

African Eurasian Migratory Landbirds Workshop

Accra – 31st August-2nd September

Opening of the Workshop

1. Borja Heredia (Science Officer, UNEP/CMS Secretariat) called the meeting to order and gave the floor to CMS Focal Point for Ghana, Nana Kofi Adu-Nsiah, the Executive Director of the Wildlife Division of the Forestry Commission as the representative of the host government. Mr. Adu-Nsiah welcomed the participants to Ghana and, recalling that the Convention's Parties had at their last Conference in Bergen in 2011 adopted a resolution calling for more action to preserve migratory landbirds, expressed his delight that significant progress had already been made.
2. Mr Heredia then introduced Professor Alfred Oteng-Yeboah, the Chair of the CMS Standing Committee and appointed CMS Scientific Councillor for African fauna. After adding his welcome, Professor Oteng-Yeboah urged participants to build on the existing momentum and expressed his confidence that the meeting would produce good results, which were anxiously awaited by the Standing Committee. He concluded his remarks by stressing that CMS was approaching an important period with a series of major meetings and the imminent appointment of new Executive Secretary, who would strengthen the diplomatic presence of the Convention.
3. Mr Heredia explained some of the background to the proposed Action Plan, the mandate for which was set out in COP Resolution 10.27 adopted in Bergen in 2011. The decline in the populations of a number of landbirds had been recognized and COP10 had therefore asked for a draft Action Plan to be prepared for presentation to COP11. The Resolution had not been accompanied by any financial support for its implementation, so the Secretariat was particularly grateful to Switzerland for its voluntary contribution and to the Wildlife Division of the Forestry Commission for its logistical support and for organizing the visit to the Kakum National Park. The role of BirdLife International and its member organizations was also acknowledged, especially in funding the post of coordinator. All in all, the proposed Action Plan was being supported by a strong and broad coalition. In conclusion, Mr Heredia explained how the Action Plan was to be developed and the roles of the CMS Standing Committee, which had a watching brief in the process; the Scientific Council, to which the Working Group would be reporting; and the Conference of the Parties, which would be requested to adopt the final text.
4. Mr Adu-Nsiah suggested that a *tour de table* be conducted so that participants could introduce themselves. A list of the Workshop participants appears as Annex I to this report.

Election of Officers

5. Mr. Adu-Nsiah (Ghana) asked for nominations for the post of Chair of the Workshop. Jean-Philippe Sibley (Scientific Councillor, France) nominated Olivier Biber (Scientific Councillor, Switzerland). There were no other nominations, so Mr Biber was declared elected unopposed.
6. Mr. Adu-Nsiah (Ghana) then asked for nominations for the post of Vice-Chair of the Workshop. Kaysay Asgedom (Ethiopia) nominated Professor Oteng-Yeboah (Ghana). Similarly, there were no other nominations, so Professor Oteng-Yeboah was declared elected unopposed.

7. Accepting his election, Mr. Biber explained that he was no longer employed by the Swiss government, which he had represented for many years in international environment fora, but was now working under contract, so his appointment was more in his individual capacity rather than as a national delegate. He thanked Ghana for having taken the lead on drafting the Resolution adopted at COP10 which Switzerland had been happy to support.

Adoption of the Agenda

8. The Chair introduced the provisional agenda. As it had been decided to start each day's sessions at 09:00 rather than 08:00 as had been intended when the document was prepared, all times should be put back one hour. He suggested that it would be better to deal with the geographic range first and only then move to species coverage and then called for further comments from the floor.
9. Fernando Spina (Italy and Chair of the CMS Scientific Council) supported the Chair's proposal to switch the geographical range and species coverage, while Nicola Crockford (RSPB/BirdLife International) sought clarification from the Secretariat about the nature of Action Plans under CMS. (See the Secretariat's explanation in para 38)

Keynote addresses

Franz Bairlein, Director of the Institute of Avian Research, Germany

10. The Chair introduced Mr. Bairlein, who gave a presentation entitled "*Conservation of migratory landbirds: status, pitfalls and prospects*". The slides accompanying the presentation area attached to this report as Annex II.
11. After thanking the Secretariat for having invited him to the Workshop, Mr Bairlein proceeded to give an illustrated presentation starting with a map of the AEWA Agreement Area showing migration patterns within the region. Some long intra-country migrations (such as those in Norway and Sweden) had been excluded. Many migrations were contained within a single continent or sub-region such as those taking place within the tropics. There were also many migrations which covered different continents.
12. Estimating the number of species involved was difficult and many species had several discrete populations, some of which were sedentary, while others migrated. It was however thought that 280 species migrated between the Palaearctic and Africa, 130 in the Austral tropical region and possibly 530 species (as much as 30 per cent of all African species) in the intra-tropical region. Five regional categories had been identified: Africa-Europe; Africa only; Eurasia only; Central Asia and the Middle East.
13. A survey of birds breeding in UK had shown that the sharpest declines were being experienced by those species migrating between Europe and Africa. German surveys found that resident species were faring best, those undertaking relatively short migrations were faring moderately well but long distance migrants on the red list were declining. Danish figures confirmed that the greatest declines were among long distance migrants.

