

5. A handbook on managing animal disease in wetlands is being prepared for Ramsar COP11 aimed at wetland managers – case studies are being sought for the handbook and a draft will be available for circulation in late September 2010. Again, SC invited to contact Rebecca Lee (rebecca.lee@wwt.org.uk).

Wildlife Disease Task Force issues

1. Terms of Reference for the Wildlife Disease Task Force (WDTF) have been prepared based on the WDTF meeting held in Rome at FAO in March 2010. The vision of the WDTF is to support an integrated approach to manage the health of wildlife, ecosystems, livestock and people within the One Health framework. The purpose, objectives, structure and mode of operation is detailed in the TOR circulated yesterday to the Scientific Council. The WDTF is jointly coordinated by FAO and CMS.
2. SC is invited to support the WDTF through several mechanisms:
 - to endorse the TOR of the WDTF (available outside the meeting room, in English only)
 - Suggestion of possible regional or taxonomic representatives
 - Provide input on priority disease issues (in the context of One Health, wildlife, domestics, human) for migratory species
 - Provide input to three reviews/guidance documents on wildlife disease being developed by FAO
 - Serve as “on the ground” local disease intelligence observers and provide feedback to the WDTF about any unusual wildlife morbidity and mortality
 - Serve as a mechanism for the WDTF to disseminate (at the national and local levels) important information and other WDTF outputs
3. Co-funding by FAO and CMS is vital for the WDTF to be established – in Resolution 9.8, CMS is directed to provide funding to support this TF as well as the AITF.
4. Launch of the WDTF – proposed dates end 2010-early 2011.
5. It was suggested that the WDTF web page could be a valuable location to host the “unusual morbidity or mortality” reporting site and information would be immediately communicated to FAO and then incorporated into global disease intelligence activities under the EMPRES and GLEWS programmes.
6. The Saiga antelope mortality event is a good example of how future wildlife disease outbreak events, information sharing, and response efforts can be coordinated between CMS and FAO. A workshop and capacity building effort (co-supported by CIC and FAO) will take place in late August/early September, to include discussions on this mortality event between resource managers and veterinarians in Kazakhstan and the central Asia region.
7. Different wildlife health capacity exists in different regions of the world - in particular, significant wildlife health capacity needs to be developed in central and western Africa. FAO is doing wildlife capacity building for national wildlife biologists and vets with AUIBAR – 4 regional trainings and will be following up with broader One Health training activities.

Emergency situations for CMS Species

1. There is an operational framework for addressing infectious animal diseases at FAO called EMPRES (Emergency Prevention System - Animal Health) that was established in 1994. The 4 components of EMPRES are 1) early warning, 2) research/science, 3) intervention and strategy development, and 4) partnerships and technical communications. FAO would welcome additional disease intelligence information to be conveyed to an EMPRES focal point, and this information could be passed along to other early warning system programmes such as GLEWS (Global Early Warning System an FAO-OIE-WHO collaboration) when appropriate.
2. It was suggested the use of the WDTF website to promote transfer of information on wildlife morbidity and mortality events. Additional guidance is needed to support reporting. The reports received will need to be directly and automatically communicated to the FAO EMPRES focal point.
3. Community based local and national reporting needs to be strengthened and a strategy needs to be developed. One option might include use of mobile phones, SMS messages, and photos.

It was recognized that the work could be facilitated through the development of an MOU between CMS and FAO on the wildlife disease related work, but also on seabird by-catch, forestry, agriculture, marine and wetland and other issues.



16TH MEETING OF THE CMS SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL

Bonn, Germany, 28-30 June, 2010

UNEP/CMS/ScC16/REPORT
ANNEX IV

REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON BYCATCH

The Bycatch Working Group (BWG) met to discuss progress on bycatch issues since ScC15, to review progress in the implementation of Resolution 9.18 on bycatch, and to discuss and agree further work on bycatch matters.

Progress on Bycatch Councillor Work Program

The Bycatch Councillor provided a report on progress in implementing the Bycatch Councillor's Work Program since ScC15, which is provided below:

As previously noted in reports of the BWG to the Scientific Council there is a high workload associated with addressing the bycatch issue, and the complexities associated with this threat. The Appointed Councillor needs strong support from others if significant progress is to be made. The Work Program is ambitious and progress remains slower than planned due largely to the high workload of the Appointed Councillor, the Scientific Officer and other CMS personnel working on bycatch issues. Nonetheless, some significant advances have been made with respect to Work Program Items 3, 4, 5, 6 and 9, in particular through working with CMS's daughter Agreements ACAP and ASCOBANS. Most of my work has focussed on seabird bycatch issues, and this situation is expected to continue for some time.

Work with FAO and relevant RFMOs (Work Program Items 3, 10)

FAO and RFMOs have direct management responsibility for most of the global high seas fisheries. The Scientific Council has previously agreed that attendance at key meetings of these bodies is essential to influence adoption of mitigation strategies and implementation of independent observer programs, which are considered necessary for improving knowledge of bycatch issues.

I have previously reported that in September, 2008, the FAO held an Expert Consultation (Bergen, Norway) to develop Best Practice Guidelines (BPG) for the International/National Plan of Action-Seabirds (IPOA/NPOA-Seabirds), which I attended as an invited technical expert. The group of experts developed a strong set of guidelines to greatly improve the delivery of IPOA-Seabirds through a suite of NPOA-Seabirds that should contain a mix of mandatory and voluntary measures. Importantly, the BPG are not confined to the longline fishing method, but include guidelines that cover other relevant fishing gears such as trawls and gillnets. This document has now been finalised and was approved by the U.N. Commission on Fisheries

(COFI) in March 2009. The BPTGs can be downloaded at: <http://www.fao.org/fishery/ipoa-seabirds/publications/en>.

Representing ACAP I attended meetings of the Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT – ERSWG Ecologically Related Species Working Group) in September 2009 (Ecologically Related Species Working Group) and the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) in October 2009 (WPEB – Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch).

Progress remains slow in CCSBT's ERSWG with reluctance by most members to submit data, hold regular meetings or undertake ecological risk assessments. However, a decision to adopt mitigation measures applied by other tuna RFMOs in ocean basins in which they have jurisdiction has been a positive step. Given the importance placed on ecologically related species in CCSBT's recent Performance Review, and the current practice of other RFMOs to conduct annual meetings of their bycatch Working Groups, it is disappointing that the next meeting of the ERSWG is unlikely to be held until the first half of 2012. Further involvement in the work of the CCSBT is recommended. However, the dysfunctional nature of the ERSWG still remains. At this stage I would recommend that CCSBT members and cooperating non-members encourage the WG to function effectively, or to ensure its current roles are made a standing item for discussion at the Scientific Committee. The latter course of action would at least ensure bycatch matters were considered annually by the Commission, and go some way to dealing with the consistent assertions of some Members that CCSBT does not have competence to deal with ERS matters.

Considerable success was achieved at the IOTC WPEB and subsequent Commission meeting in revising an existing seabird conservation measure to extend the area in which mandatory mitigation measures apply to all longline vessels fishing south of 25°S. The revised *Resolution 10/06 On Reducing The Incidental Bycatch Of Seabirds in Longline Fisheries* was adopted by the Commission in June 2010. Consideration will also be given to further revise this measure when the WPEB next meets later this year, and I anticipate working closely with BirdLife International and the Government of France to provide best practice pelagic mitigation advice to further improve the measure.

Representing CMS I attended the joint Tuna Commissions (tRFMO) 'Kobe II' Bycatch Workshop in June 2010. A key outcome of the workshop was agreement to establish a joint technical Working Group, consisting of 2-3 participants from each tRFMO who could seek the assistance of expert advice from IGOs and NGOs to facilitate cooperation and coordination between the tRFMOs on bycatch issues. Agreement was also reached on the tRFMOs establishing a centralised source of information on bycatch mitigation measures. A range of other recommendations were made, encouraging tRFMOs to implement their responsibilities under relevant international instruments. As this is the only meeting of the Kobe Bycatch Workshop scheduled to be held, adoption of recommendations will need to be pursued in relevant tRFMO meetings and at the Kobe III meeting.

Work closely with CMS daughter agreements (Work Program Item 4)

I continue to work with the ACAP Secretariat on a part time basis which has ensured frequent contact with a range of people actively working on seabird bycatch mitigation measures. I currently convene ACAP's Seabird Bycatch Working Group (SBWG), which has made significant progress since its formation in building relationships with relevant RFMOs and developing best scientific advice on technical mitigation for seabird bycatch. The ACAP Secretariat remains keen to work closely with CMS, particularly with a view to sharing the

costs of representing both ACAP and CMS at relevant meetings of RFMOs and other organisations.

Database of relevant scientific literature on bycatch (Work Program Item 6)

A bibliographic database on published references to bycatch and mitigation research continues to be regularly updated to assist the work of the Bycatch Working Group and the Scientific Council. An updated copy of the Endnote file and associated references (pdf files) were lodged with the Secretariat. This product is continually updated and references relevant to bycatch of marine mammals, turtles, sharks and seabirds, together with references on the biology of some of these taxonomic groups. Most of the references contained in the database relate to seabirds and seals, reflecting my current work areas, and I would appreciate electronic transmission of relevant research papers from daughter Agreements and Scientific Counsellors for other taxonomic groups to ensure the coverage is more comprehensive. I would be delighted if members of the Scientific Council with a particular interest in bycatch of small cetaceans, turtles and sharks were prepared to cover the literature on these groups and contribute to building the database.

Study to assess bycatch in global fisheries (Work Program Item 2)

At ScC14 it was agreed that CMS should conduct a study to assess bycatch in global fisheries. This study was to assess the available information on bycatch of seabirds, marine turtles, sharks and marine mammals, focusing particularly on CMS-listed species and the importance of bycatch as a threat to migratory species; it was also to provide an overview of priority fisheries, regions and species which will benefit from international action through CMS. Draft specifications for the review were submitted to the meeting for consideration as document CMS/ScC14/Doc.19. The United Kingdom has kindly provided UK15,000 as a contribution toward this project.

Subsequently, Terms of Reference for this study were developed, and a suitable consultant was sought to carry out the study. Unfortunately, no suitable proposals received, and the study has not commenced. At ScC15 it was agreed to re-shape the Terms of Reference so that they reflect the resources available but this has not happened intersessionally. CMS is now aware of recent work carried out by BirdLife International estimating global seabird bycatch in longline fisheries and identifying priority fisheries, and plans to do a similar study for trawl fisheries. Other recent studies have also broadly reviewed bycatch of turtles in longline and purse seine fisheries, and cetacean bycatch in longline gear. The Working Group agreed that there was no need to duplicate this work.

The Working Group discussed potential fisheries and gear types that were known to be problematic and would benefit from a global review of bycatch. The serious data gaps that exist in knowledge on the level of gill net effort and associated bycatch was identified as the highest priority, and it is recommended that the proposed study focus on this gear type, subject to the agreement of the United Kingdom. The Secretariat and the Bycatch Councillor undertook to revise the Terms of Reference accordingly and proceed to identify a suitable consultant to conduct the review. It was also noted there could be benefit in identifying consultants based in developing countries to conduct the work for reasons of capacity building and value for money.

Proposal to review mitigation measures for reducing bycatch (Work Program Item 5)

At Sc15 it was proposed that CMS conduct a review of mitigation measures to reduce bycatch of marine turtles, with funding to be provided from a voluntary contribution provided by Australia. However, a review for this species group has been recently carried out (FAO 2009)

and widely promulgated by FAO, which removes the imperative for this work to be funded by CMS.

Gill nets are used widely throughout the world and are responsible for high levels of bycatch of birds, marine mammals, turtles, sharks and non-target fish. Development of mitigation measures for gillnets is urgently required and the literature on this topic is widely spread. A review of mitigation measures for this gear type is of relevance to many CMS listed species, and the Working Group recommends that the available funds now be directed to such a study, subject to the agreement of Australia. It is envisaged that the review would be a useful tool for many fisheries managers to guide the development of policy and practice within fisheries under their jurisdiction.

Follow-Up of CMS Resolution 9.18 on bycatch

The Working Group took note of the responses received from the Secretariat's call for information sent to fisheries organisations, CMS daughter agreements and Parties. Eight responses had been received in time for this meeting, which had been made available to the Council as ScC16/Inf.11.

Four of these had been submitted by RFMOs, namely CCSBT (Inf.11.1), NEAFC (Inf.11.2), IOTC (Inf.11.7) and NAFO (Inf.11.8). They contain responses related to policies and management approaches to migratory species bycatch, information held on estimates of bycatch, impact assessments, monitoring and surveillance measures and best practice mitigation measures they recommend on the basis of any performance reviews that have been carried out. Three reports were received from Secretariats of the CMS daughter agreements. The CMS Office in Abu Dhabi, which administers the Dugong MoU (Inf.11.3), provided information on their strategy for addressing dugong bycatch. The ACAP Secretariat (Inf.11.4) submitted a document outlining their extensive work on seabird bycatch, which includes a dedicated working group to address this issue, the development of advice for pelagic and demersal longline and trawl fisheries, and their quantitative assessment methodology to determine priorities for the Agreement. The ASCOBANS Secretariat (Inf.11.6) reported on the Agreement's work on bycatch, which was identified as a strategic priority issue for the 2010-2012 triennium. The document contains references to documents considered by the Agreement's Advisory Committee and recommendations contained in the regional harbour porpoise action plans, as well as information on efforts to improve collaboration with fishermen. Germany kindly submitted a paper (Inf.11.5) on modification of gill nets to minimise by-catch of sturgeons.

The Working Group expressed its appreciation for the information submitted and expressed the hope that a follow-up call for information from further organisations or, where applicable, updated information in preparation of ScC17/COP10 would enable the Secretariat and Bycatch Councillor to prepare a summary/synthesis document for presentation to the Parties in order to make this valuable information more readily accessible.

How should CMS progress management of bycatch issues in fisheries

The Working Group discussed the difficulty of influence change in national and international fisheries and noted relevant documentation provided by ASCOBANS (ScC16 Inf 11-6) and ACAP (ScC16 Inf 11-4). Two differing approaches had been adopted. ACAP, in collaboration with BirdLife International, has chosen to develop a range of products such as best practice mitigation advice, distributional information overlaid on fishing effort use to

highlight fishery areas with a high risk to migratory species, and a prioritisation tool for identifying conservation priorities within fisheries and gear types. These tools had been useful in improving the profile of ACAP with fisheries managers and the development of mitigation measures that have been adopted by RFMOs. ASCOBANS has focussed on activities that educate fishers on bycatch and solutions to problems, seeking to encourage fisheries to develop their own solutions to recognised problems. It was agreed that both these approaches had merit.

Concerned was raised on the difficulty of getting the Commissions of RFMOs to adopt and implement the advice provided by their Scientific Committees and other technical working groups. In many cases, it was clear that there is poor coordination between fisheries and conservation agencies within governments, leading to conflicting positions being expressed by a State at inter-governmental fishery and conservation fora. Invariably, the priorities of fishery managers prevail. The Working Group encouraged all CMS Parties to address this problem by ensuring their delegations are fully briefed on bycatch issues and the need for urgent action to implement necessary changes to fishing practices.

Review of Work Program for Bycatch Councillor

The Work Program was reviewed and updated, and is attached for the endorsement of the Scientific Council. It should be noted that the program remains ambitious and it is unlikely that all work items will be completed before the next meeting of the Scientific Council. The work program is presented with this caveat, and in the hope that if additional resources become available intersessionally they can be directed toward some of the items identified.

