourced, *requested* the Coordinating Unit, in cooperation with the TAG, to compile a prioritised list of activities for implementation of the MoU that were to be undertaken in the intersessional period and to communicate details of these activities to Signatories, non-Signatory Range States, Co-operating Partners and other relevant stakeholders on an annual basis;
- *invited* Signatories, non-Signatory Range States, Co-operating Partners and other relevant stakeholders to provide contributions (either financial or in kind) for implementation of these activities;
- *further requested* the Coordinating Unit to provide a full financial breakdown of the funding requirements for the activities recommended by the TAG to MoS2;
- whilst welcoming the proposal to establish a small grants programme, *would transmit* this proposal to MoS2 for further consideration once the TAG was fully established and had developed the procedures and expertise necessary to assess applications for grants, and in this regard *recommended* that consideration be given to ensuring that any projects for which grant funding might be sought in future demonstrate commitment to the project by providing financial or in-kind contributions towards the project's implementation;
- *invited* Signatories, non-Signatory Range States, Co-operating Partners and other stakeholders to consider bilateral approaches to initiate and resource urgent projects.

202. **Switzerland** pointed out that the MoU was part of the CMS Family. CMS was recognized as the lead partner of CBD in matters relating to migratory species and CBD had a financial mechanism. National biodiversity strategies needed to be funded, so CMS might seek GEF and other money available for NBSAPs to help Signatories develop their strategies.

203. **Norway** said that the UK only mentioned countries applying for funding and sought clarification whether organizations such as BirdLife International seeking to benefit would have to channel their requests through Signatories. **Mr Lenten** said that this was the procedure under the CMS Small Grants Programme. The UK suggested that this issue be referred to the TAG to consider.

204. **South Africa** expressed concern about using resources to employ a fund-raiser if no additional resources resulted. At this stage, fund-raising should be an *ad hoc* activity. South Africa agreed that the government of any country where a project was to take place should be on board and asked whether there was a half-way house between a system of funding based on the UN Scale and a totally voluntary one.

## Key points

### **Voluntary contributions**

205. The Working Group had advocated a purely voluntary system for contributions whereas South Africa had expressed doubts about how regularly non-assessed contributions would be paid. The UK opposed any degree of compulsion as it was still unclear what the demands on the budget would be.

206. It was therefore agreed to retain for the time being an *ad hoc* voluntary system which would be reviewed periodically.

### **Priority List**

207. A list of projects was to be prepared by the TAG to help inform the discussion to identify priorities for funding. At South Africa's suggestion, the draft list would be circulated to Signatories and Co-operating Partners to broaden the consultation process and maximize ownership. The CU should prepare a financial estimate of the costs of the projects identified by the TAG.

### **Signatories, Range States, Co-operating Partners and Stakeholders**

208. All of these actors were to be requested to provide financial and in kind support. The value of in kind rather than financial assistance should not be underestimated.

### **Small Grants Programme**

209. It was agreed that any decision about establishing a Small Grants Programme would be deferred until MoS2 by which time the TAG would have been able to start assessing the priorities for action under the MoU.

### **Encouraging bilateral approaches**

210. The **Working Group's** suggestion that Signatories, non-Signatory Range States, Co-operating Partners and other stakeholders should be encouraged to consider bilateral approaches to initiate and resource urgent projects was accepted by the Plenary. **South Africa** supported by **Equatorial Guinea** said that if the CU wanted to launch a major initiative, negotiations might need to be directed through diplomatic channels, with the Foreign Affairs Ministry rather than with the NCP. The **Chair** agreed that in some cases activities might need the involvement of Foreign Affairs Ministries, but in others, where NGOs were involved, this would, in all probability, not be necessary. The CU should approach the appropriate authority.

### **Emergencies**

211. The parent Convention had adopted a formal procedure for dealing with interventions when emergencies arose. There were no further comments from the floor.

212. The **Chair** confirmed with the UK, that as convener of the Working Group they were satisfied that all points raised had been adequately covered. **The UK** acknowledged that good coverage of the points had been achieved and progress made.

### **CMS Small Grants Programme (SGP)**

213. **Ms Christiane Röttger** gave a presentation outlining the operation of the CMS SGP, the goals of which were to catalyze the development and implementation of concerted and cooperative

actions, to create incentives for the conservation of migratory populations of species and their habitats, to stimulate dialogue and co-operation at the local and regional level and to raise awareness of the conservation and management needs of migratory species and their habitats.

214. All species included in the CMS Appendices qualified for funding. Eligible activities included fieldwork, conservation actions, building regional and national cooperation, capacity building and awareness-raising, etc.

215. The SGP was inaugurated in 1994 when it was funded from surpluses in the Convention's Trust Fund. After a period of dormancy due to lack of funding the Programme was revived thanks to a pledge of US\$300,000 from UNEP for the 2012-2014 triennium. A total of 75 applications were received in response to the 2012 call and of these 12 were selected for funding and a total of €154,000 was allocated. A further call was planned for the end of 2013 when an additional €77,000 would be available for distribution.

216. The **Chair of the CMS Scientific Council** reiterated how convinced he was of the importance of the SGP, as CMS based its decisions on sound science. The SGP was a life-line to scientists and Parties. The varied range of applications posed a challenge to the selection panel. He hoped that more resources would be forthcoming for further rounds. Projects led to the publication of scientific papers and this added to the profile and reputation of CMS.

217. **South Africa** agreed about the importance of the SGP and re-echoed the point raised by Switzerland that raptors needed to be included in NBSAPs and other seams of funding exploited. It was important to find long-term, secure funding sources as voluntary contributions tended to be sporadic.

218. The **Chair** commented that he was confident that voluntary contributions would be forthcoming. It was part of human nature to like giving presents and not to like being taxed.

219. **France** pointed out that there were important criteria for eligibility with applied research qualifying for funding. It was also important with a cap of €15,000 on the grants that bureaucracy and administration should be kept to a minimum.

220. **Madagascar** expressed thanks for the grant towards the project involving the Sooty Falcon (*Falco concolor*).

221. **Bangladesh** urged that priorities be set and these should include projects concerned with restoring damaged raptor habitats.

222. **Mr Lenten** pointed out that the 2012 call for projects had been the first for ten years and to have funded all the applications would have required US\$1.5 million. While twelve projects had received a grant, the majority went empty handed, which was the downside of the SGP and might lead to CMS losing some of its reputation.

#### **14.2. Arrangements for Convening Meetings of Signatories**

223. The Finance and Procedure Working Group had already dealt with this issue comprehensively in its report and the arrangements for convening the MoS were included in the revised Rules of Procedure, a copy of which are attached as Annex IV.

#### **Agenda Item 15. Adoption of Outcomes**

224. **The Chair** itemized the principal outcomes of MoS1. These were:

- a) adoption of Rules of Procedure;
- b) an 18-month deadline for Signatories to develop their national or regional strategies;
- c) agreement in principle to a national reporting system, utilizing the Online Reporting System, for which the TAG would finalize details;
- d) formal acceptance of the offer from EAD, on behalf of the Government of the UAE to continue funding the Coordinating Unit;
- e) formal agreement to the establishment of the Coordinating Unit;
- f) the establishment of the Technical Advisory Group;
- g) endorsement of the CMS COP Resolution on power lines;
- h) adoption of mechanisms for accepting Co-operating Partners; and,
- i) initiation of a process for the CU to establish an Interim TAG to operate inter-sessionally until MoS2.

225. **Mr Williams** declared the CU entirely satisfied with the outcomes (see Annex VII) and looked forward to start implementing the Meeting's decisions.

#### **Agenda Item 16. Date and Venue of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of Signatories**

226. **Mr Williams** said that no offers had been received to host MoS2 at this stage, and no offers were forthcoming from the floor. The **Chair** suggested that the issue of the venue be left open but commented that given the MoU covered a large geographical area, it would be good over time to hold meetings in as many countries in different regions as possible so that delegates could see conditions on the ground.