14. One explanation for these declines was probably fluctuating rainfall in the Sahel. Population trends in British breeding birds in the 1990s had established the decline in bird numbers to conditions in the Sahel, with a clear correlation to population survival and breeding success in species such as the Sedge warbler (*Acrocephalus schoenobaenus*).
15. EURING (www.euring.org) which had accumulated over ten million records could now show where ringed birds had been found, helping to answer the question of where the birds went and providing clues as to the direct and carry-over threats they were facing. The greater part of EURING's data came from Europe but a significant minority was now emanating from Africa. EURING was not confined to ringing and greater use of telemetry was being made as equipment design improved. Not long ago, there was little information on Montagu's harrier (*Circus pygargus*) migration; now there was a great deal, much collated in Chad and Burkina Faso. As tracking devices became smaller, more species could be followed using transmitters, and satellite data for cuckoos on the BTO website showed a large variety of destinations for that species. However, smaller birds (those under 16g) were not large enough for this technology.
16. Regarding the Northern Wheatear (*Oenanthe oenanthe*), not a single ringed bird was traced south of the Sahara so far, but it was now known that the Canadian population migrated to Mauritania, the Alaskan one to Sudan via the Middle-East and the German one to Mali. Previously there had been a great deal of speculation about the migration habits of swifts, but now hard facts were known. All this new knowledge has been gathered through the latest introduction of geo-locators, while recent research into the habits of the Willow Warbler (*Phylloscopus trochilus*) had been based on the use of stable isotopes.
17. Some investigation has been carried out into the behaviour of birds when they reach their non-breeding ("wintering") sites and it was clear that many did not remain in one location, for which there were several reasons, although understanding of why remained incomplete. In the case of Montagu's Harriers, they had been observed moving from Niger to Nigeria in pursuit of food (locusts). "Ground-truthing" had yet to determine the full extent of winter movements, as Palaearctic species accounted for a large percentage of avian populations in Africa – as much as 20 per cent not being an unusual score recorded for local counts, with some even higher.
18. Local level selection of habitat could be driven by the presence of other species and the ability to coexist. The arrival of Northern Wheatears in a location affected the movements of other wheatear species, with some evidence of coexistence and less of interference. The seasonality of the habitat seemed to be the greater determining factor.
19. Leo Zwarts et al. in *Living on the edge* indicated why African species had declined faster than others, with the main contributing factors being identified as the massive environmental changes affecting the region resulting in huge habitat losses. These included changing land use to agriculture, artificial irrigation diverting rivers and the prolonged drought. The Sahel had undergone considerable greening recently, and the end to the prolonged drought had encouraged the resumption of agriculture, but the threat of further desertification remained along the southern fringe of the Sahara and towards the North African coast.
20. Research has been undertaken into the reasons why Reed (*Acrocephalus scirpaceus*) and Sedge warblers (*A. schoenobaenus*) were faring differently, with the former increasing and the latter declining, despite their having similar ecological indices. Both needed to put on fat to clear the Sahara, but while the Sedge Warbler

depended on aphids in France, the Reed Warbler had a more varied diet and spent more time fattening in North Africa. Key refuelling sites had been identified in north-west Africa and the conservation of species reliant on stop-overs was dependent on the maintenance of these habitats.

21. Examination in Denmark of the Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) in relation to Barn swallows (*Hirundo rustica*) had revealed that those arriving at the winter grounds earliest were, contrary to normal expectation, not always at an advantage.
22. In trying to explain the reasons for the disproportional declines in European-Saharan migrant species, a number of pitfalls had to be avoided, as false conclusions could be drawn if the whole annual cycle were neglected and too much emphasis placed on stop-over sites, regardless of their undoubted importance. As well as immediate threats, there were a number of “carry overs”, the effects of which took time to manifest themselves. Our understanding would improve if we examined: the entire annual cycle; developed the scientific basis; worked on mitigation and adopted an integrated, international approach. New technology was available through which we could learn more about species in the Middle East, and policies could be developed, integrating sound ecological management including the greening of agricultural while taking human needs fully into account. Capacity could be increased through education and training.

Questions and Comments

23. Mr Spina complemented Mr Bairlein for his excellent presentation. The point regarding habitat loss in the Sahel creating more formidable barriers for birds to cross was relevant to a recent collaborative effort between CMS and the UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD). CMS cooperation with other MEAS was likely to increase when IPBES was fully operational.
24. Phil Atkinson (BTO) stressed that lack of knowledge was a great impediment to progress. Our understanding of farmland birds was now much better after twenty years of concerted effort, but he doubted whether so much time was left for landbirds in view of the declines they were suffering. He suggested that indicator species should be selected such as redstarts which had a relatively easy habitat to research so that results would be obtained quickly.
25. Prof. Oteng-Yeboah said that a number of governments in the Sahel and Sahara region were working through Great Green Wall project to stop the spread of the desert. Sponsored by the World Bank, it was operating on a 4- to 5-year time span, but great improvements were to be expected. Mr. Bairlein interjected that he hoped that the greening meant more habitat for wildlife and not just more alfalfa being cultivated.
26. David Stroud (United Kingdom) urged that new technologies and analytical tools be used to their full potential, so that more information could be gained from existing data.

Development of the AEML Action Plan

27. The Chair said that the Parties had set out a clear roadmap of actions needed to elaborate the Action Plan, and support had been received from BirdLife International and its member organizations, Schweizer Vogelschutz (SVS/BirdLife Switzerland), Vogelbescherming Nederland (BirdLife Netherlands), Sveriges Ornitologiska

Forening (BirdLife Sweden) and the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB/BirdLife UK). He went on to introduce Samuel Temidayo Osinubi, coordinator of the African-Eurasian Migratory Landbirds Action Plan, who gave a brief overview of the current draft of the document explaining the underlying vision and its goals, as well as outlining how the workshop was to operate and the outcomes that were expected to be achieved.

28. Mr Osinubi thanked all those that had contributed ideas and material to the draft Action Plan.
29. The first slide in the presentation set out the vision and goals of the Action Plan and provided a definition of migratory landbirds and listed both the Range States and the taxa to be covered. The second set out aspects of habitat management, including dealing with human-wildlife conflicts, the impacts of climate change, disease and areas where knowledge was lacking. The third dealt with habitat and species conservation. The slides from the presentation are included at Annex III.
30. The Chair then asked whether there were any questions of a general nature before the Workshop began detailed examination of the Action Plan.
31. Joost Brouwer (Coordinator, Niger Bird DataBase NiBDaB) stressed the need to strengthen the human aspect of the Plan and address stakeholders that did not necessarily attach importance to conservation, such as those people involved in human-wildlife conflicts. The Plan should not just preach to the converted but take into account differing viewpoints. The Chair said that the draft Action Plan contained a chapter on this very subject but agreed that it was vital to strike the right balance and adopt appropriate language.
32. Bernd de Bruijn (VBN/BLI Netherlands) endorsed what Mr Brouwer had said, highlighting other activities that could potentially lead to conflicts, namely agriculture, fuel and wood gathering, and dam construction amongst others. More than for other taxonomic groups, a cross-sectoral approach was vital in the conservation of landbirds.
33. Idrissa Zeba (Naturama, Burkina Faso) thanked Mr Osinubi and emphasized the importance of including the human angle of conservation, especially regarding livelihoods and living conditions of local people.
34. Branko Micevski (Scientific Councillor, the FYR of Macedonia) felt that the Action Plan should be more specific and less general, with clearly targeted actions identified for the various sub-regions. The resources required for implementation should be quantified. A small investment in activities and projects in Africa would bring disproportionately greater rewards.
35. Leon Bennun (Appointed Scientific Councillor for Birds) found the introduction informative and stressed that the Action Plan addressed a highly complex policy area, where a number of other initiatives were already active. It was vital to stress both the potential synergies with AEWA and the Raptors MOU as well as areas where the Landbirds Action Plan brought added value. This would contribute to "mainstreaming" wider avian conservation concerns into general policy development.
36. The Chair summarized by saying that the aim of the Workshop would be to elaborate an Action Plan addressing threats and human livelihoods and containing concrete actions.

