



UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME
(UNEP)



CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF MIGRATORY SPECIES
OF WILD ANIMALS (CMS)

Distr .
GENERAL

UNEP/CMS/Conf.3.20
9 September 1991

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

**Third Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to
the Convention of Migratory Species of Wild Animals**

Geneva, 9-13 September 1991

REPORT OF THE THIRD MEETING OF THE SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL

AGENDA ITEM 1: OPENING OF THE MEETING

1. The Secretariat of the Convention convened the third meeting of the Scientific Council in Geneva on 8 September 1991. The list of participants is attached as Annex VI. Apologies were received from Drs. Amer, Rao and Spina.
2. The Chairman of the scientific council opened the meeting, welcomed participants and introduced members of the Secretariat, after which Councillors introduced themselves. The Chairman also thanked the Co-ordinator of the Secretariat, who will be returning to the Australian Government in October, for all of her work in relation to the Scientific Council.

AGENDA ITEM 2: ORGANIZATION OF THE MEETING

3. The agenda (document UNEP/CMS/ScC/3.1) was adopted and is shown in Annex I.

AGENDA ITEM 3: REPORTS

(a) Report of the Chair

4. The Chairman referred to his report (UNEP/CMS/ScC/2.9 Rev.1, Annex 3) submitted to the second meeting of the Council (Bonn, March 1991). He noted that much of the Council's work over the past triennium had concentrated on the global review of small cetaceans, which was coming to fruition at this conference. He reminded the meeting that he would not be standing for re-election as Chairman, and that consideration should be given to his potential successor.

(b) Report of the Secretariat

5. The Co-ordinator reported on developments since the second meeting of the Council: Australia became a Party to the Convention, effective 1 September 1991, and France had confirmed that the Convention entered into force for them on 1 July 1990 (it had not yet appointed a Scientific Councillor).

6. Two new appointments have been made to the Scientific Council: Mr. S. Deb Roy (India), replacing Dr. Ranjitsinh; and Dr. William Phillips (Australia), both in attendance at this meeting.
7. The Co-ordinator drew attention to two tabled papers that the Secretariat had prepared at the request of the Scientific Council at its previous meeting: one containing background information on species and the other a draft AGREEMENT on the conservation of Asian waterfowl.
8. The Co-ordinator reported that, in addition, the following actions had been undertaken. The small cetaceans review report had been submitted to the Scientific Committee of the International Whaling Commission (IWC), and will be published as part of the 1991 IWC report. (It may also be printed by the Norwegian Institute for Nature Research.) It was also circulated to Parties and other Range States. A draft agreement on small cetaceans in the Black and Mediterranean Seas and contiguous waters has been prepared, in co-operation with the Secretariats of the Bern and Barcelona Conventions, IUCN and Greenpeace International. This is contained in a Council of Europe document recently distributed as a Conference information paper (UNEP/CMS/Conf.3 Inf.2).
9. She advised the meeting that the Secretariat had prepared draft resolutions for the Conference covering the funding and role of the Scientific Council, listing of species in the Appendices and additional measures for conserving species in the Appendices. Furthermore, the Scientific Council's views had been incorporated in the draft resolution on agreements and the draft budget for 1992-1994.
10. The Secretariat had circulated the full Range State list to all members and would, at this meeting, distribute to each Party appointee a special list covering the species in his particular Range State. Councillors were requested to provide written comments and changes during the week of the Conference or by post shortly thereafter.
11. The Co-ordinator concluded by thanking those Governments (Norway and United Kingdom) which had donated funds to assist the participation of developing country Scientific Councillors.

