

**CONVENTION ON  
MIGRATORY  
SPECIES**

Distribution: General

UNEP/CMS/ScC18/Report

Original: English

---

STRATEGIC AND PLANNING MEETING  
OF THE SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL  
Formia (Italy), 9-11 October 2013

**MEETING REPORT****1. Opening Remarks**

Fernando Spina (Chair, Italy) opened proceedings, welcoming the Councillors and Secretariat staff and explained that the primary purpose of the meeting was to consider ways in which the CMS Scientific Council could improve its efficiency and better serve the Convention's needs.

Bradnee Chambers (CMS Executive Secretary) said that the meeting's agenda included two issues of paramount importance. The first related to the Future Shape process and the need to address strengthening the effectiveness of the Scientific Council and the second was the gap analysis of the Convention's Appendices species. CMS like the other MEAs present at the meeting of the Chairs of Scientific and Advisory Bodies (CSAB) two days previously had to deal with wider environmental governance.

Mr Chambers concluded his opening remarks by saying that he was looking forward to a frank, open and friendly discussion of the issues over the coming days and by thanking the chair, the regional government of Lazio and the Regional Park of Riviera di Ulisse.

The Chair then invited all those present to introduce themselves briefly. A list of participants can be found at Annex I.

**2. Adoption of the agenda**

The draft agenda had been circulated in advance. As there were no comments, it was adopted as presented.

### **3. Planning, assessment and gap analysis of the Scientific Council (PAGA)**

Mr Chambers gave a presentation outlining options for reforming the Scientific Council, stressing that the ideas contained in it were meant to stimulate discussion and were not a *fait accompli*. A proposal would be put to the COP after full consultation.

The Convention had a mandate from COP Resolution 10.9 to undertake a review, examining the options to restructure the Council to maximize its efficiency. The idea of reforming the Council had first been raised as long ago as COP7 in 2002. The current structure had strengths and weaknesses, and lessons could be learned from the advisory bodies of other MEAs and greater synergies achieved with the other instruments within the CMS Family. MEAs were expected to work together through bodies such as the CSAB and CMS had a clear niche role within the wider strategy of environmental governance.

The views of the Council itself would be invaluable, and the discussion while primarily concentrating on the scientific aspects, should take account of political considerations. The aim would be for the Secretariat to draw up an options paper to be circulated to all interested parties for comment and ultimately for the COP to make a decision. If possible, the changes would be made without the need to amend the text of the Convention, as re-ratifying the treaty would be time consuming. A legal opinion could be sought from either UNEP HQ or the UN Office of Legal Affairs (UNOLA) on the extent to which changes could be implemented without requiring changes to the Convention text.

A survey of Councillors' expertise had shown that there were numerous specialists for birds, forest habitats and wetlands, but some key areas were underrepresented or not represented at all. On threats, there was wide knowledge of issues relating to habitat and climate, hunting and invasive alien species, but gaps e.g. regarding ship collisions, oil pollution, electrocution, and acoustic and light pollution.

CMS was a relatively old Convention originating from the 1972 Stockholm Conference. The CMS model (allowing each Party to nominate a Councillor plus nine COP-appointees resulting in a membership of circa 100) was not followed by later treaties such as those arising from the Rio Summit and the Ozone Convention. Many of these later MEAs had a two-tier advisory system – a wide pool of experts with a smaller (c. 20-member) body composed of regional representatives, specialist experts and technical bodies (the model used by AEWA within the CMS Family). They also had a dedicated funding mechanism attached to them.

The Chair welcomed the Executive Secretary's presentation, which had set the role of the CMS Scientific Council in the broader context of the family of biodiversity-related MEAs represented at the CSAB. Experience had shown that many members of the Council did not have enough time to fulfil their role properly and even innovations such as the workspace had only had a marginal effect on increasing the level of participation. The experience of AEWA with its workspace was different as a dedicated staff member was available to drive the discussions forward. The Chair suggested that the Secretariat should in future inform the institutions employing councillors of the requirements of the

post. It was said that it was unlikely that any individual would have the full range of expertise to cover all the issues being dealt with by the Council. It was time to consider the role of the Scientific Council and how it could best exploit the unique niche role of the Convention in contributing to policy on protected areas, seasonality, connectivity and climate change, given the potential for using migratory species as a vehicle.

Rodrigo Medellín (COP-appointed councillor for Neotropical fauna) described his experience of working for ten years with CITES, whose Animals and Plants Committees each with 13 members seemed to have evolved differently from the CMS Scientific Council. Parties had greater incentive under CITES to act in their national interest and Mr Medellín asked whether this was also the case with the nationally appointed councillors in CMS. Generally it was felt that nationally appointed councillors were unbiased but were sometimes subject to political pressure.

Zeb Hogan (COP-appointed councillor for freshwater fish) said that the strength of the CMS Scientific Council was its integrity and objectivity. Many of the COP-appointed councillors had also been in post for some time providing the continuity that a high turnover of nationally appointed members made difficult to achieve, and leadership on the issues within their portfolios. His experience was that the Council was not over-politicized, a view shared by Bill Perrin who spoke of his different experiences in two other organizations, the IWC and IUCN. He thought that meetings should be kept as small as possible and that more work should be done through intersessional ad hoc working groups.

Leon Bennun (COP-appointed councillor for birds) said that the Council should also be compared with the Ramsar Scientific and Technical Review Panel (STRP); this body was made up of experts but seemed to be rather divorced from policy implementation and operated in something of a vacuum. The Council might be unwieldy but it seemed to work, with the nationally appointed councillors often providing a political reality check. He feared that reducing the size of the Council might make the appointment of national members or regional representatives political.

Colin Limpus (COP-appointed councillor for marine turtles) said that CMS had very Eurocentric origins with a strong focus on birds and terrestrial mammals. This had led to the imbalance of the Council's taxonomic working groups, with large numbers attending the avian group and only a handful the marine turtle one. Some taxonomic groups attracted the attention of NGOs (WDC was active in the marine mammals group) but there was no such engagement regarding marine turtles. He also said that he received little feedback from Parties and commented on the low level of expertise on marine science in some countries. MOUs could have a greater role in the detailed aspects of implementation.

Mr Perrin (COP-appointed councillor for aquatic mammals) said that the regional agreements usually had their own rosters of experts familiar with the local issues, so the parent Convention should focus on those areas with no instruments in place. The Secretariat should identify both the themes and the appropriate experts to lead them. This might entail maintaining a database of scientists and their areas of expertise. As there

were a great many cross-cutting issues affecting various taxa and of interest to other bodies, the Convention should seek to collaborate with partners, such as the IUCN Taxonomic Specialist Groups.

Malta Qwathekana (Vice-chair of the Scientific Council and scientific councillor for South Africa) suggested one solution to the problem of councillors being too detached from government was the establishment of a national CMS committee as had been done in South Africa. She had advertised for experts with knowledge of a range of species to provide her with information in her capacity of nationally appointed councillor.

The Chair summarizing the discussion so far said that two issues had emerged: the first being the size of the council and how to ensure representation if its membership were reduced substantially; and the second was how the Convention should strike the balance between scientific and political considerations.

The Secretariat had looked at a number of models with various schemes of regional representation coupled with COP-appointees, with an average membership of 20; the regional representatives would be drawn from the larger pool of national nominees. It was also envisaged that much of the work of the Council would be undertaken in smaller groups, operating intersessionally and through electronic communication. Mr Hogan wondered whether anything would be gained by establishing an additional tier in the structure which might entail holding consultation meetings. Mr Mundkur stressed the importance of regional representatives consulting other countries. Mr Biber said that the Convention text made clear that Parties could nominate a councillor (although the COP decided on the *modus operandi*), so major changes would mean amending the treaty.

