



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

Distribution: General

UNEP/CMS/Raptors/STF-  
Ws/Report\*

05 December 2013

## Saker Falcon Task Force

**Second Meeting on 12 September 2013**  
**Yas Island, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates**



## Meeting Report

*\* Document reissued for technical reasons.*



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

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



## Table of Contents

|                                                                                        |           |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>1. Welcome and introductions .....</b>                                              | <b>2</b>  |
| <b>2. Review of actions from the First Meeting of the Saker Falcon Task Force.....</b> | <b>2</b>  |
| <b>3. Identification of key issues for the STF Stakeholders' Workshop.....</b>         | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>3.1. International policies and legislation (STF Work Plan Objective 4) .....</b>   | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>3.2. Knowledge gaps (STF Work Plan Objective 6) .....</b>                           | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>3.3. Sustainable use (STF Work Plan Objective 7) .....</b>                          | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>3.4. Fieldwork (STF Work Plan Objective 8).....</b>                                 | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>4. Finalizing the SakerGAP (STF Work Plan Objective 9) .....</b>                    | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>4.1. Steps required.....</b>                                                        | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>4.2. Timeline.....</b>                                                              | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>5. Options to promote and implement the SakerGAP .....</b>                          | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>5.1. Governance (STF Work Plan Objectives 11 and 12).....</b>                       | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>5.2. Structures.....</b>                                                            | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>5.3. Stakeholder engagement (STF Work Plan Objectives 5 and 10).....</b>            | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>5.4. Funding (STF Work Plan Objective 3) .....</b>                                  | <b>10</b> |
| <b>6. Reporting and preparations for CMS COP11 in 2014 .....</b>                       | <b>10</b> |
| <b>7. Any other business .....</b>                                                     | <b>10</b> |
| <br>                                                                                   |           |
| <b>Annex I: Action Points from the Second Meeting of the STF .....</b>                 | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Annex II: List of Participants.....</b>                                             | <b>13</b> |
| <b>Annex III: SakerGAP Work Plan .....</b>                                             | <b>15</b> |

## 1. Welcome and introductions

1. The Chair, Colin Galbraith, opened the meeting welcoming participants to the Second Meeting of the Saker Falcon Task Force (STF). He particularly welcomed Boris Barov of BirdLife Europe, who had acted as facilitator for the previous days' Stakeholders' Workshop.
2. The agenda had been circulated in advance and in the absence of any requests for amendments it was adopted as presented. Robert Kenward (IUCN) commented that in order to achieve the "quick wins" identified during the Workshop, the STF should clearly allocate responsibility for actions to particular countries or regions, rather than assuming that the Coordinating Unit would take everything forward.

## 2. Review of actions from the First Meeting of the Saker Falcon Task Force

3. A list of Actions arising from the 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting of the Task Force had been circulated. The Chair proposed that each be taken in turn so that the person or organization in the lead could report on the progress achieved.

Action Point 1: The Coordinating Unit (CU) had provided details of the membership of the Task Force.

Action Point 2: The CU had contacted a number of governments to increase membership of the Task Force. A representative from China had attended the Workshop; the Russian Federation had been contacted and it appeared that there was interest in attending but in the event, this did not materialize. However, representatives from 31 Saker Falcon Range States had attended the gathering.

Action Point 3: Mohammad Sulayem had written to other governments in West Asia, through the GCC (Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf) and the League of Arab States. Diane Klaimi had intended to attend the meeting but had been prevented from doing so due to unforeseen circumstances.

Action Point 4: The CU Unit had consolidated STF membership by bringing in a wider range of contributors.

Action Point 5: Members were continuing to liaise with their national CBD Focal Points to promote Saker Falcon conservation within NBSAPs.

Action Point 6: The CU had used the opportunities presented by the AEWA MOP5 in May 2012 to contact the European Commission and had written outlining the work of the STF, resulting in securing funds through an ENTRP Cooperation Agreement (SCA) between the European Commission (DG Environment) and UNEP for the Workshop.

Action Point 7: Information had been prepared by the Coordinating Unit for the CITES COP. This COP had been the largest ever held under CITES and had attracted a great deal of media attention.

Action Point 8: Robert Kenward had written to IUCN, FACE and CIC and contributed to the sustainable livelihoods bulletin.

Action Point 9: Nick Williams reported that the CBD and Ramsar National Reports had been reviewed and information used in drafting the 1<sup>st</sup> Draft of the Saker Falcon Global Action Plan (SakerGAP).