AGENDA ITEM 4: MATTERS TO BE DISCUSSED AT THE THIRD MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES

(a) Funding and role of the Scientific Council

12. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/Conf.3.18, which includes, as Annex I, a draft resolution updating the Scientific Council's mandate. The Co-ordinator drew attention to the desirability of involving all members of the Scientific Council in its activities, of providing financial support for the Chairman to attend meetings, and of having Conference-appointed Councillors being able to attend meetings of the Conference of the Parties as observers. With regard to the latter, it was pointed out that some Conference appointees might not have organizational affiliations that would permit them to attend such meetings in other circumstances.
13. Deferring discussion of operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, the Council endorsed the general intent of paragraphs 1 and 2. The Chairman put forward minor changes to paragraph 1 to emphasize that Conference-appointed Councillors **should be entitled** to attend the Conference, and to 2 (b) to take account of situations where Governments might be in a position to cover

expenses relating to attendance at meetings. These changes, agreed to by the meeting, are reflected in the amended draft resolution attached as Annex II to this report.

(b) Future work programme

14. The representative of the Secretariat was asked to introduce document UNEP/CMS/Conf.3.14.4, containing proposals to promote activities under the Convention related to species listed in Appendix I. Referring to the draft resolution annexed to that document, he described a mechanism whereby a comprehensive review of the conservation status of a limited number of Appendix I species could be undertaken, with a view to providing recommendations for concrete conservation measures. The work would be a collaborative effort involving the Secretariat, Scientific Councillors, Party focal points and others.

15. Dr. Devillers expressed support for this initiative and suggested that the resolution go even further, instructing the Secretariat and/or Scientific Council to encourage and assist Parties in the preparation and enactment of concerted actions under the Convention, within existing instruments of bilateral or multilateral co-operation. He proposed small cetaceans and *Numenius tenuirostris* as species for consideration under this proposal. Dr. Phillips also endorsed the proposal to give particular attention to priority species listed in Appendix I, and suggested marine turtles (in the Indo-Pacific) as one such group. Dr. Perrin expressed the view that *Eubalaena glacialis* in the North Pacific deserved attention due to its critical population status. Although no CMS Parties are Range States for the species, he considered that Parties might be able to act through other institutions, such as the International whaling Commission. The representative of the Secretariat suggested that a number of antelopes listed in Appendix I - such as *Gazella dama*, *Gazella leptoceros* and *Cervus elephas barbarus*, might be considered. Dr. Edelstam also expressed support for additional work on North African antelopes, as well as *Bos sauveli* in Indochina.

16. However, it was emphasized that the identification of these particular priority species should not give the impression that other endangered species in Appendix I did not also require attention. The urgency of the threat to a species should be the main criterion. The focus should be on conservation actions under the particular provisions of the Bonn Convention.

17. The Council endorsed the proposal, in paragraph 4, that the Secretariat draw to the attention of Parties matters of importance to the conservation of species listed in the Appendices; the draft resolution was revised and is attached as Annex I to this report.

18. The representative of the Secretariat then introduced document UNEP/CMS/ScC/3.2 which contained information on particular migratory species requested by the Council at its last meeting. He explained that part of the information related to the future work programme, while the remainder consisted of brief status reports on species suggested as candidates for listing in the Appendices or for retention in Appendix I (agenda items 5 (b) and (c)).

19. With regard to the future work programme, it was agreed that work on small cetaceans should continue as a high priority and that, while it was up to Parties to develop Agreements for these species, the Scientific Council could play a facilitating role.

20. It was noted that dugong is a species for which data were limited and for which population trends were difficult to discern. It was also suggested that West African manatees warranted consideration, as they were thought to migrate in rivers across national frontiers. It was agreed to establish a working group to promote work on Agreement(s) for dugong, already listed in Appendix II, and to examine the question of listing manatees.

21. It was acknowledged that there were serious gaps in information on North African land mammals and *Bos sauveli*, and that up-to-date data were needed, where possible, by consulting government scientists in the Range States.

22. It was again noted that neotropical species were under-represented in the Appendices. It was suggested that attention might be given to freshwater fishes, and that emphasis ought to be placed on non-avian species. However, some reluctance was expressed to expend resources, at this time, on a consultancy to assess the situation in this region, given that there were so few Parties. (It was suggested, though, that the small number of Parties may stem from the limited number of neotropical species in the Appendices.) It was recommended that the Secretariat, from available sources (i.e. ICBP, IUCN etc.) and assisted by Scientific Councillors, produce a provisional list of neotropical species for consideration for addition to the Appendices. The Scientific Council would then be requested to comment and provide its advice on whether more work was needed, for example, through a consultancy.