Definition of Migratory Landbirds

37. Promising to be as flexible as possible within the constraints of the time available for the meeting, the Chair opened the debate about deciding on a working definition of migratory landbirds upon which to base subsequent discussions. The mandate for developing an Action Plan from COP Resolution 10.27 aimed at achieving certain aims for the conservation of landbirds, recognizing that these aims should be consistent with AEWA, the Raptors MOU and other avian instruments concluded under CMS.
38. In response to the question asked by Ms Crockford on what was to be considered an action plan (definition of an AP), the Chair asked Mr Heredia (CMS Secretariat) to explain the nature of the final product which the Parties were expecting from the process. He stressed that this Action Plan differed from a Single Species Action Plan, as it covered a broader range of taxa and would require a lesser degree of detail, if it were to remain a manageable document. The immediate target audience of the Action Plan was made up of the CMS Parties, and the Plan should therefore be written in such a way that those responsible for its implementation could understand it. One major challenge presented by the broad-front migration of many of the species to be covered was that the wider countryside and not just specific sites would have to be addressed and managed, including landscapes and entire ecosystems; this would make defining precise activities more difficult. The nature of the likely activities and their interface with other interests would require close cooperation with a number of other MEAs and actors, including FAO and international NGOs.
39. The Chair thanked Mr Heredia and added some personal observations. He noted that the procedure for the elaboration of the Action Plan had to a large degree been set out in the Resolution, with the COP as the forum for finally deciding whether to adopt the Action Plan. The Working Group was required to cooperate with the Scientific Council and the Secretariat¹. The wording of the Resolution, however, appeared to allow some flexibility with regard to starting implementation of the Plan even before its formal adoption and the guidance of the Standing Committee should be sought on this point. He proposed that a modular approach should be adopted with the Plan containing a common core applicable to the entire range, but to which specific details for sub-regions, individual species or species groups and particular themes could be added. He noted that the Secretariat had produced a paper on next steps with an explanation of the legal and institutional options.
40. Mr Micevski suggested that it might be easier to categorize the birds – forest dwellers, wetland dwellers, seedeaters etc – and assign appropriate actions to each group. This would help avoid making the Plan too general and the more specific the Plan, the more likely it would be that donors could be found for particular actions.
41. Mr Bennun said that in the light of the breadth of the issues to be dealt with and the sometimes patchy level of our current knowledge, a modular approach to the structure and construction of the Plan was appropriate as this would facilitate its development. It should be so designed that details and further sections could be added when new data were available.
42. Mr Sibley said that by definition an “Action Plan” should set out a range of coordinated activities, key among them was the protection and management of the birds’ “filling stations”, a point stressed in Mr. Bairlein’s presentation.

¹ Resolution 10.27, paragraph 3: *Calls* on the Scientific Council and Secretariat to support this initiative, including through the establishment, under the Scientific Council, of a working group to steer the production and implementation of the action plan

43. Mr Spina said that the Action Plan could be based on other models but needed to be adapted to the particular needs of landbirds. If the Landbirds Action Plan reiterated the same threats faced by other taxonomic groups it would help underline the importance of the problems. He agreed with the idea of a modular structure, with a general framework at one level backed up by details at another. The fact that within one species different populations behaved in different ways had to be accommodated.
44. Ms Crockford expressed her satisfaction at the way the discussion was going, thanked the Chair and Mr. Heredia for their informative introductory comments and welcomed the presence at the workshop of Marco Barbieri and Sergey Dereliev of the AEWA Secretariat, Nick P. Williams from the Raptors MOU and Mr Stroud of the JNCC, who between them commanded a wealth of knowledge of the development and running of CMS instruments and whose experience would therefore be invaluable. The ecological needs of landbirds differed in many ways from those of waterbirds and raptors, so it would be necessary to be innovative.
45. Mr Stroud suggested that clear summaries of the issues and the actions could be placed in a separate document. The Chair said that he would prefer a single document but agreed that a succinct summary at the beginning of the Plan would be useful. Mr Brouwer said that from the audience's perspective, it would be important to have an explanation of why an Action Plan was deemed necessary at all and the points to stress would include: achieving economies of scale; synergies and avoidance of duplication; transparency and establishing a data clearing house. He added that migratory landbirds were more likely to have stopover areas than specific sites.
46. The Chair counselled that the Action Plan should adopt the precautionary principle and act to preserve what was known to be endangered rather than delay awaiting the results of further research. Mr. Spina said that it would not be difficult to draw up a list of actions, with budget estimates and outline timescales based on information readily available. For example, the data from which to build maps for Barn swallow distribution were to hand. Priorities should be set to acquire information on other key species and a strategy devised for research and fund-raising.
47. Mr Sibley agreed but stressed that in many cases action was urgently needed as some species had suffered declines of 80 per cent in a relatively short period. He added that governments and other sponsors would prefer a clear indication of the actions that they were being asked to finance; this was particularly true in the present economic climate.
48. The Chair sought confirmation that everyone agreed on the basic requirements of an Action Plan. Mr Barbieri suggested discussing in more detail the projected timescale of the Plan and whether it would be open-ended or have a pre-determined duration. The Chair felt that the Plan should remain in force until such time as all the species covered had a favourable conservation status, and that setting measures of achievement made more sense than arbitrary time limits. Mr. Williams said that the text of that instrument contained definitions of the timescales envisaged for certain actions, ranging from immediate (up to two years), short term (up to three), medium (up to seven), long (up to ten) and ongoing (indefinite). As the MOU had only been in force for four years, it was difficult to say how well this system worked.
49. Mr. Bennun felt that the draft Plan essentially contained the chapters that were needed: issues known to be generally true of the entire flyway; known threats in specific areas and the unknowns where more research was needed.

