

**CONVENTION ON
MIGRATORY SPECIES**

UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Meeting Report

Original: Russian

**MEMORANDUM OF
UNDERSTANDING CONCERNING
CONSERVATION, RESTORATION
AND SUSTAINABLE USE OF THE
SAIGA ANTELOPE**

FIFTH MEETING OF THE SIGNATORIES (MOS 5) TO THE
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING CONCERNING
CONSERVATION, RESTORATION AND SUSTAINABLE
USE OF THE SAIGA ANTELOPE

Astana, Kazakhstan, March 12-14, 2025

**REPORT OF THE FIFTH MEETING OF SIGNATORIES TO THE MEMORANDUM OF
UNDERSTANDING CONCERNING CONSERVATION, RESTORATION AND
SUSTAINABLE USE OF THE SAIGA ANTELOPE (SAIGA MOU)**

*(drafted by the Association for the Conservation of Biodiversity of Kazakhstan for the CMS
Secretariat)*

Agenda Item 1. Welcoming Remarks

1. The Meeting was opened by Mr. Nurken Sharbiev, Vice Minister of Ecology and Natural Resources of the Republic of Kazakhstan. In his welcoming speech, he expressed gratitude to the Secretariat of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS), the International Fund For Houbara Conservation (IFHC), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in Kazakhstan and the Association for the Conservation of Biodiversity in Kazakhstan (ACBK) for the opportunity to hold this meeting and continued support in the Saiga conservation activities. Mr. Sharbiev noted that in 2003, the Saiga numbers in Kazakhstan amounted to only 21,000 animals, therefore, the Government adopted comprehensive measures for its conservation: a hunting ban was introduced, state programs for wildlife protection were developed and implemented, and cooperation with international environmental organizations and Range States was established. Today, the total number of Saigas in Kazakhstan is around 4,000,000, which exceeds the historical peak of 1,200,000 individuals. According to scientific estimates, the total number of Saigas could reach 6,000,000 individuals by the end of this year. At the same time, the increasing number of Saigas leads to more intense competition with livestock for natural pastures and watering places, thus saiga populations cannot grow indefinitely and need to be effectively managed to achieve stable numbers. In this context, joint efforts to conserve and sustainably use the saiga antelope must continue while considering technological and socio-economic aspects. On behalf of the Ministry, Mr. Sharbiev expressed confidence that joint work under the Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation, Restoration and Sustainable Use of the Saiga Antelope (Saiga MOU) will be the key to the successful conservation of the ecosystems inhabited by the Saiga. The Vice Minister concluded his welcoming remarks by wishing the participants a successful and fruitful meeting.
2. Ms. Clara Nobbe, Head of the Terrestrial Species Team at the CMS Secretariat, welcomed all participants to the Fifth Meeting of the Signatories of the Saiga MOU. She expressed gratitude to the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan as host of the

Meeting, as well as ACBK, UNDP and the German Society for International Cooperation (GIZ) for their support and collaboration in organizing the event. Ms. Nobbe noted that the Saiga MOU was concluded within the framework of CMS and has been in force since 2006, when the Saiga was classified as Critically Endangered on the IUCN Red List. In 2023, the species was moved to Near Threatened. This achievement can be attributed to the efforts and cooperation of the Range State governments and the organizations attending today. This conservation success is based on the increase in the population of saiga particularly in Kazakhstan and the stability or positive dynamics of population sizes in other Range States. However, this positive trend may change due to the species' susceptibility to disease and mass mortality. Ms. Nobe suggested that based on the success in conserving the species sustainable use of the saiga antelope may be considered for some populations, provided that mechanisms are put in place to ensure appropriate response measures in the event of population decline. It is equally important to ensure benefits for local communities in case of the sustainable use of saiga. Accordingly, the International Work Program under the Saiga MOU should be updated in line with the evolving situation and objectives of the MOU Signatories. Ms. Nobbe emphasized the readiness of the CMS Secretariat to actively assist the MOU Signatories in achieving their goals.

Agenda Item 2. Election of the Chair and Vice-Chair

3. Mr. Andrey Kim, Deputy Chair of the Forestry and Wildlife Committee of the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of the Republic of Kazakhstan, was elected as the Chair of the Meeting.
4. Ms. Natalia Tretyakova, Head of the International Conventions Division of the Department of International Cooperation on Natural Resources and Environmental Protection of the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of the Russian Federation, was elected as the Vice-Chair of the Meeting.
5. Mr. Andrey Kim had to leave the meeting temporarily due to unforeseen circumstances and asked the following participants to take on his duties as the Chair: Deputy Chair Ms. Natalia Tretyakova on March 12, and Mr. Vladimir Kertiev, Deputy Director General of the Republican State Enterprise Production Association Okhotzooptom of the Committee for Forestry and Wildlife of the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of the Republic of Kazakhstan, on March 13 and 14.

Agenda Items 3 and 4. Objectives and Methods of the Meeting. Adoption of the Agenda

6. The Vice-Chair explained that the participants intended to take decisions by consensus and that, in the event of disagreement, the Rules of Procedure of the CMS Conference of the Parties would apply.
7. She then introduced the provisional agenda and schedule of the meeting (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Doc.1) and the agenda was approved without amendments.

Agenda Item 5. Report of the Secretariat

8. The Secretariat introduced the report of the Secretariat (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Doc.2). The Secretariat recommended including cross-cutting measures that benefit several species covered by CAMI in the revised CAMI Work Programme (CAMI WP), while the Saiga Work Programme for 2025-2030 (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/ MOS5/Doc.4) should focus on measures specific to saiga and its individual populations. This approach is consistent with the decision of CMS COP 14.167 d) to revise, for adoption by COP15, the CAMI POW for the period 2027-2032,

with the aim of streamlining its actions to focus on cross-cutting activities that benefit multiple species and to reflect updated CMS mandates relevant to the region, in alignment with Parties' commitments to the Global Biodiversity Framework, ensuring that emerging threats such as climate change are understood and included. The Secretariat also noted that, within the framework of CAMI, two experts, Ms. E.J. Milner-Gulland, Professor at Oxford University and Chair of the NGO Saiga Conservation Alliance (SCA), and Mr. Steffen Zuther, researcher and project manager at the NGO Frankfurt Zoological Society (FZS), are currently serving as scientific advisors for species within CAMI on saiga conservation issues (CAMI Species Focal Points (SFP)).

9. The report was noted.

Agenda Item 6. Reports on the MOU Implementation

10. The Vice-Chair invited MOU Signatories to present overviews of the implementation of the Saiga MOU for 2021-2025. Their reports can be accessed online:
 - [Saiga Conservation in Kazakhstan](#), presented by Mr. Vladimir Kertiev, Deputy Director of the State Enterprise Okhotzooptom of the Forestry and Wildlife Committee of the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of the Republic of Kazakhstan.
 - [Saiga Conservation in Mongolia](#), presented by Mr. Buuveibaatar Bayarbaatar, member of the Steering Committee of the Saiga Conservation Alliance (SCA) and Researcher at the Wildlife Conservation Society (WWF Mongolia).
 - [Saiga Conservation in the Russian Federation](#) (Russian Federation), presented by Bataar Ubushaev, Director of the Federal State Budgetary Institution "Chernye Zemly State Natural Biosphere Reserve".
 - [Saiga Conservation in Turkmenistan](#), presented by Arazmurat Amanov, Researcher at the Kaplankyr State Reserve, Ministry of Nature Protection of Turkmenistan.
 - [Saiga Conservation in Uzbekistan](#), presented by Sarvar Akhmedov, specialist of the Ministry of Ecology, Environmental Protection and Climate Change of the Republic of Uzbekistan.