23. Dr. Phillips drew attention to the high incidental mortality of albatrosses in the southern oceans (one of which was listed in Appendix I) through long-line fishing.

24. The meeting then returned to the draft resolution attached as Annex I to document UNEP/CMS/Conf.3.1. Some minor changes were suggested to the wording of sub-paragraphs 3 (c) and (d), to reflect the meeting's recommendation to pursue work on sirenians, generally, and to continue to review the Appendices, but only as the need arises. It was agreed also that the need to examine the problem of artificial barriers to migration should be reflected in the resolution. The Secretariat was requested to draw up a list of issues to be considered in a preliminary paper on this subject, and to circulate it to Councillors for comment. Then, a preliminary review of the problem would be prepared, followed by case studies of various taxonomic groups. These changes are incorporated in the revised version of the draft resolution attached as Annex II to this paper.

(c) Conference appointees to Scientific Council

25. Having identified areas for future work under the Convention, the meeting considered what additional expertise on the Scientific Council was needed. It was pointed out that although Resolution 1.4 had allowed for eight Conference appointees, a maximum of four to five was desirable, for financial reasons. The Chairman noted continuity would be important for work on waterfowl and small cetaceans. The Scientific Council recommended the reappointment of Drs. Moser and Perrin, both of whom expressed their willingness to continue.

26. For its work on sirenians, it was agreed that it would not be necessary for the Conference to appoint a member of the IUCN/SSC Sirenia Specialist Group, after Dr. Phillips pointed out that Australia could liaise directly with its Chairman (an Australian, Dr. Helene Marsh). It was suggested that an expert could be co-opted to a working group later, if necessary. Dr. Georgina Mace, of the Zoological Society of London, was suggested as a Conference-appointed expert on North African mammals.

(d) Reports by Parties

27. A number of Councillors indicated that their reports on implementation of the Convention were or would soon be available.

28. There was general agreement that it had been useful to have a format to follow when writing the report, however, there was some uncertainty as to how much detail to include under certain sections (for example, on research undertaken and on implementing legislation). In response to a comment from the Secretariat, it was suggested that Parties use Format A (the full report) this time, even if they had submitted reports in the past, since the older reports were not likely to contain all of the information requested in the new formats. Further, it was suggested that Format A, Item III and Format B, Item IV, relating to national research be split into three components survey, monitoring, and research. On legislation, it was suggested that the title of the legislation and an indication of whether or not it was specific to migratory species was adequate, to allow someone to follow up if so desired, and that it would be useful to list new regulations in the updated reports. The Scientific Council recommended that the Conference adopt these formats for the guidance of all Parties, but indicated that a formal resolution to this effect would be premature.

(e) Measures under Article IV of the Convention

29. The meeting considered document UNEP/CMS/Conf.3.14.3, containing information on the various Agreements concluded or under development.

(i) concluded

30. The Co-ordinator advised that the agreement on Wadden Sea seals, between Denmark, Germany and the Netherlands, would enter into force on 1 October 1991.

(ii) pursuant to Resolution 1.6

31. The respective focal points for the Agreements briefed the meeting on latest developments.

32. The Chairman, as focal point for the AGREEMENT on bats in Europe, explained that a text had been circulated to all Range States for comment, followed by a revised final draft. It was planned to have a meeting of Range States in conjunction with the Conference, in order to come to agreement on its content. It was hoped that a signing ceremony would take place in London in November 1991.

33. Dr. Devillers indicated that the status of the white stork AGREEMENT was essentially unchanged. A technical meeting had been held in Metz in June, and another was planned in conjunction with the Conference. It was now felt that a potential difficulty in implementing the AGREEMENT had been overcome, with the discovery of ways to deal with the problem of overhead cables, other than burial, at relatively low cost.

34. The Netherlands Government had submitted a draft Western Palearctic Waterfowl AGREEMENT and management plan to the EEC Commission. The EEC had not yet obtained a negotiating mandate from its Council.