After some discussion, consensus emerged that the COP-appointed councillors should attend the COP, where they could lead side events and be available to take questions. With the development of electronic means of communication it was not necessary for the Council to meet physically as frequently as it had before. More work could be done through thematic, regional and taxonomic working groups. Efforts needed to be made however to ensure that the online workspace was as attractive to French and Spanish speakers as it was to Anglophones.

The slides comprising Mr Chambers' presentation are attached to this report as Annex II.

#### **Action Points**

- The Secretariat should contact the institutes/agencies employing Scientific Councillors explaining the level of commitment required and the prestige of association with the Convention.
- The *pros* and *cons* of other models such as the one based on the Ramsar Scientific and Technical Review Panel, which provides pure scientific advice but is divorced from practical implementation, should be considered.
- The Secretariat to consider establishing a database of experts which Councillors could

consult if they need to people with specialist knowledge.

- The Secretariat would draft an options paper for formal consultation with a view to a decision being taken by the Parties at COP11 on the future structure of the Council. Including one option with the pure science and political considerations dealt with by separate bodies.
- Consideration should be given to seeking legal advice from UNEP or UNOLA regarding the extent of the changes possible without having to amend and re-ratify the Convention.
- Investigate the scope of greater cooperation between the Scientific Council and the technical bodies of the other members of the CMS Family as foreseen by the Future Shape process.

#### **4. Presentation of Reports from the taxonomic and thematic Working Groups**

Reports were taken from the Appointed Councillors with responsibility for a taxonomic group and from the Chairs of Working Groups. All the presentations have been posted on the CMS Website.

##### **a. Aquatic Mammals / Bill Perrin**

Mr Perrin reported that the Working Group's progress had been impeded by its lack of members with at times only one or two other participants, so efforts had been made to involve experts from outside the Council. Of 85 experts invited to participate, 34 had accepted including specialists from the UK, Australia and South Africa. The Working Group had a section on the Scientific Council Workspace and all members of the Group were informed of new information and the species being proposed for inclusion on the Appendices.

Two proposals had been received for adding species to the CMS Appendices. One submitted by the Migratory Wildlife Network concerned the Polar bear (*Ursus maritimus*) for inclusion on both Appendices. The second concerned the Mediterranean population of Cuvier's beaked whale (*Ziphius cavirostris*) for which noise pollution was a major threat and was being proposed by ACCOBAMS. A number of further draft proposals were under development; these concerned the Beluga (*Delphinapterus leucas*), the Narwhal (*Monodon monoceros*) and north-eastern Atlantic population of the Orca (*Orcinus orca*) together with its transient form from the north-western Pacific, and the White-beaked Dolphin (*Lagenorhynchus albirostris*).

Resolution 10.15 had requested that a workshop be held on cetacean social culture and the implications for CMS conservation priorities. The workshop was being organized in conjunction with WDC and would be held in London in April 2014 with Giuseppe

Notarbartolo di Sciara as chairman. Although not within the direct remit of the Working Group, three reviews required under Resolution 10.4 on marine debris were under way. Mr Perrin's presentation can be found at Annex III.

#### **b. Birds / Leon Bennun**

Mr Bennun reported that the Working Group had not met since the last meeting of the Council but progress had been made on a number of issues related to birds through use of the Workspace and opportunities presented for informal contacts during meetings such as the BirdLife International Congress. No proposals had been actively sought for amendments because of the lack of clarity regarding the listing criteria.

The principal developments included the ad hoc meeting on avian taxonomy where the importance of the IUCN Red List for a number of CMS instruments had been stressed. CITES, CMS, AEWa and the Raptors MOU would analyze the implications of the provisional new non-passerine list being prepared by BirdLife International.

Funding from the UK and the Raptors MOU had enabled a coordinator (Symone Krimowa, based at RSPB) to be appointed for work on the poisoning resolution adopted at COP10. A Workshop, chaired by Richard Shore (CEH) had been held in Tunis in May 2013 where reviews of rodenticides, agro-chemicals, veterinary pharmaceuticals, lead and poison baits had been produced.

The Saker Falcon Task Force had met in March 2012 and again in September 2013, the latter meeting held back-to-back with a Stakeholder Workshop. Funding had been secured from the Saudi Wildlife Authority, the European Commission and the CITES Secretariat.

Clearer terms of reference were needed to guide activities to be undertaken under Resolution 10.23 (Concerted and Cooperative Actions). Establishing a CMS Working Group on energy might be considered to follow up the resolution on power lines (Resolution 10.11). The revision of NBSAPs and the Friends of Aichi Target 12 provided opportunities for building partnerships and synergies as foreseen in Resolution 10.12. The emergence of influenza virus H7N9 had not yet been linked to wild birds, but the same questions were being raised as before. The unsustainable level of taking of birds was a cause for concern in Egypt and Libya and the Secretariat had responded by offering assistance to the Egyptian Government. Good news however was being received from Nagaland (India) and the trapping of Amur falcons (*Falco amurensis*).

The slides comprising Mr Bennun's presentation can be found at Annex IV.

#### **c. Freshwater fish / Zeb Hogan**

Mr Hogan reminded the meeting that 5 fish species were listed on CMS Appendix I and 27 on Appendix II, covering a number of sturgeons, seven sharks (some added at COP9), a cat fish and the Giant Manta ray, added to both Appendices at COP10. At COP10 four

proposals had been received from Paraguay to list freshwater fish species. The Council had asked for the proposals to be reworked.

Some further shark and ray species were also being considered with draft proposals in circulation awaiting Parties to table them. There were several potential candidate species for which no CMS Party was a range state; this was particularly true of fish in the Mekong where dam building was affecting migration.

The Sharks MOU was attracting interest from non-Parties (notably the USA) and was a new venture for CMS in the marine environment. It was however questionable whether CMS was the most appropriate forum for tuna conservation, because there were RFMOs in place to deal with these fisheries. There was also scope in South America for the Convention and other marine fish species to expand its interest in this area. Finally, the UN General Assembly had established an ad hoc Working Group on areas beyond national jurisdiction (ABNJ).

Barry Baker (COP-appointed councillor for bycatch) emphasized the importance of working with RFMOs especially with regard to bycatch. Some RFMOs were more relevant to CMS and its instruments than others; ACAP regularly attended meetings of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC).

Taej Mundkur (COP-appointed councillor for Asiatic fauna) said that the South American office of Wetlands International was active in projects relating to fish. It was frustrating that the CMS Small Grants Programme was restricted to species already listed, as research into non-listed fish could be useful and might attract the interest of non-Parties. He also mentioned World Fish Migration Day, which was an initiative similar to World Migratory Bird Day and was attracting growing interest.

Olivier Biber (Chair of the African-Eurasian Migratory Landbirds Working Group) said that CMS had proposed a project to IPBES concerning the High Seas and as CBD's lead partner with regard to the conservation and sustainable use of migratory species, CMS should be eligible for funding under GEF. The Chair stressed the importance of ensuring that migratory species were considered at the next IPBES plenary meeting in Turkey and that the Convention maintained its profile in this forum.

The slides comprising Mr Hogan's presentation can be found at Annex V.

#### **Action Points**

- The Secretariat should seek a COP mandate to continue its involvement in issues relating to marine fish and the High Seas and areas beyond national jurisdiction.
- Consideration should be given to supporting World Fish Migration Day as a means of promoting the profile of the Convention
- Migratory species should be considered at the next IPBES plenary meeting in Turkey in December 2013

#### **d. Climate change / Colin Galbraith**

In the absence of Colin Galbraith (COP-appointed councillor for climate change), Borja Heredia (CMS Secretariat) gave an account of progress made by the Climate Change Working Group. Work was concentrating on developing a CMS Programme of Work on Climate Change and the Secretariat was in the process of recruiting a dedicated team of interns. There were plans to hold a Workshop, possibly jointly organized with another MEA. Promises of financial support had been received from Germany and Monaco along with an invitation from Costa Rica.