Agenda Item 7. Presentation and Review of the Overview Report on the Saiga Conservation Status and MOU Implementation (Overview Report)

11. A consultant introduced the draft Overview Report (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Doc.3). She noted that some inconsistencies had been identified between the structure of the national report templates (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Inf.2 - 5) and the structure of the Medium-Term International Work Program for the Saiga Antelope (2021-2025) (Saiga/MOS5/Doc.4/Rev.2) (MTIWP) and recommended that the format of these documents is harmonized in the future.
12. The Secretariat informed the participants about the procedure for proposing amendments and additions to the draft Overview Report. Further discussion of the draft report refers to paragraphs in the draft (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Doc.3) and quotes the agreed text from the final version of the report (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome1).
13. The Nature and Biodiversity Conservation Union (NABU) proposed adding information to paragraph 35 of the draft about the activities of NABU and the NGO Tabigi Orta in the Ustyurt region, where these organizations carry out monitoring and anti-poaching activities in close cooperation with Okhotzooptom.

14. Paragraph 57 was edited at the request of China, who indicated the need to specify “mainland China” and “Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of China” in the text.
15. With regard to paragraph 66, the Vice-Chair noted the need to cross-reference paragraph 73 of the Overview Report, as it also contained information on the decision of the Government of Kazakhstan to regulate the numbers of the Saiga antelope in the Ural and Betpakdala populations. The Parties agreed to continue to apply this principle throughout the text in similar cases (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome1, paragraphs 68 and 75).
16. As requested by the representatives of the NGOs Tabigi Orta and NABU, information on the activities of these organizations in the range of the Ustyurt saiga population was added to paragraphs 35, 80, and 164 (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome1).
17. As suggested by the Saiga SFP, new information was added, which refers to the research conducted by Oxford University and WSC China on the factors determining consumer demand for saiga products, as well as on the efforts to implement the SMART tool for monitoring saiga and their threats (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome1 paragraphs 100 and 140).
18. Regarding paragraph 141, Russian Federation proposed to exclude the clarification on the location of the Askania Nova Nature Reserve in Ukraine. NABU objected, proposing to maintain the words “in Ukraine,” given that this clarification corresponds to the UN recognized state borders. As a result of subsequent discussions, the Signatories to the Memorandum agreed to delete the entire paragraph 141 “Outside of the Saiga range, about 300 animals are kept under semi-wild conditions in Askania Nova Nature Reserve in Ukraine”, covering 33,482.7 hectares in total” from the Overview Report.
19. In paragraph 156 and throughout the text of the Report, the Russian Federation requested that it be specified that cooperation between Kazakhstan and the Russian Federation on the Ural and Betpak-Dala populations is carried out within the framework of the Agreement between the Ministry of Natural Resources and Ecology of the Russian Federation and the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of the Republic of Kazakhstan on the conservation, reproduction, and sustainable use of transboundary saiga populations. Kazakhstan agreed. (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome1, paragraph 159, measure 14.8).
20. Regarding paragraph 193 on habitat fragmentation and migration barriers, Kazakhstan proposed deleting or amending the wording on the threat to saiga from the construction and operation of railways. The Saiga SFP and ACBK referred to the findings of several years of research on saiga migration, confirming the negative impact of railways, especially railway tracks with parallel fencing. A representative of the Institute of Zoology of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan confirmed that the railways do have an impact on the southern part of the Ustyurt population. Kazakhstan stated that this impact factor was not relevant for other, more numerous populations. NABU added that railway tracks have the greatest impact on small populations. Signatory States agreed on the wording: “Infrastructure developments in 2021- 2025, such as roads and railways, especially if fenced, and other fences, hinder the natural migration of the saiga antelope, for instance, along the borders of the Russian Federation and, particularly, Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan. Some infrastructure projects, like railways, do not include provisions for wildlife corridors, which restrict saiga movements and threaten the survival of small, isolated populations.” (UNEP/CMS/ Saiga/MOS5/Outcome1, paragraph 196).

21. Regarding paragraph 200 on the need to mitigate existing conflicts and ensure the coexistence of local people and Saiga, the Vice-Chair requested clarification of the term "peaceful coexistence" and asked the meeting to consider replacing it with "minimization of conflict." The representative of the Institute of Zoology of Kazakhstan and NABU explained that this was a commonly used term, the Secretariat confirmed the standard use of the equivalent term in English, and the replacement of the term was rejected (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome1, paragraph 203).
22. Upon the suggestion of Mongolia to mention the impact of potential barriers and threats associated with planned linear infrastructure facilities, a new sentence was added to paragraph 201, as follows: "It is important to minimize the impact of potential barriers and threats posed by planned linear infrastructure, such as railroads and roads."(UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome1, paragraph 204).
23. The Vice-Chair suggested deleting paragraph 204, as it was not applicable to countries that do not have saiga stockpiles. Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan supported the proposal. WCS Mongolia noted that this paragraph is important in terms of developing stockpile management protocols and is also a priority matter in the context of combating poaching. NABU supported WCS, adding that the issue is important in the context of potential changes to the CITES listing of saiga. Mr. Vyacheslav Rozhnov, Academic, A.N. Severtsov Institute of Ecology and Evolution, Russian Academy of Sciences, proposed replacing the wording with one that does not imply the mandatory establishment of a stockpile storage system, or designating specific countries. The Russian Federation noted that as long as the saiga antelope remains in their national Red Book this issue is not relevant for the country. Signatories agreed on the following "Support and develop transparent governance frameworks for saiga horn stockpiles and conduct consultations between Signatory States, if needed" (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome1, paragraph 207).
24. Regarding the Annexes, the Vice-Chair proposed changing the titles of annex A and B so that they would not carry any negative connotations. The wording has been changed to: A. Missing information, B. Unimplemented aspects.
25. At the request of Kazakhstan, the Secretariat provided clarification on the measures of the MTIWP 2021-2025, the implementation of which was not covered in the Overview Report due to lack of information or unclear wording of the actions themselves, and added that the activities implemented by the Secretariat are described separately in the Secretariat's report (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Doc.2).
26. At the request of the Mongolian delegation, the total saiga population number in Mongolia was adjusted to 23,215 animals in accordance with the data obtained in October 2024.
27. The Overview Report was officially adopted by the Meeting (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome1).