35. Dr. Edelstam reported that it was hoped that the few outstanding problems related to the Baltic and North Sea small cetaceans agreement could be

resolved before the proposed signing ceremony scheduled for 12 September 1991. He drew attention to a new issue that had arisen with the recent independence of the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. Although it would be desirable for them to be Parties to the agreement, they were not in a position to share in the administrative costs.

(iii) pursuant to Resolution 2.3

36. The Co-ordinator reported that a draft agreement on small cetaceans in the Mediterranean and Black Seas had been prepared, covering 6 of the 28 species/populations identified by the Scientific Council in its global review of small cetaceans. The text had arisen from a meeting of the secretariats of the Barcelona, Bern and Bonn Conventions, Greenpeace International and IUCN; and is contained in a Conference document submitted by the Council of Europe (UNEP/CMS/Conf.3/INF.2).

37. The Co-ordinator then referred to a related draft resolution (UNEP/CMS/Conf.3.14.3 Addendum 1) the Secretariat had prepared for consideration by the Scientific Council. Among other things, the draft resolution sought the Conference's agreement to use the above-mentioned text as the basis for an agreement to be implemented under the Bonn Convention. Although it was generally felt that the Bonn Convention was a more appropriate vehicle than the Bern Convention, which had no obvious mechanism for agreements, the Chairman and several Councillors expressed reservation about seeking the endorsement of the Conference for an agreement the terms of which they had not had an opportunity to consider fully. It was suggested that a more careful approach be taken, as had been the case in the past, whereby attention would be drawn to the draft legal instrument in a preambular paragraph, and Range States would be encouraged to conclude agreements under the Convention for small cetaceans. Accordingly, the draft resolution was revised and is attached as Annex IV to this report.

38. The Chairman pointed out that if the Conference agreed to add species/populations of small cetaceans to Appendix II, this should be seen as a prelude for the conclusion of Agreements for their conservation. Freshwater dolphins were considered priorities in this regard, as had been noted in previous meetings. The Council concluded that its small cetaceans working group should continue its work. The Chairman suggested that, while consideration had been given to achieving global representation in its membership, it may be desirable to change the balance somewhat depending on the particular region under consideration.

(iv) others

39. There was no new information on Agreements being developed on the houbara bustard or great bustard.

40. The representative of the Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/ScC/3.4.4, a draft agreement on the conservation of Asian waterfowl, prepared at the request of the Council for discussion at an IWRB symposium to be held in Karachi, Pakistan from 14 to 20 December 1991. The main body of the draft agreement incorporates general conservation measures, with more specific initiatives to follow in regional action plans annexed thereto. Councillors were requested to provide their comments to the Secretariat by 25 October. The meeting agreed that it would be helpful to constitute a working group on this Agreement which would meet for the first time in association with the Karachi symposium. Councillors were asked to give their suggestions for its membership as soon as possible.

41. It was agreed that Dr. Moser should serve as the focal point for the Asian waterfowl agreement, for purposes of convening a first meeting of the working group, but that if the working group were to continue, it may be preferable for a focal point to be chosen from a Party.

42. Dr. Moser indicated that the development of the draft agreement was very timely, as it relates to other work that is to be undertaken next year. More generally, he stated that consideration should be given now on how best to incorporate management prescriptions for single species into broader agreements, so as to avoid a proliferation of less comprehensive accords. Dr. Phillips gave details of several bilateral agreements in the Oceania/ Australasian region, and suggested that the draft agreement ought to cover that region as well, since interest had been expressed in the region for a multilateral approach, which offered advantages over the proliferation of bilateral accords.

43. Dr. Wilson advised the meeting that Ireland is working on a flyway management plan with four Range States for the Greenland white-fronted goose, and that a meeting will be held next year. This might ultimately be incorporated into the Western Palearctic Waterfowl Agreement.

(v) draft Conference resolution

44. The Co-ordinator introduced the draft resolution attached as Annex I to document UNEP/CMS/Conf.3.14.3, concerning *inter alia* the scope of agreements concluded under Article IV, paragraph 4. It was pointed out that there may be biological and political reasons why it would be useful for an agreement to cover only a subgroup of Range States, and that Article IV, paragraph 4, agreements should not necessarily be viewed as a first step towards the conclusion of AGREEMENTs under Article IV, paragraph 3.