Geographic Scope of the Action Plan

50. Turning to the geographic scope of the Action Plan, the Chair pointed out that there were two precedents upon which a decision could be based – AEWA and the Raptors MOU. Their ranges were similar but not identical, with AEWA covering Greenland and the Canadian archipelago and the Raptors MOU extending into China and south-east Asia. Mr Dereliev (AEWA) pointed out that the map included on page 14 of the draft Action Plan circulated before the meeting was taken directly from the current AEWA Agreement. AEWA's range might however be extended eastwards if the forthcoming meeting (12-13 December, 2012, Abu Dhabi) decided to pursue the option of institutionally linking the Central Asian Flyway to the Agreement. Any such decision would however have to be ratified by the next AEWA MOP. The extension would add a further 15 Range States to AEWA's current total of 119 (plus the EU) – 15 existing AEWA Range States were also in the Central Asian Flyway.
51. Mr Williams recalled that there had been long discussions over the range of the Raptors MOU and the decision had been made to include south-east Asia to accommodate one long-distance migrant whose range extended from Siberia to southern Africa.
52. Mr Brouwer said that it was unavoidable that drawing lines on a map would be to some degree arbitrary. The exclusion of the Canadian archipelago raised questions about the inclusion of all of Siberia and Alaska. He felt though that it was safe to exclude the Polar Regions as there were no migratory landbirds there.
53. Mr Bairlein suggested that the geographic scope should be the same as for AEWA but without the Canadian archipelago and Greenland. S. Bala Balachandran (Bombay Natural History Society) advocated the addition of India. Jelena Kralj (Scientific councillor, Croatia) raised the question of the additional threats and habitat types that would be covered by extending the range towards the east and suggested that it would be useful to seek the input of local experts. The Chair suggested considering also the addition of Central Asia.
54. Mr Bennun said that a balance had to be struck between scientific and political issues. It would be right to deviate from AEWA's area where avian ecology made this sensible, but the larger the area, the more complicated it would be administratively and politically. These difficulties could be in part addressed through adopting a modular or "building brick" approach.
55. Mr Micevski urged that resources be channelled to where there would do most good, and in most cases that would be Africa where the costs of conservation work were less and the gain greater.
56. Mr Atkinson said that the decision on the geographical scope of the Action Plan should be based primarily on ecological considerations with a measure of pragmatism. One major element of uncertainty was the linkage between Africa and Asia, so the door should be left open.
57. The question was raised of whether the Action Plan would stand alone or be attached to another instrument and whether that instrument would be legally binding or not. These options had been set out in the COP Resolution. Further issues were how to elaborate the Action Plan in the absence of representatives from key regions (such as Central Asia) and how conservation measures would be implemented in non-signatory states.

58. The Chair concluded that the geographic range of the Action Plan would include Europe (*sensu* UN Economic Commission for Europe), Africa and Asia including the Indian subcontinent but excluding Mongolia, China and South East Asia. Greenland and the Canadian archipelago would also be excluded.

Taxonomic Scope of the Action Plan

59. Both the Chair and Mr Osinubi recommended that rather than deal with each species individually to decide whether or not it should be included - a process that would potentially be very time-consuming - the discussion should concentrate on general eligibility criteria.

60. The Chair commented that the prime source for species to be covered in the Action Plan was the Appendices of the Convention. The source was complemented by a definition of migratory species provided by the text of the Convention itself, which alluded to crossing national boundaries². BirdLife International (BLI) operated under a different and not entirely compatible definition, and its list included species that migrated within a country. It would be useful to receive the rationale for the BLI listings as a starting point. Mr Bennun confirmed that the BLI list would not exclude intra-national migration but he was unable without checking to quantify how many species would be affected. Mr Heredia added that CMS did not list species confined to one country even if they did migrate in the broader sense of the term. The Chair therefore proposed four steps: examination of the BLI species list for Central Asia and the Indian sub-continent; examination of the CAF species list to exclude waterbirds; examination of the AEWA annexes to ascertain whether any species had been omitted and exclusion of intra-national migrants which did not meet the CMS definition of “migratory”

61. Mr Osinubi explained that the five lists included in the draft Action Plan circulated before the meeting were intended to stimulate discussion and to provide an indication of the number of species likely to be involved. Mr Bairlein (Institute of Avian Research) highlighted the fact that the number of affected species would depend on the definition of different populations some of which bred in Europe and others in Africa and the two did not mix. The Chair surmised that taking this consideration into account, the house sparrow (*Passer domesticus*) would not qualify; Mr Balachandran said that the same would apply to non-migratory sub-populations of blackbirds in India.

62. It was pointed out that the family Charadriiformes was on the list of species included in the draft text although this covered many species dealt with by AEWA. Some species within this family were, however, not considered to be waterbirds and were therefore not covered by AEWA and should be considered for inclusion in the Landbirds Action Plan. Ms Kralj said examples of such species were the stone-curlews or thick-knees. She also asked whether endemic migrants from countries such as the Russian Federation should be automatically discarded. Finally, she questioned the inclusion of blue tits (*Parus caeruleus*) and the exclusion of great tits (*Parus major*), doubting whether the two species' behaviours differed significantly. These species and others also had sedentary and migratory populations.

63. The Chair suggested that species covered by other instruments of CMS such as AEWA and the Raptors MOU should be excluded (although care should be taken to ensure that none had slipped through the net). Mr. Williams said that he was confident that the MOU's species listing was comprehensive and requested that any queries in this regard be referred to him so that they could be raised at the

² Article 1 (Interpretation) paragraph 1, sub-paragraph a)

forthcoming Meeting of Signatories³. Mr Dereliev welcomed the inclusion in the draft species list of kingfishers, which by most definitions were considered waterbirds, but which did not fit well in the AEWA scheme. He also pointed out that at MOP4, AEWA Parties had added 20 species of seabirds to the Agreement's appendices. He concluded his remarks by saying some species were more "nomadic" than strictly migratory.

64. The Chair suggested that the Workshop should be pragmatic but consistent in its approach, while paying heed to the terms of the Convention, such as Article II paragraph 2⁴. He felt that the COP was likely to want to adhere strictly to the terms of the Convention, in response to which Rubén Moreno-Opo (Spain) proposed that for the sake of clarity, brief explanatory sentences be added to confirm the Action Plan's definition of "migratory" and "landbirds". Mr Barbieri also cautioned against deviating from CMS definitions but pointed out that some CMS instruments did cover species not listed on the CMS Appendices (such as owls under the Raptors MOU). He added that some species might have been excluded from AEWA and the Raptors MOU for geographical reasons, rather than taxonomic ones. Mr Spina agreed that it would be difficult to propose exceptions as this might lead to the flood gates opening and shared Mr Barbieri's reservations about ignoring the Convention's definitions.
65. The Chair identified two problems: species not covered by other instruments and the species considered migratory by BLI but that did not meet the Convention's definition in that their migration did not take them across international borders. It would though not be too difficult to establish lists of the species affected. Mr. Stroud said however that as the Action Plan was likely to address broad habitats and landscapes used by a multitude of different species, these problems were more theoretical than practical.
66. Mr Bairlein said that while species lists were available for Mongolia and China, often it was not specified whether the species was present in the east or west of the countries concerned. Mr. Barbieri said that the CAF Action Plan might help in this regard. Mr. Bennun asked whether Afghanistan and Pakistan counted as Central Asia or the Indian sub-continent.
67. Mr Osinubi undertook to contact BLI HQ to seek the clarifications necessary for the completion of the species list. As some species were not included on the AEWA Annexes even though other members of the same family were, careful consideration would have to be given regarding how to deal with such cases. Mr. Barbieri said that some of the species currently annotated as "none" in the column of the table regarding status under CMS might in fact be covered where CMS listed an entire higher taxon and not individually named species.