Agenda Item 8. Sustainable Use Planning for Saiga in Kazakhstan within the Framework of International Conventions

28. Mr. Andrey Kim presented an overview prepared by the Government of Kazakhstan on [Planning Sustainable Use of the Saiga Antelope in Kazakhstan within the Framework of International Conventions](#).
29. Uzbekistan asked whether commercial taking would be performed by only one organization. Kazakhstan confirmed that commercial taking will be carried out by a

- single operator, the State Enterprise Okhotzoprom, and added that the following options for involving the local people are being considered: 1) harvesting of horns from naturally deceased saigas, which will be submitted to Okhotzoprom by local residents; 2) Okhotzoprom will hire local people to hunt saiga.
30. Regarding saiga culling in Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation asked whether the removal of approximately 50% of adult males was intended and whether the experience of the Soviet Union was being replicated. Kazakhstan clarified that it was never intended to take such a high percentage of adult males. The removal was carried out using two methods: shooting, which allows for selection based on sex and age, and the corral method, where such selection is not feasible. It was also emphasized that the number of taken animals did not exceed the scientifically approved permissible thresholds.
 31. Regarding marking, Russian Federation asked why each horn was marked separately. The representative of Kazakhstan explained that marking two horns together with a skull is technically difficult to do. He then explained that the usage of different tags was to demonstrate various marking methods, with the iron seal method being recognized as the most reliable. He emphasized that it is crucial for subsequent trade to eliminate the possibility of counterfeiting and to ensure the identification and recording of horns, e.g. using a mobile application.
 32. NABU noted Kazakhstan's successes in developing marking methods and recommended using shooting instead of corralling as a more humane method of take. Kazakhstan noted that opinions on the humanity of various methods of take differ within the professional community. The Institute of Zoology of Kazakhstan reported that saiga meat used to be exported to France during the Soviet time, where it was in high demand.
 33. Kazakhstan underscored that the Government had initiated discussions with the Range States and international organizations on its proposal to remove the zero-export quota for Kazakhstan and noted that the 78th session of the CITES Standing Committee had decided that the results of the current discussion under this Memorandum would be considered at the upcoming Conference of the Parties to CITES.
 34. In this regard, Kazakhstan proposed in the final slide of their presentation that the Meeting recommends to CITES Parties to agree to adopt an amendment to abolish the zero quota for *Saiga tatarica* of wild origin from Kazakhstan with a view to allowing legal trade for Kazakhstan. Kazakhstan added that some states had previously expressed concerns about illegal trade. In response, Kazakhstan suggested introducing a marking system that includes a permanent label and a centralized database accessible to the public. Such a system will ensure transparency, reliable identification and recording of origin using a mobile application. He invited the Signatories to carefully consider the proposal to support Kazakhstan's initiative.
 35. The Vice-Chair asked the representative of the CITES Secretariat to clarify the procedure for lifting the zero quota. Ms. Hyeon Jeong Kim from the CITES Secretariat briefly explained the CITES procedures applicable to requests for the removal of zero export quotas.
 36. The Russian Federation asked whether Kazakhstan was planning to conduct saiga trophy hunting in the future. Mr. Andrey Kim confirmed that Kazakhstan was indeed considering the possibility of trophy hunting.
 37. NABU asked whether the horns harvested from natural mortality of saigas would be included in the marking system. Mr. Andrey Kim replied that the issue was under

consideration. The possibility of including such horns has been discussed, but no final decision was made at the time due to existing veterinary and legal restrictions.

Agenda Item 9. Presentation and review of the draft Work Program for the Saiga Antelope for 2025-2030

38. A consultant presented the proposed structure of the draft Work Program for the Saiga Antelope 2025-2030 (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Doc.4), noting that, in light of the Decisions of CMS COP14, the Secretariat proposes to retain in the Saiga WP only those measures that are applicable to the conservation of Saigas, while broader measures are proposed to be included in the CAMI Programme of Work. The general measures excluded from the draft are listed in the Annex to the draft Program and can be included in the CAMI Program of Work. The Secretariat then presented the procedure for suggesting amendments and additions to the draft.
39. The Saiga SFP noted that a number of activities included in the Annex to the draft Program were relevant to saiga and expressed concern that these activities might not be included in the CAMI Program of Work. NABU and Flora and Fauna International (FFI) also expressed concerns about the coherence of activities under CAMI and Saiga MOU. The Secretariat reminded that this proposal was based on the mandate received through the CMS COP Decision as described in the Secretariat's report.
40. The representative of Kazakhstan asked about the reason for the change in the title of the Work Program. The Secretariat explained that it was proposed to modify the title to become 'Work Program' instead of "Medium-Term International Work Program (MTIWP)" for the purpose of simplification. Signatory States declined and agreed to keep the title MTIWP.
41. The Russian Federation expressed doubts about the applicability of CAMI obligations to the Russian Federation, since the Russian Federation is not a CMS Party and proposed to clarify that the relevant provisions apply only to CMS Parties.
42. The Secretariat clarified that Signatory States could, if desired, include the measures now proposed for inclusion in CAMI Programme of Work in the new MTIWP instead. However, no such proposals followed.

1.0 Implementation, Coordination and Financing of the MoU

43. Regarding measure 1.5, the Russian Federation proposed replacing the phrase "Consider introducing a requirement for financial contributions from large businesses located in or close to the Saiga ranges to finance saiga conservation, research, and monitoring activities" with "Consider the possibility to attract financial contributions from large businesses located in or close to Saiga ranges to cover Saiga conservation, research, and monitoring activities." Signatory States agreed to this amendment (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2, measure 1.5).
44. The Saiga SFP proposed the inclusion of a new measure under 1.10. "As needed, consider participation and contribution of major consumer and trading countries in the implementation of MTIWP 2025-2030." Signatory States supported the proposal. (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2, measure 1.10).