45. The Secretariat was asked to draft alternative text for paragraph 3 using more positive language, and this is attached as Annex V to this report.

(f) Proposals for amendments to Appendix I and II to the Convention

(i) arising from the work of the Scientific Council

46. The Chairman pointed out that there was no need to discuss the proposals submitted by India, Pakistan and Norway, as they had arisen directly from the recommendations of the Scientific Council. However, with respect to a number of proposed deletions from Appendix I put forward by Norway, Dr. Devillers drew the meeting's attention to new material offered by ICBP which cast some doubt on their conservation status. It was suggested that the scientific justification for such proposed deletions needed examination before the Scientific Council could support such proposals. The Chairman pointed out that the Scientific Council had not formally recommended such deletions but, at its second meeting, had recommended that the Conference or the Parties **consider** the six species in question for deletion. Norway had given the Conference the opportunity to make such a consideration. The case for deletion was a consequence of applying technical guidelines adopted by the Conference in Resolution 2.2 and so there was no requirement to present a supporting scientific case.

47. In light of the concerns about the uncertain status of these species that had been expressed at this meeting, the Scientific Council concluded that it was unable to support the proposals for deletion.

(ii) other proposal(s)

48. With regard to the proposal of Ireland to list *Sterna dougallii* in Appendix II, Dr. Phillips indicated that there was an Australian subspecies that was not threatened and may not be migratory. It was noted that the proposal as drafted related only to the Atlantic population and should be annotated to this effect. Such an amendment could be moved by a Party during this Conference. The Scientific Council then endorsed the proposal as it relates to the Atlantic population.

(g) Listing of species in the Appendices of the Convention

49. The Co-ordinator introduced document UNEP/CMS/Conf.3.13, which includes, at Annex II, a draft resolution incorporating various suggestions agreed upon by the Council at its second meeting. The Council endorsed the draft resolution.

AGENDA ITEM 5: FURTHER MATTERS FROM THE SECOND MEETING OF THE SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL

(a) Nominations for Chairman

50. Although no further action could be taken on this point until the Conference appointees had been chosen, the Co-ordinator described briefly the postal vote procedures to be followed shortly thereafter. The Chairman announced his willingness to stay on until a new Chairman had been elected, which hopefully would be before the end of the year. The desirability for the Chairman to be from a Party, rather than a Conference-appointee, was expressed, to facilitate the carrying forward of Council recommendations to the Conference.

(b) Additional information on species identified for possible amendment of Appendices listing

51. Discussion of this item appears in paragraph 18 of this report.

(c) Information on species identified for possible listing in the Appendices

52. Discussion of this item appears in paragraph 18 of this report.

(d) Obstacles preventing or impeding migration

53. Discussion of this item appears in paragraph 24 of this report.

AGENDA ITEM 6: DATE AND VENUE OF THE FOURTH MEETING OF THE SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL

54. The Chairman reminded the meeting that the Council is supposed to meet in connection with the meeting of the Conference of the Parties. He noted that it had been necessary to hold the second meeting earlier in the triennium in order to formulate advice on which Parties could act before the deadline for submission of proposals for consideration of the Conference of the Parties. The Council agreed that provision should be made for it to have full meetings about 9-12 months before the next conference and again immediately before the conference. It was suggested that it would be helpful to Councillors to have French and Spanish translations of documents available prior to meetings, especially if budgetary constraints precluded simultaneous interpretation at the meetings themselves.

AGENDA ITEM 7: OTHER BUSINESS

55. The Councillors endorsed Dr. Wolff's expression of thanks to the Chairman for his role in shaping the Scientific Council, paying particular tribute to his comprehension of both the biological and legal aspects of the work.