#### **Agenda Item 17. Any Other Business**

227. **South Africa** read a statement, expressing pleasure at being part of MoS1 and optimism that progress would be made in addressing the challenges ahead. It was clear that half of the raptor species in the area covered by the MoU had a poor conservation status and were suffering long-term declines due to human pressures, habitat loss, illegal shooting and poisoning, collisions with power lines and climate change.

228. The funds available for the MoU were limited especially in developing countries, countries with economies in transition and Small Island Developing States, so it was important to integrate efforts to protect raptors into other UN mechanisms, such as GEF. Policies related to the conservation of migratory species had to be included in NBSAPs and attention given to capacity building and raising public awareness.

#### **Amur Falcons**

229. **South Africa** raised the issue of Amur Falcons (*Falco amurensis*). The need for CMS to remain vigilant had been re-emphasized through news of the mass harvest of the falcons in Nagaland, India. The CMS Secretariat was asked to provide an update of the latest available information.

230. **Mr Lenten** said that the Amur Falcon harvest had been raised at the recent meeting of the CMS Standing Committee, which had requested the CMS Secretariat to contact the Indian authorities. This had been done. Mr Lenten had been informed that the Federal Government had in turn contacted the State authorities in Nagaland and steps were being taken to stop the killing. It was estimated that as many as 150,000 birds were being taken annually, a level that was unsustainable.

## **Agenda Item 18. Closure of the Meeting**

231. **Mr Williams** said that he was confident that following an unplanned period of dormancy the Raptors MoU was back on track, thanks to the generous financial and logistical support of EAD on behalf of the Government of the UAE, and the UK, plus the commitment and dedication of the small team at the Coordinating Unit. He particularly thanked the Chair of the meeting for his wise stewardship, the conveners and rapporteurs of the two Working Groups, his colleagues at the CMS Secretariat in Bonn, the interpreters and the report writers. He noted with satisfaction the fact that two further countries had become Signatories and that the MoS had established the Coordinating Unit and the TAG.

232. After the customary expression of thanks to all those who had contributed to the success of the meeting, and in particular EAD, especially for hosting the Gala Dinner, and the Governments of the United Arab Emirates and the United Kingdom, the **Chair** declared proceedings closed at 12:45 on Tuesday 11 December 2012.

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS / LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS**

**SIGNATORIES / SIGNATAIRES**

(34 Representatives from 23 Signatory States and the European Union)

(34 Représentants de 23 États signataires et de l'Union Européenne)

**ARMENIA / ARMENIE**

Mr. Martiros Nalbandyan  
CMS Focal Point for Armenia  
Yerevan State University  
Ministry of Nature Protection  
Government Building 3, Republic Square  
P.O. Box 375010  
Yerevan 010  
Tel: +374 9813 1471  
Fax: +374 1058 5469  
Email: [mnalbandyan@rambler.ru](mailto:mnalbandyan@rambler.ru)

**BURUNDI**

Ms. Marie Rose Kabura  
Adviser in the Minister's Cabinet and National  
Focal Point of CMS  
Ministry of Water, Environment, Land and  
Urban Planning  
BP 631, Avenue de la Cathédrale  
Bujumbura  
Tel: +257 79 938 502  
Email: [kaburamr@yahoo.fr](mailto:kaburamr@yahoo.fr)

**CHAD / TCHAD**

Ma. Hassane Idriss Mahamat Hassane  
Chef de Service de Sensibilisation  
Direction des parcs nationaux des réserves de  
faune et de la chasse / Ministère de  
l'environnement et des ressources  
halieutiques  
BP 2115, 438 REPOS II CARREE 15  
Ndjamena 00235  
Tel: +235 66 21 93 40  
Fax: +235 22 52 29 47  
Email: [mhi1962@yahoo.fr](mailto:mhi1962@yahoo.fr)

**EQUATORIAL GUINEA/GUINÉE ÉQUATORIALE**

Sr. Santiago Biyang Mba  
Head of the Ministry of Environment and CMS  
Focal Point  
Regional Delegation of the Ministry of  
Fisheries and Environment  
Bata Litoral  
Tel: +240 24 14 17  
Email: [santiagobiyang@yahoo.es](mailto:santiagobiyang@yahoo.es)

**EUROPEAN UNION / UNION EUROPÉENNE**

Mr. Paulo Domingos Paixão  
Policy Officer  
European Commission  
Avenue de Beaulieu 5  
Brussels 1160  
Tel: +322 296 6940  
Email: [paulo.domingos-paixao@ec.europa.eu](mailto:paulo.domingos-paixao@ec.europa.eu)

**FRANCE**

Mr. Jean-Philippe Siblet  
Head of Natural Heritage Service  
National Museum of Natural History  
P.O. Box 51, 36 Geoffroy Street  
Paris  
Tel: +33 680155207  
Email: [siblet@mnhn.fr](mailto:siblet@mnhn.fr)

**GERMANY**

Mr. Oliver Schall  
Deputy Head of Division Species Protection  
German Ministry for the Environment (BMU)  
P.O. Box 12 06 29, Robert-Schuman-Platz 3  
Bonn 53175  
Tel: +49 22899 3052632  
Fax: +49 22899 3052684  
Email: [oliver.schall@bmu.bund.de](mailto:oliver.schall@bmu.bund.de)

**GHANA**

Mr. Kofi Adu-Nsiah  
Executive Director  
Wildlife Division, Forestry Commission  
MB 239, Near Gimpa Achimota  
Accra  
Email: [adunsiah@yahoo.com](mailto:adunsiah@yahoo.com)

**HUNGARY / HONGRIE**

Mr. András Schmidt  
Deputy Head of Department for Nature  
Conservation  
Ministry for Rural Development  
Kossuth tér 11.  
Budapest 2600  
Tel: +36 17952399  
Fax: +36 17950080  
Email: [andras.schmidt@vm.gov.hu](mailto:andras.schmidt@vm.gov.hu)

Mr. Matyas Prommer  
Expert of the Saker Falcon LIFE+ Project  
MME/Birdlife Hungary  
Költő u. 21.  
Budapest 1121  
Tel: + 36 205531296  
Email: [prommer.matyas@mme.hu](mailto:prommer.matyas@mme.hu)

#### **MADAGASCAR**

Mr. Lily Arison Rene de Roland  
National Director of the Peregrine Fund  
Project, the Peregrine Fund  
P.O. Box 4113  
Antananarivo  
Tel: +261 32 83 78103  
Email: [lilyarison@yahoo.fr](mailto:lilyarison@yahoo.fr)

#### **MONGOLIA / MONGOLIE**

Ms. Onon Yondon  
Specialist  
Ministry of Nature, Environment, and Green  
Development  
2nd Building of Government  
Ulaanbaatar 38-415  
Tel: +976 11 311265  
Fax: +976 11 310721  
Email: [onon@wwf.mn](mailto:onon@wwf.mn)

#### **NIGER<sup>1</sup>**

Mr. Laoual Abagana Ali  
Associate Director for Fauna, Hunting, and  
Protected Areas  
Head Office of the Environment, Water &  
Forests  
P.O. Box 578, Route de Tondbiya  
Niamey  
Tel: +22796288750  
Fax: +22720733755  
Email: [aliabagana@yahoo.fr](mailto:aliabagana@yahoo.fr)

#### **NORWAY / NORVÈGE**

Mr. Øystein Størkersen  
Principal Adviser  
Norwegian Directorate for Nature  
Management  
P.O. Box 5672, Sluppen, Tungasletta 2  
Trondheim 7485  
Tel: +47 7358 0500  
Fax: +47 7358 0501  
Email: [oystein.storkersen@dirnat.no](mailto:oystein.storkersen@dirnat.no)

#### **PAKISTAN**

Mr. Umeed Khalid  
Conservator Wildlife  
Ministry of Climate Change  
NCCW, Building No.14-D, 2nd Floor  
F 8 Markaz  
Islamabad 44000  
Tel/Fax: +92 51 9262270  
Email: [umeed\\_khalid@yahoo.com](mailto:umeed_khalid@yahoo.com)

#### **ROMANIA / ROUMANIE**

Ms. Nela Miauta  
CMS National Focal Point  
Ministry of the Environment and Forests  
Liberatii Street No. 12  
Bucharest 040129  
Tel: +40 754 23 15 17  
Fax: +40 21 4089634  
Email: [nela.miauta@mmediu.ro](mailto:nela.miauta@mmediu.ro)