Participants:

CHAIR: Barry Baker (Appointed Councillor - Bycatch)
Zeb Hogan (Appointed Councillor - Fish)
John O'Sullivan (Appointed Councillor – Birds)
Ian Karika Wilmott (Cook Islands)
Adrian Rijnsdorp (Netherlands)
Humbulani Mafumo (South Africa)
Lahcen El Kabiri (CMS Abu Dhabi)
Borja Heredia (Secretariat)
Heidrun Frisch (Secretariat)
Polina Khrychera (Secretariat)

WORK PROGRAM 2010-2011 FOR BYCATCH COUNCILLOR AND BYCATCH THEMATIC GROUP

	Topic/Task	Timeframe	Detail
1	Establish a small informal correspondence group of interested parties and technical experts to assist the Scientific Councillor	July 2010	<p>A small working group will be established to ensure thorough coverage of faunal groups and access to technical expertise on mitigation techniques and application.</p> <p>Membership of the correspondence group will be expertise based and may comprise members not directly involved with the CMS Scientific Council. The working group will assist the Scientific Councillor on Bycatch in implementing the Work Program.</p> <p>CMS daughter agreements will be asked to nominate a contact person for inclusion in the small informal correspondence group.</p>
2	Conduct a study to assess bycatch in global fisheries	<p>Revise Terms of Reference for study July 2010</p> <p>Commission September 2010</p> <p>Complete study September 2011</p>	<p>Commission a consultant to carry out a comprehensive review of all global commercial and artisanal fisheries. Study will assess the available information on bycatch of seabirds, marine turtles, sharks and marine mammals, focusing particularly on CMS listed species. It will assess the importance of bycatch as a threat to migratory species and provides an overview of priority fisheries, regions and species which will benefit from international action through the CMS.</p> <p>The scope (spatial or taxonomic coverage) of the study will be modified, if necessary, to suit available funding.</p>
3	Work closely with other international competent bodies such as FAO and relevant RFMOs	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Secretariat to request observer status at meetings of key RFMOs — July 2010</p>	<p>Implementation dependent upon funding to attend meetings, and availability/willingness of Bycatch Thematic Group members or CMS daughter agreements to coordinate action for relevant RFMOs</p> <p>FAO and RFMOs have direct management responsibility for most of the global high seas fisheries. Attendance at key meetings of these bodies is essential to influence adoption of mitigation strategies and implementation of independent observer programs, necessary for improving knowledge of bycatch issues.</p>

	Topic/Task	Timeframe	Detail
			<p>Note that RFMO engagement imposes a significant workload, that cannot be effectively carried out without full time staffing resources made available for this purpose. Support of this work through collaborative arrangements with CMS daughter agreements is highly desirable.</p> <p>Priority RFMOs initially are CCAMLR, IOTC, WCPFC. Selection of these based on known seabird, turtle and shark bycatch issues, and the potential to influence change in fishing practices.</p> <p><u>Travel & per diem costs \$5,000 per meeting</u></p> <p>Other RFMOs to be considered, dependent upon success in other fora, emerging issues, and availability of travelling funds, are: CCSBT, ICCAT, IATTC, General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean and Black Sea (GFCM).</p> <p>Adoption of mitigation strategies by RFMOs may lead to flow-on effects to EEZ fisheries of RFMO members.</p>
4	Work closely with CMS daughter agreements and other relevant conservation bodies	Ongoing	ACAP, ACCOBAMS, ASCOBANS, Waddensea Seals, Marine Turtles Africa, Marine Turtles IOSEA, Pacific Islands Cetaceans, IWC Bycatch Group, Sharks MOU
4	Risk assessments. Continuously review and utilise available information on the at-sea distribution of migratory species to assess overlap with fishing operations and hence the risk of bycatch in fishing regions	Ongoing	<p>Fishing regions include RFMO areas of competence, and national EEZs.</p> <p>Risk assessments carried out annually by the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources provide an excellent model.</p>
5	Review information on mitigation measures for fishing methods known to impact migratory species	Ongoing. Highly desirable to work with CMS daughter agreements to achieve efficiencies.	<p>Concise reviews of current knowledge on mitigation measures to reduce seabird bycatch in longline and trawl fishing have been produced by ACAP, but do not exist for other faunal groups or fishing methods.</p> <p>Work with fishery managers and RFMOs as required to comprehensively assess fishing techniques and gear used in EEZ and high seas fisheries, to identify those</p>

	Topic/Task	Timeframe	Detail
			<p>elements that have been shown to reduce or eliminate by-catch mortality of migratory species.</p> <p>Initial work should focus on pelagic longline methods for seabirds and turtles. Ensure mitigation methods developed for one taxonomic group do not lead to bycatch of other taxa.</p>
6	Maintain a database of relevant scientific literature on bycatch	Ongoing	Maintain the bibliographic database on published references to bycatch and mitigation research to assist the work of the Bycatch Working Group and the Scientific Council
7	Develop a bycatch webpage	By end 2010	<p>Develop a page for the CMS website providing information on CMS activities to ameliorate the impacts of bycatch on migratory species.</p> <p><u>Implementation by the Secretariat required.</u></p> <p>The website could also provide a ‘toolbox’ of best practice species-specific techniques to reduce bycatch in fishing operations, such as FAO publications <i>Expert consultation on interactions between sea turtles and fisheries within an ecosystem context</i>, and <i>The Incidental catch of seabirds by longline fisheries: Worldwide review and technical guidelines for mitigation on the interactions between sea turtles and fisheries</i>.</p>
8	In consultation with CMS daughter agreements, develop products to assist RFMOs and other relevant international and national bodies in reducing bycatch.	Ongoing	These could include: observer programme designs including protocols for the collection of bycatch data, analytical methods for assessing bycatch, best-practice mitigation measures
9	Develop materials and guidelines to assist CMS representatives attending RFMO and other relevant meetings to maximise effective participation and consideration of issues relevant to the	Ongoing	<p>These could include technical information to be delivered through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — concise reports that are based on sound, scientifically supported peer-reviewed papers — presentations and submission of relevant papers to meetings to support the information being conveyed, together with active participation at meetings;

	Topic/Task	Timeframe	Detail
	minimisation of bycatch		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — workshops with industry to progress uptake of mitigation in particular — building relations with fishers, national fisheries managers, RFMO Secretariats and UN FAO officials
10	Assist in the preparation, adoption and implementation of FAO NPOA-Seabirds and FAO NPOA-Sharks	Ongoing	<p>This may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — encourage adoption of best practice guidelines for IPOA-Seabirds by FAO COFI in March 2009 — providing assistance to Parties and Range States in the development of NPOA-Seabirds and FAO NPOA-Sharks.
11	Other matters that may arise	Ongoing	Subject to resources and availability, use opportunities, currently unforeseen, to promote the work of CMS in minimising the impacts of bycatch on migratory species.
12	Provide report to Scientific Council on Bycatch Councillor activities	SC 17	Provide a report to 17th meeting of the Scientific Council on the activities of the Bycatch Councillor during the inter-sessional period



16TH MEETING OF THE CMS SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL

Bonn, Germany, 28-30 June, 2010

UNEP/CMS/ScC16/REPORT
ANNEX V

REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON MARINE TURTLES (afternoon, 29 June 2010)

Chair: Colin Limpus, COP Appointed Councillor for Marine Turtles

1. **Species Profiles:**

The Secretariat advised that Species Profiles will now be prepared initially by IUCN (presumably via the Marine Turtle Specialist Group with regards to marine turtle species profiles) for review and finalization by the Scientific Council.

2. **Climate change impacts, adaptation measures (Res.9.7:9)**

- The MT Working Group is strongly supportive of the establishment of an inter-sessional Working Group on Climate Change:
- The Conference appointed Councilor for marine turtles is prepared to serve on the Climate Change Working Group. Additional members from among the National Councilors with expertise in marine turtle biology and conservation are yet to be identified.
- Emphasis needs to be given to developing and/or implementing actions that can mitigate the negative impacts of climate change on marine turtles. For example, at nesting beaches, these actions could include:
 - Increasing conservation emphasis on currently “cooler” beaches that have an elevated probability for being the beaches with future suitable incubation temperature ranges for high incubation success and for producing hatchlings with a mixed sex ratio;
 - Cooling of hot beaches using vegetation to create shading of nesting habitat or constructing of artificial shade over hatchery areas;
 - Maintaining wide buffer zones behind nesting beaches between coastal development and the frontal dunes to allow for retention of suitable turtle nesting habitat on an eroding shore line;
 - Investigate capacity for recovery of eroded beaches using engineered beach management for capturing sand that moves laterally in long-shore currents.

3. **Networks of critical sites and marine corridors (Res.9.9:4):**

The MT Working Group was supportive of applying the concept of turtle habitat protection using a network of critical sites and marine corridors, on the condition that

the particular characteristics of marine turtle life histories are incorporated in the planning.

Critical habitats would include:

- Significant nesting areas for each genetic management unit for each species;
- Inter-nesting habitats surrounding the significant nesting areas;
- Special foraging habitats including seagrass pastures, coral reefs, rocky reefs;
- Migratory bottle-necks and migratory corridors around large islands and peninsulas.

4. **Bycatch mitigation for marine turtles (Res.9.18:7) (ScC16/Doc.9):**

- The MT working Group commends the Appointed Councilor for bycatch on his efforts in championing CMS concerns regarding fisheries bycatch of migratory species including marine turtles.
- Scientific Councilors are urged to share the **FAO Guidelines to Reduce Sea Turtle Mortality in Fishing Operations** (www.fao.org/docrep/012/i0725e/i0725e00.htm) with Government and NGO organizations involved in fisheries operations and marine turtle management in their respective countries.

5. **Marine debris (ScC16/Doc.21)**

The MT Working Group recognized the significant negative impact of synthetic marine debris on marine turtles through entanglement and ingestion. The Australian Government is urged to bring a resolution to COP 10 that addresses reduction of marine debris in our oceans.

6. **Sustainable use of turtles (Para 21 ScC15 report)**

The take of marine turtles and their eggs for nutrition and custom by coastal communities is wide spread through out tropical countries. This take of turtles is often at unsustainable levels.

The Working Group on Sustainable Use is urged to consider the use of marine turtles and their eggs by coastal communities when preparing their report on the usefulness of the Addis Ababa principles in the implementation of CMS.

7. **Concerted and cooperative actions**

All marine turtle species are addressed by existing agreements:

Two CMS MoUs

- MoU concerning Conservation Measures for Marine Turtles of the Atlantic Coast of Africa (WAMT MoU): 1999; 22 signatories, signed by 100% of west African States; Secretariat in Senegal (URTOMA).
- MoU on the Conservation and Management of Marine Turtles and their Habitats in the Indian Ocean and South-East Asia (IOSEA): 2001; 30 signatory states; Secretariat in Thailand.

Two agreements that were not developed within the framework of UNEP

- Inter American Convention (IAC, a binding agreement): applicable to the Americas.

- South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP): Encompassing most of the island nations of the Central and Western Pacific Ocean.

There is little formal interaction/collaboration among these agreements.

In the absence of representation of these agreements at SC16, the MT Working Group recommends that the CMS Secretariat investigate options for facilitating:

- Sharing of resources such as website design between IOSEA and WAMT MoU secretariats.
- The collation into the CMS marine turtle database of the existing extensive data on marine turtle nesting distribution and abundance and migration throughout the west coast of Africa. This CMS turtle database is managed by WCMC and currently displayed via the IOSEA website.
- Development of a proposal for GEF funding to implement the WAMT MoU throughout the Western African region.

8. Evaluation of Potential New CMS instruments

COP 9 supported the development of an instrument on marine turtles for the Pacific Region. This proposal was considered at a meeting in Auckland, New Zealand in May 2009 that was well represented by CMS secretariat and national delegates from Australian, New Zealand, SPREP nations and USA and regional NGOs.

Action to progress this Pacific-wide integration of turtle conservation is on hold pending the completion of the Pacific-wide Gap Analysis of marine turtle conservation that is being prepared by Australia.

These is clearly demonstrated migration of multiple species of marine turtles across the both the Atlantic Ocean and the Pacific Ocean where they are exposed to a wide geographical range of threats. Therefore marine turtle conservation will benefit from cooperation between the existing Agreements:

- WAMT MoU and the Inter-American Convention across the Atlantic Ocean, SPAW (Great Caribbean).
- IOSEA, SPREP and the Inter-American Convention across the Pacific Ocean, including Permanent Commission of the South Pacific (CPPS), Marine Corridor (Ecuador, Colombia, Panama, Costa Rica).

PARTICIPANTS:

Colin Limpus: Chair
 Nigel Routh, Australia
 Julia Corsero, Ecuador
 Francisco Aceituno, Honduras
 John Mshelbwala, Nigeria
 Jorge Garcia, Panama
 Djibril Diouck, Senegal
 Philipp Zimmermann: Secretarial support



16TH MEETING OF THE CMS SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL

Bonn, Germany, 28-30 June, 2010

UNEP/CMS/ScC16/REPORT
ANNEX VI

REPORT OF THE TAXONOMIC WORKING GROUP ON FISH

The CMS Scientific Council Taxonomic Working Group on Fishes held its third formal meeting on June 29 2010.

The activity for the Taxonomic Working Group on Fish included discussion of agenda item 4.1 (Review of freshwater fish), and agenda item 11.1/11.2 (Overview of small scale projects funded by CMS/discussion of options for the future of this programme), agenda item 13.1 (Concerted actions for selected Appendix I species/groups), agenda item 13.2 (Co-operative actions for Appendix II species), agenda item 14.1 (Discussion and evaluation of draft proposals), agenda item 14.2 (Review of taxonomic groups of migratory species to identify candidate species for listing on CMS Appendices, and agenda item 15.3 (Criteria for listing of Appendix II species).

Agenda item 4.1: Review of freshwater fish

The CMS secretariat, recognizing the importance of freshwater fish and following on the recommendation of the 15th meeting of the Scientific Council, requested a review of the conservation status of migratory freshwater fish to assess which species/populations are 1) threatened, 2) migratory, and 3) likely to benefit by listing under the Convention for Migratory Species. The review covers all species of migratory freshwater fish, excluding sturgeon (Acipenseridae) and salmonids (the rationale for exclusion of salmon and sturgeon is that these groups are already well covered under other management instruments). The review is based on available knowledge from previous studies as well as consultation with members of the IUCN / WI Freshwater Fish Specialist Group, the IUCN Red List team, and the staff of the database FishBase.

The aims and objectives of the report/review include:

1. Carry out a review of freshwater fish to assess migratory status (with respect to CMS definition of migratory species), conservation status and distribution.
2. Determine which species/populations are most likely to benefit from listing under the Convention for Migratory Species.
3. Prepare a report that identifies which freshwater fish species/populations are, or are likely to be migratory according to the CMS definition of migratory species, and those among them, which are likely to benefit from inclusion in the appendices of the Convention.

The Scientific Councillor for Fish requested feedback on which criteria/filters should be used to identify priority species for listing on the Convention on Migratory Species. There was consensus among the members of the Working Group that conservation status and migratory behaviour should be the main criteria used to identify priority species. The representative from the Zoological Society of London called attention to new conservation status assessments of African fishes and of European freshwater environments. The Working Group recommended that this information should be integrated into the review as it becomes available.

The CMS secretariat emphasized that it is important not to exclude fish that have not been assessed by the IUCN and that fish species deficient in conservation status data should be included in the review, as long as they are clearly migratory. The Working Group also recommended that non-CMS party species (i.e. species that occur in states that are not CMS Parties) should be included in the review since range states may become party to the convention in the future. There was some question as to whether or not species should be recommended for listing even if there are no immediate plans for concerted action.

