



---

**8<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE**  
*03 - 05 March 2008, Bonn, Germany*

---

**Draft Minutes of the 7<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the AEWA Technical Committee**  
*29 October – 1 November 2006, Berne, Switzerland*

**1 Opening**

1. Yousoof Mungroo, Technical Committee Chairman, opened the meeting and welcomed the participants, particularly those attending for the first time. He thanked the Swiss Government and the World Association of Zoos and Aquariums (WAZA) for co-hosting the meeting, and Peter Dollinger and Olivier Biber for their excellent preparation.

**2 Welcome addresses**

2. In his opening address, Ambassador Thomas Kolly, Head of the International Affairs Division of the Federal Office of the Environment, welcomed participants to Switzerland. His country had signed almost all the biodiversity-related conventions and had been committed to AEWA from the start. Half a million waterbirds were counted on Swiss lakes annually, many of them migratory. He wished the meeting every success.

3. Peter Dollinger, Director of WAZA, outlined the work of the association, which had been based in Berne since 2001. It was now very much conservation-oriented, and cooperated among others with the Ramsar Convention, CBD and CMS. With AEWA it shared many common interests, including invasive species, avian influenza and the single species action plans.

4. Bert Lenten, AEWA Executive Secretary, thanked the co-hosts for their hospitality, and for organising the excursion to the Jura Mountains and Lake Neuchatel. He hoped that, despite limited resources, the tradition of holding meetings in different countries could continue as it allowed valuable insight into the different problems and conditions. He also particularly thanked the Swiss Government for their generous support for AEWA from the beginning.

**3 Adoption of the Rules of Procedure**

5. Olivier Biber commented that the rules required him, as Regional Representative, to contact range states; this had proved difficult. Bert Lenten agreed that the Secretariat should help by providing the names of contacts in the regions.

6. Regarding Rule 4, Bert Lenten clarified that all Parties were welcome to send observers, but that these could not be funded. It was agreed that the wording "Members of the Committee" should be used consistently throughout the text.

7. A number of suggestions for modification were made, and the meeting decided that a small working group will consider the suggestions. The group later tabled the results, and the Rules of Procedure were adopted by the meeting (see Appendix 1).

#### **4 Adoption of the agenda and work programme**

8. Documents TC 7.3 rev 1 and 7.4 rev 1 were adopted with some modifications to the order in which agenda items would be dealt with.

9. Ghassan Ramadan-Jaradi requested time to show a five-minute DVD concerning the effects of an oil spill in Lebanon. It was agreed that this could be done at the close of the morning session.

#### **5 Admission of observers**

10. The Meeting agreed to admit the observers present (see document TC Inf 7.6, *List of Participants*), and welcomed them.

11. It was noted that the European Commission, though now a Party to the Agreement, was not represented. This was regrettable, and the Secretariat agreed to bring up this question at its meeting with the EC, which was planned to take place shortly.

12. David Stroud, who represented the UK in the ORNIS scientific working group, said that the question of getting feedback into this meeting had been discussed there, and suggested that the Secretariat should try to formalise lines of communication with the Commission.

13. Abdulmuala A. Hamza asked whether the African Union had meanwhile been contacted about their participating in TC meetings. Bert Lenten agreed to remind Senegal that it had undertaken to make this contact, and that it was important that the African countries had an equal voice in discussions at the Meeting of the Parties.

#### **6 Election of vice-chair**

14. The meeting elected Ms Jelena Kralj as the new Vice-Chair of the Technical Committee, replacing Dan Munteanu, whose term of office had come to an end.

#### **7 Adoption of the minutes of the 6<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Technical Committee**

15. The meeting reviewed document TC 7.5 rev 1, *Draft Minutes of the 6<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the AEW Technical Committee*, and suggested some modifications that will be incorporated by the Secretariat. The minutes were adopted.

16. The meeting also enquired about progress on various issues referred to in the minutes of TC6. This discussion is summarised under Agenda Item 29 (Any Other Business) below.

#### **8 Report by the Chairman**

17. Mr Youssouf Mungroo reported orally on activities since the last meeting, referring to the TC work plan that outlined the main tasks for the triennium 2006-2008. It had been drawn up by the Secretariat according to the instructions received at MOP3, and approved by the TC by

correspondence. It contained eleven tasks, which had each been entrusted to a working group. He himself had been responsible for Working Group 7, reviewing the structure of the IIPs.

18. He had also been consulted by the Secretariat on issues such as the appointment of new regional representatives and alternates for the TC, and preparing this seventh meeting of the TC. As Chairman he had attended a seminar on Avian Influenza in Nairobi, and the launching of World Migratory Bird Day in Kenya. He had also attended the meeting of the Standing Committee in July 2005, and AEWA's tenth anniversary celebrations in Bonn.

19. Ward Hagemeyer suggested that a tabular overview would assist in tracking how the activities of the TC were progressing against the work plan over time. The Secretariat agreed that this would be implemented soon as part of the communication strategy, and would be on the web site. An effort would also be made to produce the proceedings of meetings faster, despite limited resources and a heavy workload.

## **9 Report by the Secretariat**

20. Bert Lenten introduced document TC 7.6 rev 1, and gave a presentation on activities since the last Meeting of the Parties. These included the move of the Secretariat to the new UN Campus in Bonn, and the official opening of the premises, the recruitment of new staff, including a Junior Professional Officer financed by the German Government, a Programme Officer and two additional part-time assistants. Other tasks included the production of single species action plans, and organising related workshops. Avian Influenza had also been an ongoing topic, and a task force had been formed with CMS, and a CD-Rom had been produced following the Nairobi seminar. The events around World Migratory Bird Day had also been organised by the Secretariat. Other information could be found in the document.

## **10 Current status regarding implementation of the International Implementation Priorities 2006-2008**

21. Introducing this item, Bert Lenten reported that, as always, the implementation depended on the availability of funding. A new feature on the AEWA web site and in the monthly e-newsletter was a "barometer", indicating how the acquisition of funding was progressing. A total of €5.2 million was needed to implement all the priorities in the triennium, but only €200,000 had been received so far. At MOP3, Parties had decided that all such activities should be outside the core budget, financed only by voluntary contributions. It was therefore the responsibility of the Parties to ensure that funding was available for the activities they had requested.

22. Document TC 7.7 provided an overview of progress for the individual projects. Highlights were the Northern Bald Ibis, Sociable Lapwing, Black-winged Pratincole and Red-breasted Goose SSAPs implementation. The document also listed some activities for which funding had not yet been found, and a number, which were still progressing, or in the final stages of completion.

23. On behalf of OMPO, Guy-Noël Olivier thanked for this useful document, which summarised the work of the Secretariat very well. He also reiterated his statement made at TC6 in praise of the AEWA Action Plans, which were of outstanding quality compared to those of other organisations.

24. Regarding satellite tracking, Ward Hagemeyer felt there was a need to set up a facility to coordinate information, especially in view of the AI problem. Olivier Biber reported that the CMS working group on this was still active. Bert Lenten reported that the International Implementation Priorities contained an item "Guidelines for the use of satellite tracking for migratory waterbirds", for which funding had not yet been found. The Secretariat would liaise with CMS on this question.

25. Preben Clausen suggested that a number of manufacturers of tracking equipment might be interested in this project, and might be willing to assist in preparing these guidelines. Preben Clausen, Ward Hagemeyer and Sergey Dereliev agreed to form a small working group to discuss this and make a proposal.

### **11 Report by TC Working Group 1**

26. David Stroud apologised for the late distribution of document TC 7.8. After some discussion it was decided that further work was required to develop this paper. The Secretariat would liaise with the members of the group to decide on the date(s) for a one or two day workshop, to be held in Bonn, to deal with this and other matters. The resulting draft documents would be circulated to TC members before the next TC, which would be held at the beginning of 2008, and would be the last before MOP4.

### **12 Report by TC Working Group 2**

27. Presenting document TC 7.9, David Stroud apologised for its late presentation and lack of consultation with the other members of the group, Preben Clausen and John O'Sullivan. Following some discussion, the group decided that more work was required and that they would convene again in 2007 to discuss the best approach to developing these criteria.

### **13 Report by TC Working Group 3**

28. David Stroud presented document 7.10, *Guidance on Dependence on a Habitat Type Which Is under Severe Threat* and presented the results of the group's deliberations. It had decided to focus on the element of "severe threat", rather than on habitat classification, and had arrived at the following draft definition, which was not exhaustive and could possibly be expanded:

29. "Severe threats to species' habitats are those which result in changes to a large proportion of habitat, especially where those changes are irreversible or where the changes are only reversible over very long time-scales, and where such changes will negatively impact on species populations that are ecologically dependent on those habitats."