#### **SENEGAL / SÉNÉGAL**

Ms. Ndeye Sene Ep Thiam  
Conservator, Directorate of National Parks  
P.O. Box 5135  
Dakar  
Tel: +221 77 6534180  
Email: [ndeyesenethiam2003@yahoo.fr](mailto:ndeyesenethiam2003@yahoo.fr)

#### **SLOVAKIA / SLOVAQUIE**

Mr. Michal Adamec  
Deputy Director  
State Nature Conservancy of the Slovak  
Republic  
Tajovského 28B  
Banská Bystrica 97401  
Tel: +421 903298115  
Fax: +421 484722036  
Email: [michal.adamec@sopsr.sk](mailto:michal.adamec@sopsr.sk)

#### **SOMALIA / SOMALIE<sup>1</sup>**

Mr. Ahmed Osman  
Wildlife Director  
Ministry of Fishery, Marine Resources &  
Environment  
Maka al-mukarama near the State House  
Mogadishu  
Tel: +252615337509  
Email: [axmedbusuri70@hotmail.com](mailto:axmedbusuri70@hotmail.com)

---

<sup>1</sup> Signed Raptors MoU at MOS1 / A signé le MdE  
Rapaces à la MOS1

**SOUTH AFRICA / AFRIQUE DU SUD**

Ms. Nopasika Malta Qwathekana  
Director, International Biodiversity & Heritage  
Department of Environmental Affairs of South  
Africa  
315 Cnr Pretorius and Van der Walt Street  
Pretoria 0001  
Tel: +27 12 310 3067  
Fax: +27 12 320 1343  
Email: [mqwathekana@environment.gov.za](mailto:mqwathekana@environment.gov.za)

Ms. Humbulani Mafumo  
Deputy Director  
Department of Environmental Affairs of South  
Africa  
315 Cnr Pretorius and Van der Walt Street  
Pretoria 0001  
Tel: +27 12 310 3712  
Fax: +27 86 541 1102  
Email: [hmafumo@environment.gov.za](mailto:hmafumo@environment.gov.za)

**SUDAN / SOUDAN**

Mr. Sanad Elarabi  
Director  
Wildlife Conservation General Administration  
P.O. Box 336, Street 60  
Khartoum  
Tel: +249 912310820  
Fax: +249 183522109  
Email: [wildlife\\_sudan33@yahoo.com](mailto:wildlife_sudan33@yahoo.com)

**UNITED ARAB EMIRATES /  
ÉMIRATS ARABES UNIS**

Environment Agency - Abu Dhabi  
P.O. Box 45553, Muroor Street, Abu Dhabi  
Tel: +971 2 6934 + extension

Dr. Shaikha Al Dhaheri  
Executive Director  
Terrestrial and Marine Biodiversity  
Email: [saldhaheri@ead.ae](mailto:saldhaheri@ead.ae) Tel. ext. 545

Mr. Abdunasser Ali Al Shamsi  
Director, Terrestrial Biodiversity  
Email: [analshamsi@ead.ae](mailto:analshamsi@ead.ae) Tel. ext. 700

Mr. Salim Javed  
Manager, Terrestrial Assessment &  
Conservation  
Email: [sjaved@ead.ae](mailto:sjaved@ead.ae) Tel. ext. 711

Mr. Shahid Khan  
Associate Scientist  
Tel: + 971 2693566  
Email: [skhan@ead.ae](mailto:skhan@ead.ae)

Mr. Shakeel Ahmed  
Tel: + 971 507518058  
Email: [akhan@ead.ae](mailto:akhan@ead.ae)

Mr. Junid Shah  
Tel: +971 502385670  
Email: [jnshah@ead.ae](mailto:jnshah@ead.ae)

Mr. Abdullah Al Hammadi  
Technical Assistant  
Tel: + 971 504212144  
Email: [abhammadi@ead.ae](mailto:abhammadi@ead.ae)

Mr. Eisa Al Hammadi  
Technical Assistant  
Tel: + 971 2 8989 233  
Email: [EalHammadi@ead.ae](mailto:EalHammadi@ead.ae)

**UNITED KINGDOM / ROYAUME-UNI**

Mrs. Elaine Kendall  
Head of Wildlife Crime, Birds and Zoos Policy  
Defra  
Zone 1/14, Temple Quay House, 2  
The Square  
Bristol BS1 6 EB  
Tel: +44 0117 3723595  
Email: [Elaine.kendall@defra.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Elaine.kendall@defra.gsi.gov.uk)

Mr. David Stroud  
Senior Ornithologist  
UK Joint Nature Conservation Committee  
City Road, Monkstone House  
Peterborough PE1 1JY  
Tel: +44 1733 866810  
Fax: +44 1733 555948  
Email: [David.Stroud@jncc.gov.uk](mailto:David.Stroud@jncc.gov.uk)

Mrs. Clare Hamilton  
Lawyer  
UK Department for Environment, Food & Rural  
Affairs  
Area 3A, Horseferry Road  
London SW1P 2AL  
Tel: +44 2072 380533  
Email: [Clare.Hamilton@defra.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Clare.Hamilton@defra.gsi.gov.uk)

**YEMEN / YÉMEN**

Mr. Galal Al Harogi  
Ministry of Water and Environment –  
Environment Protection Authority (EPA)  
P.O. Box 10442  
Tel: +967 777644797  
Email: [gharogi@gmail.com](mailto:gharogi@gmail.com)

**NON-SIGNATORY RANGE STATES /**  
**ÉTATS DE L'AIRES DE RÉPARTITION NON SIGNATAIRES**  
(24 Representatives from 20 Non-Signatory Range States)  
(24 Représentants de 20 États de l'aire de répartition non signataires)

**AFGHANISTAN**

Mr. Abdul Wali Modaqiq  
Deputy Director General  
National Environmental Protection Agency  
P.O. Box 209, Parwan 2  
Kabul  
Tel: +93 799 13 16 18  
Email: [wali.modaqiq@gmail.com](mailto:wali.modaqiq@gmail.com)

**BAHRAIN**

Mr. Abdulqader Khamis  
Head of Marine Projects Assessment Unit  
Supreme Council for Environment  
P.O. Box 18233  
Manama  
Tel: +973 1738 6571  
Fax: +973 1738 6556  
Email: [gaderk@pmew.gov.bh](mailto:gaderk@pmew.gov.bh)

**BANGLADESH**

Mr. Tapan Kumar Dey  
Conservator of Forests, Wildlife and Nature  
Conservation Circle  
Sher-E- Bangla nagar  
1207 Dhaka  
Tel: +88 02 8181142  
Fax: +88 02 8181142  
Email: [deytkcfwild@gmail.com](mailto:deytkcfwild@gmail.com)

**BHUTAN / BHOUTAN**

Mr. Kado Tshering  
Chief of Forest Division and Phibsoo Wildlife  
Sanctuary  
Department of Forest & Park Services  
Email: [kadoting@yahoo.com](mailto:kadoting@yahoo.com)

**BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA /**  
**BOSNIE-HERZÉGOVINE**

Mr. Mehmed Cero  
Assistant Minister on Environment  
Federal Ministry on Environment and Tourism  
H. Redzica 6  
Sarajevo 71000  
Tel: +387 33 215 529  
Email: [mehmedc@fmoit.gov.ba](mailto:mehmedc@fmoit.gov.ba)

**CROATIA / CROATIE**

Ms. Tamara Cimborazovko  
Expert Advisor  
Ministry of Environmental and Nature  
Protection  
Savska c. 41/20  
Zagreb 10000  
Tel: +385 14866107  
Fax: +385 14866-100  
Email: [tamara.cimborazovko@mzoip.hr](mailto:tamara.cimborazovko@mzoip.hr)

**CYPRUS / CHYPRE**

Mr. Panagiotis (Panicos) Panagitis  
Game & Fauna Officer  
Game Fund  
Ministry of Interior  
Nicosia 1453  
Tel: +35 722560113  
Fax: +35 722560114  
Email: [panayides.gf@cytanet.com.cy](mailto:panayides.gf@cytanet.com.cy)