#### **e. Flyways / Taej Mundkur**

Mr Mundkur explained that COP9 had set up the Flyways Working Group, which had looked beyond the immediate CMS Family and had sought experts from regions where the Convention was not well established to complement the COP-appointed and national councillors and representatives of CMS instruments and partner NGOs. The Secretariat had organized a meeting of the Working Group in 2010 with the support of the Government of Switzerland and a Resolution on flyways had been adopted at COP10.

There was a wide range of frameworks operating in the world's major flyways: the Americas, Africa-Eurasia, Central Asia, East Asia-Australasia, and the Pacific. CMS was actively cooperating with a number of partners, including CAFF in the Arctic, Western Hemisphere Migratory Species Initiative (WHMSI) and Western Hemisphere Shorebird Reserve Network (WHSRN) in the Americas, and Ramsar and CITES globally.

The Central Asian Flyway Action Plan overlapped with the area already covered by AEWA and the sites identified under the GEF-funded wetland project focusing on the Siberian Crane. Work was also under way for passerines through the African-Eurasian landbirds initiative and a meeting to elaborate an Action Plan had taken place in Accra, Ghana in August 2012.

The level of activity was lowest at the moment in the Pacific flyway. The countries of the region were predominantly small island developing states (SIDS) with low internal capacity facing problems associated with climate change. Addressing the detrimental effects of invasive alien species on endemic flora and fauna was the top priority. CMS had some Parties in the region and a presence in the SPREP office in Samoa.

The next Strategic Plan to be agreed at COP11 needed a simple and achievable Programme of Work, while the Flyways Working Group should be continued with an expanded membership. If sufficient funds were available, a meeting or series of regional meetings should be organized possibly in cooperation with other bodies.

The fifth meeting of "Partners in Flight" had taken place in Utah, USA, and showed that there were opportunities for CMS to reach out to the USA. Mr Medellín suggested that this was true for taxa other than birds and the trilateral meeting between Canada, Mexico and the USA would be held in Mexico in 2014, where CMS could raise its profile.

World Migratory Bird Day had begun in 2006 as a response to the negative publicity arising from avian influenza and had had gone from strength to strength. Mr Mundkur strongly supported the continuation of the annual campaigns.

The slides comprising Mr Mundkur's presentation can be found at Annex VI.

#### **Action Point**

- Consideration should be given to high level participation by CMS at the USA-Canada-Mexico trilateral meeting in Mexico in 2014

#### **f. Terrestrial mammals / Roseline Beudels**

Roseline Beudels-Jamar de Bolsée (Chair of the Terrestrial Mammals Working Group) reported that apart from the Agreements and MOUs, there were two multi-species concerted actions and CMS had been developing a niche area in aridlands, a biome where NGOs had been withdrawing staff.

##### Sahelo-Saharan Antelopes

With regard to Sahelo-Saharan antelopes, a meeting had been held in Djerba, Tunisia in 1998 leading in 2012 to the declaration of the Termit Tin Toumma Nature Reserve in Niger. The NGO Sahara Conservation Fund had been founded as a direct result of CMS actions, and the Sahelo-Saharan Interest Group (SSIG) which had been set up after the meeting in Djerba now met annually. The work funded by the European Commission and the *Fonds Français pour l'Environnement Mondial* (FFEM) had started in more modest form as a project supported by the Small Grants Programme.

##### Central Asian Aridland Mammals

An Action Plan was being drafted and it would be ready to be submitted to the full meeting of the Council. Border fences and other barriers to migration were one of the main problems and these had been discussed at a workshop on the island of Vilm (Germany).

A number of species were under consideration for inclusion in the Appendices: proposals were being drafted for the Tibetan antelope and the Gaur and some more were in preparation.

The slides comprising Ms Beudels' presentation can be found at Annex VII.

### **g. Marine Turtles / Colin Limpus**

Mr Limpus opened his presentation by explaining that all species of marine turtles had been on the CMS Appendices since the Convention's inception. The COP had first appointed Mr Limpus as the dedicated councillor for marine turtles in 1995.

In 1999 an MOU was developed that covered the entire coast of West Africa and all range states on the continent had signed it. Initially, CMS provided administrative services and in the early dates the MOU was very dynamic. Later, arrangements were made with Senegal for a secretariat to be established in a NEPAD office in Dakar but the MOU had become increasingly dormant.

The IOSEA MOU was ratified in 2001 and now had 33 signatories, including the USA, the UK and France, and a track record of being able to raise funds. The MOU had a secretariat based in Bangkok and an up-to-date website, and was achieving some international impact with governments. However, without the secretariat, Signatory States would unlikely be able to carry on the work as capacity was not being developed across the agreement area.

Outside CMS there was one treaty, the Inter-American Sea Turtle Convention with 15 parties. It had started as a bilateral arrangement between the USA and Mexico but now involved other countries in the region, but notably only one island state. The treaty had the support of governments and NGOs and was beginning to bear fruit as populations were recovering. In the Caribbean, there was also a successful government-NGO partnership called *Widecast* launched in 1981 through the UNEP Regional Office.

When SPREP was set up in the 1980s, marine turtles were soon seen as a priority. A regional programme for marine turtles was established and was currently part of a wider marine species scheme. Countries in the region lacked capacity, and with the exception of the Solomon Islands' hawksbill, virtually all turtle populations had an unfavourable conservation status.

There was a long-standing bilateral arrangement between the Philippines and Malaysia. Despite the fact that the two countries had still not resolved ownership disputes over some small islands, agreement had been reached on protecting the turtles, and ecotourism had been developed in Sabah.

Marine turtles faced both local and global threats. MOUs were good at addressing the global threats, but needed to improve their approach to the local ones, and one possibility would be for providing advice to countries on solutions and engaging local communities as well as governments. It seemed to have been wrong to have excluded the IUCN and the CMS Scientific Council from the MOU's technical group. MOUs were also organized politically rather than ecologically (animals hatched on beaches of Queensland and New Caledonia could be found in New Zealand and Peru).

Alfred Oteng-Yeboah (COP-appointed councillor for African fauna) said that there was some activity in West Africa and under the Abidjan Convention, turtle conservation was again on the agenda. Ms Qwathekana was concerned that the MOU did not seem to be effective, which could be addressed by synergies with other CMS instruments.

Mr Chambers said that the Secretariat was aware of the shortcomings of certain MOUs and was looking at ways of making them more effective, partly through consolidation and increasing cooperation. MOUs that had a lead country seemed generally to operate best and all such instruments needed to be financially viable.

The slides comprising Mr Limpus's presentation can be found at Annex VIII.

#### **h. Bycatch / Barry Baker**

Reporting on activities since the last meeting of the Scientific Council, Mr Baker said that he was operating to a ten-point programme of work. Bycatch was the most significant threat facing a range of marine taxa in all of the world's oceans. COP6 was the first to adopt a resolution on the subject and there had been resolutions and recommendations adopted at every COP since then.

The progress achieved had been uneven. Mr Baker had remained in contact with all members of the Working Group and, while working with ACAP, had been able to attend various meetings of Regional Fisheries Management Organizations. No progress had been made regarding the risk assessment and the webpage had also not developed significantly. Mr Baker was working with Heidrun Frisch at the CMS Secretariat on a database of relevant literature. The literature would be posted on the Council's workspace.