30. This criterion should be especially considered for application where the species concerned was a habitat specialist and/or a large proportion of the relevant population was dependent on a habitat of limited extent. In the case of populations qualifying for column B, the criterion was unlikely to apply to populations exceeding [2]00,000 individuals, though this figure was open to discussion.

31. Next steps would be to test these findings against real species, and produce a revised paper.

#### **14 Report by TC Working Group 4**

32. John O'Sullivan introduced document 7.11 *Guidance on the extent of extreme fluctuations in population size or trend*, produced by the working group. As many bird populations were subject to fluctuation, it was important to note the use of the word "extreme" in this context. A second paper, *Guidelines for Using the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria*, covering similar ground, had also been distributed and was probably the more useful. The group had not yet produced a full paper on this subject, but the present document identified and defined several points: the concept of mature individuals, the relationship between a reduction and a fluctuation, and a continuing decline. An extreme fluctuation also had to be clearly defined, typically as a 10-fold increase or decrease. The final bullet point, which might be subject to discussion, suggested adopting a precautionary attitude in such cases. However, the question remained as to how much effort should be devoted to defining what was likely to be a hypothetical scenario, as no bird species had yet been identified as meeting the criteria.

33. Jean-Christoph Vie confirmed that the original guidelines for applying the Red List criteria had been developed by IUCN and BirdLife, and were now available on the web. They had meanwhile been tested for all birds, and no bird species met them.

34. Preben Clausen pointed out that some species had populations that were characteristically subject to considerable fluctuation and might already be in a decline that would not become apparent for many decades unless a lower factor was applied.

35. The meeting concluded that it was good to follow the work already done by BirdLife and the IUCN on fluctuation, but that it had not been possible to apply the "10-fold" criterion to any waterbird population so far. The magnitude to be applied should therefore be tested on AEWA populations on which more information was available. The group working on the other criteria for Table 1 would therefore have additional work. All assumptions needed to be tested before reporting back to the TC with guidance on applying these criteria.

36. John O'Sullivan pointed out that if the group proceeded as outlined, the term "extreme fluctuation" should be avoided to avoid confusion with the IUCN definition.

#### **15 Report by TC Working Group 5**

37. Bert Lenten reported on the work of this group in developing and harmonising online reporting. The aim was to make information about the various MEAs more widely available. Regarding online reporting, at a meeting in Cambridge with UNEP-WCMC, the lead organisation for the project, he had appealed for the system to be made available free of charge to CMS and AEWA, and designed, so that AEWA reports were automatically inserted into the CMS report.

38. Robert Pople reported that the project had been under development since June 2006, and involved CBD, CITES, CMS and AEWA, plus the Ramsar Convention. This was already a huge task, but it was hoped later to extend the project to cover other regional conventions. A series of workshops had been convened by UNEP-WCMC. The aim was to provide a user-friendly portal providing access to all strategic documents, thus giving a better overview of how MEAs work together. Specific activities would cover agreements, their texts and resolutions, and the reporting systems. The national reporting formats would be restructured to make the data received less descriptive and more quantifiable. This should increase the response rate. For AEWA, implementation was planned for the first half of 2007, so AEWA

would be asked to submit its proforma reporting format early in 2007. Other activities linked to reporting included identifying the core set of reporting elements common to all national reports, and developing joint thematic modules across the conventions, as mandated by recent convention/agreement decisions. The system would be developed in close cooperation with the relevant secretariats, and tested with a subsection of contracting parties to ensure it met their needs.

39. Asked who would prepare the reporting format, Bert Lenten replied that this would be done by the Secretariat together with the working group established to look at the terms of reference for online reporting, but input from others was also welcome.

40. Bert Lenten said that if this very important project succeeded, UNEP would provide more funding to elaborate and extend it to other MEAs. He added that the system would provide many new features, thus making it more interesting for Parties than the current one. There would be time for Parties to consider before the final decision, which would be taken at CMS COP and AEWA MOP.

41. Outlining the timetable for Working Group 5 for the coming months, Sergey Dereliev suggested that the Secretariat should concentrate on developing the format, to be submitted to UNEP-WCMC by the end of March 2007. He suggested that the Secretariat and the working group should meet before the end of 2006, but that a larger group might be needed to finalise this before the March deadline.

## **16 Report by TC Working Group 6**

42. Olivier Biber introduced document TC 7.12. The working group had been asked to consider the potential role of AEWA in the conservation of seabirds, also considering other existing treaties. Apart from the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP), which was also under the auspices of the Bonn Convention, no others specifically covered seabirds, so AEWA would seem to be the agreement that should do this. He added that there were many paragraphs in the Convention on Biodiversity appealing especially for regional agreements to protect the species groups with coastal and marine habitats.

43. Regarding the species that might be covered, document MOP3/3.29 had included a list of 21 seabird species for inclusion in AEWA. It had not been discussed in detail there because it had been submitted too late. Some Parties had expressed reservations about its content, but as no Party had submitted any concerns to the Secretariat so far Working Group 6 now recommended that the document be re-submitted to MOP4 for approval.

44. Olivier Biber summed up the discussion by outlining the tasks to be completed before the next TC meeting. The working group would examine the Barcelona Convention and its action plans for seabirds, and check for synergies and potential conflicts with this and other conventions. It would also look closely at CBD's third report for threatened species, at the list of threats relevant to seabirds in the Action Plan, and the threats already listed in document MOP3/3.29, and would complete the proposed list in the light of these findings. The Secretariat would check for any potential conflicts between the current list and previous AEWA resolutions and decisions, and also identify Parties willing to submit and second the submission of the proposed amendments to MOP4. The revised version of the document would probably be available in February 2007.

45. Sergey Dereliev confirmed that the Secretariat would then consult Parties, including the EC, about the reservations they had expressed at MOP3. The document would also be circu-

lated to the members of the TC. This would allow sufficient time for consultations with Parties before the next TC meeting at the beginning of 2008, and for the formal proposal to amend the Action Plan to be submitted 150 days before the next Meeting of the Parties, which was scheduled for the end of November 2008.

### **17 Report by TC Working Group 7**

46. Sergey Dereliev reported that this group had the task of adjusting the International Implementation Priorities to the issues emerging from the AEWA International Reviews and other work being undertaken within the Agreement. The seven Reviews should have been presented to each MOP, however only two been produced at all. *Report on the Status and Trends of Populations* had so far been presented to each MOP, and *Status of Introduced Non-native Waterbird Species and Hybrids Thereof* had been produced for MOP2, but not updated since. MOP3 had therefore instructed the Secretariat and the TC to work together to produce all seven reviews for MOP4, and to adjust the IIP for the next triennium according to their findings.

47. The Secretariat had examined options for producing these reviews and had applied to the EC for funding to prepare the next 4<sup>th</sup> edition of the *Report on the Status and Trends of Populations* and expected a response by the end of the year. The work would be done by Wetlands International, and could then be completed by the end of 2007, enabling the TC to approve it at the next meeting early in 2008.

48. The *International Review of Gaps in Information from Surveys* and the *International Review of Networks of Sites* might not be completed. They were both linked to the WOW Project that would be presented later. The *Review on Hunting and Trade Legislation* should be prepared by the Secretariat by the end of 2007 for submission to the next TC meeting.

49. The last three (*International Review of Preparations and Implementation of Single Species Action Plans*, *International Review of Re-establishment Projects*, and the *International Review of Status of Non-native Waterbird Species*) had not been started for administrative reasons related to the AEWA budget.

50. Elaborating, Bert Lenten explained that because the Secretariat's budget had been reduced by exchange rate losses, the MOP had decided to remove such activities from the core budget and establish a second Trust Fund for these. This process was proving extremely complicated and time-consuming, the 2005 accounts had not yet been closed and the surplus could not be used. The Secretariat had had to hire a consultant who was currently trying to produce an overview of the current financial status. For the time being no new activities could be contracted out. Nevertheless, he again asked all countries for financial assistance to enable the Secretariat to proceed once the situation was clarified.

### **18 Report by TC Working Group 8**

51. David Stroud introduced document 7.17, *Assessing the Impact of Climate Change on Waterbirds and Development of Conservation Guidance for AEWA*. He had just been informed that the United Kingdom would provide GBP 20,000 to help take this substantial project forward. The document broke down the work into five groups of tasks, some of which had al-

ready been done or were currently being undertaken by other bodies. However, a considerable amount of work remained.

52. In addition the MOP had also requested the development of conservation guidelines on possible adaptation measures. This was not mentioned in the document, but should have the highest priority, and part of the UK contribution could be used for this.

53. The meeting noted that in 2007 the theme of World Migratory Bird Day would be climate change. The event would probably include a scientific workshop, as well as some activities for the general public.