The Working Group suggested that the Scientific Council may want to consider related groups of species (e.g. a genus or family) as opposed to single species as long as the species in question are similar in ecology, conservation status, and threats.

The Working Group recommended that the review should include priority species and recommendations for cooperative action.

The Working Group urged CMS to partner with other organizations that share an interest in freshwater fish, for example FAO, IUCN, Wetlands International, GROMS, and CITES.

Agenda item 11.1/11.2 (Overview of small scale projects funded by CMS/discussion of options for the future of this programme)

The members of Working Group on Fish were unanimous in their support of the small grants program, but members did not have any specific ideas about how to compel CMS parties to allocate funds to this important CMS program. The Zoological Society of London commented that there were two possible solutions: 1) to attract donor organisations, 2) to ask countries to increase their contributions.

The CMS Working Group on Fish identified the previously submitted grant proposal on Mekong giant catfish as a proposal which could be funded if money becomes available.

Agenda item 13.1 (Concerted actions for selected Appendix I species/groups)

Members on the Working Group on Fish requested an update from the CMS secretariat regarding concerted actions for Appendix I species. The Scientific Councillor for Fish commented that there is a CMS small grant proposal for work on the Mekong giant catfish but that proposal has not been funded. A Mekong Giant Catfish Working Group was formed (separate from CMS) to help manage Mekong giant catfish populations but this working group is not well funded and lacks the capacity to conduct research on the species.

Agenda item 13.2 (Co-operative actions for Appendix II species)

The Working Group on Fish was asked to consider a review process ensuring a regular update on the status of Appendix II species, especially Appendix II species for which agreements are

not anticipated during the forthcoming triennium. All of the sturgeon species listed on Appendix II of CMS fall into this category.

The Working Group on Fish recommended that CMS request that the focal point (or country which proposed CMS listing) provide an update on the species. Dr. Andreas Kruess (the Scientific Councilor from Germany) provided information on the status of sturgeon species. In Germany at the moment two research and development-projects are running until 2013. These projects aim to identify the requirements for mass release/reintroduction of the Baltic sturgeon in the Oder/Odra region. Target is the establishment of a self reproductive population. There will be scientific research on food preference, habitat preference, and causes of threat during 3 years of experimental releases and re-catch. Optimal stocking strategy will also be identified. These projects are supported by Polish partners. A national action plan has been completed and will be printed within the next days and will be also available in English and French. The European Action Plan is has been implemented. The Action plan will be available on request in the next weeks.

Agenda item 14.1 (Discussion and evaluation of draft proposals)

The Taxonomic Working Group on Fish considered four proposals for four species of migratory freshwater fish: Pirá Pitá, *Brycon orbignyanus* (Valenciennes, 1850), Salmón de río, *Salminus hilarii*, (Valenciennes, 1850), marine catfish, *Genidens barbatus* (Lacepède, 1803), and zúngaro *Zungaro jahu*, (Ihering, 1898).

The draft proposals were submitted by the Government of Paraguay and were presented by Ms. Cristina Morales, Scientific Councilor for the Government of Paraguay.

The Scientific Councilor from Paraguay indicated that species should be considered for listing under Appendix II rather than Appendix I, based on need for international cooperation for sustainable management of the these species.

Pirá Pitá (*Brycon orbignyanus*)

Brycon orbignyanus is a potamodromous species and undertakes repeated migrations throughout its life (Oldani 1990 and Tablado et al., 1988; Petreire, 1985). There is some evidence that the species makes important migrations, in some cases over 1000km. *Brycon orbignyanus* is categorized as endangered - A2ac criteria for Argentina and Paraguay (Cappato et. Al., 2009). In Brazil, it is officially categorized as critically endangered in the state of Minas Gerais (1995) and in Rio Grande do Sul (2002), and as endangered in the state of Parana (Abilhoa et al. 2004).

*The Taxonomic Working Group on Fish agreed that *Brycon orbignyanus* appears to be a migratory species of unfavorable conservation status that would benefit from international cooperation on their protection. The Taxonomic Working Group on Fish recommended that the proposal should be updated with additional information about species abundance, distribution, and migratory behavior prior to COP10 when it will be formally considered for inclusion on Appendix II of the Convention. The Taxonomic Working Group on Fish also recommended that the proposal for listing should be revised to reflect an Appendix II rather than Appendix I listing.*

Salmon de río (*Salminus hilarii*)

Salminus hilarii is a potamodromous species and undertakes repeated migrations throughout its life. There is some evidence that the species makes important migrations, possibly over 1000km. The species is categorized as Vulnerable (A1ac) in Paraguay. The main threats to this species are barriers in rivers and the consequent disappearance of lotic and continuous environments. Unregulated fishing may also pose a risk (Reis, et. al., 2004).

*The Taxonomic Working Group on Fish agreed that *Salminus hilarii* appears to be a migratory species of unfavorable conservation status that would benefit from international cooperation on their protection. The Taxonomic Working Group on Fish recommended that the proposal should be updated with additional information, especially about migratory behaviour, prior to COP10. The Taxonomic Working Group on Fish also recommended that the proposal for listing should be revised to reflect an Appendix II rather than Appendix I listing.*

Marine catfish (*Genidens barbatus*)

Genidens barbatus undertakes potamodromous migrations in breeding season and are targeted by unregulated sport fishing (Lopez et al., 2005). Potamodromous migrations (towards freshwater), takes place in breeding season. This species is a bottom feeder. It is considered a euryhaline fish (it is able to tolerate a wide range of salinity), it enters estuaries and rivers like the Rio de la Plata, to spawn in spring and early summer. This species is classified as Vulnerable under criteria D2, at regional level, in Argentina and Paraguay (Cappato, et al., 2009).

*The Taxonomic Working Group on Fish agreed that *Genidens barbatus* appears to be a migratory species and may be of unfavourable conservation status. The Taxonomic Working Group on Fish recommended that the proposal should be updated with additional information, especially about migratory behaviour and conservation status, prior to COP10. The Taxonomic Working Group on Fish also recommended that the proposal for listing should be revised to reflect an Appendix II rather than Appendix I listing.*

Zúngaro (*Zungaro jahu*)

This species follows a potamodromous pattern in its migration, it undertakes several and repeated migrations throughout its life (Oldani 1990 and Tablado et al., 1988; Petrere, 1985). Furthermore, in the Parana River, they are perfectly adapted to the geomorphology of the valley and seasonal variations of water level (i.e. they migrate upstream or downstream at any time of year) and reproduction, mainly to keep the geographical position of the populations (Oldani 1990). This species is categorized as Vulnerable (A2acd) in Argentina and Paraguay (Cappato, et al., 2009) and as Vulnerable (A2acde) in the State of Paraná.

*The Taxonomic Working Group on Fish agreed that *Zungaro jahu* appears to be a migratory species of unfavourable conservation status. The Taxonomic Working Group on Fish recommended that the proposal should be updated with additional information, especially about migratory behaviour and conservation status, prior to COP10. The Taxonomic Working Group on Fish also recommended that the proposal for listing should be revised to reflect an Appendix II rather than Appendix I listing.*

Additional notes: There was a general consensus that more detailed information could be obtained before the next COP. For example, a workshop on freshwater fish is going to be held in South America in Argentina in August 2010, where these proposals can be peer reviewed by fish experts. There may also be an opportunity to receive feedback on the proposal at the meeting of the IUCN/Wetlands International Freshwater Fish Working Group in November 2010. The Councilor from Argentina and the Scientific Councilor for Fish expressed willingness to work with the Councilor from Paraguay to revise the proposal in time for COP10.

Agenda item 14.2 (Review of taxonomic groups of migratory species to identify candidate species for listing on CMS Appendices)

The Review of Migratory Freshwater Fish identifies migratory species of poor conservation status that would likely benefit from international cooperation. The Taxonomic Working Group on Fish discussed several priority groups including diadromous species such as sawfish, eels, and shad; large-bodied catfish of the Mekong River and catfish/characins of South America, migratory fish of the Himalayan region, migratory fish of Lake Chad, freshwater rays, and the genus *Hucho* including *Hucho hucho*, *Hucho taimen*, and *Hucho perryi*. Consideration should also be given to migratory fish species in other large, transboundary rivers and international inland waters such as the African Great Lakes, the Caspian, and the Danube.

The members of the Taxonomic Working Group on Fish also noted that there are several large-bodied migratory marine species in urgent need of improved management. These species should be identified for the next Conference of Parties.

Agenda item 15.3 (Range states: criteria for their classification and current list)

Councillors who wish to provide comments on criteria for classification of range states have been asked to contact the CMS secretariat by September 2010.

I would like to express my appreciation to all those that participated in the Working Group. Dr. Zeb Hogan chaired the working group and prepared this report.

PARTICIPANTS:

Zeb Hogan, Chair (Appointed Councillor – Fish)
Barry Baker (Appointed Councillor - Bycatch)
Daniel Blanco (Argentina)
Adriaan Rijnsdorp (Netherlands)
Cristina Morales (Paraguay)
Ben Collen (Zoological Society of London)
Polina Khrycheva (Secretariat support)



16TH MEETING OF THE CMS SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL

Bonn, Germany, 28-30 June, 2010

UNEP/CMS/ScC16/REPORT
ANNEX VII

REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON BIRDS

Agenda item 7: Global bird flyways

Agenda item 7.1: Review of existing administrative/management instruments for migratory bird flyways

Agenda item 7.2: Review of scientific/technical knowledge of migratory bird flyways and conservation priorities

Dr. Taej Mundkur (CMS Appointed Councillor for Asiatic fauna) informed the group that the deadline for feedback on the flyways project would be extended until the end of July. He highlighted the importance of the comments received so far, particularly regarding Annex 1a and Annex 2b. Parties that had not yet responded were urged to consider doing so.

Agenda item 10: Threat Abatement Plan for the Impacts of Marine Debris on Vertebrate Marine Life

Dr. Jelena Kralj (Croatia) pointed out that debris was a problem in lakes and rivers as well as at sea. Among the worst hazards, particularly for seabirds, was fishing-gear, including nets and long-line hooks – not just when in use, but also when abandoned, or lost.

Dr. Jean-Philippe Sibley (France) said the debris problem must be treated at the source, avoiding waste production by pleasure boats, passenger-cruises (not only at sea, but also on rivers such as the Nile). It was important to conduct an awareness campaign. Waste may stay at sea for long periods, and kill, for instance, albatrosses and marine turtles.

It was discussed whether the definition of marine debris covered all types of waste, and if the term referred, for instance, to lead pollution and human-induced sedimentation as well. On the question of lead pollution, Mr Sergey Dereliev (AEWA) pointed out that one important aspect of this, poisoning caused by hunter's spent lead-shot in wetlands, had been under constant discussion by AEWA, but agreed deadlines for the phasing out of such shot had been repeatedly missed. The work would continue, and if any CMS Party wished to raise the issue of lead pollution/poisoning at the COP, AEWA would be prepared to provide information as appropriate.

Mr. John O’Sullivan (Chair of the Working Group) felt that the original document referred mainly to plastics and other floating waste, rather than other substances poisonous to animals, but the group could discuss this issue further.

Mr. Donatien Muembo Kabemba (Democratic Republic of Congo) said that the problem did not only arise from passenger ships; he said that the main blame lay with marine transport companies, and suggested that CMS could press for an agreement with these companies to collect and treat or safely dispose of the waste produced.

The group discussed whether the sources of most of the residues were the passengers or the transport companies themselves: Dr. Siblet and others felt it was the responsibility of the companies and that there should be corporate accountability.

Dr. Olivier Biber (Switzerland) mentioned the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) – one of the world’s highest-level treaties. A contact between Secretariats would help to clarify what UNCLOS were doing, and how it and CMS might usefully be able to cooperate on the marine debris issue.

Dr. Mundkur stressed the importance of defining the marine or terrestrial origin of the debris, and emphasized that marine debris pollution not only affects the deep sea, but extends to the coast also, where, for instance, discarded or abandoned fishing gear is washed up, and affects birds of many families, not just seabirds proper.

Mr. Carlo Custodio (Philippines) agreed with Dr. Mundkur and stressed the importance of education and raising awareness concerning this issue.

Mr. O’Sullivan proposed taking these contributions to the plenary for further discussion, and appropriate action.

Agenda Item 12: Conservation status of CMS Appendix I Species

Participants considered that the Secretariat had not received more fact sheets from Parties and others due to lack of time and not lack of will. Dr. Siblet proposed that the CMS Secretariat draft the fact sheets and then circulate them among countries so that they could be completed and corrected.

Dr. Mundkur suggested using the database of BirdLife International for information concerning birds, and Mr. O’Sullivan said that reliable bird databases, such as those of BirdLife and Wetland International, were a great benefit to this aspect of our work, as to others.

It was expected that the matter would be further discussed in plenary and beyond.

Agenda item 13.3 b: Resolution 9.9: Migratory Marine Species

Participants agreed that the document should be revised as concerns the criterion defining species that can be considered marine, as well as for what constitutes Arctic birds; for instance, *Gavia* species should be included. It was generally agreed that the annex of the document should be reviewed and the list of bird species amended as necessary. BirdLife could be asked to help further with this.

Agenda item 13.3 c: Resolution 9.19: Adverse Anthropogenic Marine/Ocean Noise Impacts on Cetaceans and other biota

Discussion of this item was brief. Mr. Mark Desholm (Denmark) mentioned that marine/ocean noise might have some impacts on bird species. Dr. Sibley thought that ocean noise was a marginal problem for migratory species, certainly compared to other anthropogenic impacts, such as collisions with ships. The working group was content that work done in other working groups to address this problem would be likely to meet the needs of birds.

Agenda item 13.3 d: Resolution 9.20: The Saker Falcon (*Falco cherrug*)

Mr. O'Sullivan reminded the working group of the key importance of this issue, as measured, for instance by the closely-argued discussions at the Rome Conference of the Parties. He said that the matter had of course already been discussed here at plenary, but encouraged further elaboration from Parties in the working group.

Dr. Kralj noted that different populations of the species showed different trends. In some cases, for instance the Hungarian population, an increase in the number of breeding pairs was being reported, thanks to nest-guarding. However, even in that case, breeding *success* was not improving. She stressed the need for much more research on this bird since there are quite plainly insufficient data.

Dr. Fernando Spina (Italy) said that the need for sound scientific work was paramount to meet the needs of both policy-making and management, including sustainable use if appropriate. The work being financially supported by Saudi Arabia promised to have very interesting and useful results.

Dr. Biber welcomed the recent downlisting of the threat-status of *Falco cherrug*, but noted that the relevant report before the meeting was rather short, and not always clear: it is certainly necessary to have more information.

Ms. Nicola Crockford (BirdLife International) noted that the recent downlisting of the species from Endangered to Vulnerable, was as a result of improved information, and should not cause inappropriate optimism: this is still a seriously threatened species.

Dr. Sibley said that better information on the species does not necessarily mean that it is in a better state of conservation, this aspect should be borne in mind, as well as the parameters that affect the reported results, such as climatic considerations, for example.

Mr. Umeed Khalid (Pakistan) said that under CITES there was currently a total ban on catching/exporting this species. Recently, Mongolia had been allowed to use artificial nests with a view to increasing its population followed by the possibility of trade.

Mr. David Morgan (CITES) explained that this process was still under way and a report will be made to the next CITES COP.

Mr. O'Sullivan concluded by encouraging CMS Parties to support Saudi Arabia's call for more financial resources for vital scientific research into this species. There would certainly be further discussion at the COP in 2011, including of COP Resolution 9.20.