2.0 Measures Addressing Several or All Populations of Saiga spp.

2.1 Monitoring (relevant to all populations)

45. Regarding measure 2.1, the Russian Federation proposed replacing the word "annually" with "regularly" and adding "and where possible" before the word "photography" due to possible funding difficulties. Thus, the following wording was approved: "Assess Saiga population sizes regularly, using scientifically sound methods, including modern technologies, such as drones and, where possible, photography and remote sensing, to obtain reliable and comparable estimates to assess conservation success and inform management decisions." FFI added that it is important that the data is reliable and comparable. Regarding measure 2.2, the representative of Mongolia suggested to include monitoring of movements which was agreed. Upon the suggestion of Kazakhstan, it was decided to exchange measures 2.1 and 2.2. (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2, measures 2.1 and 2.2).
46. The Saiga SFP proposed to include measures 8.1 and 8.6 from previous MTIWP relating to monitoring and currently in the Annex of the document into the current MTIWP instead of measure 2.3. The Russian Federation did not support this proposal, arguing that the suggested actions relate to another CMS instrument, CAMI, while the Russian Federation, not being a CMS Party, cannot commit to implementing a CMS resolution (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2, measure 2.3), following this comment the suggestion was declined.
47. The Saiga SFP expressed doubts about the feasibility of the proposal to agree on standard Saiga monitoring methods, as mentioned in measure 2.3. ACBK asked Signatory States to consider the suggestions of the SFP once again, as they addressed this issue. However, Russian Federation reiterated that suggested measures on monitoring should not be included, as they relate to CAMI. The Secretariat clarified that Annex 1 to the document UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Doc.4/Rev.2 lists a number of measures taken from the previous MTIWP, rather than from the CAMI POW. NABU stated that the paragraphs under discussion had not been included in the CAMI WP yet and that the MOU Signatories could include them in the MTIWP if desired (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2, measure 2.2).
48. FFI stressed the importance of these measures when working with transboundary populations. NABU proposed to combine measures 8.1 and 8.6 into one and to include them in the MTIWP. However, these proposals were not accepted by the Signatory States.
49. Kazakhstan suggested to keep measure 2.3 and to add 'data exchange among the Range States' and 'reporting'. The Russian Federation agreed with this proposal, however, without including the word "reporting." As a result, the following wording was agreed: "Conduct online or in-person meetings between Range States to exchange data and agree on comparable methodologies to be applied for Saiga monitoring" (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2, measure 2.3).
50. Regarding measure 2.4, the Russian Federation proposed adding the word "interested" before the word "stakeholders" and removing the clarifications in parenthesis "(including scientists, non-governmental and government organizations)." These suggestions were endorsed (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2, measure 2.4).
51. The Saiga SFP proposed to restore measure 8.4 from the previous MTIWP as a new paragraph 2.5: "Develop and expand programmes of monitoring of saiga in collaboration with local people." Kazakhstan noted that in practice it is difficult to involve local people

in the development of methodologies and clarified that the content is already reflected in measure 2.4 and thus the suggestion of the SFP was declined.

52. FFI suggested adding a new measure to set up a central national database to store information on the monitoring, conservation, and use of saiga. She clarified that this proposal was based on Kazakhstan's Saiga Strategy. Kazakhstan said it had no objections to this, as it had already committed to this activity as part of the national strategy. However, the Russian Federation stated that implementing such a measure would be too complicated and suggested that it should not be included. Uzbekistan proposed retaining the measure in the form of a recommendation, adding the words "where possible." The consultant clarified that the draft document initially referred to a common database for all Range States, but agreed to replace it with separate databases for each country. Kazakhstan supported the proposal but noted that running an international database requires a responsible organization.

3.0 Land Use and Human-Wildlife Conflict (relevant to all populations)

53. Regarding measure 3.2, "Based on 3.1, conduct landscape-scale planning, involving relevant stakeholders across agencies and sectors and involving local people, to identify priority zones for both Saiga and land use." The Saiga SFP suggested adding a reference to scenarios of likely future changes in the distribution of Saigas and threats to their existence. The Russian Federation requested an explanation. The consultant explained that this refers to land use outside protected areas, especially in the context of potential conflicts. ACBK added that in Kazakhstan, the key calving and breeding grounds are located outside protected areas, and this is where conflicts between the saiga and land users arise. The aim of the proposed measure was to identify priority areas for species conservation and economic activity.
54. The Russian Federation stated that, despite the relevance of the proposed measure for Kazakhstan, it was not applicable to the Russian Federation and offered to include the measure as a recommendation by adding 'where necessary'. Mongolia noted that this paragraph was also relevant for Mongolia, and supported its inclusion. Kazakhstan offered to indicate the populations where it was indeed necessary. The Signatory States supported these suggestions.
55. Kazakhstan proposed combining this measure with measure 3.2, which deals with landscape-level planning with participation of local communities, or deleting it. The Saiga SFP opposed the merging indicating that measure 3.3 is scientific in nature while 3.2 is administrative. The Russian Federation and Mongolia agreed with him. NABU and Uzbekistan suggested including the Ustyurt population in measure 3.2, which was endorsed (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2, measure 3.2).
56. Regarding measure 3.3, "Conduct sociological research to improve the understanding of interactions between people and Saigas, identify conflicts and synergies and evaluate the effectiveness of implemented awareness campaigns about Saiga conservation and management", the Russian Federation noted that sociological research was not envisaged in this context in Russia, and suggested that it should be worded as a recommendation. Measure 3.3 was agreed as follows: "Consider the possibility of conducting sociological research to improve the understanding of interactions between people and saigas, identify conflicts and synergies and evaluate the effectiveness of implemented awareness campaigns about saiga conservation and management." (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2, measure 3.3).
57. With regard to measure 3.4 on developing a program to mitigate conflicts and ensure coexistence between humans and wildlife, the Russian Federation proposed phrasing it

as a recommendation "recommend the development of" and replacing the reference to conflicts with the more neutral "ensuring coexistence." The delegation of Kazakhstan emphasized the importance of this topic. The Secretariat proposed replacing "recommend" with "develop as required," as it would be difficult to monitor the implementation of this measure with the previously proposed wording. The following wording was agreed "Develop, as required, human-saiga conflict mitigation and coexistence schemes based on participatory methodologies, for all populations, where conflict exists, starting with the Ural population and monitor the effectiveness of introduced mitigation schemes to adjust them, as appropriate." (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2, measure 3.4).

58. Regarding measure 3.5, the Russian Federation requested to add government organizations (GO) to the list of leads, and the Signatories supported this. ACBK proposed including an additional measure about the need to study the impact of saiga on the agricultural land use to develop recommendations on standard methodologies to support insurance or compensation schemes. The Russian Federation proposed adding: "if funding is available." ACBK proposed dividing priorities by country: 3 for Russian Federation and 1 for Kazakhstan. Both Kazakhstan and the Russian Federation supported. (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2, measure 3.6).
59. Regarding measure 3.6 "Assess feasibility of community-based eco-tourism with Saiga observation tours in specific regions and provide support for respective business development in most promising locations." Kazakhstan requested that the words "as required" be added, and the amendment was accepted (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2, measure 3.7).

4.0 Connectivity (relevant to all populations)

60. Regarding measure 4.1 on the implementation of measures to minimize barriers to migration and disturbance of saiga antelopes, FFI proposed to add 'avoid, reduce and mitigate the impact of barriers', not just minimize them. Kazakhstan questioned the need for such clarifications if such measures are already indicated in the specific guidance referenced in the text. The Saiga SFP suggested using the wording: "implement measures to mitigate barriers." Signatory States agreed on the following wording: "Require organizations permitted to develop infrastructure, including fences, railway, roads and pipelines within the saiga range to implement measures mitigating migration barriers and disturbances to saiga and following the mitigation hierarchy in accordance with internationally recognized standards IFC1 and IFC6 and as described in the "Guidelines on Mitigating the Impact of Linear Infrastructure and Related Disturbance on Mammals in Central Asia" (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2 measure 4.1).
61. Regarding measure 4.2, "*Adapt existing linear infrastructure such as railways and highways to allow saiga antelopes to cross them.*" Mongolia suggested adding a link to the [Atlas of Central Asian Mammals Migration and Linear Infrastructure](#). The Saiga SFP proposed to insert 'taking the Atlas into account' as there could also be other sources of information. Kazakhstan proposed to include the phrase "if funding is available". The Russian Federation suggested using the word "take into account" instead of "adapt". ACBK explained that the creation of crossings for animals requires a change in the existing infrastructure, which implies "adaptation", Uzbekistan supported the use of the term "adapt". There were no objections to using this term (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2 measure 4.2).