AGENDA ITEM 8: CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

56. There being no further items for consideration, the Chairman closed the meeting.

Annex I

AGENDA

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Adoption of the agenda.
3. Reports:
 - (a) Report of the Chair;
 - (b) Report of the Secretariat.
4. Matters to be discussed at the third meeting of the Conference of the Parties;
 - (a) funding and role of the Scientific Council;
 - (b) future work programme
 - (c) Conference appointees to Scientific Council;
 - (d) reports by Parties;
 - (e) measures under Article IV of the Convention
 - (i) concluded
 - (ii) pursuant to Resolution 1.6
 - (iii) pursuant to Resolution 2.3
 - (iv) other
 - (v) draft Conference Resolution
 - (f) proposals for amendments to Appendices I and II to the Convention
 - (i) arising from the work of the Scientific Council;
 - (ii) other proposal(s);
 - (g) listing of species in the Appendices to the Convention.
5. Further matters from the second meeting of the Scientific Council:
 - (a) nominations for Chairman;
 - (b) additional information on species identified for possible amendment of listing in the Appendices;
 - (c) information on species identified for possible listing in the Appendices;
 - (d) obstacles preventing or impeding migration.
6. Date and venue of the fourth meeting of the Scientific Council.
7. Other business.
8. Closure of the meeting.

Annex II

Draft Resolution

FUNDING AND ROLE OF THE SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL

The Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals,

Recalling that, pursuant to Article VIII of the Convention, the first meeting of the Conference of the Parties, through Resolution 1.4, established a Scientific Council and directed the Council to address a number of questions,

Noting with appreciation that the Council has now responded to the Conference of the Parties on those questions,

Bearing in mind that Article VIII, paragraph 5, of the Convention provides that the functions of the Scientific Council may include recommending research and the co-ordination of research on migratory species and evaluating the results of such research,

Aware that since 1985 funding has been included in the budget adopted by the Conference of the Parties to cover travel expenses for travel undertaken by the Chairman of the Standing Committee on behalf of the Conference of the Parties or on behalf of the Secretariat,

Further aware that in 1985 the Conference of the Parties directed the Secretariat to provide for payment of travel costs for representatives from least developed countries and in 1988 for representatives from developing countries to attend meetings of the Standing Committee,

1. **Agrees** that Scientific Councillors appointed by the Conference of the Parties shall be entitled to be observers at meetings of the Conference of the Parties;

2. **Determines** the following guidelines for the funding of the Council:

(a) the expenses of the members appointed by the Conference of the Parties in relation to attendance at meetings of the Council and its working groups must be met from the Convention budget as a high priority;

(b) Parties are expected to finance the expenses of their own nominees, except in case of

(i) the Chairman, in relation to travel expenses for travel undertaken as requested by the Conference of the Parties, the Scientific Council, or the Secretariat; and

(ii) members from developing countries, in relation to travel expenses for travel to meetings of the Scientific Council and, in particular, relevant working groups

when, on request, such expenses must be met as far as possible from the Convention budget.

3. Directs the Scientific Council:

- (a) to recommend specific conservation measures for species listed in Appendix I, in order to enhance implementation of Convention Article III, paragraph 4;
- (b) to recommend conservation and management measures to be included in AGREEMENTs for species listed in or recommended for listing in Appendix II;
- (c) in preparing recommendations with regard to sub-paragraph (b) above, to give priority in the first instance to sirenians and to migratory land-based mammals in North Africa, the Arabian peninsula and southern Asia;
- (d) to keep under review, as the necessity arises, the existing list of species in the Appendices;
- (e) to provide advice on further species to be added to the Appendices, giving particular attention to neotropical species;
- (f) to identify and recommend any areas of research required to ascertain the conservation status of migratory species which are listed in the Appendices or are candidates for such listing;
- (g) to undertake a preliminary review, with case studies, of the impact of artificial barriers to migration.