54. Jean-Christoph Vie reported that the IUCN Species Survival Commission had a project to identify vulnerability traits, assessing all birds, amphibians and mammals, and include climate change in the Red List categories and criteria. It would include assessments of all birds, and look at those mostly impacted by climate change. It was also hoped to use this data to help refine climate change models. A full report on this project was expected to be available by the World Conservation Congress in 2008.

55. David Stroud agreed that the main message should be to stress the need for measures to prevent climate change. He felt priority should be given to the species in Column 1 of the AEWA list.

56. Abdulmuala Hamza suggested the production of a short film to show hotspots where it was thought climate change was affecting habitats. The scientific approach was not easy for the general public to understand. The Secretariat agreed to look into this possibility.

57. Ward Hagemeyer asked if formal links existed between AEWA and UNFCCC. Bert Lenten replied that he would soon be meeting the new Executive Secretary of UNFCCC to discuss cooperation, but feared that environmental issues were no longer a priority for the Convention. The Secretariat had made contact with the US Fishery and Wildlife Service, which also held an annual International Migratory Bird Day, next year also with climate change as its theme. In addition CMS had produced a brochure on the subject, with a contribution from AEWA, which would be presented at the Nairobi Conference on Climate Change in November 2006.

58. The group had also developed a project plan, which David Stroud presented. This foresaw various strands of activity being brought together before MOP4 at the end of 2008, including a small workshop linked to World Migratory Bird Day in April 2007. Following this the group should meet again to review progress, revise the International Implementation Priorities, modify the Action Plan, and prepare a draft resolution for MOP4. The presentation also outlined possible funding for some of these activities.

59. Alfoussemi Semega noted that many studies were being done in Europe, and asked if more attention should be paid to African countries, especially the Sahel region. This was now suffering from longer rainfall, leading to increased numbers of locusts and pollution resulting from the pesticides used to combat them. He enquired if it were possible to conduct studies in these areas.

## **19 Report by TC Working Group 9**

60. Sergey Dereliev reported on progress in drafting a review of experiences of countries where lead shot has been phased out, requested by Resolution 2.2. This task was being under-

taken by the Secretariat, with Catherine Lehmann in charge, and was being done in conjunction with an update of the general review of the lead shot issue, last produced in 2001 by Wetlands International. This was an IIP project to be done this triennium, so this general review will be in a similar format to that in 2001. A second module would be the review of experiences of countries where the phasing out of lead shot had already been completed.

61. Catherine Lehmann reported that she was currently drafting a new two-section questionnaire, and would be consulting the working group on this very shortly. Cy Griffin reported that FACE had recently sent a very simple questionnaire to a total of 36 hunting associations; 20 replies had been received in the first two weeks, an excellent response rate.

62. Guy-Noël Olivier remarked that progress on phasing out lead shot was far too slow, only one country having made the change in the last two years. This was not just a European problem: France and Spain had now phased out lead shot, but this needed to be done throughout the entire flyway.

63. Bert Lenten agreed. The Secretariat was playing an active role, and the workshops on sustainable hunting being held in Africa were one aspect of this. There was also a reader on the subject available on the AEWA web site. The Parties had decided to depart from the original 2000 deadline and request progress reports instead. He felt more pressure could be put on them at the next MOP, and that the hunting associations could play an important role in doing so.

64. Niels Kanstrup also felt that more ambitious goals were needed. Now that France was on board the market for alternative materials would grow. He felt that more simple information material could be distributed at the right level, but that this should have a positive message, and should talk of replacing lead with an alternative, i.e. "phasing in" rather than "phasing out". The hunting associations could be asked to help with this.

65. Abdulmuala Hamza noted that there had been much discussion about sustainable hunting during the North African workshop. There was some reluctance in the Middle East and North Africa to phase out lead shot before all European countries had done so.

66. Rachel Adam suggested that the TC might recommend to the MOP that the Action Plan be amended to make phasing out obligatory. Olivier Biber read a request from Sweden, which would introduce a total ban on lead shot from 2008, that more pressure should be put on Parties. However, some representatives felt that too much pressure might send a negative signal to countries not yet Parties to the Agreement.

67. The meeting decided that the Secretariat should distribute the questionnaire currently under preparation to all range states, and also contact focal points to ask about the situation in the regions. The working group would also be consulted. An overview of the outcome would be presented at the next TC meeting, which could then submit a recommendation to the MOP.

## **20 Report by TC Working Group 10**

68. David Stroud introduced document 7.13, *Assessment of AEWA's Conservation Guidelines*. The main points concerned the way the guidelines were presented and "packaged" for the intended audience, and whether small modifications would make them more accessible. All guidelines should be available in at least the two working languages of the Agreement, but perhaps also in Russian and Arabic. He also suggested that presenting them in modular form would make them more user-friendly.

69. Concerning updating the guidelines, David Stroud thought that this could be outsourced. Work was needed on their substantive content, and also some editing was required to split them into stand-alone documents, to put them on the web site, and insert links to other guidelines such as the Edinburgh proceedings, Ramsar etc.

70. Sergey Dereliev reported that the WIGWAG meeting held immediately prior to the TC had discussed the advantages of internationally approved standards for monitoring work. Data from waterbird censuses etc. was increasingly being used to justify the declaration of sites for conservation. Internationally agreed standards would help prevent such sites being challenged in the courts. It had been suggested that the existing AEWA guidelines should be checked to see if they met such minimum requirements. If so, there was no need to modify them, if not, then additional work could be outsourced, for example to Wetlands International, to make them applicable for this purpose.

71. Florian Keil confirmed that he would ensure that the guidelines were easier to find on the AEWA web site, and would break them up into smaller modules to make them more user-friendly.

72. Bert Lenten agreed that the Conservation Guidelines should be better promoted, and proposed that, as an immediate improvement, they should be made more visible by featuring them in future editions of the E-Newsletter, and by inserting a button on the first page of the web site. The Secretariat would also make minor updates, check the links for correctness, and would record the number of "hits/visits". He felt it wise to delay any substantial update, and translations into Russian and Arabic, until these measures had had time to take effect, and that the next TC meeting should decide on further modifications, depending on funds. The meeting agreed to this proposal and also decided that a questionnaire regarding the usage of the guidelines should be circulated through regional representatives before the next TC meeting.

## **21 Report by TC Working Group 11**

73. Rachel Adam presented document 7.14 (*National Reports as Indicators of Implementation and Effectiveness of AEWA*) and thanked the other members of the Working Group for their input. She agreed that this group should be linked with the WG considering national reporting formats. The questions asked in the national reports needed to be designed with the desired result in mind.

74. She pointed out that the lack of compliance mechanisms in the Agreement was proving to be a problem. The text included no provisions regarding compliance, although both its implementation and effectiveness were obviously major, though separate, concerns. However, implementation of the Agreement did not necessarily mean it was being effective. In the Working Group's view, the TC should take the initiative in considering how to measure effectiveness, a question not specifically covered by the current national reporting format.

75. Petri Nummi approved the idea of measuring effectiveness and thought it would be useful to include indicators of this, rather than just asking about future plans.

76. Following some discussion of how process and outcome indicators might be applied to monitor the effectiveness of the Agreement, and how this related to the CBD 2010 target, the meeting decided that Working Group 11 would merge with Working Group 5 (on-line reporting format). The Secretariat would propose some indicators as a starting point. As there was an obvious link between such indicators and strategy, it was also decided that the interes-

sional working group on the Strategic Plan, which had been decided on at TC6 but had not yet started work (Robert Pople, David Stroud, Ward Hagemeijer and Olivier Biber) would also be included in this new group. The Secretariat would take the lead on this.

## **22 AEW Single Species Action Plans**

### **a. Progress in implementation and development of SSAPs**

77. Sergey Dereliev reported on Secretariat activities to coordinate the implementation of the eight plans so far approved by the Meeting of the Parties.

#### *Sociable Lapwing and Black-winged Pratincole*

78. Thanks to support from the Government of Switzerland and the RSPB, the Secretariat had been able to recruit a full-time coordinator for these two Action Plans. Victoria Kovshar, who had started work on 1 September 2006, was based in Almaty, Kazakhstan. Initial funding was available for one year, and more financial support would be sought to continue the project.

79. The Secretariat is currently involved in an RSPB-lead project funded by the UK Darwin Initiative, a funding instrument for countries with rich biodiversity but poor resources. In July 2006 Sergey Dereliev had visited the project in Kazakhstan, which was doing impressive work. One outcome of the project should be a revised version of the Action Plan.

#### *Great Snipe*

80. Here not much had been achieved. The Secretariat had asked the Government of Norway to consider providing a coordinator for this action plan, but had not yet received a response.