Agenda item 15.4a: Taxonomy and nomenclature of bird species

Agenda item 15.4b: Taxonomic changes in standard references

It was agreed that the question of taxonomic references for birds used by the CMS was an important one. A reliable and up-to-date taxonomy was an important tool for the Secretariat and the Parties. There were different opinions about whether the best option was to accept Dickinson alone, to use it in conjunction with the conclusions of other authorities (in particular, for albatrosses and large petrels, the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels – ACAP), or to follow another authority entirely (for instance, BirdLife International, which is the IUCN Red List authority, and which, incidentally also follows ACAP). There was strong support for adopting the conclusions of ACAP, which it was recognised had been the result of very careful deliberations among seabird specialists. It was noted that, among other considerations, the acceptance of a new taxonomy might have effects on the legal implementation of the Convention in various Party states.

After considerable discussion, it was decided to establish an intersessional working group composed of Mr. O'Sullivan, Prof. Alfred Oteng-Yeboah (CMS Appointed Councillor for African fauna), Mr. Barry Baker (Appointed Councillor for By-catch), Dr. Torbjörn Ebenhard (Sweden), Dr. Sibley (France) and Mr. Sergey Dereliev (AEWA) to work on this matter.

Agenda item 14. Proposals for amendments to Appendices I and II of the Convention

Dr. Attila Bankovics (Hungary) proposed that there should be an MoU on Eastern European grassland birds. These are shot by hunters from other European countries, in particular Italy, illegally exported, and often sold to restaurants as luxury food. This is a substantial trade, as evidenced by the confiscation in 2001 of nearly 12,000 individuals of 41 species – and this is just the tip of the iceberg. Migratory species are involved, including Quail, Turtle Dove and small songbirds (some of which are not on the Convention's Appendix II, but deserve to be). Ms. Daliborka Stankovic (Serbia) and Dr. Spina expressed strong support for the proposal, noting that other countries outside Eastern Europe were also being over-hunted for migratory species.

Dr. Biber suggested contact with the Secretariat of the Bern Convention, which has much experience of the subject and has passed several related resolutions.

It was agreed that the matter would be pursued intersessionally.

Agenda item 14.2 Review of taxonomic groups of migratory species to identify candidate species for listing on CMS Appendices

The working group had detailed discussions on which species might be proposed for addition to the Appendices at the next Conference of the Parties. Since the last COP, three species of migratory birds had been uplisted on the IUCN list to endangered status (Vulnerable in each case). These are Monteiro's Storm-petrel *Oceanodroma monteiroi*, Great Knot *Calidris*

tenuirostris, and Far Eastern Curlew *Numenius madagascariensis*. Each species occurs in the territory of at least one CMS Party. After discussion, the working group recommended that work go forward to propose these species for listing on Appendix I. A possible candidate for addition to Appendix II, the Bobolink *Dolichonyx oryzivorus*, a migratory seed-eating bird of the Americas, will be the subject of further study by Range States and others, with view to a possible recommendation at the COP. It was recognised that further candidates for both Appendices may emerge in 2011.

Agenda item 13.1: Concerted actions for selected Appendix I species/groups (Res. 3.2, 4.2, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1, 8.29 and 9.1; Rec.9.1 and 9.2)

Agenda item 13.2: Co-operative actions for Appendix II species (Res. 5.2, 6.2, 7.1, 8.28 and 9.1; Rec.9.5)

Reports were made by the designated focal points for the following Appendix I species.

Chlamydotis undulata

Mr. Mohammad Sulayem (Saudi Arabia) commented on the progress of the planned Houbara Bustard Agreement, noting that the Government of Saudi Arabia had informed the CMS Secretariat that it was not in a position to become the Depositary of the proposed Agreement. Saudi Arabia would be content to see the Agreement opened for signature, and intended to ratify it in due course. It was noted that the matter was now with the CMS Secretariat, which will coordinate further with the Range States of the species.

Numenius tenuirostris

Ms. Crockford gave an account of the CMS Slender-billed Curlew Working Group project currently in full swing, trying to re-find the species. A programme of expeditions was under way, visiting the passage and wintering sites felt most likely to contain any remaining individuals of this highly-threatened bird. The recent availability of satellite transmitters light enough for a bird this size to carry, meant that if a bird or birds could be located and caught, knowledge of the sites it subsequently visited would be of enormous value to the conservation of the species. The working group wished the project well, and would follow results with great interest.

Chloephaga rubidiceps

Mr. Daniel Blanco (Argentina) reported that the continental populations of Ruddy-headed Goose continued to decline, and the species was yet more threatened than before. For example, numbers recorded in the wintering area had fallen in the most recent count to 750 individuals from the total of 1000 estimated in 2003.

He described several concerted actions, among them bilateral Action Plans between Argentina and Chile, and new regulations such as the hunting ban on Ruddy-headed Goose in Argentina. His full written report has been provided, and is attached as annex 1 to this report.

Linked with the current examination by the Convention of a Small Grants Fund, Argentina has produced, at the request of the working group, a project proposal for the conservation of

Chloephaga rubidiceps. A copy of this proposal, which would cost an estimated US\$50,000, is attached as annex 2 to this report.

Oxyura leucocephala

Dr. Borja Heredia (CMS Technical Officer), who was formerly the Focal Point for this species, informed that Spain will identify a new Focal Point. The efforts to eliminate the alien *Oxyura jamaicensis* were continuing, with mixed success.

Dr. Sibley said that although knowledge was very good in some countries, there was a lack of information concerning some eastern populations, and Councillors were reminded that competition between the two species might affect all populations, among which interchange was known.

Mr. Dereliev referred to the joint CMS/AEWA Action Plan already in place, endorsed by AEWA's Technical Committee, as well as to the Working Group which works closely with the Range States of the species.

Grus leucogeranus

Dr. Mundkur gave an update on the work that has been done under the MoU, including at the recent 7th Meeting of the Parties. The UNEP-GEF project included a capacity-building process, currently ongoing, and that had reduced the hunting of the species. According to the latest data available, species populations remained stable. There has been no Central Asian flyway since 2002, and no birds were reported from Iran in 2009, but the East Russian/Chinese population remains stable at around 3500 birds.

He also informed about a new threat to the species, the construction of a dam in Poyang Lake, in China, that might affect the bird's water-plant food of this wintering site, which holds 99% of the world population of the species. With the UNEP-GEF project now completed, funding future work is a major challenge. Attempts to reintroduce western and central populations using microlight aircraft are showing quite positive results at this early stage. Safeguarding such birds from hunting will be a demanding but essential task.

Otis tarda

Dr. Bankovics gave a detailed report on the species status (a written copy is attached as annex 3 to this report). The Great Bustard population, at least in Hungary, Austria and Germany has grown slightly, it is believed as a consequence of appropriate management methods.

Dr Sibley reported that in 2009 a small influx of the species into southern France was probably from the Iberian population, arguably indicating some transboundary "migration".

It was recognised that any extension of the coverage of the MoU to Range States of the species outside Middle-Europe would need considerable discussion.

Falco naumanni

Dr. Sibley reported the favourable status of the species, due to successful conservation projects over recent years.

Phoenicopterus andinus / Phoenicopterus jamesi

Mr. Blanco stressed the active and cooperative conservation work that was being carried out in Argentina, Chile, Peru and Bolivia, and gave information on the status of these two species.

Anser erythropus

The International Single Species Action Plan for the Conservation of the Lesser White-fronted Goose (Western Palearctic Population) adopted by AEWA, and the Norwegian National Action Plan for the species were commented upon. The possibility was suggested of seeking information from China about the separate population of the species there, with a view to possible lessons that might be learnt.

Sarothrura ayresi /Hirundo atrocaerulea

Mr. O'Sullivan said that he was pleased to see representatives at the Meeting from South Africa, which is a vital country for the conservation of these two species. He hoped that ongoing work in the country, in cooperation with CMS and AEWA as appropriate, would be reported at the next meeting.

Acrocephalus paludicola

Dr. Jiri Flousek (Czech Republic) reported on the latest findings concerning the species. His written report is attached as annex 4 to this report. Conservation action for this species is readily apparent all along its flyway from Eastern Europe to West Africa. The good news includes the discovery of a new breeding site in Poland; the bad news is the continuing habitat destruction in the breeding grounds. However, work in progress and planned, suggest that we are better placed to ensure the survival of this Appendix I bird than we are many of the others on Appendix I.

Spheniscus humboldti

The Scientific Councillor responsible for the reporting on the species could not unfortunately be present at the Meeting. The future of this penguin species remains of considerable concern.

Puffinus mauretanicus

As regards the Balearic Shearwater, Mr. Heredia pointed out a relevant publication on Important Bird Areas for seabirds launched in Spain and Portugal last year. A new Focal Point would be identified for this species by the Government of Spain.

Aythya nyroca

Dr. Kralj informed the working group on the status of the species populations, of which there are four, all of them declining. She stressed the importance of different projects and the lack of feedback from some areas within the species' range, both key to improving the knowledge on population trends. She pointed out the necessity of more Action Plans/Management Plans and their implementation. One new project on the species (and *Phalacrocorax pygmeus*) has

been under way in Bulgaria and Romania since January 2009: the Bulgarian population, at least, appears to be stable. In general, it is clear that extensive carp ponds are vital for the conservation of the species, and that breeding at such sites depends very much on sympathetic management. New information includes records of 200 breeding pairs from Algeria, and 2009 data from Iraq, with the first record of breeding that covers six sites in the south of the country, one of which reported no fewer than 1600 individuals. Across its wide range, the species occurs in considerable numbers, but continues to be in serious decline.

Calidris canutus rufa

Mr. Blanco gave a presentation on the different activities undertaken concerning the Red Knot, including bird banding, population estimates, and mitigation of disturbance, among other subjects. A copy of his report is attached as annex 5 to this report. Numbers appear to be holding stable, perhaps because of a good breeding season in 2009 and the timely availability of food supplies (eggs of the horseshoe crab) at a major staging post on the US east coast.

Other reports of interest.

Grassland Birds MoU

Dr. Adrián Azpiroz reported on the latest activities related to the species. The two workshops held in Panama (2008) and in Paraguay (2010) were very successful. He asked the Secretariat to help with fundraising efforts, particularly as regards work needed in Bolivia. He also suggested the nomination of a focal point from each country to support the initiative.

PARTICIPANTS:

Mr. John O’Sullivan	Chair of WG (COP CMS Appointed Councillor (Birds))	johnosullivan@tiscali.co.uk
Dr. Taej Mundkur	COP Appointed Councillor (Asiatic Fauna)	taej.mundkur@wetlands.org
Dr. Zeb S. Hogan	COP Appointed Councillor for Fish	zebhogan@hotmail.com
Lic. Daniel Eduardo Blanco	ARGENTINA	deblanco@wamani.apc.org
Mr. Donatien Muembo Kabemba	CONGO, DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF	dmuembo2003@yahoo.fr
Lic. José Joaquín Calvo Domingo	COSTA RICA	joaquin.calvo@sinac.go.cr
Mr. Tano Sombo	CÔTE D’IVOIRE	sombotano@yahoo.fr
Dr. Jelena Kralj	CROATIA	zso@hazu.hr
Mr. Tomás Ramón Escobar Herrera	CUBA	tomas@ama.cu ama@ama.cu
Dr. Jirí Flousek	CZECH REPUBLIC	jflousek@knap.cz
Dr. Mark Desholm	DENMARK	mde@dmu.dk
Mrs. Julia Angelita Cordero Guillén	ECUADOR	jcordero@ambiente.gov.ec
Dr. Jean-Philippe Siblet	FRANCE	siblet@mnhn.fr
Mr. Zurab Gurielidze	GEORGIA	zgurielidze@zoo.ge; zgurielidze@hotmail.com

Dr. Andreas Krüß	GERMANY	KruessA@bfn.de
Lic. Francisco Aceituno	HONDURAS	aceitunof@yahoo.com
Dr. Attila Bankovics	HUNGARY	attila.bankovics@gmail.com
Dr. Fernando Spina	ITALY	fernando.spina@isprambiente.it
Dr. Adriaan D. Rijnsdorp	NETHERLANDS	adriaan.Rijnsdorp@wur.nl
Mrs. María Cristina Morales Palarea	PARAGUAY	cristinam@guyra.org.py; cmoralespy@gmail.com
Dr. Victor Manuel Pulido	PERU	wetperu@amauta.rcp.net.pe
Mr. Carlo Custodio	PHILIPPINES	custodiocarlo@yahoo.com
Mr. Mohammad Sulayem	SAUDI ARABIA	msulayem2@yahoo.com
Ms. Daliborka Stankovic	SERBIA	daliborka@nhmbeo.rs
Mr. Peter Puchala	SLOVAKIA	Peter.puchala@sopsk.sk
Ms. Humbulani Mafumo	SOUTH AFRICA	hmafum@environment.gov.za
Ms. Malta Qwathekana	SOUTH AFRICA	mqwathekana@environment.gov.za
Dr. Olivier Biber	SWITZERLAND	olivier.biber@bafu.admin.ch
Dr James M. Williams	UNITED KINGDOM	james.williams@jncc.gov.uk
Dr. Adrián Azpiroz	URUGUAY	avesuru_1999@yahoo.com
Mr. Galal Hussein Nasser AL-Harogi	YEMEN	g_hng@yahoo.com; gharogi@gmail.com
Ms. Nicola J Crockford	BIRDLIFE INTERNATIONAL	nicola.crockford@rspb.org.uk
Ms. Rebecca Lee	WILDFOWL & WETLANDS TRUST (WWT)	Rebecca.Lee@wwt.org.uk
Mr. Sergey Dereliev	AEWA Technical Officer	sdereliev@unep.de
Dr. Borja Heredia	Secretariat	bheredia@cms.int
Ms. Laura Aguado	Secretariat	laguado@cms.int

Ruddy-headed Goose, CMS Report 2010

The **conservation status** of the continental population of the Ruddy-headed Goose is still fragile and the species is **CRITICALLY ENDANGERED**. The latest population estimate for the wintering area is of 750 individuals, which is less than the 1,000 individuals estimated in 2003. This decrease in population numbers has also been confirmed by the results of the monitoring in major farming areas in Chile, where in 2008 there were fewer nests and pigeons than in the period 1999-2000.

Among the major **concerted actions** we can quote the First bi-national workshop (Argentina-Chile) on the conservation of the Rudy-headed Goose that took place in October 2009 in Buenos Aires. In that workshop they agreed on the elaboration of a bi-national Action Plan. Argentina developed a draft Action Plan, which was sent to the Republic of Chile.

Thanks to the support of the Agency for Spatial and Environmental Planning of Denmark and of CMS (under the coordination of WI), the population monitoring in breeding and wintering areas continued in Argentina and Chile. CMS also provided support to the development of a GIS which compiles all existing knowledge about the wintering area in Argentina.

For its part, the SAyDS of Argentina, in collaboration with provincial governments, WI and other organizations:

- Developed a national strategy for the conservation of the migratory species of the austral geese (*Chloephaga*), including the Ruddy-headed Goose
- Continued coordinating the population monitoring of geese in wintering areas, which have been conducted since 2007.
- Promoted the adoption of new legislation/regulations that protect migratory geese and in particular the Ruddy-headed Goose. As an example, I would like to mention the ban on hunting geese throughout Argentina, a stimulating measure for the Ruddy-headed Goose, adopted in January 2009.
- Similarly, they identified the lack of information on migration and stopover sites as a priority for concerted action among Argentina and Chile. In this regard, Argentina wants to present a project proposal for the study of the migration of this species to this Council and to CMS.