Feedback from the Thematic Working Groups

68. The topics for the four Thematic Working Groups for closer discussion had been chosen by a form of ballot. All participants were asked to list three subjects. As a result of this exercise, the four subjects identified as priority by most participants were: Africa; Knowledge Gaps; Habitat Loss and Illegal Killing. The four Working Groups were formed and, after their initial deliberations, the rapporteurs presented the results of the discussions to the entire meeting.

³ Abu Dhabi, 9-11 December 2012

⁴ The Parties acknowledge the need to take action to avoid any migratory species becoming endangered

1. Africa - Shiiwua A. Manu (Nigeria)

A transcription of the main points presented during Mr Manu's presentation can be found at Annex V.

2. Knowledge Gaps - Fernando Spina (Italy)

A transcription of the main points presented during Mr Spina's presentation can be found at Annex VI.

3. Habitat Loss - David Stroud (United Kingdom)

A transcription of the main points presented during Mr Stroud's presentation can be found at Annex VII. Mr Stroud pointed out at the end of his presentation that the issues of climate change and desertification would need to be explored further.

4. Illegal Killing - Nicola Crockford (RSPB)

A summary of the main points raised in Ms Crockford's presentation can be found at Annex VIII. At the end of her presentation, Ms Crockford stressed the importance of engaging with hunting organizations and securing a mandate from the Standing Committee for CMS to liaise with the Bern Convention over the issue of illegal hunting of birds in the Mediterranean.

69. Overnight, the Chair, the Coordinator and the Secretariat incorporated the ideas raised by the four Working Groups into the draft Action Plan. The revised draft was circulated to participants so that they could ensure that their proposals had been correctly and comprehensively interpreted and nothing had been lost or distorted in the editing process. The Chair asked that particular attention be paid to ensuring that where two groups had raised the same or related issues, there were no contradictions. It was also important to ensure that the proposals emanating from the Africa Working Group were fully incorporated into the text.

70. The Chair proposed that the Working Groups resume their deliberations, with the exception of the one dealing with Africa, whose tasks had been completed and which could be replaced by a Group dealing with Capacity Building and related issues. The Knowledge group was asked to consider diseases.

71. The Chair presented a simplified outline of the Action Plan (a copy is attached at Annex IV). The new format was welcomed by the Working Group, with Mr Bennun commenting that the juxtaposition of issues and responses was particularly useful. Subject only to minor modifications (including poisons under killing, relegating disease to a sub-point and the addition of a section "drivers for change") it was agreed to adopt the new format. Early in the text, the broader context of the Action Plan along side the Action Plans of other instruments would be emphasized along with a summary of the main issues under consideration.

Revision of the Draft Action Plan

72. After the morning of the second day had been spent in Working Groups, the plenary was reconvened after lunch and the Chair invited participants to review the revised draft now using the new simplified model. Mr Osinubi had begun the task of inserting the findings of the Working Groups into the new structure.

Vision and goals

73. Mr Spina proposed the addition of a reference to the alarming conservation status and population declines of landbirds along the entire flyway, stressing the need for international cooperative action to address the problems. Mr Bennun suggested placing the rationale underlying the Action Plan at the start with an explanation of how the Plan was conceived. Mr Brouwer felt that some of the bold statements needed further justification and that the audience of the Action Plan, which went beyond the conservation community, needed to be taken into consideration. It was necessary to justify why conservation action to benefit these birds was important. Danaë Sheehan (RSPB) agreed saying that some statistical backing for the assertion that the species were suffering alarming declines was needed. The Chair was wary about overburdening the document with too much detail and too many references but felt that allusion to the Aichi Targets⁵ from the CBD process would be helpful to illustrate how CMS fitted in with wider biodiversity policies. Target 12 on threatened species would be particularly relevant. It was also suggested that reference be made to our obligations to protect our common heritage.
74. There was some discussion about whether to have a preamble, an introduction or an Executive Summary or a combination of these three elements. The Chair's inclination was to keep the number of separate sections to a minimum and certainly not have all three.
75. Mr Stroud provided some text for the section on drivers. There ensued a discussion on the merits of adding a number of qualifying words - culturally, ecologically and environmentally - to describe the various benefits and values associated with landbirds. It was agreed that the birds' *intrinsic* value should be mentioned. This section would also be the place to make cross-references to other relevant CMS instruments (i.e. AEWA and the Raptors MOU) highlight parallel processes such as CBD and the Aichi Targets with which synergies would be sought and to stress the international and transboundary aspects of the work of the Convention.

Geographic and Taxonomic Scope

76. The Coordinator had received sufficient guidance on how to proceed with the elaboration of this section on the first day of the Workshop.

Action Plan

1. Habitat Degradation and Loss

77. Mr Stroud summarized the outline of issues arising from the Habitats Working Group. These were: (1) Site types (as used by birds); (2) Landscapes (as they appear on the ground); (3) Agriculture; (4) Forests and trees (5) Water management; (6) Energy; (7) Fibre; (8) Woodland management; (9) Wider processes. The question remained whether climate change belonged in this section or whether it merited a chapter of its own. It raised secondary issues such as migration mismatches, modification of range, species resilience, and adaptation and desertification.
78. Mr Micevski said that the reverse aspect of the establishment of networks was the losses of habitats through fragmentation, while Mr Asgedom said that it was necessary to change local people's attitudes but this was difficult when they were

⁵ Strategic Goal C: To improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity - Target 12 By 2020 the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has been improved and sustained

facing hunger, which was certainly a driver to unsustainable hunting. In sub-Saharan Africa it was difficult to assess status of habitats.

Direct human-wildlife interactions

79. Ms Crockford said that she had still not found an appropriate title for the subjects dealt with by her Group. As well as the sustainability of harvesting, other activities were having significant impacts; these included poisoning (but she advised that the outcome of the dedicated Scientific Council Working Group meeting foreseen to be held in June 2013 on this subject be awaited); disease (being considered by one of the other groups in the Workshop); collisions (where the review concerning power lines would be relevant); and wind turbines (although this issue might also be appropriately dealt with under “habitats”). Electrocutation was thought unlikely to be a major problem. Conflicts included birds eating seed crops and bee-eaters near apiaries.