Mr. Petros Anayiotos  
Game & Fauna Officer  
Game & Fauna Service  
Ministry of Interior  
Nicosia 1453  
Tel: + 35 722867786  
Fax: +35 722867780  
Email : [lefkosia.gf@cytanet.com.cy](mailto:lefkosia.gf@cytanet.com.cy)

**CZECH REPUBLIC / RÉPUBLIQUE TCHÈQUE**

Mrs. Libuše Vlasáková  
National Focal Point for CMS  
Ministry of the Environment  
Vršovická 65  
Prague 100 10  
Tel: +42 267 122 372  
Email: [libuse.vlasakova@mzp.cz](mailto:libuse.vlasakova@mzp.cz)

**GEORGIA / GÉORGIE**

Ms. Irine Lomashvili  
Chief Specialist for Biodiversity Protection  
Ministry of Environment Protection  
6 Gulua Street  
Tbilisi 0114  
Tel: +995 32 2727231  
Fax: +995 32 2727231  
Email: [irinaloma@yahoo.com](mailto:irinaloma@yahoo.com)

**ISRAEL / ISRAËL**

Mr. Ohad Hatzofe  
Ecologist  
Nature & Parks Authority  
Am Ve'Olamo 3  
Jerusalem 95463  
Tel: +972 577762344  
Fax: +972 25006248  
Email: [ohad@npa.org.il](mailto:ohad@npa.org.il)

**KAZAKHSTAN**

Dr. Sergey Sklyarenko  
Science Director  
Head of the Centre for Conservation Biology  
Association for the Conservation of  
Biodiversity of Kazakhstan  
Orbita-1, 40, of. 203  
Almaty 050060  
Tel/Fax: +7 727 2203877  
Email: [sergey.sklyarenko@acbk.kz](mailto:sergey.sklyarenko@acbk.kz)

**OMAN**

Dr. Mansoor Al Jahdhami  
Head of Research  
Office for Conservation of Environment  
Diwan of Royal Court  
P.O. Box 246  
Muscat 100  
Tel: +968 24941947  
Fax: +968 24691498  
Email: [mhjahdhami@gmail.com](mailto:mhjahdhami@gmail.com)

Mr. Waheed Al Fazari  
Wildlife Biologist  
Office for Conservation of Environment  
Diwan of Royal Court  
P.O. Box 246  
Muscat 100  
Tel: +968 24941950  
Fax: +968 24691498  
Email: [waheed.alfazari@gmail.com](mailto:waheed.alfazari@gmail.com)

**SAUDI ARABIA / ARABIE SAOUDITE**

Dr. Mohammed Shobrak  
Representative to the Meeting to Negotiate  
the Institutional and Legal Framework for the  
Central Asian Flyway  
Saudi Wildlife Authority  
P.O. Box 888  
Al Hawyah Street Taif University  
Taif 21974  
Tel: +966 505721001  
Fax: +966 27241880  
Email: [mshobrak@gmail.com](mailto:mshobrak@gmail.com)

Mr. Ammar Almomen  
Representative to the Meeting to Negotiate  
the Institutional and Legal Framework for the  
Central Asian Flyway  
Saudi Wildlife Authority  
P.O. Box 11071, Street 138 - Jubail Marine  
Wildlife Sanctuary  
Taif Jubail 31961  
Tel: +966 567289888  
Fax: +966 3 3412415  
Email: [almomun1@gmail.com](mailto:almomun1@gmail.com)

**SOUTH SUDAN / SOUDAN DU SUD**

Mr. Peter Minasona  
Director  
Ministry of Wildlife Conservation and Tourism  
P.O. Box 77  
Juba  
Tel: +211956188652  
Email: [minasonalero@yahoo.com](mailto:minasonalero@yahoo.com)

**SRI LANKA**

Dr. Thulmini Arambage  
Veterinary Surgeon  
Department of Wildlife Conservation  
P.O. Box 811A, Jayanthipura Road  
Battaramulla 10120  
Tel: +94112888585  
Fax: +94112883355  
Email: [thulminid@yahoo.com](mailto:thulminid@yahoo.com)

Mr. Sunil Galagama  
Embassy of Sri Lanka  
P.O. Box 46534  
Villa No. 3, Sector E-4, Madinat Zayed  
Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates  
Tel: +00971559415321  
Fax: +0097126331661  
Email: [sunilgalagama@hotmail.com](mailto:sunilgalagama@hotmail.com)

**SWITZERLAND / SUISSE**

Dr. Olivier Biber  
International Biodiversity Policy Advisor  
Gruner AG for FOEN  
Sägerstrasse 73  
Köniz  
Tel: +41 319172089  
Fax: +41 319172021  
Email: [olivier.biber@gruner.ch](mailto:olivier.biber@gruner.ch)

**TAJIKISTAN**

Mr. Nurali Saidov  
Head  
State Agency of Natural Protected Areas  
Drujba Narodov Street 62  
Dushanbe 734025  
Tel: +992 37 222 14 67  
Fax: +992 37 222 07 97  
Email: [nsaidov70@yahoo.com](mailto:nsaidov70@yahoo.com)

**THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF  
MACEDONIA / EX RÉPUBLIQUE YOUGOSLAVE  
DE MACÉDOINE**

Mr. Branko Micevski  
President  
Macedonian Bonn Committee  
Blvd. ASNOM 58, 2/4  
Skopje 1000  
Tel: +389 78 254 736  
Fax: +389 22 432 071  
Email: [brankom@ukim.edu.mk](mailto:brankom@ukim.edu.mk)

**TUNISIA / TUNISIE**

Mr. Khaled Zahzah  
Under-Director of Hunting and National Parks  
Head Office of Forests  
30 Rue Alain Savary  
Tunis 1002  
Tel: +216 98665386  
Fax: +216 71794107  
Email: [khaledzahzah2000@yahoo.fr](mailto:khaledzahzah2000@yahoo.fr)

**UZBEKISTAN**

Mr. Maxim Mitropolskiy  
State Inspection of the Republic of Uzbekistan  
on Guards and Rational Use  
of Animal & Vegetative World  
Tashkent  
Fax: +998 90 3191591  
Email: [max\\_raptors@list.ru](mailto:max_raptors@list.ru)

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS /  
ORGANISATIONS INTERGOUVERNEMENTALES**

(1 Representative from 1 organisation)

(1 représentant d'une organisation)

**LEAGUE OF ARAB STATES**

Ms. Nermin Wafa  
Head of Programs & Activities Division  
League of Arab States  
1 Tahrir  
Cairo  
Egypt  
Tel: +20 225750511  
Fax: +20 225743023  
Email: [sa22401@gmail.com](mailto:sa22401@gmail.com)

**NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS AND OTHER PARTIES /  
ORGANISATIONS NON-GOUVERNEMENTALES ET AUTRES PARTIES**

(13 Representatives from 10 organisations)

(13 représentants de 10 organisations)

**ASSOCIATION CONGOLAISE POUR LA  
PRESERVATION DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT ET LE  
DEVELOPPEMENT COMMUNAUTAIRE**

Mr. Patrick Arsene Goma  
President  
P.O. Box 14196, 18 Bis Rue Mbote Bacongo  
Brazzaville 242  
Congo  
Tel: +242 055 483 074  
Fax: +242 069 316 222  
Email: [acpedc@gmail.com](mailto:acpedc@gmail.com)

**BIRDLIFE INTERNATIONAL<sup>2</sup>**

Ms. Nicola Crockford  
International Species Policy Officer  
RSPB  
The Lodge, Sandy IP28 6SD  
United Kingdom  
Tel: +44 1767 693072  
Fax: +44 1767 683211  
Email: [nicola.crockford@rspb.org.uk](mailto:nicola.crockford@rspb.org.uk)

Dr. Vicky Jones  
Global Flyways Officer  
1 Wellbrook Court  
Cambridge CB30NA  
United Kingdom  
Tel: +44 1223 279862  
Fax: +44 1223 277200  
Email: [vicky.jones@birdlife.org](mailto:vicky.jones@birdlife.org)