Project Concept for the conservation of the Ruddy-headed Goose (*Chloephaga rubidecps*)

Submitted by the Secretariat of Environment and Sustainable Development of Argentina, CMS Argentina

Estimated budget: US\$ 50,000.-

The Ruddy-headed Goose (*Chloephaga rubidecps*) moves in the months of April and May from his breeding grounds in the southern Patagonia in Chile and Argentina to wintering grounds in the Argentinean province of Buenos Aires. Due to various factors, which include hunting, the change of breeding areas and the introduction of exotic species, this migratory species has seen a drastic decrease in population numbers within the last decades, being now very far from the abundance shown in the first part of the twentieth century, according to various chronicles and publications (Blanco *et al.* 2002, Blanco y De la Balze 2006, De la Balze y Blanco 2002, Petracchi *et al.* 2008).

Currently, this species, whose continental population was estimated at about 750 individuals in 2008 (Blanco 2009), has been categorized as “critically endangered” in both Argentina and Chile and has been declared “Provincial Natural Monument” in the province of Buenos Aires, which is the highest degree of protection granted by their jurisdiction. Likewise, it has been protected on an international level by the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS), where it has been listed on Appendices I and II, identified as “priority species” for concerted action.

To date, the period of migration and the migratory routes used have not been studied in depth. As described in preceding paragraphs and in terms of the latter, it is necessary to obtain precise information, using the satellite tracking technology currently available, the one which has been used successfully for species with similar characteristics and conservation status.

The implementation of the system mentioned above would generate basic information such as: accuracy of the migration route, altitude and flight hours, speed and resting and feeding areas. These data are essential to ensure the conservation of the species and would enable the implementation of actions effectively.

Taking into account the costs of equipment, the decent of information and of its processing, as well as the need for a minimum of replications, it would be desirable to have six satellite tracking devices.

According to the life cycle of the species there have been identified two other major components which should be managed: Nesting and Wintering:

I. Nesting:

- a. It is necessary to relieve completely the areas where nesting of the species is probable in the province of Santa Cruz y Tierra del Fuego (Rep. Argentina), as well as in the XII Region in Chile. This requires coordination and consensus

among the various institutions involved about the methods and periods for the surveys.

- b. It is necessary to ensure the reproductive success of the broods of the species known; this requires an evaluation about which could be the best system. There also should be assessed the need for local and regional control of predators.
- c. Assess the need and possibility of implementing a control and monitoring system in the areas where the species nests.
- d. Generate more information on the basic reproductive biology of the species.

II. Wintering:

- a. Estimate the population abundance. Continue with the surveys of abundance.
- b. Strengthen educational campaigns about the reality of this species at all levels of society.

Bibliography

Blanco, D.E., J. Beltrán y V. de la Balze. 2002. La caza de aves acuáticas en la provincia de Buenos Aires: diagnóstico de la situación actual. Pp. 5-25 en Blanco, D.E., J. Beltrán y V. de la Balze (Eds.): Primer Taller sobre la Caza de Aves Acuáticas: Hacia una estrategia para el uso sustentable de los recursos de los humedales: 5-25. Wetlands International, Buenos Aires.

Blanco, D.E. y V.M. de la Balze. 2006. Harvest of migratory geese (*Chloephaga spp.*) in Argentina: an overview of the present situation. Pp. 870-873 en: Boere, G.C., C.A. Galbraith y D.A. Stroud (eds.): Waterbirds around the world. A global overview of the conservation, management and research of the world's waterbird flyways. The Stationery Office, Edimburgo, UK.

De la Balze, V. y D. E. Blanco. 2002. El cauquén Colorado (*Chloephaga rubidiceps*): una especie amenazada por la caza de avutardas Pp. 119-122 en: Blanco, D.E., J. Beltrán y V. de la Balze. (Eds.) Primer Taller sobre Caza de Aves Acuáticas; Hacia una estrategia para el uso sustentable de los recursos de los humedales: 119-122. Wetlands International, Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Petracci, P.F., H. Ibáñez, A. Scorolli, N. Cozzani, D. Blanco, V. de la Balze, D. Forcelli, S. Goldfeder, D. Mac Lean, M. Carrizo, M. Zamorano, J. Cereghetti, R. Sarriá y J. Veiga. 2008: Monitoreo poblacional de cauquenes migratorios (*Chloephaga spp.*) en las provincias de Buenos Aires y Río Negro: Una actualización sobre su estado crítico de conservación. Secretaría de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sustentable de la Nación, Capital Federal.

Report on Great Bustard (*Otis tarda*)

The Middle-European population of the Great Bustard is partially migratory and, in severe winters, birds migrate from their breeding grounds in the lowlands of the Carpathian Basin to the Balkan peninsula, or sometimes to Italy. Birds from the German population fly west, reaching Belgium or Northern France.

Because of the population decline and migratory behaviour of the Middle-European Great Bustard, a MoU was created under the Bonn Convention, which was opened for signature in the year 2000.

Thirteen of the sixteen Range States have signed the instrument so far. Besides them, three participating organisations, BirdLife International, CIC and IUCN, have also signed it.

The Great Bustard population in general, at least in Hungary, Austria and Germany has grown slightly in the last few years. This is a consequence of appropriate management methods being employed in the above-mentioned countries.

A short overview on the recent situation of the Great Bustard in Range States:

ALBANIA: the Great Bustard is not a breeding bird, only a very rare wintering one.

AUSTRIA: birds have regularly used breeding ground in two areas, wintering there as well. There are about 200 birds in the breeding season, slightly more than previously. In winter, sometimes more than 200 birds are counted, or even near 300 individuals, owing to short-distance migrants moving through the Slovakian - Hungarian - Austrian border.

BULGARIA: disappeared as a breeding bird about two decades ago. Might reestablish naturally in the future.

CROATIA: extinct as a breeding bird long ago. There are some wintering and/or passage records.

CZECH REPUBLIC: disappeared recently as a breeding bird, but in South Moravia, one or two individuals still occur.

GERMANY: a regular breeding bird; dropped to the critical size population of about 60 birds in the late 1980s, but in the last decade has increased again. Recently exceeded the 100 individual mark, and in the year 2009 there were 112-114 birds.

GREECE: no data.

MACEDONIA: no breeding population. No data, but potentially might be wintering.

ROMANIA: we have no exact data. It might still breed somewhere near the Hungarian border. From that area there are some historical data.

SLOVAKIA: there is a breeding site close to the Austrian- Hungarian border. In recent years there are no data confirming successful breeding.

SLOVENIA: has never bred in the country; a very rare passage migrant historically.

UKRAINE: the country has an important role, both as a breeding area and also as a wintering ground for the Great Bustard. The wintering birds originate from the Russian breeding area along the Volga

river. Breeding populations in Ukraine number around 700 birds, the number of wintering birds sometimes exceeds 1500 individuals.

HUNGARY: a regular breeding bird, partial migrant.

There are eight areas in Hungary important for Great Bustard protection, and most of these areas are protected. The two most important breeding grounds are in the Kiskunság NP and in the Körös-Maros NP. These two national parks have 1,200 birds from the total of 1,500 birds in Hungary.

A successful 4-year LIFE project ran in Hungary between 2004 and 2008. Due to this programme, certain costly management measures were possible, like putting electricity cables under the ground in important Great Bustard habitats, buying habitats providing optimal breeding sites, and buying machines for opening the rape-fields by removing snow cover in order to provide winter food for the Great Bustards.

The two worst threats still occur in Hungary, namely nest-destruction by cutting alfalfa fields and other crops during the breeding time and also the activities of predators, such as Fox (*Vulpes vulpes*) and Hooded Crow (*Corvus cornix*), numbers of which are too high.

Comparing total populations in Hungary during the last ten years, we can see an increase of about 30 %.

Year	Total number
2000	1106 individuals
2002	1192
2004	1303
2009	around 1500
2010	around 1500

This year, in 2010, due to the unusually cold and rainy weather, the breeding success is suspected to be very low.

About enlarging the Great Bustard MoU geographically

At the First Meeting of the signature parties to the MoU in Illmitz, 2004, we talked about enlarging the MoU geographically.

- There would be several steps or possibilities in the enlargement. Serbia and Italy should be named as Range States even for the Middle-European population, amending the recent MoU.
- Further enlargement might include Russia, and other countries from Central Asia or the Middle East.
- Furthermore, we could include the eastern subspecies (*Otis tarda dybowski*), living in Russia, Mongolia and China.
- In case of a general MoU which includes the full species of Great Bustard, Spain and Portugal, and England (with the recent success in introducing the species) or other countries should join.

Later note: Daliborka Stankovic, CMS Scientific Councillor for Serbia, has recently informed me, that in the Mokrin area in NE Serbia, where in recent years about 30 birds were counted, in 2010 only 5-6 birds were found, including 3 females.

Compiled by
Attila Bankovics

Bonn, 30 June, 2010.

Report on Aquatic Warbler (*Acrocephalus paludicola*)

General

- good progress since the last report in November 2008 (with the help of the leading role of the BLI Aquatic Warbler Conservation Team - AWCT)

Administrative level

- International Species Action Plan approved in May 2010 (prepared by BLI)
- MoU signed by 14 countries out of 22 Range States identified: 2nd Meeting of Signatories, May 2010

Conservation level

- major threats continue in the breeding localities (especially habitat destruction due to changing hydrology, loss of traditional use etc.) and in wintering sites (habitat destruction, especially aquaculture and damming of waterways. This seems to be the weakest aspect of Aquatic Warbler conservation at present.
- some progress in breeding localities in three key countries (Belarus, Ukraine, Poland), especially in Poland (e. g. activities of the EU LIFE project in the Biebrza National Park)
- training workshop for local specialists (Senegal, Mali, Mauritania, Gambia) organised by the AWCT to identify and check suitable habitats in this part of Africa

Scientific level

- updated population estimate: 10,500–14,000 males in less than 40 localities in 6 countries, more than 80 % of the population in 4 sites only
- new breeding locality found in SE Poland (late May 2009, about 50 males in atypical habitat)
- feather analyses of birds from breeding localities, stopovers and wintering sites still continue (there remains a lack of suitable samples)
- geo-logger study in preparation (detects and records daylight periods along the migration route)
- wintering sites: Djoudj NP/ Senegal 2007 (importance reconfirmed 2008 and 2009, incl. several Aquatic Warbler retraps), N Senegal 2008 (0), Ghana 2009 (0), Mauritania 2010 (0), another expedition is being prepared for Jan/Feb 2011

(Jiri Flousek, 30 June 2010)

***Calidris canutus* Report, CMS 2010**

In recent years the number of Red Knots estimated in Tierra del Fuego (mainly *C. Canutus rufa*) remained stable at about 17,000 individuals. For the first time in many years, in 2008 the breeding season in the Arctic was very successful. In Delaware Bay the density of Horseshoe Crab eggs increased due to the fishing ban in the states of New Jersey and Delaware, USA.

Among the major concerted actions undertaken by numerous institutions in the Americas we can mention:

- The WHSRN is moving ahead with the Red Knot Recovery Project in the Americas and partially or fully supports conservation activities in sites along the migratory route of the species.
- Ringing campaigns in the Patagonia of Chile and Argentina, in the USA and in Canada, which involve numerous institutions of the Americas.
- Monitoring of Ringed birds to estimate the survival and turn-over, as well as studies about abundance, disturbance and trophic ecology in several costal sites in Argentina, northern Uruguay and southern Brazil.
- Studies on pathogens and the immune system in Argentina and the USA.



16TH MEETING OF THE CMS SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL

Bonn, Germany, 28-30 June, 2010

UNEP/CMS/ScC16/REPORT
ANNEX VIII

REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON AQUATIC MAMMALS

1. Conservation status of Appendix 1 species

1.1 *Reports from Species Focal Points*

A report on the conservation status of the Atlantic population of the Mediterranean monk seal and update on conservation activities was submitted by P. Fernández de Larrinoa (ScC16/Inf.16). The population continues to increase on Madeira and at Cabo Blanco in Morocco-Mauretania. At Cabo Blanco, the mean annual production of pups during the period 2006-2009 was 48, and a trend of recolonization of open beaches has continued. The Action Plan Working Group met for the 5th time in November, 2009 and made several recommendations for action: 1) renewal of a no-fishing zone on the Cabo Blanco Peninsula, 2) creation of a protected area in the Aguerguer-Safia region in Morocco, 3) reinforcement of marine and terrestrial surveillance of the Cabo Blanco Satellite Reserve in Mauretania and 4) continuation of the non-invasive GPS tagging program on adult male and a start on tagging of females. The report contains detailed lists of the conservation actions taken or in progress by the four range states of Spain, Portugal, Morocco and Mauretania.

1.2 *Species fact sheets*

Fact sheets will be prepared for the Appendix I aquatic mammal species intersessionally, based on the recently updated IUCN Red List assessments. First drafts will be prepared by the Secretariat and forwarded to Perrin for completion. Perrin will seek permission to download the Red List distribution maps.

2. Listing proposals for COP10

One proposal was submitted to the Council for review, by Spain, for listing on Appendix I of the two beaked whale species *Ziphius cavirostris* and *Mesoplodon densirostris* (ScC16/Doc.18). Major justifications given were the susceptibility of the whales to death associated with acoustic pollution, in particular military sonars, and the relatively small size of local populations that have been surveyed in the Canary Islands and Hawaii. The two species are distributed widely around the world (*Ziphius* in temperate and tropical latitudes and *M. densirostris* in the tropics), and there are no estimates of global abundance. Both species are classified as Data Deficient by the IUCN. The advice in the proposal was to include them in Appendix I as a precaution. However, the Working Group agreed that there is not sufficient information available on abundance and conservation status to justify

Appendix I listing. With further information there may be a basis for listing of a regional population. It was noted that both species are listed in the remit of the recently concluded MoU Concerning the Conservation of the Manatee and Small Cetaceans of Western Africa and Macaronesia, and that the Canary Islands are included in the agreement area (Spain participated in development of the MoU but is not at this point a signatory).

3. Concerted and Cooperative Actions for COP10

3.1 Nomination of Focal Points

The Secretariat will pursue nomination of Focal Points for the Ganges River dolphin (*Platanista gangetica gangetica*) and the Black Sea bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus ponticus*) during the intersessional period.

3.2 Recommendations on further implementations of Concerted and Cooperative Actions

No recommendations were received.

3.3 Possible identification of candidate Concerted and Cooperative Action species to be recommended to COP10

None were identified.

3.4 Intersessional work in preparation for ScC17 and COP10

3.4.1 Develop list of Appendix II species for which agreements are not anticipated during the forthcoming triennium but which nonetheless will require attention. Perrin will do this.

3.4.2 Establish a review process for Concerted Action and Cooperative Action species to ensure regular updates of status (based on research) by the relevant Focal Point councilors. The Group noted that such a requirement already exists but has not functioned well; the reports for the most part have been irregular, sketchy and not very evidentiary. Two alternatives were suggested:

- 1) Require the Focal Point to submit a report in advance of the ScC meeting, so that it can be reproduced, posted electronically and discussed at the meeting (as was done for the monk seal at this meeting).
- 2) Given the shortage of aquatic-mammal expertise on the Council (most of the present Focal Points for the aquatic mammal species are experts on other taxa), have the periodic status updates for the 25 species prepared by an expert consultant or consultants on a contractual basis.

4. Follow-up on Res.9.9: Migratory marine species

4.1 Work toward species priorities identified for the Indian Ocean and Southeast Asia

No information was available to the Working Group.

4.2 Review of list of Arctic migratory species (annex to ScC16Doc.11

The two pinnipeds in the list (*Phoca vitulina* and *Halichoerus grypus*) should be removed; they are listed in Appendix II only regionally, for the Baltic and Wadden Seas for the former and the Baltic for the latter.