5.0 Saiga health and diseases (relevant to all populations)

62. Regarding measure 5.1 on cooperation in the field of pasteurellosis research, the Saiga SFP proposed to generalize by replacing pasteurellosis with "diseases to which saigas are susceptible currently and potentially in the future." Kazakhstan suggested deleting the explanation of how cooperation would be strengthened, as it was incomplete. Signatories agreed (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2 measure 5.2).
63. Regarding measure 5.5, "Develop and implement at the national and international levels a long-term research program on saiga diseases, including the participation of national and international experts, the involvement of the local population and environmental inspectors, as well as the general public." The Russian Federation indicated that in the Russian Federation this work is only relevant at the local level and not at the national level and suggested adding "if necessary". She also asked for clarification of the meaning of the term "general public" and noted that the topic of diseases is complex, including risks for the local population. Consultant suggested changing the wording to "informing and providing advice to the general public", referring to the approach used in Mongolia. Mongolia stressed that it is important not only to inform, but also to train the population to act in case of detection of sick animals and suggested leaving the current wording unchanged. Kazakhstan noted that the measure is difficult to implement in practice, and suggested deleting the words "long-term program." The Secretariat suggested replacing "develop and implement" with a more realistic "conduct a study". The Russian Federation supported conducting a national study and proposed to add government agencies to the list of implementers. The following wording was agreed: "Conduct, as required, research on Saiga diseases at the national and international level, involving national and international experts and rangers, and engage with local communities as well as the general public." (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2 measure 5.5).
64. The Saiga SFP proposed adding a new measure to the program with proposals to create a virtual international network on saiga diseases, emphasizing the importance of such a network, given the scale of animal deaths as observed in the past. Since the participants had questions about the meaning of the phrase "international virtual network", the Secretariat suggested replacing it with 'collaboration of interested organizations'. The consultant noted that such a measure should be considered within the framework of the CAMI in general, not only for saiga (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2 measure 5.6).
65. Mongolia and NABU noted the need for a separate group specifically on saiga. Kazakhstan stressed that a similar measure had already been included in previous programs, but had not been implemented, and suggested adding a clarification "if funding is available." The Russian Federation did not support the proposal, as the issue requires additional investigation, and offered to consider it within the framework of CAMI. Uzbekistan noted that the country participates in the project One Health in Nature Conservation in Central Asia funded by the International Climate Initiative of the German Government. Mongolia insisted on maintaining this measure. Kazakhstan proposed to leave only the components related to information exchange and emergency response. The Russian Federation noted that the exchange of information on diseases is already carried out within the framework of the World animal Health Information System (WAHIS) and a separate activity in the memorandum is not necessary.
66. Mongolia noted that he was not familiar with the WAHIS system, but considered the measure important. Uzbekistan noted that it is already a part of WAHIS and is ready to share contacts with Mongolia. The Russian Federation and Kazakhstan supported the inclusion of a link to WAHIS. The Secretariat noted that an activity "support" is difficult to track and requested that the action be formulated more clearly. The Vice-Chair of the

Meeting asked Mongolia to propose wording. Mongolia suggested the use of "encourage collaboration" As a result, the measure was included as follows: "Encourage cooperation among interested organizations and experts at international level to exchange operational information on diseases affecting or threatening Saiga populations, if funding is available, including the use of the WAHIS portal for animal health data." (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2 measure 5.6).

6.0 Education and awareness-raising (relevant to all populations)

67. Regarding measure 6.1, the Russian Federation proposed to include 'strengthening environmental education' instead of 'introduction of educational programmes' in local schools, as it considers the discussion of school curricula outside the mandate of this meeting. The saiga SFP noted the importance of working with children. As a result, the following wording was approved: "Intensify ecological education and work with children within the Saiga range, integrating Saiga ecology, conservation and, where applicable, management." (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2 measure 6.1).

7.0 Sustainable use and trade

68. Regarding draft measure 7.2, FFI proposed including a reference to "Ensuring Effective Stockpile Management: A Guidance Document." The Russian Federation noted that it would be inappropriate to refer to a guidance that has not been approved by the CITES Conference of the Parties (COP). The CITES Secretariat clarified that the guidance was adopted by the Standing Committee, it is recommended to facilitate effective stockpile management. Following the discussion, the Signatory States agreed that inclusion of references to this guidance was not necessary. (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2, Measure 7.2).
69. Regarding draft measure 7.3, the Russian Federation and Uzbekistan noted that it is not relevant for their countries to create databases for saiga stockpiles. The CITES Secretariat provided an explanation on the obligations of countries to report on imports of samples from Appendix II. The CMS Secretariat recalled that in accordance with CITES Decision 19.213 on saiga all Range States should implement the MTIWP 2021-2025 and introduce systems for registration of traders and producers, market control and stockpile management. The consultant suggested clarifying that the proposed measure applies only to consumer countries and countries involved in trade, to which the other participants agreed, adopting the following wording: "Saiga Range States involved in trade and important consumer countries should create national databases for trade, purchase, storage and sale of Saiga horns and products made thereof " (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2 measure 7.3).
70. Kazakhstan suggested to add to the MTIWP a measure about supporting Kazakhstan's proposal at CITES COP20: "Recommend that saiga Range States, consumer and transit states support the proposal of Kazakhstan to amend the annotation on *Saiga tatarica* of CITES Appendix II by adding 'excluding the *Saiga tatarica* population of Kazakhstan" at CITES COP20 taking place on November 24 - December 5, 2025 in Samarkand.
71. Mongolia and Uzbekistan expressed concerns about the consequences of such a decision for the saiga populations on their territories. NABU and Mongolia noted that such a decision could not be made at this meeting. The Russian Federation proposed to specify the subspecies *Saiga tatarica tatarica*, however, the Secretariat explained that CMS and CITES use *Saiga tatarica* and *Saiga borealis* according to Wilson and Reeder (2005). WCS suggested that the activity should be changed to include a side event during COP20 to provide detailed coverage of the topic.