Action Point 10: Tom de Meulenaer had reported on the work of the STF to the CITES Standing Committee in July 2012.

Action Point 11: Mohammad Sulayem had mentioned to H.R.H. Prince Bandar the possibility of establishing funds for the Houbara Bustard and Saker Falcon and would follow this action point up.

Action Point 12: The Chair had written to the European Commission and funding had been secured for fieldwork.

Action Point 13: The CU had elaborated a revised budget for the STF (see agenda item 5.4 below).

Action Point 14 – k16: Progress had been made with regard to securing funding from H.R.H. Prince Bandar, President of the Saudi Wildlife Authority, on behalf of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia; an ENTRP Cooperation Agreement (SCA) between the European Commission (DG Environment) and UNEP; and from CITES. Future consideration would be given to applying to GEF, ISESCO and other potential donors.

Action Point 17: The Objective 4 Working Group had undertaken a review of national and international legislation.

Action Point 18: András Kovács had stepped forward to lead the Objective 4 Working Group and a report had been compiled in advance of the STF Workshop.

Action Point 19: Robert Kenward had suggested that IAF be asked to contact national falconry organizations to provide data on the legislative status of Saker Falcons in their countries. .

Action Point 20: The CU, in conjunction with András Kovács, had prepared and circulated a Questionnaire to all Saker Falcon Range States; the replies received had been posted on the Saker Falcon Task Force pages of the CMS website and countries that had not replied were being reminded politely.

Action Point 21: Mohammad Sulayem had contacted trappers in Saudi Arabia and some of them had attended the Workshop.

Action Point 22: Janusz Sielicki had provided contact details of CIC falconry contacts to the Coordinating Unit.

Action Point 23: There was no representative of Mongolia present, but Tom de Meulenaer reported that Mongolia was required to provide a five-year report to CITES following the granting of the 300 specimen quota. It was understood that this report was in preparation.

Action Point 24: An Objective 6 Working Group had been established and a report published in advance of the Workshop.

Action Point 25: Key knowledge gaps had been identified and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Draft of the SakerGAP.

Action Point 26: Colin Galbraith, in conjunction with Borja Heredia and the Coordinating Unit, had led the Objective 7 Working Group (O7WG) and had produced a report in advance of the Workshop. This had been supplemented by the report of the Modelling Contract.

Action Point 27: The O7WG had been established.

Action Point 28: It was noted that the outline management system had been considered further at the Workshop.

Action Point 29: Fernando Spina had provided the CU with a link to EU guidelines on the sustainable taking of raptors.

Action Point 30: Tom de Meulenaer had provided information on CITES risk assessment processes.

Action Points 31-33: The Objective 8 Working Group had been established. It was led by Johannes Stahl (CMS Secretariat) and had assessed field activities and published a report in advance of the Workshop.

Action Point 34: The CU had overseen the elaboration of the 1<sup>st</sup> Draft of the Saker Action Plan and had convened a Stakeholders' Action Planning Workshop (held on the preceding three days).

Action Point 35: The Falconry Festival scheduled for 2013 had been postponed; the possibility of hosting a session on the rescheduled dates would be considered by the Coordinating Unit.

Action Point 36: Janusz Sielicki said that the IAF was holding their annual Meeting in Qatar in early 2014 – this might offer a good opportunity for the Coordinating Unit to be invited to give a presentation on the Saker Falcon Task Force.

Action Point 37: Concerning Objectives 11 and 12, a report had been submitted to the 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting of Signatories to the Raptors MoU and an Information Note to CITES COP16. A report would be sent to the CMS Scientific Council in due course.

Action Point 38: As Action 35 – the Falconry Festival 2013 had been postponed.

Action Point 39: Mohammad Sulayem had contacted the Qatar Foundation and agreed to follow up this initial contact.

Action Point 40: An information note on the STF had been prepared and sent to Diane Klaimi at UNEP ROWA. The CU was in regular contact with her.

Action Point 41: The CU had developed a more detailed financial plan, which had been circulated.

Action Point 42: Diane Klaimi had facilitated contacts with ISESCO.

Action Point 43: Mátyás Prommer had provided additional information on the possibilities for funding from the European Commission.

Action Point 44: The CU was pleased to be proceeding on the basis of Plan A to fund the SakerGAP Workshop; two Plan Bs were developed, neither of them optimal, but fortunately last year's successful fundraising efforts had rendered them superfluous.