4.3 *Nomination of Councillors to assist Secretariat and Council in developing a programme of work to address human-induced impact on cetaceans.*
Williams, Qwathekana, and Perrin agreed to serve in this role.

4.4 *Intersessional preparation for ScC17 and COP1 nyq10*

4.4.1 Identify priority issues, species and habitats requiring intervention by CMS in the next decade. Perrin and Wilmott will undertake to address this issue, soliciting help from other Council members.

4.4.2 Seek avenues for research and dialogue on issues of common interest, such as climate change, fisheries and outreach strategies, with relevant organizations. This will be addressed by the Secretariat and the Working Group members. Contacts were noted with IUCN and IWC.

4.4.4 Review the latest available information on the current and predicted conservation status, in relation to the possible consequences of climate change on all Arctic marine mammal species listed in the Appendices. The Secretariat will seek input from other organizations and compile the information in a draft summary for review by the relevant councilors.

4.4.5 Consider whether additional Arctic migratory species might warrant listing on the Appendices. The Secretariat will consult relevant organizations and circulate suggestions to the relevant councilors for comment.

4.4.6 Consider existing initiatives and research relating to ongoing conservation efforts for marine migratory species, such as the establishment of ecologically representative marine protected area networks and an integrated approach to coastal and marine management. The Working Group agreed that the first step in this would be to compile an annotated list of such initiatives. The Secretariat agreed to do this, with Wilmott assisting. The next step will be a critical evaluation of the effectiveness of the initiatives with regard to conservation of aquatic mammals. This task remains unassigned, and the advice of the Plenary is sought. Contracting may be the best option.

5. Follow-up on Res.9.19 – Anthropogenic Marine/Ocean Noise Impacts

5.1 *Review of information submitted by Parties, CMS Family Secretariats and other organization [in response to round-robin request by Secretariat]*

Responses have been received so far from three sources. In addition, Routh reported that there will shortly be a response from the Australian Government, and Krüss reported that work is underway in Germany to develop guidelines for reduction of noise in marine industrial activities.

5.1.1 International Maritime Organization (IMO). As part of an initiative begun in 2008 to make progress toward minimizing incidental noise from commercial shipping, the IMO placed the item on the agenda for meetings of its Marine Environment Protection Committee (MEPC) and established an intersessional Correspondence Group, coordinated by the U.S., to identify and address ways to accomplish this, including technical guidelines and potential navigational

and operational practices (ScC16/Inf.12.1). Currently the Correspondence Group is concentrating on the major element of cavitation, as this could lead to other benefits such as fuel savings as well as noise reduction. The next meeting of the MEPC will be in September-October at IMO headquarters.

5.1.2. ASCOBANS activities. Underwater noise has been an issue of concern for ASCOBANS since inception of the agreement and has been addressed in 7 resolutions over the period 1994-2009. After a survey of practices and guidelines used by various organizations, a review group proposed an extensive set of guidelines for mitigation of intense noise generating activities in the ASCOBANS region (detailed in the report of the group, attached to ScC16/Inf.12.3). These guidelines have not yet been adopted by the parties to ASCOBANS.

5.1.3 Seismic exploration for oil in Ecuador. An environmental impact assessment conducted by the Ecuadorean Navy concluded that the proposed use of airguns had the potential to affect the echolocation systems and the habitats of whales and dolphins, as well as possibly affecting turtles and birds (ScC16/Inf.12.2). A recommended mitigation measure was to observe adequate intervals between shots.

5.2 *Develop voluntary guidelines on effective management of anthropogenic noise – provide guidance on proposal to form a joint working group of CMS, ACCOBAMS, ASCOBANS and OSPAR for the development of common guidelines.*

The Working Group endorsed the concept of developing a uniform set of guidelines but agreed that this is a highly technical task that cannot be carried out with the expertise presently available in the Council and recommended that an acoustical consultant be contracted to guide the exercise, after preliminary collation by the Secretariat of guidelines used in various organizations and agencies.

5.3 *Nominate Councilors to participate in intersessional work on ocean noise.*

This expertise does not exist in the Council, and as noted above, contracted consultation may be required.

6. Small-grants proposals

The Working Group agreed that the workshop proposed to assess status of and threats to small cetaceans in the western Indian Ocean (No. 6 in the list of project-initiatives for voluntary contributions 2006-2008 (as of 30 November 2007)) is still of high priority and recommended that it be re-considered for funding. The amount requested then was 34,500 Euros. The Secretariat will contact the authors of the proposal to check on its current status.

7. Distribution of volume on Conservation Strategy for the West African Manatee

Wetlands International in collaboration with multiple partners produced the Conservation Strategy for the West African Manatee, edited by Tim Dodman et al. and published in 2008. It is a 128-page volume and includes chapters on the species in each range state by the range-state experts. It has been suggested that the volume would be a useful reference for key stakeholders in the region, including national governments and management authorities (including CMS, CITES and CBD country representatives), convention secretariats,

international development agencies, the IUCN Sirenian Specialist Group, NGOs, etc. The Working Group agreed that the volume would be useful in furthering conservation of the manatee and recommended that CMS assist with its dissemination. The contribution being requested by Wetlands International from CMS is US\$9,900, for printing and mailing of 300 copies.

It was noted that the introductory portions of the document may need updating to reflect more recent CMS activities on the manatee, such as the recently concluded regional MoU that covers the species. If this is necessary, the Secretariat will contact the authors for permission to make the changes.

PARTICIPANTS:

William Perrin Chair (Appointed Councilor for Aquatic Mammals)
Nigel Routh (Australia)
Ian Wilmott (Cook Islands)
Andreas Krüß (Germany)
Malta Qwathekana (South Africa)
James Williams (UK)
Borja Heredia (Secretariat)
Heidrum Frisch (Secretariat & ASCOBANS)



16TH MEETING OF THE CMS SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL

Bonn, Germany, 28-30 June, 2010

UNEP/CMS/ScC16/REPORT
ANNEX IX

REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON TERRESTRIAL MAMMALS

(29 June 2010, 16.30 – 18.45, and 30 June 2010, 11.30 – 13.00)

Chair: Torbjörn Ebenhard

The appointed Working Group chair Roseline Beudels-Jamar de Bolsee was unable to attend the Council Meeting, and the councillor for Sweden, Torbjörn Ebenhard, acted in her place.

A total of 23 participants contributed to the Working Group meeting, including the councillors of Chad, the Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, Georgia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kenya, Niger, Nigeria and Tajikistan, and observers from several governments and organizations.

The Working Group began with a brief introduction by the Chairman of the aims of the working group based on an agenda prepared by the UNEP/CMS Secretariat.

Agenda item 13.1: Concerted actions for selected Appendix I species

Agenda Item 13.2: Cooperative actions for Appendix II species

Agenda Item 13.3f: The Sahelo-Saharan Megafauna

Recommendation 9.2 requested the Scientific Council, in cooperation with the Secretariat and concerned Parties, to pursue a Sahelo-Saharan Megafauna concerted action that would in due course cover all threatened migratory large mammals of the temperate and cold deserts, semi-deserts, steppes and associated mountains of the Sahelo-Saharan region. Range States and other interested Parties were called upon to support the development of a Memorandum of Understanding or other binding or non-binding instruments to complement the Sahelo-Saharan concerted action and its Action Plan. The Recommendation also encouraged the Scientific Council to envisage an extension of the action area to the deserts of the Horn of Africa.

The Sahelo-Saharan antelope concerted action was a highly successful project that had been running for several years. The vision of Rec. 9.2 was to widen the taxonomic and geographical scope of the concerted action, hence the title Sahelo-Saharan Megafauna. Borja Heredia from the CMS Secretariat introduced the topic with a “Power Point” presentation, on behalf of Roseline Beudels-Jamar de Bolsee. In Tunisia and Morocco the Concerted Action was currently engaged in the reintroduction and reinforcement of semi-captive populations of Scimitar-horned Oryx (*Oryx dammah*) and Addax (*Addax nasomaculatus*), and the establishment and management of metapopulations of Addax and Oryx. In Niger, a project

was being developed, with a team in place and fully functional, excellent cooperation with nomads and tribal leaders, a proposal for a protected area submitted to government, a wildlife monitoring system in place, and a project website designed and online (www.ass-niger.org). Remaining challenges included the strengthening of government capacity, identification of rural development goals and actions, and a revival of the Chad component of the trans-boundary approach. Two range state meetings had been held in Djerba and Agadir, and a third was planned but the date and the venue had not yet been decided. Chad had made a proposal to hold the meeting in Niger. The aim was to finalize a Sahelo-Saharan Megafauna MoU.

The Councillor of Niger proposed the inclusion of the Cheetah (*Acinonyx jubatus*) and the Barbary Sheep (*Ammotragus lervia*) in the Concerted Action/ Cooperative Action. The councillor of Chad supported the proposal. The Cheetah had already been approved for concerted action by COP 9, whereas the Barbary Sheep should be proposed to COP 10.

The CMS Ambassador suggested that an International Year of Sahelo-Saharan Antelopes could be declared. Niger and Chad supported the suggestion. The Secretariat informed participants that such a campaign could not take place until at least 2014, due to existing planning for the years 2011-2013.

The Councillor of Ethiopia recommended not only to increase the number of species in the Concerted action / Cooperative action, but also to extend the geographic scope, to encompass the countries of the Horn of Africa. Ethiopia shared several endangered species with both Somalia and Eritrea.

**Agenda Item 13.3e: Central Eurasian Aridland Mammals and
Agenda Item 13.3g: Tigers and other Asian big cats**

COP 9 requested (in Recommendation 9.1) the Scientific Council, in cooperation with the Secretariat, Mongolia and other concerned Parties, to pursue the Central Eurasian Megafauna Concerted Action and associated Cooperative Action. This was envisaged to cover all threatened migratory large mammals of the temperate and cold deserts, semi-deserts, steppes and associated mountains of Central Asia, the Northern Indian sub-continent, Western Asia, the Caucasus and Eastern Europe. The Action would include an Action Plan and status reports for all species concerned, and would initially be centred on *Camelus bactrianus*, *Bos grunniens*, *Uncia uncia*, *Cervus elaphus bactrianus* and *Acinonyx jubatus*, for the Concerted Action; and on *Equus hemionus s.l.*, *Gazella subgutturosa*, *Procapra gutturosa* and *Saiga tatarica s.l.* for the Cooperative Action. The Recommendation also encouraged Range States and other interested Parties to prepare the necessary proposals to include in Appendix I or Appendix II threatened species that would benefit from the Action;

This Concerted Action / Cooperative action was intended to emulate the success of the Sahelo-Saharan project, in similar biotopes in Eurasia. The Working Group observed that the scope of the Central Eurasian Aridland Mammals action was very wide, both in terms of potential species to be included, and in geography, and that priorities had to be decided on. A first step would be a meeting between Range States and other interested Parties. Such a meeting had been planned, but as of today no date or venue had been decided, mainly due to lack of financial resources.

FAO informed that a Capacity Building project would take place at the end of August in Kazakhstan. The agenda had not yet been fixed so there was a possibility for the UNEP/CMS Secretariat to attend, and possibly to “piggy-back” on a small planning meeting.

The Chairman informed that the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency had a programme to finance implementation of international conventions in developing countries. The Agency had invited the organizers of the Concerted Action to submit a proposal for funding.

A presentation was given by the government observer from Kyrgyzstan with a suggestion for a proposal to include the Argali sheep (*Ovis ammon*) in the Appendix II of CMS, with the intention to nominate the species for Cooperative Action. Kyrgyzstan was not Party to the CMS yet, but was in the process of acceding to the Convention. Tajikistan had agreed to make the proposal if needed.

Also within the context of the Central Eurasian Aridland Mammals Cooperative Action, the councillor of Georgia suggested the listing of two species of wild goats, *Capra caucasica* and *Capra cylindricornis*, on Appendix II of CMS. Three Range States would be involved: Georgia, the Russian Federation and Azerbaijan.

Through Recommendation 9.3, COP 9 *inter alia* called upon the Scientific Council to review, in consultation with international conservation bodies, including the IUCN Cat Specialist Group, the conservation and management of tigers and other Asian big cat species and to propose any appropriate actions required. To this end, the appointed Working Group Chair Roseline Beudels-Jamar de Bolsee had produced a draft proposal for the listing of the Tiger (*Panthera tigris*) on Appendix I of the CMS, with the intention to include it in the Concerted Action for Central Eurasian Aridland mammals (see agenda item 14.1).

Agenda Item 13.3h: Central African Elephants.

Recommendation 9.5 requested the Secretariat to include in its programme of work the development of an appropriate instrument on the conservation of elephants in Central Africa, and to engage in relevant consultations with Range States (COMIFAC), and to establish a working group composed of representatives of Range States and CMS partner organizations on this issue. The Scientific Council would be an additional member of the working group. The Scientific Council was asked to review the state of progress of work.

The Secretariat introduced the topic, with a presentation of activities. A meeting with the West African Elephant agreement revealed that the best way forward would be to create a new instrument for the Central African countries, instead of extending the West African instrument. The process was currently at the stage of identification of the geographical scope. Among the ten countries of COMIFAC, seven were clearly concerned by the action:

- Cameroon
- Central African Republic
- Chad
- Republic of Congo
- Democratic Republic of Congo
- Equatorial Guinea
- Gabon

Rwanda belonged to COMIFAC but had traditionally cooperated with East African countries on elephant issues. The elephant population in western Rwanda was however biologically separate from the eastern populations, and represented different taxonomical units (*Loxodonta*

cyclotis, and *Loxodonta africana*, respectively). It would make sense to cooperate with Uganda and the Democratic Republic of Congo to the west. The Secretariat had decided to ask Rwanda about their position. It was agreed that there was no need to wait for Rwanda to sign an instrument, but that the geographical scope still needed to be determined. A meeting between Range States was planned, but with no date or venue set.

The Working Group suggested that any possible synergies between the Gorilla agreement and the Central African Elephant instrument should be explored.

Proposals of further species for Concerted and Cooperative actions for COP10

Among species already on the CMS Appendices, the Barbary Sheep (*Ammotragus lervia*) was suggested for Cooperative Action by Niger and Chad (see agenda item 13.3f).

An additional five species, that had been proposed for new listings on the CMS Appendices, were simultaneously suggested for Concerted or Cooperative Action. The delegate from Kyrgyzstan nominated the Argali Sheep (*Ovis ammon*) for Cooperative action. Also within the context of the Central Eurasian Aridland Mammals Cooperative action, the councillor of Georgia nominated two species of wild goats, *Capra caucasica* and *Capra cylindricornis*. The councillor for the Republic of Congo proposed Cooperative Action for the African Lion (*Panthera leo*) (see agenda item 14.2). If listed on Appendix I, the Tiger (*Panthera tigris*) was nominated for Concerted Action by the appointed Working Group chair (see agenda item 13.3e and 13.3f).

Agenda Item 14: Proposals for amendments to Appendices I and II of the Convention

Agenda Item 14.1: Evaluation of draft proposals: Tiger

The appointed Working Group chair Roseline Beudels-Jamar de Bolsee had produced a draft proposal for the listing of the Tiger (*Panthera tigris*) on Appendix I of the CMS, with the intention of including it in the Concerted Action for Central Eurasian Aridland Mammals (see agenda item 13.3g). Formally, the proposal had to be made by a Party to CMS, at least 150 days before the COP meeting, but so far no Party had been identified. There were at least 13 Tiger Range States, but of these only Bangladesh and India were Parties to the CMS. The historic distribution of the Tiger included several more countries.