80. The suggested actions would include: proper legislation; better implementation and enforcement; regulation of legal harvesting with a system of alerts when populations declined and “bag” statistics; hunting seasons to be synchronized with phenology; unsustainable and illegal subsistence hunting including provision of alternatives; and regulation of international hunting tourism. Mr Siblet mentioned that light pollution was also a problem leading to birds being disorientated. Mr Bairlein added that this was a particular problem for nocturnal migrants.

Knowledge Gaps

81. Mr Spina presented his Group’s latest thoughts on screen, to which the research needs from the Habitats Group would have to be added. Disease was not just an area for research, as immediate action as sometimes required (the AEWA Action Plan had a section on emergency interventions). Mr de Bruijn said that intensive poultry production and transportation were the main vectors.

Implementation Strategies (was “Ways and Means”)

Capacity building

82. Key actions included: research, monitoring, awareness-advocacy, field skills, fundraising and conservation business planning.

International Cooperation

83. Cooperation should be encouraged among NGOs, government departments and agencies, MEAs; research institutes and universities, especially in the field of ornithology and other cross-cutting areas.

Incentives

84. Landbird conservation should be combined with the interests of land-owners and – users. Employment opportunities should be created and schemes such as REDD encouraged. Mr. Spina thought that there was a potential role of captive breeding to reduce the take of bushmeat, whereby animals would be farmed for consumption. Mr Bennun suggested twinning schemes between sites in different countries to help with information exchange and capacity building.

85. The Chair asked participants to ensure that all suggestions made at the beginning of the exercise had been covered.

Review Mechanism

86. Mr Spina asked whether it was envisaged for the review process to be internal or external. One possible means for monitoring progress was through holding regular workshops. The Chair felt that the Working Group would be the best forum for reviewing implementation and could be given the task of reporting back to the COP just at the AEWA Technical Committee reported to the AEWA MOP.

87. Ms Sheehan said that other instruments would provide precedents and models that could be copied. Mr. Dereliev explained the processes operating under that Agreement, which were quite onerous and costly in terms of time and other resources.

Joost Brouwer Presentation – “Why conserve birds?”

88. When answering this question, one has to use a language that the audience understands. While they might not care too much about birds, they might care more about money, so stress the financial value of birds. This element is covered in the CMS booklet on Flyways, the second edition of which is about to appear with translations into French and Spanish.

89. Mr Brouwer described the functions of the Niger Bird Database (NiBDaB), which was bilingual and could easily be adapted for other countries and taxa. It also served a social function by bringing birders together. Maintenance of such a system potentially involved a great deal of work, but even simply keeping it running required a certain level of commitment.

90. The system was jointly run by Mr Brouwer and Ulf Leidén and it could be found at www.nibdab.org. It had been started in 1994. The system had an auto-prompt for bird species but contained limited information on endangered birds and particularly did not give the coordinates of any sightings.

91. The species data used the Dowsett code and allowed up to five different names (taxonomic, English and French with room for two more) with field for numbers, breeding, dates, source, altitude (where relevant), vegetation and pictures and a “look-alike” identification guide. Aspects relating to local culture could be added. It also listed the range states of all migrant species in Niger showing links to at least 80 other countries.

92. One challenge in Niger was the fact that a country twice the size of France had only ten regular birders.

Next Steps

93. Mr. Heredia said that the 40th meeting of the CMS Standing Committee would be taking place 7-8 November 2012 and would expect to receive a progress report on the Action Plan and a report of the current workshop. Consideration was being given to scheduling a restricted meeting of the Scientific Council in September 2013, where technical aspects of the Plan could be examined, but this meeting was dependent on finding funds from outside the Convention’s core budget. Mr Spina said that he was looking for funding sources within Italy but might not find enough to finance this Council meeting. The fall-back position would be that the Scientific Council held prior

to COP11 in 2014 would have to review the Plan. In any event, there was sufficient time to elaborate and refine the Plan before any definitive decision had to be taken at COP11.

94. The Chair reminded the Workshop of the wording of Resolution 10.27, by which a Working Group was to be established under the Scientific Council (rather than the Standing Committee). This meant that it would not be necessary at this stage to prepare translations of the current draft Action Plan. The Chair felt that at this stage, the draft could be circulated to the Council after a brief consultation, and that in the light of the terms of the Resolution, clearance should be obtained for the Working Group to embark on implementation, in particular by addressing the knowledge gaps identified.
95. Mr Heredia clarified that a Working Group under the Scientific Council was already in place, after the call for volunteers issued from the Secretariat in February 2012. This Working Group had now been extended to include all those attending the landbirds workshop.
96. Mr Osinubi sought guidance on the timescales for completing the revision of the draft Action Plan. He aimed to complete the changes agreed and required by the Workshop by mid-October before he left to attend the Pan-African Ornithological Congress in Tanzania. Comments on the draft could be submitted then, allowing Mr Osinubi until mid-January to produce a final draft. Consultees would include the Secretariat, all those that had participated in the Workshop and all invitees that had not been able to attend. Ms Crockford (RSPB) requested that the net be spread as wide as possible to include more experts. The Chair agreed in principle but was concerned that the Coordinator might be overburden with an excessive number of comments and suggested that as nothing confidential was being discussed that it be left to participants' discretion to consult as widely as they thought appropriate and that they channel composite replies through to Mr. Osinubi. Mr Spina supported the idea of increasing the number of consultees as this would help build the profile of the Action Plan from the outset.
97. Mr Stroud said that the final input from the Habitats Working Group would take some time to complete as he wanted to consult wider. The Chair asked that everything available at the Workshop should be presented to the meeting, but the text could always be completed afterwards.

Working Group

98. The Chair commented that a large number of experts had been approached to contribute to the elaboration of the Action Plan. However, the decision to extend the geographic scope meant that some regions were not well represented, particularly in Central Asia. More even coverage could be achieved in Europe and thought should be given to ensuring full representation in the Middle East and Africa. The Secretariat was asked to try to address the geographic gaps. That said, in the Chair's opinion the size of the Working Group was close to the optimum and enlarging it significantly might impinge on the effectiveness of face-to-face meetings. Mr. Heredia confirmed that the list of invitees had been larger than the number attending, as some Scientific Councillors had been keen to participate but had prior engagements. Ms Crockford said that hunters and other interest groups, such as IGOs (e.g. UNCCD and FAO) should be involved. Recognizing the need to keep numbers manageable, she suggested that a communications pyramid be established, with an inner core of participants charged with working on the details of the plan. Mr Micevski said that this was exactly how he worked, drawing information from a wide range of contacts. The AEWA Technical Committee operated through regional

representatives who had to consult and coordinate replies. Ms Kralj asked what the response rate had been to the initial calls for input, which Mr Osinubi estimated at 40 per cent.