Action Point 45: Andrew Dixon had sent a list of IWC projects to the CU.

Action Point 46: A teleconference had been convened in February 2013 (rather than June 2012). There had been a high level of participation.

**Action Point**

Mohammad Sulayem would contact the Qatar Foundation again regarding funding.

**3. Identification of key issues for the STF Stakeholders' Workshop**

4. The Chair commented that the Workshop held on the previous three days had been well organized and the number of people attending had been encouragingly high, with wide and open discussions held in a positive atmosphere. He invited Boris Barov, the Facilitator to give his impressions.

5. Mr Barov thanked the Chair and the organizers. He said that it had been a challenge to facilitate the Workshop as the methodology employed was more suited to smaller groups (15 rather than 70) but working in regional break-out groups had helped. These break-out groups had been able to focus more on specific topics and had produced concrete ideas which would need to be incorporated into the Action Plan. The Workshop had paved the way for the future and it was important that momentum be maintained.

6. Comments from the floor from Tom de Meulanear, Robert Kenward, Mohammed Shobrak and Sadegh Sadeghi Zadehan were both positive and supportive. It had taken some time to become used to the format, but a great deal of ground had been covered, a wide range of stakeholders had been brought together, gaps in knowledge had been identified and a conclusion reached that solutions might vary across the species' vast range. It was also clear that national legislation in various countries took different approaches and harmonizing this and the provisions of MEAs might need to be addressed.

**3.1. International policies and legislation (STF Work Plan Objective 4)**

7. András Kovács said that the review of national legislation was based on the Questionnaires sent to the governments of all Range States, 33 per cent of which had been returned so far. Analysis of legislation and policy instruments in key Range States might be the next step, to assess the degree of omission, duplication and contradiction. The chapter on improving compliance was an important part of the Action Plan and one means of achieving this was improving awareness of the issues.

8. In discussion it was stressed that the STF could play a major role in addressing key threats such as electrocution.

9. The Chair suggested that it would be appropriate if a Resolution on electrocution, covering a range of bird species, were brought to the next CMS COP.

10. Umeed Khalid pointed out the benefits of the close cooperation between CMS and CITES.

11. Andrew Dixon suggested that the contradictions of the listing of the Saker Falcon on CMS Appendix I which imposed a general prohibition on taking should be examined. Some conservation benefits did accrue from taking species. Robert Kenward said that trapping could be useful for understanding migration but such information could only be accessed by actively engaging with trappers.

**Action Point**

The Coordinating Unit to clarify with the CMS Secretariat whether a Resolution on electrocution is likely to be discussed at the next Conference of the Parties.

### 3.2. Knowledge gaps (STF Work Plan Objective 6)

12. The Chair recalled that the Workshop had devoted some time to considering knowledge gaps and many had been identified. The STF faced the challenge of operating with inadequate data in many respects. Mohammed Shobrak said that the provisions of CBD might provide a way forward and that Parties to various MEAs were obliged to provide large amounts of data; these should be produced in a harmonized way to maximize their usefulness. Fernando Spina said that the situation was better than it appeared; many activities were being undertaken but were not being recorded in Questionnaires or National Reports. Securing a better overview of what was happening would help reduce knowledge gaps. It would be unreasonable for the COP to expect all problems to be solved, but Parties might expect the problems to have been quantified and identified.

13. Mátyás Prommer said that another major knowledge gap concerned the effects of chemicals both in terms of direct and indirect poisoning. Leon Bennun called for a coordinated approach to addressing knowledge gaps. Nick Williams said that the Coordinating Unit would need a clearer indication of what the priorities were, and Robert Kenward felt that the Workshop and the methods it had used had helped in identifying the key areas.

14. It was noted that there was still time for comments to be made on the 1<sup>st</sup> Draft of the SakerGAP, but those wishing to submit more detailed editing issues should consider holding back their comments until the 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft was published.

#### Action Point

All to provide comments on the second draft of the Global Action Plan in due course.

### 3.3. Sustainable use (STF Work Plan Objective 7)

15. The Chair said that the STF had a good overview of guidance available on best practice for a wide range of activities. What was needed was a transparent system of governance related to the overall management of the species to which all players would agree to adhere. He noted that the Workshop held over the preceding few days had provided the outline of such a management system and that this could now be worked up in more detail for comment by the Task Force.