72. ACBK explained that proposals to amend CITES Appendices are submitted in advance and cannot be presented at a side event. After some discussions, Signatories agreed on the following: “Kazakhstan to conduct additional consultations with Range States, including the discussion of potential benefits and risks of permitting international commercial trade in specimens of Saiga tatarica from Kazakhstan before and at the CITES COP 20 to consider the proposal of Kazakhstan to add to the annotation on Saiga tatarica in Appendix II, “excluding the populations of Saiga tatarica of Kazakhstan”. (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2 measure 7.4).
73. It was decided to delete draft measures 7.4 and 7.5, since information on the trade in saiga parts and derivatives and its control is duplicated in other measures.
74. Then a draft measure concerning the development of trophy hunting tourism as a potential source of income for hunting enterprises was discussed. The Russian Federation noted the absence of commercial and other types of saiga hunting in the country and requested that the Russian part of the population be excluded. Uzbekistan reiterated that saiga hunting within its territory is not being considered. Turkmenistan requested that the measure specify the need for coordination of any removal of animals from the Ustyurt population in Kazakhstan with neighboring countries. As a result, the countries agreed to indicate that this measure applies only to Kazakhstan and, with respect to the Ustyurt population, it should be implemented upon agreement with Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan. “Consider the feasibility of developing sustainable hobby (sport) hunting including trophy hunting in Kazakhstan as a potential funding source for hunting areas. (BD, UR, US - upon additional agreement with Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan).” (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2 measure 7.5).
75. FFI proposed measures to study the demand for saiga parts for use in oriental medicine in order to identify sales points, motivation and develop measures. Mongolia proposed adding the word “derivatives,” since saiga blood is also used in the country. WCS reported that a study on the demand for saiga horns, parts, and derivatives is already being conducted in Mongolia. Kazakhstan noted the relevance of this issue and proposed adding international organizations to the implementers of relevant measures (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2 measures 7.7, 7.8).
76. The Saiga SFP drew the participants’ attention to the need to analyze poaching. Measure 7.8 on the analysis of the causes of poaching and illegal trade routes was added upon her suggestion (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2 measure 7.8).
77. Regarding draft measures on international trade, the Russian Federation and Mongolia noted that these points are not relevant for their countries. Kazakhstan explained that international trade is important for Kazakhstan in the future, so it was decided to formulate a measure separately for Kazakhstan. (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2 measure 7.9).

8.0 Captive breeding (applies to all populations)

78. These draft activities were approved without discussion

9.0 Ustyurt population (Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan)

79. Regarding measures 9.3 and 9.4, FFI and Kazakhstan suggested that, in addition to protected areas, OECMs should also be indicated, due to their importance for the

conservation of the Ustyurt saiga population. The proposals were accepted (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2 measures 9.4 and 9.5).

80. Uzbekistan proposed to add a measure with information on the establishment of the Saiga nursery at the Saigachiy sanctuary, and also expressed its intention to share experience in this area with the countries of the range. "Create a specialised breeding centre "Saiga" within the "Saigachiy" sanctuary to support the wild population and the restoration of the distribution range." (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2 measure 9.8).
81. Turkmenistan suggested including Turkmenistan in the title of section 9, since the Ustyurt population includes the territory of the country. Signatory States agreed (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2 Section (9)).

10.0 *Betpak-Dala population (Kazakhstan, Russian Federation)*

82. Mr. Vyacheslav Rozhnov suggested adding a reference to the Saiga Conservation Strategy of the Russian Federation in measure 10.2 (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2 measure 10.2).

11.0 *Ural population (Kazakhstan, Russian Federation)*

83. The Russian Federation proposed to delete measure 11.2 on *exploring the experience of other countries* in the field of sustainable management of migratory species included in Appendix II of CMS from the MTIWP. Kazakhstan pointed out the importance of this activity for Kazakhstan, and the measure was subsequently retained as follows: "Organize an exchange of experience for appropriate specialists in the field of sustainable management of migratory species, listed on CMS Appendix II." (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2 measure 11.2).
84. The Russian Federation expressed doubts about the need for draft measure 11.4 on assessing the degree of damage to farmers from saigas, since each country has its own regulations, in connection with which Kazakhstan proposed to clarify "taking into account national legislation." ACBK added that the conflict between saiga and farmers is related not only to the number of animals, but also to the intensity of pasture use, so she suggested listing all potential types of damage. The comments were taken into account in a new phrasing: "Conduct research on the intensity and nature of the impact of grazing pressure from Saiga, and other potential impacts from their presence on territories, including disease transmission, use of water sources, considering aspects such as ecosystem type, season, crop type and other parameters, aiming to develop a method for the assessment of damage, caused by saiga for farmers and land users taking into account national legislations." (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2 measure 11.3).
85. FFI proposed a new measure on the expansion of the network of protected areas, ecological corridors and OECMs to ensure the migration of saigas. She also noted the role of the local people in preserving the OECMs and environmental corridors. Kazakhstan added that when creating protected areas, the local people are involved at the stage of public hearings. NABU added that it is especially important to involve local communities in environmental protection activities. Kazakhstan proposed the final wording for the new measure, which was adopted: "Consider the expansion of the protected and conserved area network in the Ural population range, including protected areas, ecological corridors and OECMs, to maintain ecological connectivity and allow Saiga migration." (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2 measure 11.8). UNDP noted that the effectiveness of environmental protection measures is associated not only with the creation of new protected areas, but also with increasing the efficiency of existing

ones, their support and logistical equipment.

12.0 Mongolian population (Mongolia)

- 86. China proposed adding OECM to measure 12.1 to expand the habitats of the Mongolian saiga (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2 measure 12.1).
- 87. Measure 12.9, “Establish a captive breeding center and strengthen cross-border and cross-border cooperation on captive breeding,” was removed upon Mongolia's suggestion.
- 88. Mongolia proposed adding three new measures to strengthen epidemiological surveillance, strengthen stock storage procedures, and a National Saiga Conservation Plan. These proposals were accepted without changes. (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2 measures 12.11-12.13).

13.0 Population of the North-Western Caspian Region (Russian Federation)

- 89. The Russian Federation proposed to delete draft measure 13.1 on studies of the morphological and genetic diversity of the species, since the information is duplicated in measure 13.5. The delegation members also adjusted two measures regarding provision of funding and strengthening institutional capacity for saiga conservation to make them advisory and non-obligatory. The adjustments were accepted (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Outcome 2 measures 13.5, 13.6).
- 90. It was agreed that Annexes 1 and 2 will be removed from the MTIWP 2025-2030 (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Doc.4/Rev.2) and will be considered for possible inclusion in the revised CAMI Programme of Work.
- 91. The Fifth Meeting of Signatories to the Saiga MOU adopted the MTIWP 2025-2030.

Agenda item 10. Implementation of the MTIWP 2025-2030

- 92. The Secretariat presented a preliminary list of MOU focal points of the Signatory States. Technical adjustments were made by the Signatory States. It was agreed that additional data will be sent to the Secretariat, as needed. The Secretariat asked Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation and Turkmenistan to send updated information.

Terms of reference for technical support organizations

- 93. The Secretariat recalled that an agreement on the need to prepare terms of reference (TOR) for technical support organizations had been reached at the previous Meeting of Signatories based on the previous MTIWP. The Secretariat asked Signatory States to provide a mandate for the development of new TORs based on the updated MTIWP. Signatory States agreed that the Secretariat shall develop new TORs, which will be submitted to them for consideration.

Mandate to create a new reporting format

- 94. The Russian Federation requested clarification of the reasons for the change in the reporting format, the timing of its availability. Secretariat explained that the previous reporting format did not correspond to the structure of the current MTIWP, which caused difficulties in preparing an overview report on the implementation of the MTIWP. In this regard, the Secretariat proposes the development and subsequent agreement of a new

reporting format by 2029. All Signatories supported the mandate to create a new reporting format.