#### *Ferruginous Duck, White-headed Duck and Light-bellied Brent Goose*

81. The Secretariat had consulted with the Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust in the UK, which was largely responsible for drafting these three plans. There was now a full-time post at WWT for the Light-bellied Brent Goose action plan, and this person would also coordinate the Light-bellied Brent Goose working group. The Ferruginous Duck action plan had been drafted with the support of the BirdLife conservation team on that species, which was currently being chaired by the BirdLife Partner in Bulgaria. Details regarding the coordination mechanism for this action plan were still being discussed with WWT, which was closely involved with the conservation team, but it was hoped to report on the arrangements at the next TC meeting.

#### *Corncrake*

82. There had not been much progress on providing a mechanism for the Corncrake action plan, as the BirdLife conservation team for this species was not currently active. The Secretariat was currently investigating alternatives.

#### *Northern Bald Ibis*

83. This plan had been largely drafted by the international advisory group for the Northern Bald Ibis, which included representatives from outside the species' current range. The advisory group had met in October and discussed appointing a coordinator for the implementation of this action plan, but could not decide. However, BirdLife International was also interested in taking a more active role, and a final decision would be taken in the coming months. This

single species action plan had high priority as the Syrian population had recently been found to be wintering in central Ethiopia.

84. The following plans were still in the pipeline:

*Maccoa Duck*

85. A number of comments had been received, and the draft plan was almost ready for submission to the Standing Committee meeting in November, where it was expected to be approved provisionally, before final adoption at the next MOP.

*Lesser White-fronted Goose*

86. Controversies over genetics and reintroduction of the species in Europe were slowing down this process. Comments on the first draft, which had been circulated in parallel to the Range States, had been received from Sweden, and any others should be submitted as soon as possible. It was hoped that the ORNIS Committee, where the consultation over the plan at the EU level is taking place, would provide its comments in 2007, and that the plan could then progress.

*Dark-bellied Brent Goose*

87. Three key countries, Denmark, France and Russia had not yet submitted their comments on the current draft. It had been suggested that in future a deadline for comments should be set, after which plans would automatically progress to the next stage of the approval process. However, a study on the effect of hunting on the Dark-bellied Brent Goose population was currently in progress, and would be ready by February 2007. These results could be included in the new version of the action plan. Comments that Germany had recently submitted would certainly be included. The Committee must decide whether to wait for the results of the scientific study to be included, or to endorse the current version, including the comments from Germany.

88. The Meeting agreed that the German comments would be circulated for review, and the result of the scientific analysis should be included in a new version. However, it was important that this plan, one of the oldest in the portfolio, was concluded and adopted by the Standing Committee without further delay, if possible in 2007. Any remaining flaws could be dealt with in a review at a later date.

89. As already mentioned in the Secretariat's report, three more single species action plans would soon be drafted. These were for the Lesser Flamingo (a joint CMS/AEWA action plan, for which a workshop had been held in Kenya in September), the Black-tailed Godwit and the Spoonbill, which would be commissioned on receipt of a grant from VBN (BirdLife Netherlands). The Secretariat was also discussing with CMS and other donors the possibility of producing action plans for the Madagascar Pond Heron, White-winged Flufftail, Slaty Egret and Shoebill (all inter-African migrants). It was hoped that additional Range States, e.g. Botswana and Ethiopia, would ratify the Agreement, and would participate in the development of these plans. So far no funding was in place, and contributions from Parties would be very welcome.

90. Olivier Biber reported that Switzerland had finalised its national action plan on the White Stork, to be launched and publicised in 2007. It also included actions concerning France, Spain and northwest Africa.

91. Responding to a general question from Preben Clausen about the procedure for ensuring that comments submitted were included in the final versions, Sergey Dereliev assured the meeting that the drafts were circulated to the Technical Committee, and all responses received in writing, by e-mail to himself, were taken on board.

## **b. Species Working Groups**

92. Sergey Dereliev introduced document 7.15 rev 1, *Draft Terms of Reference for the White-headed Duck Working Group*.

93. As mentioned under the previous agenda item, the White-headed Duck was one of five species for which action plans had been approved at MOP3. Talks had been held with the Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust, which would coordinate the implementation of the plan, which had been drafted in conjunction with Wetlands International in Asia. In order to ensure the most effective implementation of the plans, it had been decided to establish species working groups, bringing together the internationally recognised experts for each species. The terms of reference should be adaptable to the other working groups as they were established, and should be regarded as a template, rather than valid for the White-headed Duck Working group only. The Secretariat would then fine-tune them for each working group.

94. The meeting raised a number of questions as to the composition and objectives of such groups, how they should be funded etc., and it was decided that the Secretariat would elaborate and re-draft the Terms of Reference in the light of these comments, and circulate it to the TC by e-mail for further consultation.

## **23 Avian Influenza**

### **a. Update and setting priorities**

95. Florian Keil gave a presentation on the AIWeb project (Avian Influenza, Wildlife and the Environment), which AEWA had been involved with since April 2006 as a member of the International Scientific Task Force on Avian Influenza and Wild Birds. It was intended as a crisis response web page for the media, and now it was established it could be re-activated in the case of a fresh outbreak. If this occurred, TC members should not hesitate to submit data to ensure that this was a really useful tool

96. Bert Lenten showed the meeting a leaflet on the project. This was currently only available in English, but the Secretariat was trying to obtain funding from a donor for Russian, Arabic and French versions.

97. John O'Sullivan commended the Secretariat on doing a very good job at very short notice, and hoped that other Task Force members were also contributing.

### **b. Avian Influenza: Report by Switzerland**

98. Iris Bachmann, from the Swiss Federal Veterinary Office, the authority responsible for monitoring AI in Switzerland, reported on the "Constanze" programme. This joint Swiss, German and Austrian project to monitor avian influenza around Lake Constance would be launched in Spring 2007. Public awareness of the disease had increased dramatically in 2005, and as a result many dead birds were reported and sampled, and some cases of AI were indeed found. It aimed to improve knowledge about the epidemiology of the virus in wild waterfowl, examining the dynamics of the virus in wild birds, the role of migratory birds and the risk to domestic poultry. To do so existing data on migration was being analysed, and data collected and would include the sampling of healthy birds and sentinel ducks. Lake Constance was a particularly interesting area because of the large numbers of birds that overwintered there.

## **24 Addis Ababa Principles**

99. The Technical Committee had been asked to review MOP3 Resolution 3.19, and TC information document 7.5. (the CBD document *Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity*).

100. David Stroud explained that three of these were more relevant to AEWA than other: Practical Principle 4 (p. 11), Principle 9 (p. 16) and Principle 12 (p.18). These would be useful for committee members to consider when preparing case studies for the Meeting of the Parties, as required by Resolution 3.19.

## **25 Other reports**

### **a. AEWA Strategic Plan**

101. The Executive Secretary reported orally on this project, which would commence at the Standing Committee meeting at the end of November 2006. Time was very limited, so this would be linked with and run parallel to the project on online reporting already discussed. More information would be available in the coming weeks. The work would be contracted out to the consultancy that had produced the AEWA communication strategy. The plan would be based on the CMS Strategic Plan, and funds would be sought to hold additional workshops if necessary. It was important to ensure the best communication between all key players, and this would be done, probably in a workshop.

### **b. African-Eurasian Flyways GEF Project**

102. Edoardo Zandri reported on the progress on this project, the name of which had now been changed to *Wings over Wetlands: The African-Eurasian Flyways Project (WOW)*. Information on the project was available on the temporary web site hosted by Wetlands International (<http://www.wetlands.org>), but he was closely liaising with the Secretariat's JPO, Florian Keil, to develop a more structured web site soon.

103. The main focus of WOW was on capacity building and training. The project entailed the establishment of four regional hubs, and the implementation of eleven demonstration projects in countries throughout the AEWA region, as well as the provision of know-how and support for regional training centres. These initiatives would demonstrate the advantages of implementing AEWA, and would facilitate the dissemination of best practice and management activities at key sites in the area. Unfortunately some important parts of the project were still under-funded. However, work had finally started in July 2006, and focal points had been established in the partner organisations and meetings held. He expressed his thanks to those who had helped launch the project.

104. Mr Hamza asked how non-members could be involved in the project. Mr Zandri stressed again that each of the eleven demonstration projects had only limited funding. The circulation of information would be an important part of the output, they would try to reach all the countries in each region and all potential partners were welcome to take part, even though there was no financial support available for them to participate in workshops etc.

105. Alfoussemi Semega asked how the various partners in the West Africa region and local communities would be represented. Mr Zandri explained that projects were being implemented by local organisations, making use of existing capacity, with support from Wetlands International and BirdLife International. The local teams were already in place and ready to start work.

106. Ward Hagemeyer pointed out that this was one of the first flyway-wide GEF projects and would benefit not only the countries with demonstration sites, but the entire region, and would involve all the existing networks. In addition, the capacity development component would establish sub-regional training boards, also involving all countries and stakeholders in the region. The communication component, which had many elements, would also reach out to all the stakeholders in the region, and would develop materials to increase awareness.