Mr. Marcus Kohler  
Senior Programme Officer (Flyways)  
1 Wellbrook Court  
Cambridge CB30NA  
United Kingdom  
Tel: + 44 7872601254  
Email: [marcus.kohler@birdlife.org](mailto:marcus.kohler@birdlife.org)

Mr. Julien Jreissati  
Communication Officer  
P.O. Box bp 179 hazmieh liban  
Mar Takla, Hazmieh  
Lebanon  
Tel: +961 3585859  
Email: [julien.jreissati@birdlife.org](mailto:julien.jreissati@birdlife.org)

**BIRDLIFE CYPRUS**

Dr. Claire Papazoglou  
Executive Director, BirdLife Cyprus  
P.O. Box 28076  
2090 Nicosia  
Cyprus  
Tel: +357 22455072  
Fax: +357 22455073  
Email: [clairie.papazoglou@birdlifecyprus.org.cy](mailto:clairie.papazoglou@birdlifecyprus.org.cy)

**BULGARIAN SOCIETY FOR THE PROTECTION  
OF BIRDS / BIRDLIFE BULGARIA**

Mr. Stoyan Nikolov  
Project Manager  
Yavorov Complex  
1111 Sofia  
Bulgaria  
Tel: +359 878 599 372  
Fax: +359 2 979 95 00  
Email: [stoyan.nikolov@bspb.org](mailto:stoyan.nikolov@bspb.org)

**EURAPMON – THE RESEARCH AND  
MONITORING FOR AND WITH RAPTORS IN  
EUROPE**

Mr. Janusz Sielicki  
Steering Committee Member  
Al. Jerozolimskie 113/115/13  
Warszawa 02-017  
Poland  
Tel: +48 502196061  
Fax: +48 222502895  
Email: [sielicki@iaf.org](mailto:sielicki@iaf.org)

**FALCON FOUNDATION INTERNATIONAL –  
PAKISTAN**

Mr. Mukhtar Ahmed  
President  
216 Upper Mall  
Lahore 54000  
Tel: +92 42 35711979  
Fax: +92 42 35712293  
Email: [mukhtar@thuraya.com.pk](mailto:mukhtar@thuraya.com.pk)

<sup>2</sup> Cooperating Partners that have signed the Raptors MoU / Partenaires coopérants qui ont signé le MdE Rapaces

**INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR  
FALCONRY AND CONSERVATION OF BIRDS OF  
PREY<sup>2</sup>**

Mr. Janusz Sielicki  
AC Member  
Al. Jerozolimskie 113/115/13  
Warszawa 02-017  
Poland  
Tel: +48 502196061  
Fax: +48 222502895  
Email: [sielicki@iaf.org](mailto:sielicki@iaf.org)

**INTERNATIONAL AVIAN RESEARCH**

Dr. Michael McGrady  
Am Rosenhuegel 59  
Krems 3500  
Austria  
Tel: +43 273 272028  
Email: [mikejmcgrady@aol.com](mailto:mikejmcgrady@aol.com)

**INTERNATIONAL WILDLIFE CONSULTANTS  
LTD**

Dr. Andrew Dixon  
Head of Research  
P.O. Box 19, Lysonnen Road  
Carmarthen SA33 5YL  
United Kingdom  
Tel: +44 1267 233864  
Email: [falco@falcons.co.uk](mailto:falco@falcons.co.uk)

**INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR ANIMAL  
WELFARE**

Dr. Elsayed Mohamed  
IFAW Middle East Regional Director  
Al-Shandagah Heritage Area  
P.O. Box 43756  
Dubai  
United Arab Emirates  
Tel: +971 50 7870875  
Email: [emohamed@ifaw.org](mailto:emohamed@ifaw.org)

**REPORT WRITERS**

(2 Representatives)  
(2 représentants)

Mr. Robert Vagg  
Editor  
UN Campus, Hermann-Ehlers-str. 10  
Bonn 53113  
Germany  
Tel: +49 228 815 2476  
Email: [rvagg@cms.int](mailto:rvagg@cms.int)

Mr. Tim Jones  
Rapporteur  
DJ Environmental  
Harpers Mill, Sterridge Valley  
Berryarbor N. Devon EX34 9TB  
United Kingdom  
Tel: +44 1271 882 965  
Email: [tim.jones@djenvironmental.com](mailto:tim.jones@djenvironmental.com)

**UNITED NATIONS ORGANISATIONS / ORGANISATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES**

(19 Representatives from 4 organisations)  
(19 représentants de 4 organisations)

**UNEP/ROWA**

Ms. Diane Klaimi  
Regional Biodiversity MEAs Focal Point  
P.O. Box 10880, Street 1010  
Manama, Bahrain  
Tel: +973 17 812752, Fax: +973 17 825110  
Email: [diane.klaimi@unep.org](mailto:diane.klaimi@unep.org)

**UNEP/AEWA**

Mr. Sergey Dereliev  
Technical Officer  
UN Campus, Hermann-Ehlers-str. 10  
Bonn 53113, Germany  
Tel: +492288152415  
Email: [sdereliev@unep.de](mailto:sdereliev@unep.de)

**UNEP/CMS SECRETERIAT<sup>2</sup>**

UN Campus, Hermann-Ehlers-Str.10  
53113 Bonn, Germany  
Tel: +49 228 815 + extension

Mr. Bert Lenten  
Deputy Executive Secretary  
Email: [blenten@cms.int](mailto:blenten@cms.int); Tel. ext. 2407

Ms. Melanie Virtue  
Acting Agreement Development &  
Servicing Officer  
Email: [mvirtue@cms.int](mailto:mvirtue@cms.int); Tel. ext. 2462

Ms. Laura Cerasi  
Associate Fundraising & Partnership Officer  
Email: [lcerasi@cms.int](mailto:lcerasi@cms.int); Tel. ext. 2483

Ms. Christiane Roettger  
Junior Professional Officer  
Email: [croettger@cms.int](mailto:croettger@cms.int)

Dr. Fernando Spina  
CMS Scientific Councillor  
Via Ca'Fornacetta 9, I-40064 Emilia (BO), Italy  
Tel: +39 51 65 12 214  
Email: [fernando.spina@isprambiente.it](mailto:fernando.spina@isprambiente.it)

Dr. Taej Arun Mundkur  
Chair of CMS Flyways Working Group  
Horapark 9 (2nd floor), Ede 6717 LZ,  
Netherlands  
Tel: +31 318 660910  
Email: [taej.mundkur@wetlands.org](mailto:taej.mundkur@wetlands.org)

**UNEP/CMS OFFICE - ABU DHABI**  
c/o Environment Agency - Abu Dhabi  
P.O. Box 45553, Abu Dhabi, United Arab  
Emirates  
Tel: +971 2 6934 + extension

Mr. Lyle Glowka  
Executive Coordinator (from early 2013)

Mr. Nick P. Williams  
Programme Officer (Birds of Prey - Raptors)  
Email: [nwilliams@cms.int](mailto:nwilliams@cms.int); Tel. ext. 624

Dr. Donna Kwan  
Programme Officer (Dugongs)  
Email: [dkwan@cms.int](mailto:dkwan@cms.int); Tel. ext. 410

Ms. Jenny Renell  
Associate Programme Officer  
Email: [jrenell@cms.int](mailto:jrenell@cms.int); Tel. ext. 523

Ms. Rima Al Mubarak  
Finance/Administrative Assistant  
Email: [ralmubarak@cms.int](mailto:ralmubarak@cms.int); Tel. ext. 437

Ms. Mariam Yacout  
Team Assistant  
Email: [myacout@cms.int](mailto:myacout@cms.int); Tel. ext. 541

Ms. Dragana Stojkovic  
Team Associate  
Email: [dstojkovic@cms.int](mailto:dstojkovic@cms.int); Tel. ext. 481

Mr. András Kovács  
Specialist Technical Advisor (Raptors)  
Eger  
Hungary  
Tel: +36 30 260 55 33  
Email: [andras.kovacs.ecol@gmail.com](mailto:andras.kovacs.ecol@gmail.com)