Agenda item 11. Financing and partnership opportunities for the implementation of the MTIWP

95. Mr. Josh Brann, Technical Consultant on Biodiversity at UNDP in Kazakhstan, presented a report on financing and partnership opportunities online (see the [report on Biofin online](#)). WCS asked if there had been previous attempts to raise funds from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) for saiga conservation or if this was planned in the future. Mr. Josh Brann replied that he was not aware of any specific attempts to obtain GEF funding for projects directly related to saiga. He noted that it is difficult to obtain GEF funding for the conservation of a particular species, since the GEF focuses on larger-scale landscape conservation programs. Nevertheless, there is a possibility of implementing such projects within the framework of broader regional initiatives. The Michael Succow Foundation (MSF) asked a question about the Global Wildlife Program (GWP). Mr. Josh Brann explained that this is a major international program, the main focus of which is energy, wildlife management and anti—poaching. The possibility of participation depends on the country and the nature of the project application. The submission can be made through various UN bodies and agencies or directly through the GEF.

96. The Secretariat asked Signatory States to describe how the provisions of the MTIWP are planned to be reflected in national biodiversity conservation strategies. Kazakhstan said that a new National Strategy and Action Plan for the Conservation of Biodiversity (NBSAP) is currently being developed in Kazakhstan with the support of UNDP. As part of this process, the integration of the provisions of the MTIWP on saiga is envisaged. It is planned that the strategy will be submitted to the Government of Kazakhstan before August of this year. The Russian Federation said that in 2021, the Saiga Conservation Strategy in the Russian Federation was approved, which detailed measures, steps and mechanisms for the protection of this species. One of the sections of the strategy is devoted to international cooperation in the study and conservation of saiga. It reflects key instruments and agreements, including CITES, CMS, Saiga MOU, and bilateral agreements. Measures to adapt border fences, ensure the veterinary well-being of populations, counter poaching, prospects for the creation of protected areas, engagement of local communities and participation in initiatives such as the Saiga Conservation Alliance are also included. In this regard, the Russian Federation believes that the provisions of the MTIWP have already been integrated into national documents. Uzbekistan said that it is currently reviewing its NBSAP. The revision process will take into account the MTIWP, as well as provide funding for measures aimed at protecting the population in the Ustyurt region. Mongolia shared information on the development of a national strategy that will take into account the MTIWP, as well as Mongolia's Action Plan for the protection of saiga and its habitats, which has already been submitted to the Government for approval. Turkmenistan said that at the moment there are no measures to protect saiga in Turkmenistan due to the absence of species in the country. However, MTIWP will definitely be taken into account when developing a future biodiversity conservation strategy.

97. The Secretariat invited the observer organizations present to provide information on how they can support the implementation of the Saiga Medium-Term Work Program for 2025-2030.

98. Mr. Vitaly Gromov, Advisor to the Director of the Institute of Zoology of Kazakhstan, said that the Institute of Zoology of Kazakhstan has been engaged in saiga research for more than 70 years. It is implementing a five-year project on the concept of "One Health"

where the Saiga is one of the key species. It is planned to work on the control of zoonoses in cooperation with government agencies.

99. Mr. Wei Ji thanked Range States for their efforts to preserve, restore and sustainably use the saiga. Representing the Chinese delegation, he expressed his willingness to support the implementation of the MTIWP 2025-2030, including through the expansion of work on population restoration, reintroduction, maintenance and breeding in captivity in China and joint scientific research on this topic.
100. Mr. Rozhnov, representing the Institute of Ecology and Evolution named after A. N. Severtsov of the Russian Academy of Sciences noted that the Russian Federation is conducting comprehensive work on the study of saiga in the Northwestern Caspian region, including migration, genetics, ecological and physiological status, pathogens, as well as the development of methodologies and the study of interaction with wolves.
101. Ms. Alyona Krivosheeva, representing ACBK, said that since 2006, work has been underway within the framework of the Altyn Dala Conservation Initiative, where the saiga is a flagship species. It is planned to continue monitoring, introduce new approaches to population accounting, collect data on calving, rutting and migration, analyze the impact of infrastructure, satellite tagging, recommendations on protected areas and environmental corridors, work on changing legislation, interaction with the local population and countering illegal trade.
102. Mr. Rustam Murzakhanov said that MSF projects are mainly focused on Ustyurt in Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan, and a number of activities are being implemented jointly with protected areas of Kazakhstan.
103. Ms. Justine Shanti Alexander, director at WCS Mongolia noted that WCS works on saiga in Mongolia and China. Mongolia is working on inventory management, telemetry, cooperation with law enforcement agencies, and countering poaching and illegal trade. In China, the use of saiga is being studied.
104. Ms. Meruyert Sarsembayeva, UNDP, said that UNDP will support the development of a National Strategy and Action Plan for the Conservation of Biodiversity in Kazakhstan by the end of 2027, including species management issues.
105. Ms. Anna Yachmennikova, senior researcher at Severtsov Institute of Ecology and Evolution, Russian Academy of Sciences said that the educational activities, which began in the early 2000s, continue as part of the work of the Saiga Conservation Alliance in the Russian Federation.
106. Ms. Michaela Butorova-McGurk, Senior Programme Manager at FFI said that FFI will continue to support the Ustyurt Monitoring Group, the implementation of the SMART approach in Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan, as well as projects to combat the illegal saiga trade.
107. Mr. Steffen Zuther, project manager at FZS said that the FZS will continue its activities within the framework of the Altyn Dala Conservation Initiative for the conservation and sustainable use of saiga. Work is planned to study migration, ecology, support aerial surveys and study saiga diseases.
108. Mr. Till Dieterich said that NABU is ready to continue working with local communities in Ustyurt on projects related to sustainable use of saiga and environmental education.

109. Mrs. E.J. Milner-Gulland said that SCA has been supporting the implementation of the MOU since 2006 and will continue this work. She noted that the Saiga News bulletin is available in six languages and invited participants to send information. They also announced the publication of an article on the saiga trade and expressed their willingness to cooperate.

Agenda item 12. Session on stockpile management of the CITES Secretariat

110. The CITES Secretariat presented guidance on ensuring effective stockpile management: (UNEP/CMS/Saiga/MOS5/Inf.7).
111. Kazakhstan asked whether the guidelines would be put forward for consideration and adoption by the CITES Parties at CITES COP20. The CITES Secretariat explained that the guidelines themselves were not subject to formal adoption by COP, but the definition of the term "stockpile" would indeed be discussed.
112. MSF asked whether even small pieces of rhino horns would be considered stockpiles and who should audit the stocks — the organization's employees or external specialists. The CITES Secretariat confirmed that according to the guidelines, any fragments, including small pieces, belong to stockpiles. As for the audit, it is usually conducted by external specialists.
113. As part of the discussion, Kazakhstan presented a video demonstrating the cigarette labeling system as one of possible methods to track marked saiga horns.

Agenda item 13. The Next Meeting of the Parties to the Memorandum

114. The Secretariat introduced the agenda item, inviting Range States to express their interest in hosting MOS6 in 2030. Mongolia has announced its readiness to host MOS6.