107. Jérôme Mokoko enquired how the demonstration sites, which appeared to be concentrated in West Africa, had been chosen. Responding, Mr Zandri regretted that there were indeed many gaps, but explained these were places where partners had already been active on the ground, to take advantage of existing infrastructure. The aim was to obtain the best results to benefit the whole region, rather than protecting the individual sites, although these were all important.

108. Ward Hagemeyer added that initially a list of criteria had been established; all countries along the flyway had then been invited to submit proposals for projects to be included, and the proposals submitted were checked against this list. Unfortunately there had been no suitable candidate in central Africa at the time - just as there was no demonstration project in the central Asian region. This certainly did not mean that these areas were not important.

109. Mr Hamza expressed concern that the project was concentrating on establishing guidelines rather than work in the field. Mr Zandri sympathised, but explained that WOW would maximise the capacity of people working on these issues throughout the flyway and channel the knowledge gained to the local institutions involved and towards building up the regional hubs.

110. Mr Hagemeyer added that this flyway-scale strategic project could not address issues within all the sites; but it was important as a background to the more traditional kind of GEF project being used to achieve results locally on the ground.

111. Mr Lenten hoped that in the longer term hitherto unknown sites might be identified, and felt that when the project was finalised in five years' time it might be clear for example that more action on sites, or training was needed, for which additional funding would be required. It should not be forgotten that only 25% of the money was being spent on demonstration projects; 75% on everything else. AEWA committed itself to provide US \$ 1.3 million co-funding to this project. This contribution partly consists of a contribution in cash, partly in kind. Additionally, voluntary contributions received for the implementation of IIP 2006-2008 regarding projects that are linked to the WOW project will be allocated to WOW as co-funding.

### **c. World Migratory Bird Day 2006**

112. Florian Keil gave a presentation on this event, held at the Ol Ari Nyiro estate in Laikipia, Kenya in April 2006.

113. The Executive Secretary followed this by outlining plans for the coming years to make this an annual event, possibly in cooperation with BirdLife and run by a separate secretariat. The 2007 event, to be held in April, would have the theme "Climate change and Migratory Birds".

114. John O'Sullivan remarked that he was impressed by the event, and the worldwide response and participation.

115. Olivier Biber was pleased to hear that in future it would be supported by all the conventions dealing with migratory birds.

116. Abdulmuala A. Hamza regretted that Libya had not been able to take part because the next day had been the Libyan National Environment Day. He strongly supported the initiative, not least because such activities were vital to demonstrate how important migratory birds were, especially in the wake of the avian influenza crisis. He would report home about it and would do his best to participate in 2007.

117. David Stroud also expressed his enthusiasm for the idea.

#### **d. Other projects**

##### *a. Conservation Status Review (third edition)*

118. Sergey Dereliev reported that the first version had been available as a rough draft in October 2005. The TC had commented and returned it to the main compiler, Simon Delany (Wetlands International) for further work. The Secretariat had received the second version only days before the present TC meeting, and circulated it to members by e-mail, and invited them to discuss it now.

119. The conservation status review was AEWA's "flagship" product used to track the implementation of the Agreement. It should correctly reflect the status of populations within the Agreement area, and should also be easy to read. It was not yet complete because version 2 had been submitted before finalisation of the *Waterbird Population Estimate, Fourth Edition*, and because several species were split up into separate subspecies/populations. The TC was therefore asked to review its content again.

120. Bert Lenten added that as the Standing Committee would be asked to reconsider the need for updates at three-yearly intervals, this meeting should also discuss the question.

121. Olivier Biber confirmed that this was one of the most important documents available to assess – and demonstrate – the effectiveness of AEWA, so he felt it should be available in a printed version. Although funding was available, it was very expensive to produce, and he felt that this need not be done every three years. Updates could be available on the web site, or perhaps a short printed update could be published, referring to the last full report.

122. Preben Clausen found the report very attractive. However, the first 29 pages contained the necessary information, while the rest merely duplicated the *Waterbird Population Estimates 4*, which Wetlands International submitted to Ramsar. In his opinion, the financial burden should ideally be shared by making this a joint AEWA/Ramsar publication, but it should be published now and discussion about its future development postponed to the next TC meeting.

123. David Stroud agreed that this was a fundamental information document that should be presented to each Meeting of Parties, but that parts of it should be available on the web to make updating it more cost-effective. Its two parts addressed separate audiences: the key messages, and the data section. The Executive Summary should be given highest profile. He also felt that some more simple analyses could be included, and linked to the main headline messages. For example a comparison of trends between 2002 and the present would show a progressively worsening pattern throughout.

124. Ward Hagemeyer pointed out that this document was required by the Agreement, and that updates were therefore mandatory. The document still required a lot of work, and could be improved by including key messages etc. A more appealing style and presentation would be a step in the right direction.

125. Several members pointed out that the population estimate data used came from many sources, but mainly from voluntary groups; it was neither collected systematically nor updated automatically. Gathering it was an extremely time-consuming and expensive task, and was often done without payment. However, to ensure the value of the data this process had to be streamlined and the information actively sought.

126. The Secretariat confirmed that an additional grant of 50,000 Euro was available from the European Commission to produce the next Conservation Status Review, which should be ready at the end of 2007, for consultation with the TC in 2008. There were, however, doubts about the future productions of the CSR, especially if AEWA's budget was cut still further.

127. The meeting concluded that an update was necessary every three years, and that the next was therefore due in 2008, at least as a draft. The Standing Committee should be reminded that the MOP had given priority to this activity, and that the budget of the next triennium should take account of this.

128. Regarding the current version, however, TC members were asked to submit proposals for modifications to the Secretariat immediately after the meeting, to allow it to be finalised by the end of the year.

*b. Project on sustainable hunting in the Mediterranean region*

129. Sergey Dereliev reported on this EU LIFE-funded project being run by BirdLife International, its full title being *Building capacity for sustainable hunting of migratory birds in Mediterranean third countries*. All northern African and eastern Mediterranean Arabic countries with the exception of Libya had been involved in this, and a workshop had been held in Tunisia at the beginning of September.

130. The first workshop had been devoted to developing the two flagship documents that were required by the project. The first, *Regional guidelines for sustainable migratory bird hunting*, was a very extensive document, and a second draft including input from the two-day workshop would be circulated to the TC. At the workshop it was proposed to submit it to the Meeting of the Parties for approval as regional guidelines for sustainable hunting of water-birds. The second document, *Regional code of best practice*, would be dealt with in a similar fashion. Both documents were being finalised in consultation with the stakeholders within the region. The TC was requested to review these two documents after the meeting and express an opinion whether they would merit an approval by MOP.

131. A second workshop promoting sustainable hunting practices would be organised in May 2007. Its aim was to review the obligations of the countries in the region under the international biodiversity conventions and to stimulate the phase out of lead shot.

*c. Guidelines on mitigation of effect of aquatic weeds on waterbird habitats in Africa*

132. Sergey Dereliev reported that the last TC meeting had asked the Secretariat to look at the report on aquatic weeds related to sites important for waterbirds in Africa. He was in the process of drafting a guideline on this issue for circulation within the TC for comments, with a view to submitting it to the Meeting of the Parties for approval.

*d. CMS questionnaire on windfarms and electrocution*

133. He also reported on a recent CMS initiative related also to AEWAs. In line with two resolutions passed at CMS COP7, and the approval of the CMS Strategic Plan for 2006-2011 by COP8, CMS had circulated a questionnaire on the environmental impact of windfarms and on the electrocution of migratory birds. A consultant was currently evaluating the information being received from CMS contracting parties. Information on the outcome would be circulated to the Technical Committee.

## **26 TC Work Plan 2006-2008**

134. Sergey Dereliev reported that document 7.16, the work plan for the triennium, had been circulated by e-mail to the TC members in mid-February 2006 and approved. He now suggested that the work plan should be reviewed at the end of each TC and if necessary adjusted in the light of the outcome of the meeting.

135. The Secretariat had made note of the numerous changes that had been discussed during the meeting so far, and would circulate a revised version to the TC shortly. This would include new titles for the re-organised working groups previously agreed.

## **27 TC working languages**

136. The Secretariat had experienced problems producing French translations of all the documents for this TC meeting due to lack of resources. For the time being, it would continue to do its best to ensure that all documents were available in the two official languages, English and French, but asked members to bear in mind the time required for translation, and to submit their documents as early as possible.

137. The one French-speaking member of the Committee expressed his disappointment at not being able to participate fully in the discussion, but had kindly agreed to his contributions being translated by other members of the Committee for those who did not understand French. Olivier Biber, representing the host country, apologised for the fact that no French interpretation had been provided for this meeting.