The Working Group agreed that the Tiger was gravely endangered and certainly in need of effective conservation. The Scientific Council had been asked by COP 9 to review, in consultation with international conservation bodies, including the IUCN Cat Specialist Group, the conservation and management of tigers and to propose any appropriate actions required. The Working Group noted that a substantial amount of work was already being done by a large number of government agencies and non-governmental organizations. Working Group participants suggested that the Tiger could be considered migratory under the CMS definition and that its conservation status was such that it should be considered for Appendix I listing at COP10. However, the group noted that it would be vital for the species proposal to highlight how a CMS listing would add value to the existing institutional frameworks for tiger conservation. If an Article IV agreement was to be considered for the tiger, then it would also be important for the country submitting the species proposal to highlight how obstacles such as the low number of CMS Parties within the Tiger Range States would be overcome. A proposition was made by IFAW to negotiate with the Global Tiger Forum, which involved all the range states with the exception of North Korea.

Agenda Item 14.3: The listing of the Cheetah on Appendix II

The Cheetah (*Acinonyx jubatus*) was proposed for inclusion in Appendix I at COP9. During the discussion of the proposal the representative of Norway pointed out that the existence of small quotas for trade under CITES in three southern African states, namely Botswana, Namibia and Zimbabwe, might cause difficulties, as an Appendix I listing precluded the taking of specimens for trade. The possibility of including the populations in these three countries under Appendix II was considered at COP9 and strongly supported by the representatives of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt and Uganda. Eventually COP9 adopted the inclusion of the Cheetah in Appendix I with the exception of the three populations which remained unlisted on CMS Appendices. The Activity Planning Meeting of the Scientific Council (Bonn, 13 June 2009) had asked the Scientific Council to review the issue.

In the Working Group, several councillors advocated the inclusion of all Cheetah populations in Appendix I, since the split listing might cause problems for the Concerted Action. The problem of the trade quotas did however remain. Two possible alternatives were apparent. The first was to suggest that Cheetah populations of Botswana, Namibia and Zimbabwe should be placed on Appendix II. The other was to leave them unlisted until the situation regarding the trade quota had changed. A listing on Appendix II should only be made if there was an expressed will to create a new regional instrument, or at least a Cooperative Action, among the Range States concerned. The Working Group did not decide on any option since the views of the three countries concerned should be taken into account. The Secretariat would approach Botswana, Namibia and Zimbabwe to discuss the matter further. Councillors of other Range States for the Cheetah are invited to submit their views in this matter to the Secretariat to be reviewed by the appointed Working Group chair. Any listing proposal would need to be submitted by a Party to the CMS.

Agenda Item 14.2: Review of taxonomic groups of migratory species to identify candidate species for listing on CMS Appendices

As described above, the government observer from Kyrgyzstan suggested a proposal to include the Argali Sheep (*Ovis ammon*) in the Appendix II of CMS. Kyrgyzstan was not Party to the CMS yet, but was in the process of acceding to the Convention. Tajikistan had agreed to make the proposal if needed. The councillor for Georgia suggested the listing of two species of wild goats, *Capra caucasica* and *Capra cylindricornis*, on Appendix II of CMS.

In addition to this the Councillor for the Republic of Congo proposed the listing of the African Lion (*Panthera leo*) in Appendix II, and asked for Cooperative Action with the aim to reintroduce lions in Congo. An unfavourable conservation status was reported by several other Range States, including Niger and Nigeria, and suggestions were made by Working Group participants, e.g. the government observer from Kyrgyzstan, to list the species on Appendix I, instead of Appendix II. The councillors of Nigeria and Chad supported a listing on Appendix II. Niger wished for more studies to be conducted.

The representative from CITES pointed out that listing lions in Appendix I could lead to the same situation as with Cheetahs. In several countries there were conflicts between the human population and lions, and trophy hunting programs had been created. These programs would not be possible if lions were to be listed on Appendix I.

The CMS Ambassador informed the meeting that the ‘Born Free Foundation’ could be helpful in taking the process forward.

PARTICIPANTS (23)

Torbjörn Ebenhard – Chair, Councillor, Sweden
John Hyelakuma Mshelbwala, ScC Chairman, Councillor, Nigeria
Alfred Oteng-Yeboah – Appointed Councillor African Fauna, Ghana
Mahamat Hassane Idriss – Councillor, Chad
Dieudonné Ankara – Councillor, Congo
Kahsay Gebretensae Asgedom – Councillor, Ethiopia
Zurab Gurielidze – Councillor, Georgia
Bahareh Shahriari – Councillor, Iran
Samuel M. Kasiki – Councillor, Kenya
Abdou Malam Issa – Councillor, Niger
Kobul Khasanovich Kasirov – Councillor, Tajikistan
Ian Redmond – CMS Ambassador, GRASP – UNEP/UNESCO
Askar Davletbakov – Observer, Kyrgyzstan
Mohammad Sulayem – Observer, Saudi Arabia
David H.W. Morgan – Observer, CITES
Scott Newman – Observer, FAO
Peter Pueschel – Observer, IFAW
Borja Heredia – Secretariat
Aline Kühl – Secretariat
Marco Barbieri – Secretariat
Melanie Virtue – Secretariat
Alexandre Ghafari – Secretariat
Cassandra Fernandes – Secretariat



Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals

Secretariat provided by the United Nations Environment Programme



16TH MEETING OF THE CMS SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL

Bonn, Germany, 28-30 June, 2010

UNEP/CMS/ScC16/REPORT
ANNEX X

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS / LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS / LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES

Chairman / Président / Presidente

Mr. John Hyelakuma Mshelbwala
Ag. Deputy Director
Federal Ministry of Environment
Plot 393/394, Augustus Aikhomu Way
Utako District, PMB 468, Garki
Abuja, FCT
NIGERIA
Tel.: (+234 9) 8033 2870 39
Fax: (+234 9) 523 4014
E-mail: johnmshelbwala2@yahoo.com

Vice-Chairmen / Vice-Présidents / Vicepresidentes

Prof. Dr. Colin A. Galbraith
45 Mounthooly Loan
Edinburgh EH10 7JD
Scotland
UNITED KINGDOM
E-mail: colin@cgalbraith.freeserve.co.uk

Members / Membres / Miembros

ARGENTINA

Lic. Daniel Eduardo Blanco
Coordinador de Programa
Wetlands International Argentina
25 de Mayo 758 Piso 10 I CP
1002 Buenos Aires
ARGENTINA
Tel.: (+54 11) 4313 4543
Fax: (+54 11) 4312 0932
E-mail: deblanco@wamani.apc.org

AUSTRALIA

Mr. Nigel Routh
Assistant Secretary
Marine Biodiversity Policy Branch
Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts
GPO Box 787
Canberra ACT 2601
AUSTRALIA
Tel.: (+61 2) 6275 9915
Fax: (+61 2) 6274 1542
E-Mail: Nigel.Routh@environment.gov.au

CHAD

M. Mahamat Hassane Idriss
Chef de Service de Sensibilisation d'Information et de Formation/PFCMS/CS-Chad
Ministère de l'Environnement et des Ressources Halieutiques, B.P. 2115
N'Djamena
TCHAD
Tel.: (+235) 621 9340, 995 1126
Fax: (+235) 252 2947
E-mail: mhi1962@yahoo.fr;
mhthassan@hotmail.com

CONGO, REPUBLIC OF

M. Dieudonné Ankara
Directeur de la Conservation de Ecosystems
Direction Générale de l'Environnement (MODEFE)
B.P. 958, 54, rue Bordeaux Oeunzé
Brazzaville
CONGO
Tel.: (+242) 551 67 50
Fax: (+242) 551 67 50
E-mail: graspcongo@yahoo.fr

CONGO, DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF

M. Donatien **Muembo Kabemba**
Directeur de l'Audit Scientifique et Technique
Institut Congolais pour la Conservation de la
Nature
13, avenue des Cliniques B.P. 868
Kinshasa 1
REPUBLIQUE DEMOCRATIQUE DU CONGO
Tel.: (+243) 81 5006 840
E-Mail: dmuembo2003@yahoo.fr

COOK ISLANDS

Mr. Ian Karika **Wilmott**
Chairman
Rarotonga Environment Authority
P.O. Box 3036
Rarotonga
COOK ISLANDS
Tel: (+682) 55499 (mob)
E-mail: kakerori@tca.co.ck

COSTA RICA

Lic. José Joaquín **Calvo Domingo**
Coordinador del Programa Nacional Vida
Silvestre
Ministerio de Ambiente Energía y
Telecomunicaciones, Sistema Nacional de Áreas
de Conservación (MINAET-SINAC)
Edificio Padilla, Avenida 1, Calle 11
San José
COSTA RICA
Tel: (+506) 2522 6549
Fax: (+506) 2566 2436
E-mail: joaquin.calvo@sinac.go.cr

CÔTE D'IVOIRE

M. Tano **Sombo**
Directeur de la Protection de la Nature
Ministère d'Environnement, des Eaux et Forêts
06 B.P. 6648
Abidjan 06
CÔTE D'IVOIRE
Tel/Fax: (+225 20) 22 53 66
E-mail: sombotano@yahoo.fr

CROATIA

Dr. Jelena **Kralj**
Scientific assistant
Institute of Ornithology
Croatian Academy of Science and Arts
Gundulićeva 24
HR-10000 Zagreb
CROATIA
Tel.: (+385 1) 4825 401
Fax: (+385 1) 4825 392
E-mail: zzo@hazu.hr

CUBA

Sr. Tomás Ramón **Escobar Herrera**
Director General
Agencia de Medio Ambiente
Ministerio de Ciencia, Tecnología y Medio
Ambiente
Calle 20, Esquina 18-A
41 y 47, Municipio Playa
Ciudad de la Habana
CUBA
Tel: (+53 7) 2025542 / 2028242
Fax: (+53 7) 202 5542
E-mail: tomas@ama.cu; ama@ama.cu

CZECH REPUBLIC

Dr. Jirí **Flousek**
Zoologist
Krkonoše National Park Administration
Dobrovskeho 3
CZ-543 01 Vrchlabí
CZECH REPUBLIC
Tel.: (+420 499) 456 212
Fax: (+420 499) 456 422
E-mail: jflousek@knap.cz

DENMARK

Dr. Mark **Desholm**
PhD Scientist
Department of Wildlife Ecology & Biodiversity
National Environmental Research Institute
Aarhus University
Grenåvej 14
DK-8410 Rønne
Denmark
Tel: (+45) 89201728
Fax: (+45) 89201514
E-mail: mde@dmu.dk

ECUADOR

Sra. Julia Angelita **Cordero Guillén**
Technico de Patrimonio Natural de la Dirección
Provincial de Manabí
Ministerio del Ambiente
Calle Olmedo entre sucre y Cordova
Ecuador
Tel.: (+593 52) 638857
Fax: (+593 52) 651848
E-mail: jcordero@ambiente.gov.ec

ETHIOPIA

Mr. Kahsay Gebretensae **Asgedom**
Director
National Parks & Sanctuaries Coordinating
Directorate
Ethiopian Wildlife Conservation Authority (EWCA)
386, Addis Ababa
ETHIOPIA
Tel: (+251 11) 5504842 / (+251) 911 742003
Fax: (+251 11) 5546804
E-mail: kahsaygt@hotmail.com

FRANCE

Dr. Jean-Philippe **Siblet**
Directeur du Service du Patrimoine Naturel
Muséum National d'Histoire naturelle (MNHN)
36 rue Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire
CP 41
75231 Paris Decex 05
FRANCE
Tel: (+33 1) 4079 3256
E-mail: siblet@mnhn.fr

GEORGIA

Mr. Zurab **Gurielidze**
General Director
Tbilisi Zoo
64 Kostava Street
0171 Tbilisi
GEORGIA
Tel.: (+995 32) 213 040 / (+995 99) 568 031
Fax: (+995 32) 213 050
E-mail: zgurielidze@zoo.ge;
zgurielidze@hotmail.com

GERMANY

Dr. Andreas **Krüb**
Head of Department
Federal Agency for Nature Conservation
Department for Ecology and the Conservation of
Fauna and Flora
Konstantinstr. 110
53179 Bonn
GERMANY
Tel: (+49 228) 8491 1410
Fax: (+49 228) 8491 1419
E-mail: KruessA@bfn.de

HUNGARY

Dr. Attila **Bankovics**
President of BirdLife Hungary
Hungarian Ornithological Society (BirdLife
Hungary)
Vikár Béla utca 19. IV./ 2
H-1181 Budapest
HUNGARY
Tel: (+36 20) 310 5414
E-mail: attila.bankovics@gmail.com

HONDURAS

Lic. Francisco **Aceituno**
Analista Ambiental
Dirección General de Biodiversidad
Secretaria de Recursos Naturales y Ambiente
Colonia Alameda
Calle Tiburcio Carías Andino, casa 1414
Tegucigalpa
HONDURAS
Tel/Fax: (+504) 232 5078
E-mail: aceitunof@yahoo.com

ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN

Ms. Bahareh **Shahriari**
Environmental Expert
Department of Environment
Wild Life and Biodiversity Bureau
Nature Environment and Biodiversity Division
Environment Research Center
Pardisan Park, Hakim Highway
P.O. Box: 14155-73155
Tehran
ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN
Tel: (+98 21) 8826 9293
Fax: (+98 21) 8826 7993
E-mail: shahriarib@yahoo.com;
b_sh_am@yahoo.com

ITALY

Dr. Fernando **Spina**
Senior Scientist, Head Italian Ringing Centre
Istituto Superiore per la Protezione e la Ricerca
Ambientale ISPRA, Sede ex-INFIS
Via Cà Fornacetta 9
1-40064 Ozzano Emilia (BO)
ITALY
Tel: (+39 051) 6512 111 direct 6512214
Fax: (+39 051) 7966 28
E-mail: fernando.spina@isprambiente.it

KENYA

Dr. Samuel M. **Kasiki**
Deputy Director Biodiversity Research &
Monitoring
Kenya Wildlife Service
P.O. Box 40241 – 00100
Nairobi
KENYA
Tel.: (+254) 721 446729
Fax: (+254 20) 603792
E-mail: skasiki@kws.go.ke

**THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF
MACEDONIA**

Dr. Branko **Micevski**
President of Macedonian Bonn Committee (MBC)
Bird Study and Protection Society of Macedonia
(BSPSM)
Blvd. ASNOM 58, 2/4
Skopje, 1000
THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF
MACEDONIA
Tel/Fax: (+389 22) 432 071
E-mail: brankom@ukim.edu.mk

MOROCCO

M. Abdellah **El Mastour**
Chef du Service d'Aménagement des Parcs
et Réserves Naturelles
Haut Commissariat aux Eaux et Forêts et à la
Lutte contre la Désertification
Quartier Administratif, Chellah-Rabat
Rue Haroun Arrachid
Agdal-Rabat
MOROCCO
Tel.: (+212 537) 67 42 69
Fax: (+212 537) 67 27 70
E-mail: elmastourabdellah@yahoo.fr

NETHERLANDS

Dr. Adriaan D. **Rijnsdorp**
Chair Sustainable Fisheries Management
Wageningen University and Research Centre
P.O.Box 68
1970 AB Ymuiden
THE NETHERLANDS
Tel: (+31 317) 487191
Fax: (+31 317) 487326
E-mail: adriaan.Rijnsdorp@wur.nl