Agenda item 14. Closure of the Meeting

115. Signatory States thanked the host country, the Secretariat as well as all participants of the meeting. They expressed hope for the continued constructive cooperation between all Signatories to the Memorandum.
116. The Chair thanked the participants for their contribution to the discussion and stressed that success in the field of nature conservation is the shared success of all countries and organizations involved in saiga conservation. He wished further success to all Signatories.
117. The Secretariat expressed gratitude to the host country, the Vice-Chairman and the Chairman, the technical specialists, ACBK, consultants Alena Krivosheeva and Steffen Zuther, the translators and all the participants for their contribution to the meeting.
118. The Chair thanked all the participants and officially adjourned the meeting.

ANNEX

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS OF THE FIFTH MEETING OF SIGNATORIES TO THE SAIGA MOU

SAIGA MOU SIGNATORY STATES - DELEGATION MEMBERS

Representative	Position Institution Organization Range State	Contact Email
KAZAKHSTAN		
Askar ABDRAKHMANOV	Chief Specialist, CFW, Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of the Republic of Kazakhstan	a.abdrakhmanov[at]ecogeo.gov.kz
Vitaliy GROMOV	Advisor to the Director General, Institute of Zoology, Committee of Science, Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan	
Vladimir KERTIEV	Deputy General Director, Okhotzoprom	ohrana79[at]mail.ru
Andrey KIM	Deputy Chairman, CFW, Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of the Republic of Kazakhstan	a.kim[at]ecogeo.gov.kz
Dosymzhan NURMAGAMBETOV	Specialist, CFW, Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of the Republic of Kazakhstan	dosyados.2018[at]gmail.com
MONGOLIA		
Buuveibaatar BAYARBAATAR	Member of the Scientific Council, WCS	buuveibaatar[at]wcs.org
Chimeddorj BUYANAA	Programme Implementation Unit Manager, WWF Mongolia	chimeddorj[at]wwf.mn
Uranchimieg TSERENDORJ	Head of Department of Policy and Coordination in the Field of Natural Resources, Ministry of Environment and Climate Change of Mongolia	Uranchimegtserendorj[at] gmail.com
RUSSIAN FEDERATION		
Ayuna ALEKSEEVA	Leading Researcher, Chair of the Expert Council of the CITES Scientific Authority in the Russian Federation, Head of the "CITES" Laboratory	shodotova[at]mail.ru
Alexander GAVRILOV	Chairman, Committee for Hunting Management and Fisheries of the Saratov Region	info[at]ohotasaratov.ru
Maxim IVANOV	Deputy Head, Service for Natural Resource Use and Environmental Protection of the Astrakhan Region	imax.ivanov[at]andex.ru
Natalia TRETYAKOVA	Head, Department of International Conventions, Department of International Cooperation in the Field of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection	ntlbor[at]mail.ru
Bataar UBUSHAYEV	Director, State Nature Biosphere Reserve "Cherniye Zemli"	

Representative	Position Institution Organization Range State	Contact Email
TURKMENISTAN		
Arazmurat AMANOV	Researcher, Kaplankyr State Nature Reserve	amanowarazmurat[at]gmail.com
Jumamyrat SAPARMYRADOV	Scientific Secretary, National Institute of Deserts, Flora and Fauna, Ministry of Environmental Protection	saparmuradovdzuma[at]gmail.com
UZBEKISTAN		
Alisher ABDURAKHMANOV	Ministry of Ecology, Environmental Protection, and Climate Change of the Republic of Uzbekistan	
Sarvar AKHMEDOV	Chief Specialist, Ministry of Ecology, Environmental Protection, and Climate Change	sarvar.akhmedov90[at]gmail.com
Otabek BABAMURADOV	Head, Department of Ecotourism and Hunting, Ministry of Ecology, Environmental Protection, and Climate Change	o.bb3816[at]gmail.com
Maria GRITSINA	Institute of Zoology, Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan	mgritsina[at]gmail.com

OBSERVER COUNTRIES - DELEGATION MEMBERS

Representative	Position Institution Organization	Contact Email
Wei JI	Managing Director, Shanghai Wildlife Conservation Association	wjiseason[at]foxmail.com
Rui SU	Acting Director, Fauna Division, CITES Administrative Authority of China	surui8423[at]sina.com

OBSERVERS- NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

Representative	Position Institution Organization	Contact Email
Akmaral AGAZHAYEVA	Project expert, UNDP	akmaral.agazhayeva[at]undp.org
Justine Shanti ALEXANDER	Regional Director, WCS Mongolia	jalexander[at]wcs.org
Michaela BUTOROVA-MCGURK	Senior Manager, Fauna & Flora	michaela.butorova[at]fauna-flora.org
Til DIETERICH	Spokesperson National Voluntary Expert Group on Eurasia, NABU	til.dieterich[at]nabu.de
Alyona KRIVOSHEEVA	Conservation Director, ACBK	alyona.krivosheyeva[at]acbk.kz
Dastan KUSMANOV	PhD student, Nazarbayev University	
Gulnara MERGENOVA	National Coordinator in Turkmenistan, GIZ	Gbegjanova21[at]gmail.com
Stefan MICHEL	Freelance Expert, NABU	st-michel[at]gmx.de

Representative	Position Institution Organization	Contact Email
Eleanor-Jane MILNER-GULLAND	Chair, Saiga Conservation Alliance	e.j.milner.gulland[at]gmail.com
Rustam MURZAKHANOV	Technical Advisor on Protected Area Development, Michael Succow Foundation	rustam.murzakhanov[at]succow-stiftung.de
Aibat MUZBAY	Expert, NABU	aibatmuzbay[at]gmail.com
Aiman OMARBEKOVA	Project expert, UNDP	
Vyacheslav ROZHNOV	Severtsov Institute of Ecology and Evolution, Russian Academy of Sciences	rozhnov-v-2015[at]yandex.ru
Albert SALEMGAREEV	Lead Specialist, ACBK	albert.salemgareev[at]cbk.kz
Meruyert SARSEMBAYEVA	Project consultant, UNDP	meruyert.sarsembayeva[at]undp.org
Ilya SMELYANSKY	Researcher, ACBK	ilya.smelansky[at]cbk.kz
Madina TAUEKELOVA	Senior Specialist, ACBK	tauyekelova.madina[at]cbk.kz
Steffen ZUTHER	Project Manager, Frankfurt Zoological Society, Saiga Conservation	steffen.zuther[at]fzs.org
Ksenia ZYUKOVA	Senior Specialist, ACBK	ksenia.zyukova[at]cbk.kz
Anna YACHMENNIKOVA	Severtsov Institute of Ecology and Evolution, Russian Academy of Sciences	yachmennikov[at]sev-in.ru

CMS SECRETARIAT

Representative	Position Institution Organization	Contact Email
Clara NOBBE	Head of the Terrestrial Species Team	clara.nobbe[at]un.org
Polina ORLINSKIY	CAMI Coordinator, Terrestrial Species Team	polina.orlinskiy[at]un.org

CITES SECRETARIAT

Representative	Position Institution Organization	Contact Email
Hyeon-Jeong KIM	Associate Scientific Support Officer, CITES Secretariat	hyeon-jeong.kim[at]cites.org