With regard to Resolution 10.14 on gillnets, a consultant had been appointed to undertake a review. A workshop was due to take place in New Zealand in late October to investigate how nets caught seabirds. A fisherman had designed a smart tuna hook with a shield and a pin which dissolved ten minutes after immersion. Given that the tuna industry was worth US\$4 billion annually and that two billion hooks were set each year, its introduction could have significant benefits. David Kellian was also working on new bottom line gear in response to Black Petrel bycatch and trials of the prototype had revealed some design faults.

There were 17 RFMOs worldwide and four or five had been selected for closer attention. Mr Baker welcomed the news that CMS would take a more active stance in engaging RFMOs as he would no longer be attending their meetings. He was disappointed that CMS Parties often took a conservationist line at CMS but supported contradictory positions at RFMOs. Artisanal fisheries were largely ignored and smaller operators were rarely taken into account despite their potential impact. They were not organized in umbrella bodies so had to be approached individually.

Mr Baker concluded his comments by thanking Heidrun Frisch, the ACAP Secretariat, the Southern Seabirds Solutions Trust and the Government of New Zealand for their assistance and support. The slides comprising the presentation can be found at Annex IX.

**i. Landbirds / Olivier Biber (Chair of the African-Eurasian Migratory Landbirds Working Group)**

The Working Group established by COP Resolution 10.27 on African-Eurasian migratory landbirds had met in Accra in 2012 to develop an Action Plan. An initial draft Plan had been prepared by the Coordinator, Mr Samuel Temidayo Osinubi, and this had been circulated within the Group for comment. The next steps were for the draft Plan to be translated into French and Spanish and submitted to the Standing Committee in November 2013 for consultation. Then the 2014 Council meeting would be asked to endorse the final draft and then the document would be submitted for adoption at COP11.

There had been long discussion of the area to be covered by the Action Plan. Some advocated including Alaska so that the migration of the European Wheatear could be covered. The meeting had decided to exclude Mongolia and China but to include Greenland in the West and Afghanistan and India in the East.

The Chair recognized the challenge of developing an Action Plan for such a diverse range of species with their different habitat preferences and broad front migration habits. He also thanked the Government of Switzerland for its support of the initiative.

Concluding Comments

Ms Qwathekana asked whether a more regional approach to the work of the Council could be considered. She wanted to know whether the Convention could provide support to Appointed Councillors travelling to workshops and whether staff could be assigned to assist particular regions. Mr Chambers said that there was scope for using the UNDP network of offices and academic and governmental institutions in the Parties.

Drawing Agenda Item 4 to a close, the Chair commented that the reports received indicated that a considerable amount of work was being done by the Working Groups to advance the Convention's understanding of the issues.

**Action Points**

- The Secretariat would table a proposal at COP to enhance the Convention's work in the regions
- The current drafts of the African-Eurasian Migratory Landbirds Action Plan and annexes should be sent for translation into French and Spanish in order to meet the deadline for posting Standing Committee documents. Priority should be given to the French translation given that there were several francophone countries among the Range States

## **5. Gaps in threats and challenges to migratory species; emerging issues**

The Chair opened the agenda item suggesting that one solution for addressing knowledge gaps would be to have more COP-appointed councillors; another would be to change the way the current councillors operated.

The workspace seemed to be a means well suited to extending participation while minimizing the need for physical meetings. All councillors were aware of its existence but there had been some resistance to registering (200 people had now done so) and should realise that it was meant to be the main means of communication between meetings. There was an issue about the predominance of the use of English compared it French and Spanish, which prevented some members from participating fully.

Mr Biber suggested informing the NFPs what sort of person the Council needed, namely a scientist interested in contributing to the work of the Council. Most suitable candidates would at least able to read English as this was the language in which most scientific literature was published.

The Secretariat had an obligation to present an options paper to the COP and would prepare an initial draft on which those attending the present meeting and the full Council membership would be consulted. Mr Chambers presented a diagram with an option for the future structure for providing scientific advice, discussing options and making policy decisions. A scaled-down advisory body of approximately 20 members would be more cost-effective.. The COP-appointed councillors would also be funded to attend the Conference of the Parties. Regional representation was commonly used throughout the UN system, as neighbouring countries often shared the same concerns.

Mr Limpus felt that the new structure would place more responsibility on the taxonomic and thematic Working Groups, and accordingly more thought should be given to their composition. Using the example of marine turtles, he suggested Working Groups should include the relevant COP-appointed councillor and representatives of the IUCN SSG, the two CMS MOUs, SPREP, the Inter-American Turtle Convention and observers from qualified NGOs. This model was essentially the one adopted by the Flyways Working Group.

Mr Bennun welcomed the idea of Working Groups being open to outside experts, but felt that this structure would have to entail an increase in the number of COP-appointees. Members of the advisory body would need not just scientific expertise but also awareness of the science-policy interface. Rather than splitting the science-policy interface off into a separate body as indicated on the diagram, he suggested that the Council liaise with the Standing Committee for “reality checks”.

Mr Biber voiced his misgivings over regional representation as this would possibly lead to a bias towards the North and West. This would be contrary to the policy from the capacity building agenda of promoting collaboration with the South and East.

Mr Chambers said that his proposal was an attempt to address the problems faced by the Convention arising from there not being sufficient resources for full meetings of the Council. Other MEAs (e.g. CITES and Ramsar) operated with smaller representative advisory bodies. The North/West-South/East issue was a real concern that could be addressed by varying venues, establishing a special travel fund or seeking support from UNDP.

The Chair reminded the meeting of a paper he had circulated in which he proposed some rearrangement of responsibilities without increasing the number of appointed councillors, which would entail establishing groups for migratory species as indicators of habitat quality and climate change and sustainable use. Mr Hogan said that the proposal to establish a working group on migratory fish within the IUCN-Wetlands International partnership presented an opportunity to CMS to seek synergies. Mr Mundkur said that there were ad hoc arrangements being developed to increase cooperation between CMS and the IUCN SSG; consideration might be given to formalizing such arrangements. Mr Heredia pointed out that formal requests had already been received to make IUCN a permanent observer to the Scientific Council, while the Chair said that IPBES was a forum in which CMS could promote its objectives with potential partners.

#### **Action Point**

- The Secretariat would take note of all the comments made and draft an options paper for submission to COP. The draft would be circulated to those attending the present meeting and the full Council membership

#### Gap Analysis

Mr Heredia opened the discussion on the gap analysis which was another exercise arising from the Future Shape process. Consideration of the viability of existing MOUs was being dealt with separately. Mr Stahl stressed that the document was a draft and further input would be welcome.

Mr Medellín said that there were significant gaps as many terrestrial mammals in South America were missing. He asked whether he should provide a comprehensive list or the main priorities. An important issue was the deaths of bats caused by wind turbines.

The Chair pointed out that wind farms were an issue that CMS could raise with the Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA), and Sergey Dereliev (AEWA Secretariat) said that there was already a joint project under way among CMS, AEWA, BirdLife International and IRENA looking at the impact of renewable energy installations on migratory species. The terms of reference had been approved by the Council and the consultants had been appointed and drafts of the inception report would be circulated in due course.

Mr Heredia said that CMS was often perceived as being primarily a species Convention not sufficiently concerned about habitats; this view was also expressed in Wild

Migration's report "A Natural Affiliation", a document that had been tabled for the meeting. However, the text of the Convention mentioned and the areas the Council was expected to consider included habitat protection. The Chair commented that while enough habitat were available for some species, barriers prevented species from making use of them. Ms Beudels added that the conservation value of aridlands was not appreciated as they were seen as to be wastelands to be converted to other purposes.