Prof. Colin Galbraith  
Chairman of the Saker Falcon Task Force  
45 Mounthooly Loan  
Edinburgh EH107JD  
United Kingdom  
Tel: +44 1314455425  
Email: [colin@cgalbraith.freeserve.co.uk](mailto:colin@cgalbraith.freeserve.co.uk)

Interns:  
Mr. Mohamed Kayal, [mkayal@cms.int](mailto:mkayal@cms.int)  
Mr. Benjamin Jance, [bjance@cms.int](mailto:bjance@cms.int)  
Mr. Alf Lim, [alim@cms.int](mailto:alim@cms.int)

**Welcoming Statement from the Environment Agency - Abu Dhabi (EAD)**

*Dr. Shaikha Al Dhaheri, Executive Director of the Terrestrial and Marine Biodiversity Sector,  
on behalf of H.E. Mohammad Al Bowardi, Managing Director of EAD*

Good Morning Ladies and Gentlemen,

It gives me great pleasure to be amongst this distinguished group of conservationists and decision makers assembled here in Abu Dhabi to attend the first Meeting of the Signatories (MoS) of the Raptor MoU. It is very satisfying to see that this agreement, which became a reality here in Abu Dhabi on October 22, 2008, is moving forward. On behalf of the Government of the UAE, the Ministry of Environment and the Environment Agency - Abu Dhabi, I welcome you all to Abu Dhabi.

Birds of prey are exposed to threats from habitat loss to changing land use practices, pollution and lack of suitable breeding areas. Additionally, long distance migrants are vulnerable to pressures of hunting, collision from power lines and lack of suitable stopover sites. Climate change may put further pressure on migratory birds. The presence of this agreement is itself an indication of the magnitude of the problems.

Unfortunately, none of these problems have abated over the last four years; on the contrary they have possibly become much more intense. Conscious of these facts we need to act quickly and take actions not only to safeguard the globally threatened birds of prey but also to improve the conservation status of other migratory birds of prey, which are not listed as threatened at the moment but have poor conservation status.

The MoU on Birds of Prey not only provides a clear road map to conserve key migratory raptors, but also offers new opportunity to network, forge new partnerships and compensate for variable institutional and financial capacities across the range states. I am really encouraged to see that nearly 100 delegates from nearly 40 countries including key international NGOs are here to participate in the two meetings being held back to back. Your presence here is a clear indication of the importance attached to conserve migratory birds of prey in Africa, Europe, Middle East and Asia.

I am also happy to know that most of you will also be actively participating in a meeting to negotiate for a new instrument to conserve migratory birds along the Central Asian Flyway (CAF) immediately after the Meeting of Signatories of Raptor MoU.

Conserving migratory birds in general and birds of prey in particular is a real challenge, however our collective efforts and clear plans can make this happen. The UAE is strongly committed to work for the conservation of migratory birds of prey and our signing of the agreement, supporting and hosting the CMS Unit is a clear indication of the commitment and leadership shown by the UAE.

Let all of us make this agreement work by developing national and regional strategies to implement the Action Plan without any further delays. I hope during this meeting more countries will sign the Raptor MoU and we will also agree on a suitable framework for the CAF to conserve migratory waterbirds.

Finally, I would like to extend my heartfelt wishes for a successful meeting and a pleasant stay for all of you in Abu Dhabi.

Thank You.

## Welcoming Statement from the Interim Coordinating Unit of the Raptors MoU

*Mr. Nick P. Williams, Programme Officer - Birds of Prey (Raptors)*

Your Excellency, Acting CMS Executive Secretary, Signatories, Distinguished Colleagues, Ladies and Gentlemen, and friends. Good morning and welcome.

It's an immense privilege for me to be standing here in front of you today here in Abu Dhabi. It really is a dream come true!

Please allow me to impart a short personal story to explain why this is so.

I've been fascinated with birds of prey since I was a boy growing up on a small mixed farm in SW England. I've studied many species, particularly their migration and foraging behaviours, and have been actively involved in raptor conservation projects all of my life.

Exactly ten years ago this month, I was attending a conference in Scotland on *Birds of Prey in a Changing Environment*. David Stroud, a UK professional ornithologist whom I'm delighted is here with us today, gave an excellent presentation summarizing the status of British raptors in a European context. He highlighted that many of species occurring in Britain are migratory and that most are in unfavourable conservation status. Moreover, that even though all are included in the Appendices to the Convention on Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS), very little attention had been paid to them by CMS.

That, almost throwaway comment from David, resonated deeply inside me and sowed the seed of an idea. Some months before, I'd seen a news item publicizing the fact that the African-Eurasian Waterbird Agreement (AEWA) had secured around one million pounds of European funding to support the conservation of that group of birds. And I remember thinking at the time that, whilst this was indeed good news, because many raptors feed on waders and waterfowl, so the more of these prey available the better! I couldn't help wishing that a similar sum, or perhaps even more, should really be targeting directly at raptor conservation.

There was a period of reflection during the early part of 2003 and then in May I was preparing to attend the 6<sup>th</sup> World Conference on Birds of Prey and Owls at Budapest in Hungary. At the time, I was the UK's Chief Wildlife Inspector employed by the Government's environment Ministry, now known as Defra. I'd managed to persuade my manager that I needed to attend the meeting for personal development reasons, though it wasn't actually part of my job!

Just two weeks before the meeting, an idea literally popped into my head. I drafted a Resolution, proposing the establishment of an international agreement on African-Eurasian birds of prey and submitted it to the Secretary – the late Robin Chancellor. I had no real idea how this would be received by I thought that as the majority of those attending the meeting would be raptor biologists or ecologists, they would very likely be supportive.

The Hungarians hosted an excellent meeting, and by volunteering to serve on the Resolutions Committee, I was able to nurse the draft Resolution through the discussions. In fact, I recall that a huge amount of time was spent discussing a rather contentious Resolution on the Saker Falcon and when it came to the final plenary session 'my' Resolution sailed through with only a couple of minor textual amendments.

It just so happened that my manager, Martin Brasher, was Head of UK Wildlife Policy, which included being responsible for CMS. I knew he was a strong supporter of the Convention. So on returning to the UK, I went to see him and presented the Resolution.

There had recently been a Ministerial reshuffle and we had a bright, new young and enthusiastic Environment Minister by the name of Jim Knight. I was aware that he was looking for new initiatives on which the UK could lead, so I left the Resolution with Martin to consider.

Just a few days later Martin came see me and told me that he'd asked a colleague to draft a Ministerial submission proposing that UK fund a study into the feasibility of developing an instrument under CMS covering migratory raptors. And, as they say, the rest is history.

I've been extremely fortunate to have travelled widely to around 50 countries in search of birds of prey, particularly falcons. So I've been granted to opportunity to witness first-hand the immense beauty, incredible behavior and spectacular flying abilities of this amazing group of birds. Like countless humans in the past, I personally find these birds both fascinating and uplifting, and I've encountered many, many people who feel exactly the same. So I'm totally convinced that we really must do all we can to conserve them.

The UNEP/CMS Raptors MoU provides the necessary framework for Governments, Institutions, Agencies, IGOs, NGOs and other interested parties to work together with the single shared goal of doing just that.

The point of my story was to show that really big and important changes can happen when many people work together towards the same vision.

And ultimately, it's down to the people here today to make positive changes happen for birds of prey in Africa and Eurasia. There are some highly influential people in this room, but each one of us holds the power to take action which can, and I feel sure will, lead to real conservation benefits for the 76 species covered by the Raptors MoU.

This 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting of Signatories represents a unique opportunity for us all, so let's do everything we can to make the most of it.

Thank you for your indulgence now let's get down to business!

## **RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR MEETINGS OF SIGNATORIES TO THE RAPTORS MoU**

### **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, and shall 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.
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 to the Coordinating Unit at least 150 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 Technical Advisory Group (TAG).
  - c) Comments on the proposed amendment may be provided to the Coordinating Unit 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.