Annex III

Draft Resolution

STATUS REPORTS FOR APPENDIX I SPECIES

The Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals,

Recalling that, pursuant to Article VII of the Convention, the Conference of the Parties may review and assess the conservation status of migratory species and the progress made towards their conservation,

Appreciating the importance of having access to and sharing current information on the endangered species listed in Appendix I, for the purpose of recommending actions to benefit those species,

Recognizing the relevance of reports prepared by Parties, pursuant to Article VI of the Convention, on measures they are taking to implement its provisions,

1. **Decides** to establish a formal review process, at each meeting of the Conference of the Parties, for a selected number of species listed in Appendix I, with a view to recommending initiatives to benefit those species;
2. **Directs** the Secretariat to co-ordinate the preparation of status reports for species identified by the Conference, incorporating the information included in the annex to this Resolution; the Secretariat shall be assisted in this task by the Scientific Council and other bodies, as may be necessary;
3. **Urges** Parties to co-operate fully in providing the information needed to compile the species status reports;
4. **Instructs** the Secretariat and the Scientific Council to encourage and assist Parties to take concerted actions to implement the provisions of the Convention, where possible through existing instruments of bilateral or multilateral co-operation;
5. **Requests** the Secretariat to draw to the attention of Parties matters of importance to the conservation of species listed in the Convention appendices, including those arising from the preparation of the status reports, either at meetings of the Conference of the Parties or, if appropriate, intersessionally.

Annex

Information for inclusion in species review reports

1. Taxonomy

- 1.1 Specific taxonomy
- 1.2 Common name(s)

2. Biological data

- 2.1 Distribution (current and historical)
- 2.2 Habitat
- 2.3 Population estimates and trends
- 2.4 Migratory patterns

3. Conservation status, by Party

4. Actual and potential threats

- 4.1 Habitat degradation/loss
- 4.2 Exploitation: direct and incidental (including flag vessels, where applicable)
- 4.3 Other threats

5. Legislation

- 5.1 International
- 5.2 National

6. Conservation measures, by Party

- 6.1 Prohibition of taking, including any exceptions (grounds for exception, duration, analysis of effects)
- 6.2 Conservation/restoration of habitat
- 6.3 Mitigation of impediments to migration
- 6.4 Regulation of other detrimental factors
- 6.5 Further measures

7. Research activities

- 7.1 Governmental
- 7.2 Non-governmental

8. Needs and recommended actions

- 8.1 Legislative
- 8.2 Conservation measures
- 8.3 Research and monitoring
- 8.4 Other

9. Additional remarks

10. References

Annex IV

Draft Resolution

SMALL CETACEANS

The Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals,

Acknowledging that the Scientific Council's report on the global review of the conservation status of small cetaceans provides a detailed basis for conservation measures to be included in agreements for the species and populations identified for listing in Appendix II,

Recalling that Resolution 2.3 adopted by the second meeting of the Conference of the Parties instructed the Secretariat and Standing Committee to envisage and facilitate agreements between Range States for such species,

Noting that under the auspices of the Convention on the conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats a technical report and draft agreement concerning small cetaceans in the Mediterranean and Black Seas and contiguous waters prepared by Greenpeace International has already been discussed with the secretariats of the Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea Against Pollution and this Convention and with IUCN - the World Conservation Union,

Noting that the draft legal instrument on the conservation of small cetaceans of the Mediterranean and the Black Seas and contiguous waters prepared by Greenpeace International could be used as a basis for an agreement under the Convention, to be implemented in co-operation with the Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea Against Pollution and in consultation with the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats,

1. **Urges** Parties which are Range States for the species and populations of small cetaceans listed by the Conference in Appendix II of the Convention, to give priority to concluding agreements for their conservation;

2. **Urges** Range States to collaborate, under the sponsorship of a Party Range State, to conclude an agreement under the Convention for the Conservation of Small Cetaceans of the Mediterranean and Black Seas;

3. **Directs** the Secretariat to assist Parties in these endeavours.