99. It was suggested that a support group be set up to assist the core team. This suggestion met with general approval and a name for the support group was approved – the Friends of the Landbirds Action Plan (FLAP). The Secretariat was asked to maintain a mailing list, and Ms Crockford said that social media provided various options for communication as would the Scientific Council e-workspace which was under development.

Chair of the Working Group

100. Mr Biber was proposed as Chair of the Working Group and was elected by acclamation. Professor Oteng-Yeboah was proposed as Vice-Chair and similarly elected.

Report of the Workshop

101. Robert Vagg (CMS) would submit a draft report to Mr Heredia and to the Chair a week after the Workshop, after which it would be circulated to all participants. The final version would be ready for submission to November's Standing Committee.

Draft Action Plan

102. On the evening of the second day, the Chair, the AEML Coordinator and the Secretariat had further refined the Draft Action Plan to take account of the deliberations of the Working Groups. The revised draft was presented to the meeting on the third day, which was examined in detail as the meeting split into the four Working Groups. Plenary reconvened after the mid-morning break.

Executive Summary

103. It was agreed that the Executive Summary would be written last when the rest of the text was complete. It was also agreed to add "water" to the list of resources subject to increasing demand.

Geographic and Taxonomic Scope

104. Mr Spina said that as the BLI and CMS criteria for defining a migratory species differed, an explanation should be included in a footnote. The species to be covered should be listed in an Annex. It was also agreed to include a map of the Range States in another Annex.

Action Plan

Habitats

105. Mr Stroud explained the further thoughts of the Habitats Working Group. A novel approach was adopted with regard to setting priorities, working backwards from when results were expected to be seen rather than from projected start dates for activities. Given the greatly different nature of many of the activities, it had proven difficult to apply the same criteria to all when setting priorities. Some sections of the draft plan remained in square brackets where further consultation with other stakeholders was considered necessary.

106. Important aspects included the identification, management and protection of sites and local community engagement; the management of broader landscapes; re-vegetation, water management, mainstreaming into other processes and finding a suitably prominent place for climate change considerations.

Unsustainable Harvesting and Trade (and poisoning needs to be in the title)

107. Ms Crockford said that some additional editing was needed and some activities needed to be prioritized. The title of the section also needed to be amended to take account of the issue of poisoning. She also proposed to add some explanatory text before the table containing the issues, actions and priorities, and undertook to provide revised text to the Coordinator before the end of the Workshop. She stressed that she felt that it was important to establish the principle of recognizing different categories of species reflecting their conservation status and therefore acting as a guide for prioritization.

Knowledge

108. Mr Spina said that some points raised in the Habitats Group had been incorporated. Mr Bennun explained that this included research into stop-over sites. With regard to disease, the sub-heading “emerging issues” had replaced “emergency measures”; these were separate points and both were important.

Implementation

109. Mr Osinubi said that three headings had been identified: capacity building, international cooperation and incentives. The first covered activities such as research, monitoring, data management, communication, skills, ecotourism, fund raising and livelihoods. More work was required to develop the sub-themes under international cooperation, while the third category would deal with landowners and managers, addressing perverse incentives, fostering conservationists, encouraging local initiatives, creating employment opportunities and instigating schemes to pay for eco-services.

Review Mechanism

110. Mr Spina said that devising such a mechanism had proved to be a challenge. Although the Action Plan could be treated as a stand alone initiative, reporting requirements ensuing from it could be added to CMS Parties’ wider obligations under the Convention to provide information on implementation. The Chair of the Working Group could report to the COP, the Standing Committee and the Scientific Council on overall implementation and on collective, international activities.
111. He also floated the idea of having an independent refereeing system, calling on outsiders to assess performance. This would be transparent and objective and a novel approach under CMS. He suggested that Parties be consulted on this concept.
112. Mr Williams said that that instrument had a seven-year Action Plan with an in-built review period after five years, when work on the revised version would start.
113. Mr Stroud proposed having a dual review system, reporting to the bodies of the Convention coupled with regular outward facing review of status and actions, especially looking at actions benefitting people and birds that could help build partners and serve as an advocacy tool.

Conclusion and Closure of the Meeting

114. The Chair thanked all participants warmly for their active engagement, the Secretariat for all the organizational work before and during the meeting and the hosts from the Ghanaian Forestry Commission for their support and in particular for the organization of the excellent excursion to Kakum National Park. Mr Heredia thanked Mr Biber for his able and energetic chairmanship, Nana Kofi Adu-Nsiah, Charles Amankwah and Cornelia Danso of the Wildlife Division, the Working Group rapporteurs, Laura Aguado and Robert Vagg of the CMS Secretariat and Mr Osinubi for their contribution to the success of the meeting. Finally, Mr Julius Arinaitwe (BirdLife Africa) presented a copy of the Birds of Ghana book to Mr. Biber.

ANNEX I – List of Participants

SCIENTIFIC COUNCILLORS

<i>Appointed Scientific Councillor for Birds</i>	Leon Bennun Director of Science and Policy BirdLife International	Wellbrook Court, Girton Rd. Cambridge CB3 0NA, United Kingdom Tel: +44 1223 – 277 318 Fax: +44 1223 – 277 200 Leon.Bennun@birdlife.org
<i>Chair of the CMS Standing Committee and Appointed CMS Scientific Councillor for African Fauna</i>	Alfred Oteng Yeboah Chairman, National Biodiversity Committee Council for Scientific and Industrial Research	CSIR-Ghana P.O. Box M32 C/o Wildlife Division, Forestry Commission of Accra Tel: (+233 24) 477 2256 Fax: (+233 21) 777 655 alfred.otengyeboah@gmail.com
<i>Croatia</i>	Jelena Kralj Scientific Assistant Institute for Ornithology	Croatian Academy of Science and Arts Gunduliceva 24, 10000 Zagreb Croatia Tel: +385 -1- 4825 401 Fax: +385 -1- 4825 392 zso@hazu.hr
<i>Ethiopia</i>	Kahsay Asgedom Director of the Protected Areas Coordinating Directorate, Ethiopian Wildlife Conservation Authority	Mexico Square, P.O. Box: 386,, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia Tel: +251(1)115504842 Fax: +251(1)115546804 kahsaygt@hotmail.com
<i>France</i>	Jean-Philippe Sibley Head of the Natural Heritage Service National Museum of Natural History, Paris	Muséum National d'Histoire naturelle (MNHN) Paris P.O.Box : CP 41 rue Geoffroy Saint Hilaire, 36, 75231 Paris, France Tel : 0680155207 sibley@mnhn.fr
<i>Italy and Chair of the CMS Scientific Council</i>	Fernando Spina Senior Scientist Italian National Ringing Centre Istituto Superiore per la Protezione e la Ricerca Ambientale (ISPRA),	Sede amministrativa ex-INFS via Ca' Fornacetta 9 I - 40064 OZZANO EMILIA, Bologna, Italy Tel: +39 34703507032 Fax +39 051 796 628 fernando.spina@isprambiente.it
<i>Kenya</i>	Samuel M. Kasiki Deputy Director Biodiversity Research and Monitoring	Kenya Wildlife Service, P.O. Box 40241 00100 Nairobi, Kenya Tel: +254 721446729 Fax: +254 20 603 792