## **Terms of Reference for the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) to the Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation of Migratory Birds of Prey in Africa and Eurasia (Raptors MoU)**

### **Purpose and Main Tasks**

1. The purpose of the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) is to serve and assist the Signatories in the effective implementation of the Raptors MoU, including the Action Plan.
2. Members of the TAG serve in their capacity as specialist individuals rather than as representatives of Governments or organizations with which they also may be affiliated.
3. The Coordinating Unit (CU) of the Raptors MoU will serve to receive and transmit requests from the Signatories for advice from the TAG.
4. The main tasks of the TAG are to:
  - a) Provide expert advice, information and make recommendations on the implementation of the Raptors MoU, to the Signatories and the CU, as requested;
  - b) Analyse, as necessary, scientific advice and assessments and to make recommendations, particularly concerning the content of Annexes I, II and III, in the Action Plan of the Raptors MoU;
  - c) Provide comments on any proposals to amend the MoU text which have a technical content;
  - d) Prepare a written report of its activities to deliver its work programme for each session of the Meeting of Signatories to be submitted to the CU at least 60 days in advance of the meeting; and,
  - e) Carry out any other tasks referred to it by the Meeting of Signatories (MoS).

### **Size and Composition**

5. Membership of the TAG shall comprise persons operating in their personal capacity, and qualified as specialists in raptor research, conservation and/or management. In appointing persons to the TAG, the MoS should strive to achieve a balance amongst areas of expertise especially in the context of delivery of advice requested of it, and the need for representation of those geographic regions with few Signatories.
6. Membership shall include:
  - a) Ten persons nominated by Signatories from the four main geo-political regions covered by the Raptors MoU, namely: Africa<sup>1</sup> (excluding North Africa) – three representatives; Asia<sup>2</sup> – two representatives; Europe<sup>3</sup> – three representatives; and, the Middle East and North Africa<sup>4</sup> – two representatives;
  - b) Up to five other experts;
  - c) One person nominated by BirdLife International – the IUCN nominated authority on birds; and,

- d) To promote synergies and co-operation, observers from the African-Eurasian Waterbirds Technical Committee, the CMS Landbirds Action Plan and Co-operating Partners may attend at their own cost.

7. The Chair of the TAG may additionally invite a small number of other experts to attend meetings to provide additional specific expertise not represented within the TAG, where this is relevant to advice requested by the MoS.

#### **Criteria and characteristics of candidate TAG members**

8. Candidates for appointment as members of the TAG should have the following:

- a) Demonstrated capacity for networking with other experts in raptor research, conservation and/or management of species and their habitats at local, national and international scales, and demonstrated engagement in such expert networks; and/or,
- b) Widely recognized experience and expertise in one or more aspects of raptor research, conservation and/or management of species and their habitats, particularly those relevant to the tasks identified by the MoS for the forthcoming work of the TAG;
- c) Experience of working with raptor experts at local, national and international levels;
- d) Full access to electronic mail and web-based information and communication systems, through which the intersessional work of the TAG will take place; and,
- e) Commitment to undertake the work required of the TAG with the support, where relevant, of the member's organization or institution.

#### **Nomination and Appointment**

9. For the period from MoS1 to MoS2, the following procedure shall apply:

- a) Signatories will submit nominations for members of an Interim TAG to the Coordination Unit by 28 February 2013 including detailed information on the professional background and expertise of the nominee (e.g. Curriculum Vitae);
- b) A Panel comprising the CU's Programme Officer and Executive Coordinator, the Chair of MoS1 and the Executive Secretary of CMS, will select members with regional and other expertise to serve on the Interim TAG based on an appropriate balance of geographic and other experience, and having regard to the tasks indicated as priorities by MoS1 (Annex);
- c) Members of the Interim TAG will serve until MoS2 when the procedures set out in paragraph 10 will apply; and,
- d) Procedures related to the Interim TAG, once established, will otherwise be the same as for the TAG established at MoS2 as outlined by these Terms of Reference.

10. From MoS2, the following procedure shall apply:

- a) Each Signatory may nominate one individual (regardless of their nationality) as a candidate for regional representative to the TAG in accordance with Paragraph 5.
- b) Nominations for any vacancies should be provided in writing to the CU at least 180 days in advance of the MoS and should include detailed information on the professional background and expertise of the nominee (e.g. Curriculum Vitae).
- c) The regional representatives and other experts will be appointed by the MoS at the recommendation of a Panel which shall comprise the current Chair and Vice-chair of the TAG, and the CU's Programme Officer and Executive Coordinator. The Panel will be chaired by the TAG Chair.

11. TAG members should serve for a period of two regular Meetings of Signatories and in exceptional cases, where the MoS so decides, may be nominated for a third term.

12. The CU should inform the Signatories and Co-operating Partners of any vacancies arising from the expiry of a term or other reason, such as voluntary resignation.

13. Should a vacancy arise intersessionally, the Chair of the TAG may propose a replacement for consideration by the Signatories. The proposal shall be communicated to the Signatories of the region concerned by the CU and shall be accompanied by the same information on the professional background of the nominee as would be required for a regular nomination. In the absence of any objections from the Signatories of the region concerned, within 30 days of the communication from the CU, the interim appointment will be considered as having been accepted, and will become effective immediately. If an objection is raised by a Signatory, the procedure may be repeated, as appropriate, until an acceptable candidate is identified. The term of appointment of the provisional nominee shall expire at the end of the next MoS, unless re-appointed by the MoS further to paragraph 11.

### **Officers**

14. The TAG shall select from its regional representatives a Chair and a Vice-Chair, who shall be the principle point of contact between the TAG and the CU.

15. The Chair of the TAG should participate as an observer in Meetings of Signatories, and may also participate, if funding permits, in the meetings of related and associated agreements and organisations that the Signatories deem relevant to the work of the Raptors MoU. The other members of the TAG may participate as observers in the Meetings of Signatories.

16. The Chair of the TAG shall co-ordinate the production of the report of the Group's work to each session of the Meeting of Signatories further to paragraph 4d above.

17. The Vice-Chair shall assist in the execution of the Chair's functions, and shall preside over meetings in the absence of the Chair.

### **Modus Operandi**

18. In order to conduct its business efficiently and to minimize costs, the TAG should operate through electronic means whenever possible.

19. Where the need arises, and finances permit, face-to-face meetings of the TAG should be convened by the Chair of the Group in consultation with the Coordinating Unit, and where possible hosted by a Signatory to the Raptors MoU. Where necessary and feasible, participation in TAG meetings can also be undertaken by teleconference or web-based conferencing systems.

20. Notice of meetings of the TAG, including the date and venue, shall be sent to all members of the Group by the Coordinating Unit at least 60 days in advance.

21. Recommendations of the TAG shall be adopted by consensus unless a vote is requested by the Chair or by three members.

22. A summary record of each TAG meeting shall be prepared by the CU as soon as possible and shall be communicated to all members, circulated to Signatories and made available on the MoU web-site.

23. The documents for each meeting of the TAG shall be distributed to its members by the CU at least 30 days before the opening of the meeting. At the discretion of the Chair, in exceptional circumstances documents may be accepted after these deadlines, but not later than two weeks before the meeting. Documents will be distributed electronically.

---

<sup>1</sup> Africa includes the following 46 countries (17 Signatories): **Angola**, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, **Burundi**, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, **Chad**, Comoros, **Congo**, Cote D'Ivoire, **Democratic Republic of the Congo**, **Equatorial Guinea**, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, **Gambia**, **Ghana**, **Guinea**, Guinea-Bissau, **Kenya**, Lesotho, Liberia, **Madagascar**, Malawi, **Mali**, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, **Niger**, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, **Senegal**, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, **Somalia**, **South Africa**, Swaziland, **Togo**, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

<sup>2</sup> Asia includes the following 15 countries (3 Signatories): Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, **Mongolia**, **Nepal**, **Pakistan**, People's Republic of China, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Turkey, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan.