16. Andrew Dixon pointed out that there was no mention of the IWC artificial nest box project being undertaken in Mongolia. This had already made a considerable contribution to the potential for sustainable use and had highlighted the link between conservation actions and mitigation of harvesting. Robert Kenward felt that too much emphasis was being placed on mitigating threats; many conservation actions were focused on developing new opportunities and not directed at threats at all. It was noted that these issues would be addressed in the next draft of the GAP.

17. Boris Barov said that the process should be an iterative one of constant review and refinement and that some actions should proceed straightaway on the basis of the information available rather than waiting for all the pieces to be in place.

#### Action Point

The Chair and the CU to draft an outline management system for comment by the STF.

### **3.4. Fieldwork (STF Work Plan Objective 8)**

18. The Chair recognized that monitoring and other work in the field needed funding. Much valuable work was already being undertaken, for instance Andrew Dixon's artificial nesting project in Mongolia and a range of activities in the UAE. Janusz Sielicki said that talking to the Russian-speaking participants at the Workshop, two obvious steps would be to provide microchips and facilitate access to databases to make the work of Customs Authorities in central Asian countries easier.

19. Fernando Spina said that better coordination of marking and ringing schemes would be a major advance, allowing different organizations to benefit from the effort being made in various countries. Mátyás Prommer said greater use could be made of volunteers, many of whom were prepared to travel abroad to carry out their conservation work. Some coordination would be necessary to match volunteers from one country to projects in another.

20. In summary the Chairman noted that consideration of these issues would be included in the development of the next draft of the GAP.

### **4. Finalizing the SakerGAP (STF Work Plan Objective 9)**

21. The Chair said that the STF needed to reach the stage where the 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft of the SakerGAP could be issued as the next step in the process culminating in presenting the final SakerGAP at the CMS COP11.

#### **4.1. Steps required**

22. András Kovács made a presentation outlining the areas where further work was needed. The slides comprising Mr Kovács' presentation are attached as an Annex III to this report.

#### **4.2. Timeline**

23. András Kovács presented a table illustrating when various elements of the Plan had to be completed in the run-up to the CMS Scientific Council which was due to take place around April 2014 (the dates had not been confirmed, but the new policy was for the Council to take place four months or so in advance of the CMS COP, which would be held towards the end of 2014), meaning draft documents would have to be submitted in March 2014.

24. The Chair said that as he saw it the procedure would be as follows: the next revision of the SakerGAP would be ready by the end of October and would be circulated to the STF. Members would be allowed two weeks to submit comments before the document would be issued for wider consultation. The STF would be informed of any substantive changes arising from the wider consultation and a third draft issued, if necessary. The SakerGAP would be submitted to the CMS Scientific Council and then to the COP. Andrew Dixon requested that the draft be sent in "Word" format, so that any amendments requested could be inserted in "track changes".

25. Janusz Sielecki said that some issues seemed not to have been addressed and had slipped through the four regional break-out groups. Examples were active reintroductions and translocations. Mohammad Sulayem felt that the timeframe was tight and urged that momentum should be maintained in developing and even taking actions while the consultation process was in progress, as unexpected delays might occur. He would also have to consult within Saudi Arabia on any revisions. Fernando Spina saw advantages in casting the net as wide as possible for the consultation to ensure that as many doubts as possible could be assuaged. He undertook to prepare a memo to circulate to the Scientific Council and to promote the consultation process via the Scientific Council Workspace.

26. Tom de Meulenaer pointed out that some sections of the draft would be subject to considerable revision and it therefore seemed to serve little purpose to make detailed comments on redundant text at this stage. He sought guidance on where to concentrate his efforts. Mr Kovács said that some parts of the 1<sup>st</sup> Draft had been left vague deliberately as it was clear that further work was needed, notably through the workshop held over recent days. The Chair suggested that any comments should be of a general nature at this stage, such as pointing out omissions and that the opportunity for detailed comments would come with the presentation of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft of the SakerGAP.

27. Nick Williams undertook to post the 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft of the SakerGAP on the website to increase its reach and encourage the greatest number of responses. He also said that he would send the Plan direct to all Range States and follow up by phone if responses were not received.