Annex V

Draft Resolution

IMPLEMENTATION OF ARTICLE IV, PARAGRAPH 4, OF THE CONVENTION

The Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals,

Considering Resolutions 2.6 and 2.7 of the second meeting of the Conference of the Parties,

Recognizing that, based on experience since the second meeting of the Conference of the Parties, further guidance and clarification with respect to agreements concluded pursuant to Article IV, paragraph 4, is desirable,

1. **Understands** that Article I, paragraph 1(j) refers to AGREEMENT(s) concluded in accordance with the basic principles governing such instruments as included in Article IV, paragraph 3, and Article V;

2. **Agrees** to apply **mutatis mutandis** the principles of Articles IV, paragraph 5, Article VII, paragraph 5(d), and Article IX, paragraphs 4(b) and (h), to instruments concluded under Article IV, paragraph 4, of the Convention;

3. **Agrees** that, while it should generally be the goal for agreements concluded under Article IV, paragraph 4, to cover the whole of a range of the migratory species and be open to accession by all Range States, this is not necessary if this would adversely affect the conclusion or implementation of such an agreement under the Convention*;

4. **Recognizes** that, while in some cases such agreements may be established as a first step towards conclusion of AGREEMENTs under Article IV, paragraph 3, in other cases this may not be appropriate.

Annex VI
Attendance list, Scientific Council Meeting, 8 September 1991

Dr. Pierre Devillers
Institut Royal des Sciences
Naturelles de Belgique
31, rue Vautier
B-1040 Bruxelles 4
Belgique
Tel/Fax: 0032-2-649 4825

Dr. Carl Edelstam
Research Department
Swedish Museum of Natural History
P.O. Box 50007
S-10405 Stockholm
Sweden
Tel: 0046-8-666 4000
Fax: 0046-8-666 4212

Mr. Steiner Eldoy
Directorate for Nature Management
Tungasletta 2
N-7004 Trondheim
Norway
Tel: 7-580560
Fax: 7-915433

Dr. Michael J. Ford
Joint Nature Conservation Committee
Monkstone House
City Road
Peterborough PE1 1GY
United Kingdom
Tel: 0044-733 62626
Fax: 0044-733 893971

Dr. Eliezer Frankenberg
Nature Reserves Authority
78 Yirmeyahu Street
Jerusalem 94467
Israel
Tel: 22-536271
Fax: 22-383405

Dr. Eero Helle
Finnish Game and Fisheries Research Institute
P.O. Box 202
00151 Helsinki
Finland
Tel: 358-0-624211
Fax: 358-0-628396

Dr. Mike Moser
International Waterfowl and Wetlands Research Bureau
Slimbridge GL2 7BX
United Kingdom
Tel: 0044-453-890624
Fax: 0044-453-890827
Telex: 437145 (WWF G)

Dr. Jean Ngog Nje
Directeur adjoint de l'école de faune de Garoua
B.P. 271
Garoua
Cameroon
Tel: 271125

Dr. Eugeniusz Nowak
Bundesforschungsanstalt für Naturschutz und Landschaftsökologie
Konstantinstr. 110
D-5300 Bonn 2
Germany
Tel: 228-8491123
Fax: 228-8491200

Dr. William Perrin
National Marine Fisheries Service
Southwest Fisheries Centre
P.O. Box 271
La Jolla
CA 92038
United States of America
Tel: 619-546 7096
Fax: 619-546 7003

Dr. William Phillips
Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service
GPO Box 636
Canberra ACT 2601
Australia
Tel: 6-2500200
Fax: 6-2500399
Telex: AA62971

Mr. S. Deb Roy
Add. Inspector General of Forests (Wildlife)
Ministry of Environment and Forests
Paryavaran Bhawan. GCO Complex
Lodi Road
New Delhi 110003
India
Tel: 11-362785
Fax: 11-360678 / Telex: 3163015 wild in

Professor Daniel TORRES Navarro
Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores
Instituto Antartico Chileno
Luis Thayer Ojeda No. 814
Santiago
Chile
Telex: 346261 inach ck
Fax: 56-02-232 0440

M. Namory Traore
Chef du Programme
Ressources de la Faune
D.R.F.H./I.E.R.
B.P. 1704
Bamako
Mali

Mr. John Wilson
Wildlife Service
1-3 Sidmonton Place
Bray, Co. Wicklow
Ireland
Tel: 00-3531-286 7751
Fax: 00-3531-2868126

Dr. W.G. Wolff
Rijksinstituut voor Natuurbeheer
Postbus 46
NL 3956 ZR Leersum
Netherlands
Tel: 03434-55211
Fax: 03434-56454