The Chair said that the issue of "connectivity" was a strong one for CMS to emphasize, along with flyways and corridors and emerging issues such as areas beyond national jurisdiction in the High Seas.

Mr Biber warned against over-compartmentalizing issues; he recalled moves to remove consideration of climate change from the CBD agenda because some delegates believed that this was an issue for UNFCCC. It was appropriate for the different MEAs to work in parallel and feed ideas and particular perspectives to each other.

A number of other issues were being picked up by other MEAs as they too conducted horizon scanning exercises. The loss of pollinating species and the secondary effects on other biota had been identified by CBD. CMS was working on poisoning as a result of the COP10 Resolution and guidelines would be presented to COP11. Mr Medellín expressed particular interest in neo-nicotinoids, a new generation of insecticides; insects that had existed for millions of years had developed resistance to some pesticides within three years. Mr Mundkur raised the issue of the "sticky sea life killer", polyisobutene (PIB) which was widely used in the manufacture of a range of products including lubricants, chewing gum and cling film. This substance was thought to have been responsible for four incidents of sea bird die-offs.

The Chair said that the forthcoming workshop on the economic value of migratory species would be a first for Italy showing how migratory species could generate income for communities. Mr Mundkur drew parallels with the report issued by TEEB and a new project ("Destination Flyways") being conducted by CMS, AEW, Wetlands International and BirdLife International in conjunction with the UN World Tourism Organization (UNWTO). Some key sites were being examined with a view to introducing or further developing ecotourism.

There was a general discussion on the best way to identify keys threats. It was agreed that the issue was complex with different threats affecting different taxa in different regions. A transparent process was needed that included not only the identification of threats but also an indication of how they might be addressed.

## **6. Gap analysis of the species listed in the Appendices**

Mr Limpus said that he was surprised at some of the species included in the document; one of the beaked whales was classified as Data Deficient under IUCN and the numbers of the Grey *Myotis* bat were increasing. An explanation of why such species were being proposed was required.

With regard to the bat, Mr Medellín said that the IUCN category took no account of white-nose syndrome in the Americas. The species had suffered a catastrophic collapse and was now endangered. Other species that currently had strong populations might suffer a similar fate. Some species should be considered for listing because of the importance of the ecosystem services they provided rather than their IUCN category.

Mr Perrin said that the species listed in the table annexed to the document should be reviewed. A number of beaked whales had an identical comment identifying overfishing as a threat, which was incorrect and certainly did not accord with IWC information.

Mr Biber pointed out that the Monarch butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*) was the only invertebrate included. Many other species in this order probably deserved listing but they were not charismatic and often did not attract attention.

Mr Baker said that his main concern was not the species missing from the Appendices but the lack of action being taken regarding those already listed. CMS already had a virtually dormant Gorilla Agreement and he felt that species should only be added to the Appendices where a Party or organization undertook to take conservation actions forward.

Mr Bennun said that the criteria for adding species needed to be more sophisticated than meeting the two conditions of being migratory and threatened. Those species with limited habitat and that therefore could become threatened very suddenly should also be eligible.

The Chair said that listing should be based on clear criteria and the explanations that Mr Medellín provided should be included in the document. Recalling the resistance by some countries at COP9 to support the listing of certain shark species, he said that the Convention should however adopt the precautionary principle and seek to act promptly and not when it was too late.

Mr Heredia explained that the CMS listings were the result of a gradual, slightly random organic process which had depended on the whims of the proponent countries rather than being the product of a methodical process. The review being carried out was meant to redress the imbalances that had built up over the years. The Secretariat would address the concerns raised and revise the list before circulating it again.

The Chair suggested preparing a draft resolution for COP11 on connectivity and the international approach to the protection of sites, emphasizing the linkage between international instruments such as CMS and habitat networks such as *Natura 2000*, and ensuring that all taxa were included.

Mr Heredia urged all present to add further ideas to those suggested by Mr Perrin and Mr Medellín for species to be listed.

There was further discussion about the merits of listing species on Appendix II where there was little prospect of action. Mr Hogan said that the process of listing and the fact that a species was included helped raise awareness. Mr Baker was concerned that listing entailed reporting and administrative burdens that without accompanying actions would be a waste of resources. There were other instruments and other listings that could be used to promote awareness. The Gorilla Agreement which had been advocated by Range States and donor Parties, was now dormant. On the other hand, pressure to act on Sahelo-Saharan antelopes had come from the Council and led to a major conservation effort. A more streamlined reporting system would also enhance the Convention's ability to act as an advocate for migratory species. Ms Qwathekana said that listed species still seemed to be in decline, so listing needed to be coupled with action, where necessary with the support of other agencies and instruments. Mr Medellín said that there were potentially hundreds of bat species that could be considered for listing, but developing action plans for each would be time-consuming and duplicative; it would make more sense to choose a smaller number of priority species upon which to focus attention.

The Chair proposed that CMS should suggest through CSAB that the IUCN conduct an overview of all migratory species *sensu* CMS, particularly those taxa not well represented on the current Appendices. As the IUCN Species Survival Commission was meeting in November, contact could be made with the Commission's chairman, Simon Stuart. The IUCN SSC and the CMS Scientific Council should have named contact points. It was also suggested to request IUCN to add an entry on Migratory Status in the Red List species sheets.

With regard to species groups under-presented on the CMS Appendices it was too early to appoint specialists. Expertise could be sought instead from outside the Council. Mr Heredia said that a review might have to be commissioned, similar to the one undertaken at the time of the development of the Sharks MOU, but that would need funding.

#### **Action Points**

- The Secretariat to revise list of species to be considered for inclusion on the Appendices before circulating it to a wider audience
- CMS to approach IUCN to undertake a review of migratory insects and other invertebrates
- CMS Scientific Council to consider appointing a member to act as contact point to the IUCN SSC
- Mr Medellín to broker contact between the Chair and Simon Stuart on the issues discussed
- All present to submit precise comments to the document by 20 December 2013

## 7. Criteria for listing species under the Appendices

Mr Baker reported on the work to develop criteria for listing species on the CMS Appendices. He was in the final stages of drafting a paper that would be distributed shortly to the members of the ad hoc working group.

Mr Baker explained the background to the process which had started some years before when he had served on the Council as the nationally appointed councillor from Australia, when he had written a paper suggesting that the IUCN Red List categories should be used as a basis for the CMS Appendices. At COP9 Norway had raised the question of listing commercially exploited species and there had been some disagreement over the listing of the Mako shark (*Isurus oxyrinchus*). The 16<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Council had asked Mr Baker to resume his work. Appendix II required more judgment because of the wording in the Convention concerning the benefits of international cooperation. In the revised proposal, candidates for Appendix I would have to be in IUCN Categories “Extinct in the Wild” to “Vulnerable”. It was also suggested that the Party proposing adding a species to Appendix II should also take the lead in coordinating conservation actions.

With regard to delisting species, the Secretariat’s analysis served as the base document. It showed that 24 listed taxa did not meet the IUCN criteria, with six categorized as “Least Concern”, seven “Near Threatened” and eleven were unevaluated. Article III paragraph 3a of the Convention allowed for species to be removed from Appendix I if they were not threatened and were unlikely to become threatened as a result of delisting.

Mr Dereliev explained that the listing rationale for AEWA was totally different. The Agreement set out to include all migratory waterbird populations in the flyway.

Mr Limpus questioned the wording in the table attached to the draft gap analysis document where there were references to “uplisting” species from Appendix II to Appendix I. The wording should reflect the definitions of the Appendices.

Mr Baker said that the IUCN reviews were conducted using robust science, and separating CMS listing from the IUCN categories would require duplication of work. He agreed that Appendix II was more difficult and sought comments on how to refine the qualification criteria.