28. Robert Kenward said that an Executive Summary would be useful, especially as the Plan was not likely to be produced in anything other than English. András Kovács sought advice on how to elicit a response to the Questionnaire from some of the important Range States (e.g. Mongolia and the Russian Federation), for which vital information was needed for the distribution map was still outstanding. Janusz Sielicki said that he would contact NGOs if necessary in those countries where the authorities had not replied. Tom de Meulenaer said that the CITES network could also be used, and Mohammad Sulayem suggested enlisting the help of Diane Klaimi in the UNEP ROWA in Bahrain to ensure that all Range States and not just CMS Parties and MoU Signatories were approached. Nick Williams assured the meeting that the Coordinating Unit had approached all possible contacts in governments and NGOs of all Saker Falcon Range States in the first round of consultations, irrespective of each country's status as either CMS Party or Signatory to the Raptors MoU.

## Timeline

| Actor(s)         | Action                                           | Timing                      |
|------------------|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| András Kovács    | Produce 2 <sup>nd</sup> Draft SakerGAP           | End October 2013            |
| STF members      | Comment on 2 <sup>nd</sup> Draft                 | End October – mid-November  |
| All Stakeholders | Wider consultation                               | Mid-November - end December |
| András Kovács    | Produce Draft 3 <sup>rd</sup> Draft SakerGAP     | End December – end January  |
| STF members      | Final comments on 3 <sup>rd</sup> Draft SakerGAP | February                    |
| András Kovács    | Produce Final version of SakerGAP                | Early – mid-March           |
| STF              | Submit Final SakerGAP to CMS ScC                 | End March                   |
| CMS ScC          | Consider SakerGAP                                | April                       |
| CMS COP11        | Adopt SakerGAP                                   | November 2014               |

29. Robert Kenward noted that the preceding workshop had given some consideration to a range of “quick wins”. This included the creation of a single Saker Information Network that should be established. On knowledge of captive birds, ten leading trappers and ten falcon hospitals should be contacted. For monitoring wild populations, 100 satellite tags should be fitted. To restore wild populations, 1,000 nest boxes should be installed and to improve protection and one million poles should be erected or adapted to reduce the risk of electrocution. The remaining question was how to ensure that these actions are undertaken.

30. András Kovács had some doubts about including such specific targets in a strategic document, but the Chair thought that the actions and the numbers were attractive from the point of view of presentation and gaining attention as well as making a substantive contribution to the conservation of the species. Mr Kenward said that the actions probably needed a few sentences of explanation and that some could be achieved more easily than others; erecting or adapting one million poles would take some time, for example. Andrew Dixon made a quick calculation and estimated that in Mongolia, one million poles would equate to



approximately 200 average power lines. Moreover, that there were many thousands of powerlines in the country, and this was only one of around 70 Range States of the species. It was suggested that the costs could be borne by the utility companies when they built new or repaired old infrastructure. Janusz Sielicki suggested that instead of an undertaking to erect or adapt one million poles, the activity could rather be to inspect that number to ensure that they were as safe as possible. He also suggested liaising with FACE and CIC on publicity work.

31. Mátyás Prommer said that he hoped to achieve a “quick win” by engaging with a electricity company in Hungary at a conference in the spring on birds and power lines. Representatives from other countries had been invited. Nick Williams wondered whether “quick wins” was the appropriate term; erecting, adapting or inspecting one million poles seemed to be a longer-term exercise.

32. The Chair said that he would be content for these activities to be included in the SakerGAP, but felt that they needed some explanation and more thought should be given as to how to plan them. It should also be made clear that the STF was not seeking funding for the all of the activities, as it would be for utility companies to maintain their installations.

33. Fernando Spina said that the COP had singled out the Saker Falcon for special attention and the STF had been established to identify and tackle the threats to the species, including the challenge of sustainable use. The SakerGAP was potentially an excellent product and the next step would be for the CMS COP to take ownership and responsibility for it. Boris Barov said every effort should be made to spread the message and engage stakeholders; he suggested that before the COP a letter should be sent to Parties and the wider donor community seeking resources.

34. It was agreed that Leon Bennun and Robert Kenward would draft the text on the Saker Information Network; Robert Kenward, Janusz Sielicki, Mohammed Shobrak, Monif Al Rashidi, Mátyás Prommer and Salim Javed would lead on the 10 trappers/10 falcon hospitals (András Kovács said that a Questionnaire had already been prepared for hospitals as a follow-up to the 2004 CITES review); Mátyás Prommer, Andrew Dixon, Fernando Spina and Mohammed Shobrak would deal with the 100 satellite tags; Robert Kenward and Andrew Dixon would work together on the 1,000 nest boxes, and András Kovács, Andrew Dixon and Michal Adamec would work on the one million poles.