138. It was agreed that the Secretariat would approach the *Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie* to ask about possible financial assistance to maintain these services. In addition, increased use should be made of PowerPoint summaries to aid comprehension, particularly for agenda items where no documents or translations were available.

## **28 Date and venue of next Technical Committee meeting**

139. The Executive Secretary reported that this was likely to be in January or February 2008. Ghana had been approached as a possible host. The decision would be made as soon as possible. The next meeting was expected to take a minimum of four days, it being the last TC event before the Fourth Meeting of the Parties (Madagascar, 23-27 November 2008).

## **29 Any other business**

### **a. Alpine population of the Goosander (*Mergus merganser*)**

140. Dr Verena Keller of the Swiss Ornithological Institute gave a presentation of new data on the status of the Alpine population of the Goosander or Common Merganser. There was a very large breeding population of the species in northern Europe, one in Iceland, one on the British Isles, a tiny population in the Balkans, as well as the Alpine population. In Switzerland, Lake Geneva was the main breeding area, from which the species had spread. This was concentrated in Switzerland, Bavaria and Austria, and had been increasing in recent decades. Ringing recoveries indicated that the male birds left the region in winter, but there was no information as to where they went. A genetic analysis indicated that the Alpine females probably stayed in the Alps, whereas the males migrated to and from Northern Europe. The Alpine population was not listed by AEWA, but there was definite evidence of some seasonal migration, meeting the Bonn Convention definition of a migratory species, though many questions remained unanswered and more research was needed.

### **b. The role of the TC in producing waterbird population status reviews**

141. Guy-Noël Olivier of OMPO, who suggested adding this point to the agenda earlier, withdrew this item.

### **c. Letter from the Azov-Black Sea Ornithological Station**

142. The request from the director of the Azov-Black Sea Ornithological Station to consider establishing a commission to deal with coordination of research and monitoring in a large part of the Agreement area had been circulated to the Members before the summer break. The Meeting agreed that the Secretariat should contact this organisation again to ask for clarification on their precise requirements.

## **30 Closure of the Meeting**

143. The Executive Secretary thanked the participants, in particular the new members, for their input. As a result the Secretariat now had more work, but this was a positive sign. The success of such meetings much depended on the hosts, and this TC had been unique in having been organised jointly by a governmental and a non-governmental organisation. He expressed his thanks to everyone involved for the perfect organisation.

**RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR MEETINGS OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE  
OF THE AGREEMENT ON THE CONSERVATION OF AFRICAN-EURASIAN MI-  
GRATORY WATERBIRDS (AEWA)**

**General functions**

**Rule 1**

The Technical Committee (hereinafter referred to as Committee), established in accordance with Article VII of the Agreement provides scientific and technical advice and information, to the Meeting of the Parties and, through the Agreement Secretariat, to the Parties; it makes recommendations to the Meetings of the Parties concerning the Action Plan, implementation of the Agreement and further research to be carried out; it prepares for each ordinary session of the Meeting of the Parties a report on its activities, which shall be submitted to the Agreement secretariat not less than one hundred and twenty days before the session of the Meeting of the Parties; it carries out any other tasks referred to it by the Meeting of the Parties. The Technical Committee works closely with the Standing Committee to ensure consistency across the Agreement's work.

**Representation and attendance**

**Rule 2**

1. In accordance with Article VII paragraph 1, the Committee membership shall comprise:
  - (a) nine experts representing the different regions of the Agreement Area (northern & south western Europe, central Europe, eastern Europe, south-western Asia, northern Africa, central Africa, western Africa, eastern Africa and southern Africa) elected among all the Parties on the recommendation of the Parties of the region in question;
  - (b) one representative appointed by each of the following organisations: the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN), Wetlands International, the International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC); and
  - (c) one expert from each of the following fields: rural economics, game management, and environmental law; elected by the Parties.
2. Any Party has the right to recommend an expert in the fields of rural economics, game management and environmental law for nomination by the Meeting of the Parties.
3. With the exception of the experts in the field of rural economics, game management and environmental law, all the above-mentioned representatives shall name an Alternate Member for each position to be approved by the Meeting of the Parties.

**Rule 3**

Except as provided for in Rule 7, attendance at meetings of the Technical Committee shall be limited to members of the Technical Committee or their Alternates and observers of the Parties.

**Rule 4**

Only members of the Committee (hereinafter the members) shall exercise the voting rights. In his/her absence, the Alternate shall act in his or her place.

**Rule 5**

1. The term of office of the members shall expire at the close of the second ordinary Meeting following that at which they were elected, unless extended by agreement of the Meeting of the Parties. At each ordinary meeting of the Meeting of the Parties, elections shall be held only for those regional members whose term of office will have expired at the close of the meeting and for any regional member who indicates a desire to step down without completing a full term of office. The same provisions shall apply with respect to the alternate/ members nominated in accordance with Rule 3.

2. In the instance of a member and his/her alternate standing down simultaneously without completing a full term of office, the Chair of the Committee, in close cooperation with the region/organisation involved and in consultation with the Agreement Secretariat, is permitted to nominate an expert of the region or organisation involved to replace the member and alternate intersessionally with full voting rights. The term of office of the replacement member/alternate shall expire at the close of the next ordinary Meeting of the Parties with the possibility that the Meeting appoints him/ her as a representative or alternate.

**Rule 6**

1. The Chairperson may invite observers of non-contracting Parties and the Chair of the AEWA Standing Committee.

2. Furthermore he may invite or admit a maximum of four observers from specialized international inter-governmental and non-governmental organisations.

3. In addition, at each meeting of the Committee, the Chairperson may invite guests to contribute to specific agenda items.

**Officers**

**Rule 7**

The members shall elect a Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson from their regional representatives of the Parties, for terms corresponding to those of the Meetings of the Parties. This election will normally take place as soon as possible after the Meeting of the Parties, and the newly elected officers shall assume their functions upon election.

**Rule 8**

The Chairperson shall preside at meetings of the Committee, approve the provisional agenda prepared by the Secretariat for circulation, and liaise with the members between meetings of the Committee. The Chairperson may represent the Committee as required within the limits of the Committee mandate, and shall carry out such other functions as may be entrusted to him/her by the Committee.

**Rule 9**

The Vice-Chairperson shall assist in the execution of the Chairperson's duties, and shall preside at meetings in the absence of the Chairperson.

**Rule 10**

The Agreement Secretariat shall serve the meetings of the Committee.

**Elections**

**Rule 11**

If in an election to fill one place no candidate obtains an overall majority in the first ballot, a second ballot shall be taken, restricted to the two candidates obtaining the largest number of votes. If the votes are equally divided in the second ballot, the presiding officer shall decide between the candidates by drawing lots.

**Rule 12**

If in the first ballot there is a tie amongst candidates obtaining the second largest number of votes, a special ballot shall be held amongst them to reduce the number of candidates to two.

**Rule 13**

In the case of a tie amongst three or more candidates obtaining the largest number of votes in the first ballot, a special ballot shall be held amongst them to reduce the number of candidates to two. If a tie then results amongst two or more candidates, the presiding officer shall reduce the number to two by drawing lots, and a further ballot shall be held in accordance with Rule 12.

**Meetings**

**Rule 14**

Unless the Meeting of the Parties decides otherwise, meetings of the Committee shall be convened by the Agreement Secretariat in conjunction with each ordinary session of the Meeting of the Parties and at least once between ordinary sessions of the Meeting of the Parties.

**Rule 15**

Where in the opinion of the Committee an emergency has arisen that requires the adoption of immediate measures to avoid deterioration of the conservation status of one or more migratory waterbird species, the Chairperson may request the Agreement Secretariat to urgently convene a meeting of the Parties concerned.

**Rule 16**

Notice of meetings, including date and venue, shall be sent to all Parties by the Secretariat at least 45 days in advance and, in the case of extraordinary meetings, at least 14 days in advance.

**Rule 17**

A quorum for a meeting shall consist of half of the members of the Committee. No decision shall be taken at a meeting in the absence of a quorum.

**Rule 18**

Decisions of the Committee shall be taken by consensus unless a vote is requested by the Chairperson or by three members.

**Rule 19**

Decisions of the Committee by voting (pursuant to Rule 19) shall be passed by a simple majority vote of the members present and voting. In the case of a tie, the motion shall be considered rejected.

**Rule 20**

A summary record of each meeting shall be prepared by the Secretariat as soon as possible and shall be communicated to all members of the Technical Committee.

**Working groups**

**Rule 21**

The Committee may establish such ad hoc working groups as may be necessary to deal with specific tasks. It shall define the terms of reference and composition of each working group.

**Rule 22**

In so far as they are applicable, these Rules shall apply *mutatis mutandis* to the proceedings of working groups.