The COP had over the years expressed a certain unwillingness to follow the IUCN categories unconditionally. It was understood that the IUCN also did not approve of other organizations adopting its listing and had issued guidance on their use. Mr Biber said other forums did not recognize IUCN as the definitive authority at all, although Resolution 6.7 accorded the IUCN observer status at the Scientific Council. There might therefore be a case for CMS developing its own independent criteria. Mr Hogan said that in most cases the IUCN had gathered the best experts in their field to make the assessment, so it would be time consuming and duplicative for CMS to set up its own system. Ms Qwathekana summarized what the two extreme positions were – absolute adherence to IUCN and a CMS separate process – and said that the solution lay somewhere between the two, adapting IUCN criteria for the purposes of CMS.

With regard to Appendix II, Mr Bennun said that the Convention had a definition for “unfavourable conservation status” and Article IV seemed to open the door for international cooperation where Parties were willing to collaborate. He could not think of any species listed whose conservation status could not be helped by transboundary cooperation. He did point out that a species undergoing a slow decline might not be included in the highest IUCN categories but CMS might want to take pre-emptive action.

**Action point**

- Barry Baker, Chair of the ad hoc working group on listing criteria, to liaise with Zeb Hogan to incorporate these comments in the draft paper and circulate it to the working group members.

**8. Cooperation between the IPBES and CMS: the role of the Scientific Council**

The Chair commented that CMS had been the most active MEA in submitting proposals to IPBES, and Mr Oteng-Yeboah had promoted migratory species issues at meetings in both Norway and South Africa. The priorities identified included issues relevant to CMS: pollination, land degradation and invasive alien species. IPBES was an important science-policy mechanism of great potential value to CMS, especially its capacity building component.

Mr Oteng-Yeboah said that six proposals had been submitted by CMS to IPBES and the Multi-disciplinary Expert Panel (MEP) was aware of the importance of migratory species. The MEP had wanted to make as great an impact as soon as possible and was anxious not to spread resources too thinly. Migratory species per se had not been identified as one of the immediate priorities but the final decision would be taken in the plenary meeting to be held in Turkey in December.

The Chair added that the chairs of the scientific advisory bodies all had observer status at the MEP. He also had detected a positive attitude towards migratory species at the MEP and the presiding officer, Professor Zakri, had asked CMS to make a final statement to the meeting. A general assessment of migratory species might yet be undertaken if the plenary felt that this was a priority.

Despite the Resolution adopted at COP10, CMS did not have clear directions with regard its dealings with IPBES and the Secretariat would seek guidance from the Parties at the Standing Committee. As CITES had established a working group within its Standing Committee to address IPBES, the CMS Scientific Council might consider doing likewise.

Mr Mundkur was concerned that IPBES was bringing forward another set of reporting obligations, but Mr Oteng-Yeboah reassured the meeting that IPBES was very

collaborative and inclusive and would use the expertise of other MEAs and IUCN, rather than set itself in competition with them.

#### **Action Points**

- Consideration should be given to establishing a Scientific Council contact group to deal with IPBES issues

### **9. ScC Work Programme 2013-2014: assignment of tasks and activities**

The Chair gave an assessment of progress achieved in accomplishing the tasks assigned to the Council at the previous COP. Mr Heredia introduced the tabular form of the Work Plan which set out the various mandates for the Council's activities, primarily Resolutions adopted in Bergen. This document had been made available on the Workspace so that Councillors could amend it as appropriate.

#### Resolution 10.2: *Modus Operandi* for Conservation Emergencies

Mr Heredia reported that no emergencies within the definition provided by the Resolution had arisen. The Convention would also have to be in a position to respond to major criminal incidents.

There was a general discussion on when it would be appropriate for the Convention to intervene given that implementation was the responsibility of the Parties' governments and that responding to minor incidents would undermine the credibility of the mechanism. Depending on the nature of what happened, other international fora, such as CITES, the WHO or the FAO might also have an interest.

Mr Mundkur said that the Saiga die-off had led to a well-coordinated response including CMS and the WHO. Ms Beudels said that the well-publicized VIP hunting parties in the Sahara posed the problem that they had been licensed by the appropriate authorities and had therefore been operating under legal terms.

#### Resolution 10.3: The Role of Ecological Networks in the Conservation of Migratory Species

The Resolution called for a review of how networks responded to species' habitats needs and this would be a major undertaking and it was on the list of activities for which funding was being sought. A number of case studies had been prepared and these had been posted on the Council's workspace for comment.

Mr Biber pointed out that a year before the next COP, funds had not been secured for the review or the Workshop and asked whether idea of starting these activities had been abandoned. Funds would have to be found urgently if progress were to be made before the COP and he suggested that the Chair of the Standing Committee be asked to write to Parties seeking the resources needed for the review and the Workshop. Ms Qwathekana

suggested that a composite list of projects needing funding should be maintained in parallel to sending specific requests for funding particular projects. Mr Mundkur suggested that the terms of reference for the review be posted on the workspace in the hope that it might provoke a response. Ms Cerasi said that the Secretariat had successfully raised funds for many activities, but none so far for this one and there seemed to be little prospect of donors coming forward. A new proposal for fund raising was being prepared and would be presented to the Standing Committee.

Mr Bennun welcomed the fact that the case studies had been done and suggested that they should be publicized at meetings of other fora with which CMS could collaborate and with whom synergies could be found, such as CBD and the forthcoming World Parks Congress.

Mr Oteng-Yeboah recalled a side event at IPBES to introduce CMS to African delegates where the importance of National Focal Points for all MEAs liaising with their CBD counterparts over the NBSAP reviews was stressed and a consultation process had been set up in Ghana.

Ms Beudels recalled that at each COP there had been calls for regional workshops to be organized across the world, but these were never funded as donors preferred to support conservation actions rather than capacity building. The importance of such workshops should be reiterated.

#### **Action Points**

- The Chair of the Council was asked to write to the Standing Committee asking that the resources required for the review of how networks respond to species habitats needs (estimated at €20,000) should be found as a matter of priority.
- The terms of reference for the review should be posted on the Scientific Council workspace.
- The case studies should be highlighted at meetings of other fora such as CBD meetings and the World Parks Congress
- The importance of regional workshops should be reiterated and funding sought to organize them

#### Resolution 10.4: Marine Debris

With the support of Australia which had provided a voluntary contribution, a consultancy firm had been appointed following a call for tenders, and a report was due by the end of 2013. This report would be considered by the Scientific Council in 2014.

#### Resolution 10.8: Cooperation between the Inter-governmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) and CMS

The relationship between CMS and IPBES had been discussed in detail the previous day (See agenda item 8 above). Action was dependent on resources being available and fundraising might become easier if IPBES responded positively to CMS proposals.

Mr Stahl said that the document presented the previous day was a revised version of the paper submitted to the Standing Committee and it included a request for funding to be made available to enable the Chair of the Council and a representative of the Secretariat to attend the IPBES meetings. Mr Oteng-Yeboah suggested that UNEP should be contacted to ascertain whether similar support could be given to CMS as was being given to CITES to attend IPBES meetings.

**Action Point**

- The Secretariat to enquire whether UNEP could support attendance of CMS representatives to IPBES meetings in the same way as CITES

Resolution 10.10 Guidance on Global Flyway Conservation and Options for Policy Arrangements

The multifaceted Resolution had been sponsored by Switzerland which had also supported the Flyways Working Group. It was hoped to organize a further meeting of the Working Group in the course of 2014, possibly in the Americas.