#### **Action Points**

- CU to send the draft GAP to the members of the STF by the end of October for comment. The document should be sent in “Word” format to allow comments and changes to be added.
- Fernando Spina to prepare issue a memo to the Scientific Council and to promote the consultation process via the Scientific Council Workspace.
- The CU to send the next draft of the GAP to Range States and open communications to help ensure that comments are received from as many as possible.
- The CU to contact Parties in advance of the next COP to inform them of the work of the STF.
- Leon Bennun and Robert Kenward to draft the text on the Saker Information Network.
- Robert Kenward, Janusz Sielicki, Mohammed Shobrak, Monif Al Rashidi, Mátyás Prommer and Salim Javed to lead on the 10 trappers/10 falcon hospitals.
- Mátyás Prommer, Andrew Dixon, Fernando Spina and Mohammed Shobrak to deal with the 100 satellite tags.
- Robert Kenward and Andrew Dixon to work together on the 1,000 nest boxes, and András Kovács, Andrew Dixon and Michal Adamec would work on the one million poles.

## 5. Options to promote and implement the SakerGAP

### 5.1. Governance (STF Work Plan Objectives 11 and 12)

35. The Chair said that the STF should look beyond the adoption of the SakerGAP at CMS COP11. The message from the Workshop was that the STF should continue, possibly with some adjustments to its membership.

### 5.2. Structures

36. Boris Barov had worked with the European Commission through BirdLife Europe to review all existing Species Action Plans to assess their effectiveness. A stakeholder conference had taken place in 2012. What seemed to work best was to have one person leading activities (as András Kovács had done up to now for the STF) supported by a small core team and a wider management or steering group. The core person could be based in an NGO, an IGO or a Ministry or special ad hoc arrangements could be made. Leon Bennun agreed, adding that the steering group might want to set up a technical team to ensure that the most up-to-date data were available.

37. The Chair commented that there was virtually an in-built review mechanism, with the CMS COP occurring very three years and suggested that the Coordinating Unit look at models from the management of other Action Plans and make a recommendation, taking account of the possible cost implications.

#### Action Point

The CU to look at models from the management of other Action Plans and make a recommendation, taking account of the possible cost implications.

### 5.3. Stakeholder engagement (STF Work Plan Objectives 5 and 10)

38. One of the main partners to be contacted in the immediate future was the European Commission. Janusz Sielicki said that it would be useful to have information material to hand to falconers when promoting the SakerGAP. Fernando Spina suggested that the CMS Information and Capacity Building Unit might be in a position to assist.

39. The Chair proposed that a small team of four or so be established to oversee production of promotional leaflets. This team would be in addition to the Working Group and its task would be the immediate production of material. András Kovács undertook to have the leaflet ready by the end of October.

40. Tom de Meulenaer saw benefits for the CITES community from the STF and said that collaboration on the implementation of the SakerGAP could be added to the CMS-CITES Joint Work Plan which was due for renewal in 2014.

41. Umeed Khalid reiterated the importance of engaging utility companies to address the issues of electrocution and collisions, while Mohammed Shobrak said that lessons could be learned from the Soaring Birds Project and its outreach activities.

#### Action Points

- The CMS Secretariat's Information and Capacity Building Unit to be asked to assist with the production of promotional material.
- A small team to be established to oversee the production of promotional material.
- András Kovács to have the leaflet ready by the end of October.

#### 5.4. Funding (STF Work Plan Objective 3)

42. The Chair said that funding would be one of the more interesting challenges. The STF had enough funds to continue its operations until the COP, but more resources would be required afterwards to help with implementation. It was noted that funding from a number of sources, including the European Commission would be worth further exploration.

43. Mátyás Prommer said that a recent change in the EU rules meant that projects in Serbia were now eligible, and other funding streams were available for projects in Asia and in developing countries. The European Action Plan was now out of date and in need of revision; it also of course took little account of areas beyond Europe. Boris Barov added that current and future LIFE regulations allowed projects outside the EU to be funded; any applications under LIFE should nonetheless point out the relevance of the species to the EU.