**Rule 23**

The Committee shall receive reports from other committees and working groups established under the Agreement as necessary.

**Communication procedure**

**Rule 24**

Any member of the Committee, or the Secretariat, may submit a proposal to the Chairperson of the Technical Committee for a decision by correspondence. Upon request by the Chairperson, the Secretariat shall communicate the proposal to the members for comments within 60 days of the date of communication. Any comments received within these limits shall also be thus communicated. In case of emergency the proposal shall be communicated to the members for comment within 30 days.

**Rule 25**

If, by the date on which comments on a proposal were due to be communicated, the Secretariat has not received any objection from a member, the proposal shall be adopted, and notice of the adoption shall be given to all members.

**Rule 26**

If any member objects to a proposal within the applicable time limit, the proposal shall be referred to the next meeting of the Committee.

**Rule 27**

The Secretariat shall inform the Contracting Parties on the date and venue of the next Meeting of the Committee. For each Meeting of the Committee the Contracting Parties will receive at least the provisional agenda and draft minutes of the previous meeting. All other documents to be discussed will be made available through the Agreement's website.

**Rule 28**

The regional representative shall act as a co-ordinator for range States and Contracting Parties in their region, submit a report to the Committee on AEWA Implementation in their region

and disseminate to the technical focal points of Contracting Parties the outcomes of Committee meetings.

**Other functions**

**Rule 29**

In accordance with Art. 3 c) of the Agreement the Chairperson shall submit a written report on the Committee's activities to the Agreement Secretariat not less than one hundred and twenty days before the session of the Meeting of the Parties..

**Final provisions**

**Rule 30**

These Rules shall be applied at the first meeting of the Committee following their approval by the Meeting of the Parties, and may be amended by the Committee as required, in accordance with the provisions of the Agreement and decisions.

## Appendix II

### LIST OF PARTICIPANTS 7<sup>th</sup> AEWB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING

#### ***REPRESENTATIVES OF THE REGIONS***

##### **NORTH AND SOUTH WESTERN EUROPE**

Dr. Olivier Biber  
Swiss Agency for the Environment, Forests and  
Landscape  
3003 Bern  
SWITZERLAND/ SUISSE

Tel: 0041 313230663  
Fax: 0041 313247579  
E-mail: olivier.biber@buwal.admin.ch

##### **EASTERN EUROPE**

Dr. Serhiy Khomenko  
Department for Monitoring  
and Conservation of Animals  
Shmalgausen Institute of Zoology,  
National Academy of Sciences  
Khmelnitskogo Str,  
01601, Kiev-30, 15, Bogdana  
UKRAINE/ UKRAINE

Tel: (+380) 442355187  
Fax: (+380) 442465862  
E-mail: khomenko@izan.kiev.ua

##### **CENTRAL AFRICA**

Mr. Jérôme Mokoko DIT IKONGA  
Directeur Adjoint WCS Programme Congo  
Wildlife Conservation Society  
B.P. 14537  
Brazzaville  
CONGO/ CONGO

Tel.: (+242) 511785  
Fax: (+242) 81 18 28  
E-mail: Jrmokoko@yahoo.fr

##### **EASTERN AFRICA**

Mr. Oliver O. Nasirwa  
National Museums of Kenya  
Regional Coordinator, Wetland Biodiversity Moni-  
toring Scheme for Eastern Africa Department of  
Ornithology  
P.O. Box 40658  
GPO 00100 Nairobi  
KENYA/ KENYA

Tel.: +254 (0) 20 3754 172  
Fax: +254 (0) 20 37 41 421  
E-mail: wbms@nbnet.co.ke

##### **CENTRAL EUROPE**

Dr. Sci. Jelena Kralj (Vice-chair)  
Institute of Ornithology  
Croatian Academy of Arts and Science  
Gunduliceva 24  
10000 Zagreb  
CROATIA/ CROATIE

Tel.: +385 1 4825 401  
Fax: +385 1 4825 392  
E-mail: zzo@hazu.hr

##### **SOUTHWESTERN ASIA**

Dr. Ghassan Ramadan-Jaradi  
Chair of Arab MAB Network  
Chair of Palm Islands Nature Reserve  
Vice-President OSME  
Professor Lebanese University  
P.O. Box: 11- 8281  
Beirut  
LEBANON/ LIBAN

Tel: +961 1 644518  
Fax: +961 1 822639  
E-mail: r-jaradi@cyberia.net.lb

##### **WESTERN AFRICA**

Mr. Alfoussemi Semega  
Directeur du Parc National du Baoule  
Direction Nationale de la Conservation de la Nature  
DNCN/OPN  
B.P. 275  
Bamako  
MALI/ MALI

Tel.: (+223) 223 3695 ; (+223) 223 2498  
Fax: (+223) 233 3696  
E-mail: foussemega@yahoo.fr conserva-  
tionature@datatech.net.ml

##### **NORTHERN AFRICA**

Mr. Abdulmuala A. Hamza  
Researcher at Acting Directory of Technical Coop-  
eration  
Environment General Authority  
P.O. Box 83618  
1202 Tripoli  
LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA/ LIBYE

Tel.: +218 21 48 70 266  
Fax: +218 21 48 72 160  
E-mail: abdamza@yahoo.com

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**  
**7<sup>th</sup> TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING**

**SOUTHERN AFRICA**

Mr. Yousoof Mungroo (Chairman)  
4A, Impasse Barthelemy Ohsan  
Beau-Bassin  
MAURITIUS/ MAURICE

Tel.: +230 464 2993  
Fax: +230 465 1184  
E-Mail: ymungroo@gmail.com

***REPRESENTATIVES OF ORGANISATIONS***

**WETLANDS INTERNATIONAL**

Mr. Ward Hagemeyer  
Head of Wetlands Species Conservation Programme  
Wetlands International  
P.O. Box 471  
6700 AL Wageningen  
THE NETHERLANDS / PAYS-BAS

Tel: (+31) 317 47 88 67  
Fax: (+31) 317 47 88 50  
E-mail: Ward.Hagemeyer@wetlands.org

**CIC**

Mr. Niels Kanstrup  
President  
CIC Migratory Birds Commission  
Molsvej 34  
8410 Rønde  
DENMARK / DANEMARK

Tel.: +45 87910600 / +45 20332999  
Fax: +45 86372365  
E-mail: nk@jaegerne.dk

**IUCN The World Conservation Union**

Dr. Jean-Christophe Vie  
Deputy Coordinator Species Programme  
Rue Mauverney 28  
1196 Gland  
SWITZERLAND/ SUISSE

Tel.: (+ 41) 22 999 0208  
Fax: (+ 41) 22 999 0015  
E-mail: jcv@iucn.org

***EXPERTS***

**RURAL ECONOMICS**

Mr. Elijah Yaw Danso  
Social Development Advisor  
Forest Sector Development Project  
P.O. Box M 4341457  
Accra  
GHANA/ GHANA

Tel.: (+233) 21 70 12 404  
Fax: (+233) 21 70 12 405  
E-mail: eliyawdanso@yahoo.com

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**  
**7<sup>th</sup> TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING**

**ENVIRONMENTAL LAW**

Ms. Rachel Adam  
Deputy Legal Advisor  
Ministry of the Environment  
5 Canfei Neshirim St.  
P.O.Box 34033  
Jerusalem 95464  
ISRAEL / ISRAEL

Tel: (+972) 2 6553735  
Fax: (+972) 2 6553744  
E-mail: rachela@environment.gov.il

**GAME MANAGEMENT**

Dr. Preben Clausen  
Senior Scientist  
National Environmental Research Institute  
Department of Wildlife Ecology & Biodiversity  
Grenaavej 12  
8410 Roende  
DENMARK / DANEMARK

Tel: (+45) 8920 1519  
Fax: (+45) 8920 1515  
E-mail: pc@dmu.dk

***OBSERVERS FROM CONTRACTING PARTIES***

**FINLAND**

Dr. Petri Nummi  
Docent University of Helsinki  
Department of Applied Biology  
Wildlife Management  
University of Helsinki  
P.O. Box 27  
FIN-00014  
FINLAND / FINLANDE

Tel: (+358) 9 191 58366  
Fax: (+358) 9 191 58463  
E-mail: petri.nummi@helsinki.fi

**UNITED KINGDOM**

Dr. David Stroud  
Senior Ornithologist  
JNCC - Joint Nature Conservation Committee  
Monkstone House  
City Road, Peterborough PE1 1JY  
UNITED KINGDOM / ROYAUME-UNI

Tel: (+44) 1733 562 626  
Fax: (+44) 1733 555 948  
E-mail: David.Stroud@JNCC.GOV.UK

**SWITZERLAND**

Ms. Anne-Laure Torche  
Swiss Agency for the Environment, Forests and  
Landscape  
3003 Bern  
SWITZERLAND/ SUISSE