NIGER

M. Abdou Malam **Issa**
Directeur de la Faune, de la Chasse et des Aires
Protégées
Direction de la faune, de la Chasse et des Aires
Protégées, au Ministère de l'Eau de
l'Environnement et de la Lutte
B.P. 721, Niamey
NIGER
Tel.: (+227 21) 76 83 62 / 96870825
Fax: (+227 20) 73 60 12
E-mail: malam_ia@yahoo.fr

PAKISTAN

Mr. Umeed **Khalid**
Conservator (Wildlife)
National Council for Conservation of Wildlife
(NCCW), Ministry of Environment
Building No.14-D, 2nd Floor, F-8 Markaz
Islamabad
PAKISTAN
Tel/Fax: (+92 51) 926 2270
E-mail: umeed_khalid@yahoo.com

PARAGUAY

Sra. María Cristina **Morales Palarea**
Coordinadora Programa de Conservación de
Especies, Asociación Guyra Paraguay
Gaetano Martino No. 215 C/Tte.
Ross-Asunción
PARAGUAY
Tel/Fax: (+595 21) 223 567
E-mail: cristinam@guyra.org.py;
cmoralespy@gmail.com

PERU

Dr. Victor Manuel **Pulido**
Consejero Científico
Dirección General Forestal y de Fauna
Paseo los Eucaliptos N° 285
Camacho, La Molina
Lima 12
PERU
Tel: (+51 1) 9986 72369
Fax: (+51 1) 4351 570
E-mail: vpulidoc@hotmail.com;
wetperu@amauta.rcp.net.pe

PHILIPPINES

Mr. Carlo **Custodio**
Chief Ecosystems Management Specialist
Protected Areas and Wildlife Bureau (PAWB)
Department of Environment & Natural Resources
North Avenue, Diliman
Quezon City 1100
PHILIPPINES
Tel.: (+6 32) 925 8948 / 924 6031 to 35 ext: 207
Fax: (+6 32) 925 8948
E-mail: custodiocarlo@yahoo.com

SENEGAL

M. Djibril **Diouck**
Division Etudes et Amenagement
Direction des Parcs Nationaux du Sénégal
Parc Forestier et Zoologique de Hann
B.P. 5135, Dakar Liberte
SENEGAL
Tel.: (+221 33) 832 2309
Fax: (+221 33) 832 2311
E-mail: djibrildiouck@hotmail.com

SERBIA

Ms. Daliborka **Stankovic**
 Curator of bird collection
 Natural History Museum Belgrade
 Njegoseva 51
 11000 Belgrade
 SERBIA
 Tel: (+381) 63 540 991
 Fax: (+381 11) 3446 580
 E-mail: daliborka@nhmbeo.rs

SLOVAKIA

Dr. Peter **Puchala**
 Zoologist
 State Nature Conservancy of Slovak Republic
 Administrative of Malé Karpaty Protected
 Landscape Area
 Štúrova 115
 900 01 Modra
 Slovak Republic
 Tel/Fax: (+421 33) 6474002
 E-mail: peter.puchala@sopsr.sk

SWEDEN

Dr. Torbjörn **Ebenhard**
 Acting Director
 Swedish Biodiversity Centre
 P.O. Box 7007
 SE-750 07 Uppsala
 SWEDEN
 Tel.: (+46 18) 67 22 68
 Fax: (+46 18) 67 34 80
 E-mail: torbjorn.ebenhard@cbm.slu.se

SWITZERLAND

Dr. Olivier **Biber**
 Head International Biodiversity Matters Unit
 Swiss Agency for the Environment (FOEN)
 CH-3003 Bern
 SWITZERLAND
 Tel.: (+41 31) 323 0663
 Fax: (+41 31) 324 7579
 E-mail: olivier.biber@bafu.admin.ch

TAJIKISTAN

Dr. Kokul Khasanovich **Kasirov**
 Chief of the Main Department
 State Committee on Environment Conservation
 Under the Government of the Republic of
 Tajikistan
 P.O. Box 138
 734000 Dushanbe
 TAJIKISTAN
 Tel/Fax: (+992 919) 145677
 E-mail: poplar_office@yahoo.com;
 kokul@tojikiston.com

URUGUAY

Dr. Adrián **Azpiroz**
 Investigador Asociado
 Instituto de Investigaciones Biológicas Clemente
 Estable, Buxareo 1311
 11300 Montevideo
 URUGUAY
 Tel.: (+598 2) 622 7412
 E-mail: avesuru_1999@yahoo.com

YEMEN

Mr. Galal Hussein Nasser **AL-Harogi**
 Manager of Migratory Species Unit
 Environment Protection Authority (EPA)
 Ministry of Water and Environment
 PO Box 10442
 Sana'a
 YEMEN
 Tel: (+967 1) 540 669 207 816
 Fax: (+967 1) 207 327
 E-mail: g_hng@yahoo.com; gharogi@gmail.com

**Scientific Councillors appointed by the Conference of the Parties/
 Conseillers Scientifiques nommés par la Conference des Parties/
 Consejeros Científicos designados por la Conferencia de las Partes**

Mr. Barry G. **Baker**
 CMS Appointed Councillor (By-Catch)
 114 Watsons Road, Kettering
 Tasmania 7155
 AUSTRALIA
 Tel.: (+61 3) 6267 4079
 E-mail: barry.baker@latitude42.com.au

Dr. Zeb S. **Hogan**
 CMS Appointed Councillor for Fish
 2355 Camelot Way Reno
 NV 89509
 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
 Tel: (+1 530) 219 0942
 E-mail: zebhogan@hotmail.com

Dr. Colin J. **Limpus**
CMS Appointed Councillor (Marine Turtles)
Chief Scientist
Queensland Turtle Research
P. O. Box 541, Capalaba
Queensland 4157
AUSTRALIA
Tel: (+61 7) 3245 4056
E-mail: col.limpus@derm.qkd.gov.au

Dr. Taej **Mundkur**
CMS Appointed Councillor (Asiatic Fauna)
Programme Manager - Flyways
Wetlands International
Horapark 9 (2nd Floor)
6717 LZ Ede
The Netherlands
Tel: (+31 318) 660910
Fax: (+31 318) 660950
E-mail: taej.mundkur@wetlands.org

Mr. John **O'Sullivan**
CMS Appointed Councillor (Birds)
14 Gast Hatley
Sandy, SG19 3JA
UNITED KINGDOM
Tel.: (+44 1 767) 650 688
E-mail: johnosullivan@tiscali.co.uk

Prof. Alfred **Oteng-Yeboah**
CMS Appointed Councillor (African Fauna)
Council for Scientific and Industrial Research
CSIR-Ghana, C/o Wildlife Division
Forestry Commission of Ghana
Accra
GHANA
Tel: (+233 24) 477 2256
Fax: (+233 21) 777 655
E-mail: otengyeboah@yahoo.co.uk

Dr. William F. **Perrin**
Appointed Councillor (Aquatic Mammals)
Senior Scientist
U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA
Southwest Fisheries Science Center
3333 Torrey Pines Court
La Jolla CA 92122
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Tel.: (+1 858) 546 7096
Fax: (+1 858) 546 7003
E-mail: william.perrin@noaa.gov

**Governmental Observers / Observateurs de Gouvernements /
Observadores Gubernamentales**

KYRGYZSTAN
Mr. Askar Davletbakov
Senior Scientist
Academy of Science; via GTZ, Sustainable
Natural Resource Use in Central Asia
Panfilowa 150
720040 Bishkek
Kyrgyzstan
Tel: (+996 550) 965108
E-mail: askar_davl@rambler.ru

NETHERLANDS
Dr. Erik van Zadelhoff
Senior Policy Advisor
Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food
Security
Prins Clauslaan
The Netherlands
Tel: (+31)703784921 (O) (+31 6) 11063740
(mobile)
E-mail: f.j.van.zadelhoff@minlnv.nl

SAUDI ARABIA
Mr. Mohammad S. Sulayem
Advisor on International Cooperation
Saudi Wildlife Commission
P.O. Box 61681
Riyadh 11575
Saudi Arabia
Tel: (+966) 1448413
Fax: (+966) 506467787
E-mail: msulayem2@yahoo.com

SOUTH AFRICA
Ms. Malta Qwathekana
Senior Policy Advisor
Department of Environmental Affairs
P/Bag X447
Pretoria 0001
South Africa
Tel: (+27) 123103067
Fax: (+27) 123201714
E-mail: mqwathekana@environment.gov.za

Ms. Humbulani Mafumo
Deputy Director
Conservation Management
Department of Environmental Affairs
P/Bag X447
Pretoria 0001
South Africa
Tel: (+27 12) 310 3712
Fax: (+27 86) 541 1122
E-mail: hmafuno@environment.gov.za

UNITED KINGDOM
Dr James M. Williams
Indicators & Reporting Manager
Joint Nature Conservation Committee
Monkstone House, City Road
Peterborough PE1 1JY
United Kingdom
Tel: (+44 1733) 86 68 68
Fax: (+44 1733) 55 59 48
Email: james.williams@jncc.gov.uk

Intergovernmental and Non-Governmental Organization Observers /
Observateurs d'Organisations Intergouvernementales et Non
Gouvernementales / Observadores de Organizaciones
Intergubernamentales y No Gubernamentales

AMBASSADOR CMS

Mr. Ian Redmond
CMS Ambassador
Windy Gables, Rodborough Lane
Stroud GL5 1BG
United Kingdom
Tel: (+44 7769) 743975
E-mail: ele@globalnet.co.uk

AEWA

Mr. Sergey Dereliev
AEWA Secretariat
Hermann-Ehlers-Str.10
53113 Bonn, Germany
Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2415
Fax: (+49 228) 815 2450
E-mail: sdereliev@unep.de

ASCOBANS

Ms. Heidrun Frisch
ASCOBANS Secretariat
Hermann-Ehlers-Str.10
53113 Bonn, Germany
Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2418
Fax: (+49 228) 815 2440
E-mail: h.frisch@ascobans.org

BIRDLIFE INTERNATIONAL

Ms. Nicola J Crockford
International Species Policy Officer
The RSPB - BirdLife in the UK
UK Headquarters
The Lodge, Sandy, Bedfordshire SG19 2DL
UK
Tel: (+44 1767) 693072
Fax: (+44 1767) 683211
E-mail: nicola.crockford@rspb.org.uk

CITES

Mr. David H.W. Morgan
Chief, Scientific Support Unit
CITES Secretariat
Maison internationale de l'environnement
Chemin des Anemones
CH-1219 Chatelaine, Geneva
Switzerland
Tel: (+41 22) 917 81 23
Fax: (+41 22) 797 34 17
Email: david.morgan@cites.org

**FOOD & AGRICULTURE ORGANISATION
OF THE UNITED NATIONS**

Mr. Scott Newman
EMPRES Wildlife Unit Coordinator
Animal Health Officer
Emergency Center for Transboundary Animal
Diseases, Animal Production and Health Division
Food & Agriculture Organisation of the UN
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, Rome 00153
Italy
Tel: (+39 6) 570 53068
Fax: (+39 6) 570 53023
E-mail: scott.newman@fao.org

GERMAN TECHNICAL COOPERATION

Ms. Aziza Madaminova
(GTZ Translator)
German Technical Cooperation GTZ
Koethener Str. 31
10963 Berlin
Germany
Tel: (+49 61) 96792397
Fax: (+49 61) 9679802397
E-mail: aziza.madaminova@gtz.de

**INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR
FALCONRY AND CONSERVATION OF
BIRDS OF PREY**

Mr. Christian de Coune
Committee Member
International Association for Falconry and
Conservation of Birds of Prey
Thier des Forges.85
B.4140 Gomze-Andoumont
Belgium
Tel: (+32 4) 76461424
Fax: (+32 4) 3684015
E-mail: info@christian-dec.be

INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION

Dr. William Perrin
Southwest Fisheries Science Center
8604 La Jolla Shores Drive
La Jolla, CA 92037
USA
Tel: (+1 858) 546 7096
Fax: (+1 858) 546 7003
E-mail: william.perrin@noaa.gov

**INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR ANIMAL
WELFARE (IFAW)**

Mr. Peter Poeschel
Programme Director
International Policy and Conventions
IFAW - International Fund for Animal Welfare
IFAW EU Office
Bpi;avard Char;e,agme 1 (Bte 72)
B-1041 Brussels
Belgium
Tel: (+49 641) 250 11 586
Fax: (+49 641) 250 11 587
E-mail: ppoeschel@ifaw.org

RAMSAR

Mr. Lew Young
Senior Regional Advisor for Asia-Oceania
Ramsar Convention Secretariat
Rue Mauverney 28
1196 Gland
Switzerland
Tel: (+41 79) 290 2625
Fax: (+41 22) 999 0169
E-mail: young@ramsar.org

**UNEP WORLD CONSERVATION
MONITORING CENTRE**

Dr. Gerardo Fragoso
Head - Species Programme
UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre
219 Huntingdon Road
Cambridge, CB3 0DL
United Kingdom
Tel: (+44 1223) 277314
Fax: (+44 1223) 277136
E-mail: gerardo.fragoso@unep-wcmc.org

WETLANDS INTERNATIONAL

Dr. Taej **Mundkur**
Programme Manager - Flyways
Wetlands International
Horapark 9 (2nd Floor)
6717 LZ Ede
The Netherlands
Tel: (+31 318) 660910
Fax: (+31 318) 660950
E-mail: taej.mundkur@wetlands.org

WILDFOWL & WETLANDS TRUST (WWT)

Ms. Rebecca Lee
Senior Species Conservation Officer
Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust (WWT)
Slimbridge
Cloucestershire, GL11 4BG
United Kingdom
Tel: (+44 1453) 891120
Fax: (+44 1453) 890827
E-mail: Rebecca.Lee@wwt.org.uk

ZOOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF LONDON

Dr. Ben Collen
Head of Indicators & Assessments Unit
Zoological Society of London
Regent's Park
London NW1 4RY
United Kingdom
Tel: (+44 207) 449 6642
E-mail: ben.collen@ioz.ac.uk

Secretariat/Secretaría

UNEP/CMS Secretariat
Hermann-Ehlers-Str.10
53113 Bonn, Germany
Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2401
Fax: (+49 228) 815 2449
E-mail:secretariat@cms.int

Dr. Borja Heredia
Scientific and Technical Officer
Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2422
E-mail: bheredia@cms.int

Ms. Elizabeth Maruma Mrema
Executive Secretary
Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2410
E-mail: emrema@cms.int

Mr. Bert Lenten
Acting Deputy Executive Secretary
Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2407
E-mail: blenten@cms.int

Ms. Laura Cerasi
Associate Fundraising Officer
Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2483
E-mail: lcerasi@cms.int

Dr. Aline Kühl
Associate Technical Officer
Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2436
E-mail: akuel@cms.int

Ms. Heidrun Frisch
Marine Associate Officer
Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2418
E-mail: mfrisch@cms.int

Dr. Marco Barbieri
Agreements Officer
Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2424
E-mail: mbarbieri@cms.int

Ms. Melanie Virtue
Inter-Agency Liaison Officer
Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2462
E-mail: mvirtue@cms.int

Dr. Francisco Rilla
Information Officer
Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2460
E-mail: frilla@cms.int

Ms. Linette Lamare
Programme Assistant
Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2423
E-mail: llamare@cms.int

Ms. Marie Mevellec
Secretary
Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2456
E-mail: mmevellec@cms.int

Mr. Robert Vagg
Consultant (Report Writer)
Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2476
E-mail: rvagg@cms.int

Ms. Laura Aguado
Consultant
Tel.: (+49 228) 815 2461
E-mail: laguado@cms.int

CMS Interns:

Mr. Philipp Zimmermann
Ms. Polina Khrychera
Mr. Alexandre Ghafari
Ms. Cassandra Fernandes