44. The Chair suggested that GEF might be another possibility, but its eligibility criteria and procedures were difficult. Tom de Meulenaer said that his experience of GEF was limited but knew that many CITES Parties were eligible. Leon Bennun said that the fifth round under GEF had made it very difficult for multinational projects to succeed; he hoped that in the sixth round the rules would be relaxed. He advised preparing an application early and the Coordinating Unit could make preparatory enquiries of GEF to ascertain what the prospects of success were for any project on Sakers.

45. Mohammed Shobrak said that when lobbying for financial support, it was a good idea to have promotional material (see also 5.3 above). There were many schemes and foundations to which to apply. In addition, a range of companies used the Saker Falcon as a logo; they might be asked for sponsorship. Mohammad Sulayem said that seeking partial funding rather than the full amount of a project should be considered. Other possibilities identified by Andrew Dixon were the British Council which had funded activities in the Russian Federation and BirdLife International which had funded the Mongolian satellite project.

#### Action Point

The CU to make preparatory enquiries of GEF to ascertain what the prospects of success were for any project on Sakers.

#### 6. Reporting and preparations for CMS COP11 in 2014

46. The Chair commented that the question of reporting to COP11 had been raised earlier in the meeting. The Resolution from COP10 required the STF to report to COP11. COP11 should reconsider the listing of the Saker Falcon, but responsibility for amendments to the Appendices rested with Parties not the STF. Fernando Spina said that changes to the Appendices were subject to strict deadlines set out in the Convention text and had to be considered by the Scientific Council. At this stage, he was not aware of any proposals to make any changes to the Appendices.

47. The CMS Secretariat was working on the Agenda of COP11, and the dates and venue were currently subject of intense discussion.

#### 7. Any other business

48. In response to a question from Mohammad Sulayem about the possibility of another physical meeting before the COP, the Chair said that none was foreseen and there was no budgetary provision for

one. Consideration would be given to convening a telephone conference in November to discuss the revised draft if this was deemed necessary.

49. After the customary expressions of thanks to all that had contributed to the smooth running of the meeting, the Chair declared business concluded at 13:24 hours.

## Annex I: Action Points from the Second Meeting of the STF

1. Mohammad Sulayem would contact the Qatar Foundation again regarding funding.
2. The Coordinating Unit to clarify with the CMS Secretariat whether a Resolution on electrocution is likely to be discussed at the next Conference of the Parties.
3. All to provide comments on the second draft of the Global Action Plan in due course.
4. The Chair and the Coordinating Unit to draft an outline management system for comment by the Saker Falcon Task Force.
5. The Coordinating Unit to send the draft GAP to the members of the STF by the end of October for comment. The document should be sent in "Word" format to allow comments and changes to be added.
6. Fernando Spina to prepare issue a memo to the Scientific Council and to promote the consultation process via the Scientific Council Workspace.
7. The Coordinating Unit to send the next draft of the GAP to Range States and open communications to help ensure that comments are received from as many as possible.
8. The Coordinating Unit to contact Parties in advance of the next COP to inform them of the work of the STF.
9. Leon Bennun and Robert Kenward to draft the text on the Saker Information Network.
10. Robert Kenward, Janusz Sielicki, Mohammed Shobrak, Monif Al Rashidi, Mátyás Prommer and Salim Javed to lead on the 10 trappers/10 falcon hospitals.
11. Mátyás Prommer, Andrew Dixon, Fernando Spina and Mohammed Shobrak to deal with the 100 satellite tags.
12. Robert Kenward and Andrew Dixon to work together on the 1,000 nest boxes, and András Kovács, Andrew Dixon and Michal Adamec would work on the one million poles.
13. The Coordinating Unit to look at models from the management of other Action Plans and make a recommendation, taking account of the possible cost implications.
14. The CMS Secretariat's Information and Capacity Building Unit to be asked to assist with the production of promotional material.
15. A small team to be established to oversee the production of promotional material.
16. András Kovács to have the leaflet ready by the end of October 2013.
17. The Coordinating Unit to make preparatory enquiries of GEF to ascertain what the prospects of success were for any project on Sakers.