Tel: 0041 313230663  
Fax: 0041 313247579  
E-mail:

***OBSERVERS FROM INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS***

**BirdLife International**

Mr. John O'Sullivan  
International Treaties Adviser  
Birdlife International  
RSPB, The Lodge, Sandy  
SG 19 2DL Bedfordshire  
UNITED KINGDOM / ROYAUME-UNI

Tel.: (+44) 1767 680 551  
Fax: (+44) 1767 683 211  
E-mail: john.osullivan@rspb.org.uk

**UNEP/WCMC**

Dr. Robert Pople  
Programme Officer,  
MEA Support Programme  
219 Huntingdon Road  
Cambridge CB3 0DL,  
UNITED KINGDOM / ROYAUME-UNI

Tel.: (+44) 1223 277314  
Fax: (+44) 1223 277136  
E-mail: Robert.Pople@unep-wcmc.org

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**  
**7<sup>th</sup> TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING**

**O.M.P.O.**

Mr. Guy-Nöel Olivier  
Secrétaire General  
5, Avenue des Chasseurs  
75017 Paris  
FRANCE / FRANCE

Tel.: (+33) 01 44 01 05 10  
Fax: (+33) 01 44 01 05 11  
E-mail: guy-noel.olivier@ompo.org

**Project Coordination Unit (UNOPS)**

Mr. Edoardo Zandri  
Chief Technical Advisor  
WOW - Wings Over Wetlands  
UNEP-GEF African-Eurasian Flyways Project  
Wetlands International  
PO Box 471  
6700 AL Wageningen  
THE NETHERLANDS / PAYS-BAS  
Tel: (+31) 0 317 4 78 875  
Fax: (+31) 0317 4 78 850  
E-Mail: edoardo@unops.org

**Federation of Association for Hunting & Conservation of the EU (FACE)**

Mr. Alexander Griffin  
Biological Data Manager  
Rue F. Pelletier 82  
1030 Brussels  
BELGIUM / BELGIQUE

Tel.: (+32) 2 732 69 00  
Fax: (+32) 2 732 70 72  
E-mail: biodata@face-europe.org

***SECRETARIAT***

**UNEP/ AEWA SECRETARIAT**

Mr. Bert Lenten, Executive Secretary  
Mr. Sergey Dereliev, Technical Officer  
Ms. Marie-Therese Kämper, Assistant  
Mr. Florian Keil, Information Officer  
Ms. Catherine Lehmann, Programme Officer  
Mrs. Patricia Stadié, Assistant

Secretariat for the Agreement on the Conservation of  
African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds  
Hermann-Ehlers-Str. 10  
53113 Bonn  
GERMANY/ ALLEMAGNE

Tel: (+49 228) 815-2414  
Fax: (+49 228) 815-2450  
E-mail: aewa@unep.de

### Appendix III: List of Action Points

TOPIC	WHAT TO DO	WHO	DEADLINE	DONE
Rules of Procedure (para 5)	To help TC Committee members - in their capacity as Regional Representatives – to contact range states by providing them with contacts of the National TC Focal Points in their respective regions	Secretariat	December 2006	
Admission of Observers (para 11)	To approach EC about lack of representative at TC7.	Secretariat	December 2006	
Participation of African Union (para 13)	To remind Senegal that it had undertaken to make this contact.	BL	February 2007	
Minutes of TC6 (para 15)	To amend the Minutes based on the discussion in TC7.	Secretariat	April 2007	
Tracking progress of TC activities (para 19)	To implement a tabular overview of the progress of TC activities against the work plan over time as part of the communication strategy.	Secretariat		
Guidelines for the use of satellite tracking (para 24, 25)	To form a small working group to discuss this issue and make a proposal to manufacturers of tracking equipment, who might be willing to assist in preparing the guidelines.	PC, WH, SD		
WG1/TC 7.8 (para 26) <i>Paper on priority waterbird taxa that would benefit from an early review of the limits of their populations</i>	To hold a workshop in Bonn to deal with this and other matters. To circulate the resulting draft document to TC members before the next TC at the beginning of 2008.	WH, DS, JOS, PC, GRJ Secretariat	Early 2007	
WG2/TC 7.9 (para 27) <i>Guidance on the degree of concentration on a small number of specific sites at any stage of annual cycle</i>	To convene in 2007 to discuss the best approach in developing criteria.	DS, PC, JOS, PC, JOS Secretariat	Early 2007	
WG3/TC 7.10 (para 28) <i>Guidance on Dependence on a Habitat Type Which is under Severe Threat</i>	To test findings against real species and produce a revised paper.	DS, ON, JOS, WH, JK Secretariat	Early 2007	
WG5/Online reporting (para 38)	To submit the proforma reporting format early in 2007	Secretariat	End March 2007	
WG6/TC 7.12 (para 42-45) Potential role of AEWA in the conservation of seabirds	To revise the threats relevant to seabirds already listed in document MOP3/3.29.	WG6	February 2007	
	To circulate the document to the members of the TC.	Secretariat	March-April 2007	
	To amend and submit the Action Plan 150 days before MOP4 (end November 2008)	Secretariat	April 2008	
	To re-submit doc. MOP3/3.29 (21 seabird species for inclusion in AEWA) to MOP4 for approval.	Secretariat	MOP4/ Nov 2008	

TOPIC	WHAT TO DO	WHO	DEADLINE	DONE
WG7 (para 46) Adjusting the International Implementation Priorities according to AEWA Int. Reviews and other work	To produce all seven reviews for MOP4 and to adjust IIP for the next triennium according to their findings.	Secretariat	Early 2008	
WG8/Doc. 7.17 (para 51 – 59) <i>Impact of climate change on waterbirds and development of conservation guidance for AEWA</i>	To produce a short film showing hotspots where climate change affects habitats.	Secretariat		
	To meet again and review progress, revise the IIP, modify the Action Plan and prepare a draft resolution for MOP4.	WG8	Early 2008	
WG9/Phasing out of lead shot (para 60 – 67)	To produce an overview of the outcome of the questionnaire to be sent to all the range states for presentation at the next TC meeting.	CL	TC8/early 2008	
WG10/ Doc. 7.13 (para 68 – 72) <i>Assessment of AEWA's Conservation Guidelines</i>	To make the conservation guidelines more visible by featuring them in future editions of the E-Newsletter and by inserting a button on the first page of the web site.	FK	2007	
	To circulate a questionnaire regarding the usage of guidelines through regional representatives.	Secretariat	Before TC8/ Early 2008	
WG11/Doc 7.14 (para 73 – 76) <i>National reports as indicators of implementation and effectiveness of AEWA</i>	To take the lead in measuring effectiveness by proposing indicators as a starting point for the work of WGs 11 and 5 together with the proposed intersessional working group on the Strategic Plan.	Secretariat WG11, WG5, RP, DS, WH, OB	2007	
Guidelines on mitigation effect of aquatic weeds on waterbird habitats in Africa	To draft a guideline on this issue for circulation within the TC for comments and subsequent submission to the Meeting of the Parties for approval.	SD	Early 2008	
Simultaneous French interpretation at TC meetings (para 138)	The approach the <i>Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie</i> to ask about possible financial assistance to maintain these services	Secretariat	Before TC8	
Request from the Azov-Black Sea Ornithological Station to consider establishing a commission to deal with coordination of research and monitoring (para 142)	To approach the Director of the Station to seek some clarification on this request	Secretariat	Before TC8	

**Overview of abbreviations of full names of the members of working groups (in alphabetical order):**

<b>Abbreviation</b>	<b>Full name</b>	<b>Abbreviation</b>	<b>Full name</b>
<b>AH</b>	Abdulmuala Hamza	<b>JOS</b>	John O'Sullivan
<b>AS</b>	Alfousseini Semega	<b>JS</b>	John Swift
<b>BL</b>	Bert Lenten	<b>NK</b>	Niels Kanstrup
<b>CL</b>	Catherine Lehmann	<b>ON</b>	Oliver Nasirwa
<b>DS</b>	David Stroud	<b>OB</b>	Olivier Biber
<b>EYD</b>	Elijah Yaw Danso	<b>PC</b>	Preben Clausen
<b>FK</b>	Florian Keil	<b>RA</b>	Rachelle Adam
<b>GNO</b>	Guy-Noel Olivier	<b>RP</b>	Robert Pople
<b>GRJ</b>	Ghassan Ramadan-Jaradi	<b>SD</b>	Sergey Dereliev
<b>JCV</b>	Jean-Christophe Vie	<b>SK</b>	Sergey Khomenko
<b>JK</b>	Jelena Kralj	<b>WH</b>	Ward Hegemeijer
<b>JM</b>	Jerome Mokoko	<b>YM</b>	Yousoof Mungroo