Mr Mundkur reminded the meeting of his presentation (see Agenda Item 4 e) and the various existing instruments related to birds and thematic working groups dealing with poisoning and regional activities (African-Eurasian landbirds). CMS was cooperating with CAFF in the far North; Canada, the current chair of the Arctic Council, was keen to make some progress on flyways. Mr Biber urged that a date be set as soon as possible for the Flyways Working Group's next meeting so that Parties could be asked for "end of year" money.

**Action Point**

- The date and venue for the next meeting of the Flyways Working Group should be agreed as soon as possible so that Parties could be asked for voluntary contributions to fund it

Resolution 10.11: Power Lines and Migratory Birds

Guidelines had been adopted at COP10 and the Resolution included a request that the Scientific Council and the Flyways Working Group monitor implementation and developments. This was an item to be included on the agenda of the next meeting of the Flyways Working Group and Mr Mundkur said that he would need updates on the national positions.

A joint Task Force had been set up in Tunis among CMS, AEWA, the Raptors MOU and the Bern Convention to ensure that the guidelines were understood and were being implemented. The Saker Falcon Task Force had also considered the guidelines.

#### Resolution 10.12: Migratory Freshwater Fish

Mr Hogan reported further on the proposals for listing fish that were not adopted at COP10. He was looking into the extent to which the species migrated by searching Spanish language literature.

Mr Mundkur said that Richard Sneider was about to replace Gordon Reid as chair of the joint IUCN/Wetlands International freshwater fish specialist group. He agreed to contact Simon Stewart, Chair of the Species Survival Commission, to raise the issue of Asia and the Americas. It was also important to maintain contact with other organizations such as FAO, with which CMS was negotiating an MOU and which had attended the first meeting of signatories of the Sharks MOU.

#### **Action Point**

- Mr Mundkur to contact Simon Stuart regarding Asian and South American freshwater fish species

#### Resolution 10.13: Standardized Nomenclature of Birds Listed on the CMS Appendices

The Chair had liaised with his counterparts at the CSAB meeting and the ad hoc workshop on bird taxonomy held immediately before the current meeting had been very positive. BirdLife International had kindly agreed to let CMS and CITES have a preview of its revised listings as they went to press.

#### Resolution 10.14: Bycatch of CMS-listed Species in Gillnet Fisheries

Mr Baker had already reported on the general issue of bycatch (see Agenda Item 4.h) but added here that the programme of work on bycatch needed to be fully reflected in that of the Council. The Secretariat was taking up contacts with RFMOs and Andrea Pauly (CMS officer for sharks) had already attended one RFMO meeting in Australia and would be attending another in South Africa.

#### **Action Point**

- Omissions from the Council Work Plan should be notified to the Secretariat as soon as possible

#### Resolution 10.15: Global Programme of Work for Cetaceans

Mr Perrin said that the Programme of Work adopted at the last COP was ambitious considering the meagre resources available to carry it out. He said that migratory

cetaceans were not facing the same level of threat as migratory birds; it was the sedentary species that were most endangered. The threat to cetaceans had been exaggerated and most populations were doing well; one exception being a population of Bowhead whales. Mr Limpus said that discussions on cetacean conservation were often heated and politicized.

The Secretariat informed the meeting that a workshop would be held on London in 2014 on the social culture of cetaceans.

#### Resolution 10.19: Migratory Species Conservation in the Light of Climate Change

Mr Heredia said that an action plan and programme of work on climate change were being developed, and with the help of voluntary contributions from Germany and Monaco, it was hoped to organize a meeting in Costa Rica in 2014.

The Resolution called for action “to improve the resilience of species to climate change”, something beyond the capability of the Convention. Actions such as transporting Red-breasted geese (*Branta ruficollis*) from the Caspian to suitable habitat in Romania and training cranes to follow micro-light aircraft to teach them migration routes were what were meant.

The CMS Secretariat had worked with UNCCD on a leaflet on migratory species and desertification. A workshop on climate change originally envisaged to be held in June 2013 would now be organized in April 2014. The effect of climate change on species’ ranges should be considered by the next full meeting of the Council.

#### **Action Point**

- Paragraph 22 of Resolution 10.19 (interpretation of the terms “range” and “historic coverage” in the light of climate change) should be placed on the agenda of the 18<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Scientific Council

#### Resolution 10.22: Wildlife Disease and Migratory Species

Mr Heredia explained that the Task Force established on wildlife and ecosystem health had subsumed the Avian Influenza Task Force. The FAO had initially funded the post of coordinator but this support had been discontinued and its website had become dormant. The Task Force had however met in Bangkok in January 2013 but it was also noted that there was no one with specialist knowledge of wildlife disease on the Council.

There was a discussion about whether to the COP should appoint a councillor with a portfolio covering wildlife disease or to rely upon the knowledge of the working group for advice. Mr Medellín suspected that there were scientists exaggerating the extent of the problem in an attempt to secure project funding.

### **Action Point**

- Consider options for dealing with wildlife disease within the Council: (a) COP to appoint a specialist; (b) an existing appointed councillor to take the lead; or (c) rely on the Task Force
- Mr Medellín to act as contact person and liaise with the IUCN Specialist Group in order to seek their advice

### Resolution 10.23: Concerted and Cooperative Actions

The Chair said that the Council had been given the task of compiling a list with an expert or experts identified for each species. To date, only Mr Perrin had completed the exercise. Mr Baker undertook to take the lead on albatrosses and petrels. Mr Mundkur suggested starting with the Concerted Action species from Appendix I.

There followed a discussion on the level of detail any report to COP on the actions undertaken. It was pointed out that many actions were being led by organizations with no connection with the Convention, but Mr Perrin felt that the term “implementation” implied activities directed at fulfilling the mandate of the Resolution. Mr Baker pointed out that the resolution included the word “concise” which he interpreted as no more than a few pages. Mr Bennun said that only a small subset of species were included on the Concerted and Cooperative Action lists which applied respectively to Appendix I and II.

Mr Heredia said that the requirement was for the lead-councillor to be identified by the next meeting of the Council and for reports to be prepared thereafter. Until now the system of reporting had been rather ad hoc; it was now intended to be more systematic and comprehensive.

### Resolution 10.24: Further Steps to Abate Underwater Noise Pollution for the Protection of Cetaceans and Other Biota

There was no expertise on the subject of marine noise among the existing councillors, but outside specialists had been identified and there was a proposal to extend the Joint ACCOBAMS/ASCOBANS Marine Noise Working Group to include CMS.

Mr Mundkur said that the IUCN Specialist Group had been looking into the effects of oil exploration off Sakhalin on Grey whales while the WCS was doing similar work off Alaska in relation to Bowhead whales.

Unfortunately the organizers of the project selected under the Small Grants Programme concerning the effects on whales of the construction of a port complex in Mozambique had encountered insurmountable difficulties in obtaining permissions. They had therefore been forced to cancel the project and the funds were being returned to CMS.

### Resolution 10.26: Minimizing the Risk of Poisoning to Migratory Birds

The Convention was cooperating with BirdLife International, which had appointed a coordinator (Ms Symone Krimowa). A workshop had been held in Tunis in May in conjunction with a related conference convened by the Bern Convention thanks to support provided by the Government of Switzerland among others. A draft Resolution was being prepared for COP11, where guidelines will be presented along with the proposal to extend the mandate of the Working group.

#### Resolution 10.27: Improving the Conservation Status of Migratory Landbirds in the African Eurasian Region

This subject had been discussed (see Mr Biber's report under agenda item 4.i above)

#### Resolution 10.28: Saker Falcon *Falco cherrug*

The dedicated Task Force established under the Resolution was tackling the challenges posed by the species and was making progress through the positive engagement of a wide range of stakeholders. An action plan would be presented for adoption at COP11.

#### Criteria for Listing Species on the Appendices

This issue had been discussed at length under Agenda Item 7.