**Annex II: List of Participants****SAKER FALCON RANGE STATES****HUNGARY**

Mr. Mátyás Prommer  
Expert, Hungarian Ministry of Rural Development  
[mprommer@yahoo.com](mailto:mprommer@yahoo.com)

**IRAN**

Mr. Sadegh Sadeghi Zadegan  
Ornithological Expert, Department of Environment  
[sadegh64@hotmail.com](mailto:sadegh64@hotmail.com)

**IRAQ**

Mr. Ali Ne'amah Salman  
Biologist, Iraqi Ministry Of Environment  
[ali\\_bio\\_84@yahoo.com](mailto:ali_bio_84@yahoo.com)

Mr. Mohammed Fadhil Abed  
Agricultural engineer, Ministry of Environment  
[mfkyatt@yahoo.com](mailto:mfkyatt@yahoo.com)

**PAKISTAN**

Mr. Umeed Khalid  
Conservator Wildlife, Climate Change Division,  
Cabinet Secretariat  
[umeed\\_khalid@yahoo.com](mailto:umeed_khalid@yahoo.com)

**SAUDI ARABIA**

Mr. Mohammad Sulayem  
Advisor, Saudi Wildlife Authority  
[msulayem2@yahoo.com](mailto:msulayem2@yahoo.com)

Dr. Mohammed Shobrak  
University of Taif  
[mshobrak@gmail.com](mailto:mshobrak@gmail.com)

Dr. Monif AlRashidi  
Assistant professor of Behavioral Ecology and  
Wildlife Conservation, University of Hail  
[mm\\_alrashedi@yahoo.com](mailto:mm_alrashedi@yahoo.com)

**SLOVAKIA**

Mr. Michal Adamec  
State Nature Conservancy of the Slovak Republic  
[michal.adamec@sopsr.sk](mailto:michal.adamec@sopsr.sk)

**UNITED ARAB EMIRATES**

Mr. Salim Javed  
Manager, Terrestrial Assessment & Conservation  
Environment Agency - Abu Dhabi  
[sjaved@ead.ae](mailto:sjaved@ead.ae)

**INSTITUTIONS, NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS AND OTHERS****BIRDLIFE INTERNATIONAL**

Dr. Leon Bennun  
Director of Science, Policy and Information  
[leon.bennun@birdlife.org](mailto:leon.bennun@birdlife.org)

**INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR FALCONRY AND CONSERVATION OF BIRDS OF PREY (IAF)**

Mr. Janusz Sielicki  
Conservation Officer  
[sielicki@iaf.org](mailto:sielicki@iaf.org)

**INTERNATIONAL WILDLIFE CONSULTANTS LTD**

Mr. Andrew Dixon  
Head of Research  
[falco@falcons.co.uk](mailto:falco@falcons.co.uk)

**IUCN - SUSTAINABLE USE AND LIVELIHOODS SPECIALIST GROUP**

Prof. Robert Kenward  
Vice-Chair  
[reke@ceh.ac.uk](mailto:reke@ceh.ac.uk)

**UKRAINIAN SOCIETY FOR THE PROTECTION OF BIRDS**

Mr. Maksym Gavrilyuk  
Associate Professor, Cherkasy National University  
[gavrilyuk.m@gmail.com](mailto:gavrilyuk.m@gmail.com)

**UNITED NATIONS ORGANISATIONS****CITES SECRETARIAT**

Mr. Tom De Meulenaer  
Scientific Officer  
[tom.de-meulenaer@cites.org](mailto:tom.de-meulenaer@cites.org)

**CMS OFFICE – ABU DHABI**

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

Ms. Jenny Renell  
Associate Programme Officer  
[jrenell@cms.int](mailto:jrenell@cms.int)

Ms. Dragana Stojkovic  
Team Associate  
[dstojkovic@cms.int](mailto:dstojkovic@cms.int)

Ms. Mariam Yacout  
Team Associate  
[myacout@cms.int](mailto:myacout@cms.int)

Prof. Colin Galbraith  
Chairman of the Saker Falcon Task Force  
[colin@cgalbraith.freemove.co.uk](mailto:colin@cgalbraith.freemove.co.uk)

Mr. Boris Barov  
Workshop Facilitator  
Programme Coordinator at BirdLife Europe  
[boris.barov@birdlife.org](mailto:boris.barov@birdlife.org)

Mr. András Kovács  
Specialist Technical Advisor (Raptors)  
[andras.kovacs.ecol@gmail.com](mailto:andras.kovacs.ecol@gmail.com)

**CMS SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL**

Dr. Fernando Spina  
CMS Scientific Councillor  
[fernando.spina@isprambiente.it](mailto:fernando.spina@isprambiente.it)

**CMS SECRETARIAT**

Mr. Robert Vagg  
Report Writer  
[rvagg@cms.int](mailto:rvagg@cms.int)