<sup>3</sup> Europe includes the following 49 countries and the **European Union** (18 Signatories): Albania, Andorra, **Armenia**, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, **Belgium**, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, **Denmark (Incl. Faeroe Islands and Greenland)**, Estonia, **Finland (Incl. Aland Islands)**, **France (Incl. Mayotte and Reunion)**, Georgia, **Germany**, Greece, **Hungary**, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, **Italy**, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, **Luxembourg**, Malta, **Monaco**, Montenegro, **Netherlands**, **Norway (Incl. Svalbard and Jan Mayen Islands)**, Poland, **Portugal**, Republic of Moldova, **Romania**, Russia Federation, San Marino, Serbia, **Slovakia**, Slovenia, Spain (Incl. the Canary Islands), **Sweden**, Switzerland, The FYR of Macedonia, Ukraine, **United Kingdom (Incl. Jersey, Guernsey, Isle of Man, Cyprus sovereign bases and Gibraltar)** and Vatican City.

<sup>4</sup> Middle East and North Africa includes the following 20 countries (7 Signatories): Algeria, Bahrain, **Djibouti**, **Egypt**, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, **Morocco**, Oman, Palestinian Authority Territories, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, **Sudan**, Syrian Arab Republic, **Tunisia**, **United Arab Emirates** and **Yemen**.

Note: **Signatories** to the Raptors MoU (as at 1 October 2013) are highlighted in bold.

## Annex

### Priorities for the Interim TAG until the 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of Signatories

The Interim TAG will develop the TAG's work programme at its first meeting or otherwise within 12 months of its establishment.

The Interim TAG work programme should, *inter alia*, include the following issues as priority, conclusions from which – resources and time permitting – should be brought to MoS2 for consideration by the Signatories:

#### MoU – (Activity 1: Improvement of protection)

1. Review the content of Annex 1 (species) and Table 3 (sites) of the MoU, and in particular:
  - a) review existing and possible candidate Annex 1 species in the light of changes to their status;
  - b) review the current status of Annex 1 species placed in Category 2;
  - c) review the current status of Annex 1 species currently listed in Category 3, but which could be candidates for Category 2 on basis of declining global population trends;
  - d) following consultations with the Signatories, make recommendations as to the updating of Table 3 of the Action Plan listing internationally important sites for raptors;
  - e) review the geographic coverage of Annex 2 of the MoU;
  - f) review the definition of the term 'migratory' as used by the MoU and make recommendations; and,
  - g) develop a simple form and guidance that may be used by Signatories submitting information related to the possible change of species status in the context of the MoU and its Action Plan.
2. Consider and make recommendations on the issue of raptor taxonomy and nomenclature in relation to species listings within the MoU, having regard to CMS Resolution 10.13 and the desirability of harmonised approaches across MEAs.

#### 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.
4. Consider the need for guidance on species re-introduction measures specific to raptors, as well as any opportunities for international co-operation related to possible re-introduction programmes.
5. Assess knowledge of key breeding areas, stop-over, refuelling, bottleneck and non-breeding sites along raptor flyways and make recommendations on gaps in current information, how these might be filled, and appropriate approaches for the conservation and management of these critical areas.
6. Building on existing information concerning the negative impacts on raptors arising from collision and electrocution from power-lines (CMS Resolution 10.11): a) review and exchange information with Signatories as to good mitigation practices; and b) provide practical recommendations as to the best means of engaging with the power generation and distribution sectors to address these impacts.
7. Review guidance related to the mitigation of negative impacts of other energy generation sectors (e.g. wind and solar); and, a) provide a guide to available guidance, and b) make recommendations as to the need for any supplementary guidance.

8. Provide recommendations on approaches to tackling the issue of illegal persecution including, but not restricted to:
  - a) the value of technologies such as x-ray monitoring and electronic tracking methods as means of assessing the extent and location of persecution hotspots;
  - 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.

**Poisoning – (Activity 4: Raise awareness of problems faced by birds of prey and measures needed to conserve them)**

9. Contribute technical expertise on raptors and their poisoning to the work of the CMS Working Group on Poisoning (CMS Resolution 10.26).
10. Make recommendations on priorities for raising awareness of raptor conservation needs with: a) the public; and, b) those sectors whose activities impact on birds of prey; and how the MoU might best influence these.

**Guidance – (Activity 5: Monitor bird of prey populations, carry out conservation research and take appropriate remedial measures)**

11. Make recommendations as to the need 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.
12. Make recommendations as to appropriate mechanisms for the sharing of data on raptors for the better implementation of the MoU's objectives.

**Reporting – (Activity 6: Supporting measures)**

13. Advise the MoS and CU on issues of the integration of national reporting with the MoU's strategic planning process so as to provide assessments of national implementation.

### **Co-operating Partners**

1. Any intergovernmental, international or national non-governmental organization wishing to associate itself with the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) through signature as a Co-operating Partner may, at any time, send an expression of interest to the Coordinating Unit.
2. Expressions of interest shall be signed by the head of the organization, contain information about the organization's aim and work and indicate the type of contribution, whether financial or other, that will be made to support the implementation of the MoU.
3. The Coordinating Unit will review each complete expression of interest and, within 30 days of receipt, shall circulate a recommendation to Signatories. If no objections are forthcoming from any Signatory within 30 days of the date of the communication, the organisation will be invited to sign the MoU as a Co-operating Partner and the Coordinating Unit will make the necessary arrangements for signature.
4. If objections are received from one or more Signatories, the Coordinating Unit will include the matter on the agenda for the next MoS, for decision.
5. The following roles are envisaged for Cooperating Partners of the Raptors MoU:
  - To actively support and promote the implementation of the MoU and its objectives, and in particular, the Action Plan. This could be achieved via, for example, publications, outreach activities, conservation projects, research and/or promotion of the MoU in relevant fora.
  - To report back to each MoS on activities carried out in collaboration and/or support of the MoU, and in particular the Action Plan.
  - To consider establishing joint or collaborative work plans or projects with Signatories and/or the Coordinating Unit.
  - To attend and participate at sessions of the MoS as an Observer

### **Summary List of Key Outcomes of the First Meeting of Signatories to the Raptors MoU**

1. Welcomed two new Signatory States – Niger and Somalia – bringing the total number of Signatories to 43, plus three Co-operating Partners.
2. Adopted simple and concise Rules of Procedure (Annex IV of this report), including arrangements for future Meetings of Signatories and procedures for amending the MoU text and its Annexes.
3. Accepted the offer by the Environment Agency - Abu Dhabi, on behalf of the Government of the United Arab Emirates, to establish the Coordinating Unit (CU) for the Raptors MoU within the UNEP/CMS Office - Abu Dhabi.
4. Adopted a procedure to select and accept Co-operating Partners as Signatories to the Raptors MoU, which also clarifies their role and responsibilities (Annex VI of this report).
5. Established a Technical Advisory Group (TAG) to support implementation of the Raptors MoU; adopted Terms of Reference for the TAG; adopted an interim nomination and selection procedure for TAG membership to enable it to be established and to begin functioning in 2013; and, identified tasks for the TAG to address (Annex V of this report).
6. Secured commitment from Signatories to aim to develop their National or Regional Strategies for submission to the CU within 18 months (i.e. June 2014).
7. Agreed a procedure whereby the CU will develop a suite of costed project proposals and circulate these annually seeking sponsorship from Signatories and others.
8. Supported a proposal by the CU to explore securing in-kind support from Signatories and others via short-term staff loans.
9. Endorsed CMS Resolution 10.11 on Power Lines and Migratory Birds and urged Signatories and invited non-Signatory Range States to utilize the mitigation Guidelines and other measures set out in the Resolution.
10. Raised awareness and broadened support amongst Signatories for the task being undertaken by the CMS Working Group to Minimize the Risk of Poisoning to Migratory Birds.
11. Agreed basic principles and a schedule for National Reporting on implementation of the Raptors MoU, and tasked the TAG to develop an appropriate format (including future integration with the CMS/AEWA Online Reporting System).
12. Raised awareness and enhanced support amongst Signatories for the Coordinating Unit to continue its efforts to: oversee the Saker Falcon Task Force to develop a Saker Falcon Global Action Plan (SakerGAP); develop an International Single Species Action Plan for the Sooty Falcon; and, work in collaboration with the Bulgarian Society for the Protection of Birds to enhance conservation activities related to the Egyptian Vulture.