#### Invasive Alien Species

This issue had been discussed at the 17<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Council. Following a call for tenders a report on the impacts of invasive alien species on migratory species had been commissioned to the IUCN Invasive Species Specialist Group. The report had been finalized and was posted on the workspace. The report would be discussed at the 18<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Council with a view to submitting a resolution to COP11.

#### Small Grants Programme (SGP)

UNEP had provided US\$300,000 for conservation projects and the deadline for submitting applications for the second tranche of funding (US\$100,000) was 30 November 2013. UNEP had set criteria making applications from developed countries ineligible. No other sponsors had come forward so the future of the programme was again in doubt.

Given the modest amount of funding available, it was suggested by some that projects should address clear priorities of the Convention; others preferred to keep the programme open and wanted to seek ways of allowing capacity building, research and monitoring, as was the case when the Programme was funded through surpluses in the Trust Fund. It was important that CMS derived as much credit for its support and Parties had to be convinced that the SGP was worth retaining.

Mr Heredia drew the meeting's attention to a feature on the CMS Website – "Project of the Month" – where articles on the projects receiving support under the current funding

round were being posted. Mr Mundkur welcomed the attention being given to the projects by the Secretariat in this way but wondered how species not benefitting from the Programme could obtain project funding. One alternative source might be the Mohammed bin Zayed Species Fund. Ms Aguado said that details of projects not awarded funds under the SGP had been passed to Parties and other funding agencies with letters of support from the Secretariat. Ms Qwathekana said that requiring matching funding should be a criterion as this indicated that a project was more viable in the long term; she expressed doubts about whether in-kind contributions should be accepted.

Mr Dereliev described the similar but smaller programme operated by AEWA. There were sufficient funds for only one project to be supported and the AEWA Standing Committee chose which application was to be supported.

#### **Action Point**

- Secretariat to advertise the results of the projects funded under the SGP and request UNEP to provide further resources

#### **Single Species Action Plans (SSAP)**

A number of Single Species Action Plans had been adopted, some in conjunction with AEWA. It was important that the Plans should indeed lead to actions. More SSAPs were being developed.

#### **Projects (other than those under the SGP)**

The project on the Ethiopia-South Sudan mammal's migration corridor which was being funded by Norway was progressing well with interesting data being gathered on the species' migration. A meeting to bring together participants from both countries and present the project's results was being planned. The Sahelo-Saharan Antelopes Project was described in Ms Beudels' report (see Agenda Item 4.f)

### **10. Practical demonstration and training on the use of the ScC online workspace**

Ms Aguado led a practical demonstration of the Scientific Council workspace, thanking AEWA for all its pioneering work in developing the system and sharing the final product with the rest of the CMS Family. Councillors were urged to use the workspace to familiarize themselves with its features and to seek assistance from the Secretariat if they had any problems or questions.

As with other modern communication devices, the workspace relied on dependable internet connections. The "Wikidoc" feature was still being developed.

Thanks were expressed to the Government of Switzerland which had provided the funds to develop the system.

## **11. Closure and Any Other Business**

After the customary expression of thanks to all those who had contributed to the success of the meeting, from the Secretariat, the hotel, the regional authorities of Lazio and the regional park of Riviera d'Ulisse, the Chair declared that the formal business of the meeting was concluded. He then explained the format of the following day's workshop.

Mr Limpus made a presentation on the use of GIS in tracking marine turtles and the spatial and temporal database that he had built up charting their migration. The data were still being updated – and Mr Limpus's work on the Mediterranean, Indian Ocean and parts of the Pacific was probably being complemented by Jacques Fretey in West Africa - but the website had been put on ice when the WCMC changed its software. The quantity and quality of the data emanating from satellite telemetry had increased dramatically in recent years. The system lent itself for adaptation for any species that lived colonially. The slides comprising the presentation have been posted on the CMS website.

**CMS Scientific Council Strategic & Planning Meeting  
Formia, Italy, 9-11 October 2013**

**List of Participants**

**Chair**

**Dr. Fernando Spina**

Senior Scientist, Head Italian Ringing Centre

Instituto Superiore per la Protezione e la Ricerca Ambientale ISPRA, Sede ex-INFS

Via Cà Fornacetta 9

1-40064 Ozzano Emilia (BO)

ITALY

Tel: (+39 051) 6512 111 direct 6512214

E-mail: [fernando.spina@isprambiente.it](mailto:fernando.spina@isprambiente.it)

**Vice-Chair**

**Malta Qwathekana**

Senior Policy Advisor, International Biodiversity and Heritage

Department of Environmental Affairs

Private Box X447

00001 Pretoria

SOUTH AFRICA

Tel: (+271 2) 3103067

Email: [mqwathekana@environment.gov.za](mailto:mqwathekana@environment.gov.za)

**Appointed Councillors**

**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](mailto:barry.baker@latitude42.com.au)

**Mr. Leon Bennun**

CMS Appointed Councillor (Birds)

BirdLife International

Welbrook Court, Girton Road

CB3 0NA Cambridge

UK

Email: [Leon.Bennun@birdlife.org](mailto:Leon.Bennun@birdlife.org)

**Dr. Zeb S. Hogan**  
CMS Appointed Councillor (Fish)  
2355 Camelot Way  
Reno NV 89509  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
Tel: (+1 530) 219 0942  
E-mail: [zebhogan@hotmail.com](mailto: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@ehp.qld.gov.au](mailto:Col.Limpus@ehp.qld.gov.au)

**Dr. Rodrigo A. Medellín**  
CMS Appointed Councillor (Neotropical Fauna)  
President of the Society for Conservation Biology  
Instituto de Ecología, UNAM  
Ap. Postal 70-275  
04510 Ciudad Universitaria, D. F.  
MEXICO  
Tel.: (+52)-55-5622-9042  
E-Mail: [medellin@miranda.ecologia.unam.mx](mailto:medellin@miranda.ecologia.unam.mx)

**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  
E-mail: [taej.mundkur@wetlands.org](mailto:taej.mundkur@wetlands.org)

**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  
E-mail: [alfred.otengyeboah@gmail.com](mailto:alfred.otengyeboah@gmail.com)

**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  
E-mail: [william.perrin@noaa.gov](mailto:william.perrin@noaa.gov)

### **Councillors / Chairs of Working Groups**

**Dr. Roseline C. Beudels-Jamar de Bolsee**  
Coordinator Terrestrial Mammals  
Institut Royal des Sciences Naturelles de Belgique  
29, rue Vautier  
1000 Bruxelles  
BELGIQUE  
Tel: (+32 2) 627 43 54  
E-mail: [roseline.beudels@naturalsciences.be](mailto:roseline.beudels@naturalsciences.be)

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

### **Observers**

**Sergey Dereliev**  
UNEP/AEWA Secretariat  
UN Campus, Platz der Vereinten Nationen 1  
53113 Bonn  
GERMANY  
Tel: (+49) 228 815 2415  
Fax: (+49) 228 815 2450  
E-mail: [sdereliev@unep.de](mailto:sdereliev@unep.de)

**Mr. Peter H. C. Lina**  
Chair of the EUROBATS Advisory Committee  
Netherlands Centre for Biodiversity "Naturalis"  
Darwinweg 2  
2333 CR Leiden  
THE NETHERLANDS  
Tel.: (+31) 71 531 49 79  
E-mail: [phclina@telfort.nl](mailto:phclina@telfort.nl)

## **UNEP/CMS Secretariat**

**Bradnee Chambers**

**Laura Aguado**

**Laura Cerasi**

**Borja Heredia**

**Marie Mévellec**

**Johannes Stahl**

**Robert Vagg**