skasiki@kws.go.ke

Macedonia

Branko Micevski
President of the Macedonian Bonn
Committee
Institute of Biology, Faculty of
Science

58 Blvd, ASNOM/1000 , Skopje,
Macedonia
Tel: +389 78 254 736
Fax: + 389 22 432 071
brankom@ukim.edu.mk

Switzerland

Olivier Biber
Dr. phil. nat. Biologe
International Biodiversity Policy
Advisor

Gruner AG
Sägerstrasse 73
CH-3098 Köniz
Tel.: +41 31 917 20 89
Fax: +41 31 917 20 21
olivier.biber@gruner.ch
www.gruner.ch

Tunisia

Khaled Zahzah
Sous Director chasse et Parcs
Nationaux
Direction Générale des Forêts

Ministère de l'Agriculture et des
Ressources Hydrauliques
30 rue Alain Savary, 1002 Tunisia
Tel: + 21698665386
Fax: +21671794107
khaledzahzah2000@yahoo.fr

INVITED EXPERTS

Burkina Faso

Idrissa Zeba
Executive Director of Naturama

P.O.Box: 01 BP 6133 OUAGADOUGOU
01 Burkina Faso
Tel: + 22650373240
Fax: +22650372886
idrissa.zeba@naturama.bf

Germany

Franz Bairlein
Institute of Avian Research

An der Vogelwarte 21, D-26386
Wilhelmshaven, Germany
Tel: +49 4421-9689-0
Fax: +49 4421-968955
franz.bairlein@ifv-vogelwarte.de

Germany

Norbert Schaffer
Head of International Policy and
Species Recovery, RSPB

UK Headquarters, The Lodge, Sandy,
Bedfordshire SG19 2DL
United Kingdom
Tel: +44 (0)1767 693208
Fax: +44 (0)1767 693211
Norbert.schaffer@rspb.org.uk

Ghana

Augustus Asamoah
Manager of Biodiversity
Conservation Research
Ghana Wildlife Society

P.O.Box: 13252, Accra, Ghana
Efua Sutherland Children's Park,
Ridge Accra
Tel: +223 302665197/2445519719
Fax: +2330302670610
aasamoah@mail.com

Ghana	Mr. Nana Kofi Adu-Nsiah Executive Director of the Wildlife Division of the Forestry Commission of Ghana	P.O. Box: M239, Accra, Ghana Tel: +233302401210 Fax: +233302401249 adunsiahn@yahoo.com
Ghana	Ottou Reuben AG. Executive Director Ghana Wildlife Society	GP 13252 Accra, Ghana Efua Sutherland Children's Park, Ridge Accra Tel: +233244893528 Fax: +2330302670610 reubenott@yahoo.co.uk
India	Sivananantha Perumal Balachandran Deputy Director Bombay Natural History Society	S.B. Singh Road 400001 Mumbai, India Tel: 912222821811 Fax: 912222837615 bnhsbala@rediffmail.com
Kenya	Julius Arinaitwe Regional Director, BirdLife Africa Partnership Secretariat	ICIPE Campus, Kasarani, P.O. Box 3502, 00100 GPO, Nairobi, Kenya Tel. +254-20-2473259/8068314 Fax: +254-20-8068315 Julius.Arinaitwe@birdlife.org
Nigeria	Shiiwua A. Manu Director APLORI (AP Leventis Ornithological Research Institute)	P.O. Box: 13404 Laminga Street, 930106, Jos, Nigeria Tel: +2348038501780 director@aplori.org
Nigeria	Samuel Temidayo Osinubi Coordinator of the WG	P.O.Box: 13252, Accra, Ghana Efua Sutherland Children's Park, Ridge Accra Tel: +233234237732 Temidayo.Osinubi@birdlife.org
Nigeria	Phil Hall Chairman APLORI	P.O. Box: 13404 Laminga Street, 930106, Jos, Nigeria Tel: +2348033083311 Philhall.obe@btinternet.com
South Africa	Nicholas Theron BirdLife South Africa	P.O. Box: 515, Randburg, Gauteng, South Africa, 239 Barkston Drive, Blairgowrie 2125 Randburg, South Africa Tel: +270785458977 Fax: +270862391001 kzn@birdlife.org.za
South Africa	Santhuri Naido Department of Environmental	Private BAG X447, 315 Pretorius Street 0001 Pretoria

	Affairs	Tel: +270123103930 Fax: +27123207024 SNaidoo@environment.gov.za
South Africa	Pamela Kershaw Biodiversity Conservation Officer; Conservation Management Department of Environmental Affairs	Private BAG X447, 315 Pretorius Street 0001 Pretoria Tel: +270123103930 Fax: +27123207024 PKershaw@environment.gov.za
Spain	Rubén Moreno-Opo Díaz-Meco Technical assitant,, Conservation Actions Area	Sub-directorate of Biodiversity, Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Environment Rios Rosas 24, 28003, Madrid, Spain Tel: +34 917493733 rmorenoopo@gmail.com
Switzerland	Werner Müller Director, SVS/Birdlife Switzerland	Wiedingstrasse 78 P.O.Box: 8036 Zurich, Switzerland Tel: +41444577020 Fax: +41444577030 werner.mueller@birdlife.ch
The Netherlands	Bern de Bruijn VBN, BirdLife International in the Netherlands	P.O.Box: 925, 12 Boulevard 3700 AX, Zeist, The Netherlands Tel: +31306937799 Fax: +316918844 bernd.debruijn@vogelbescherming.nl
The Netherlands	Joost Brouwer Expert migratory birds in Africa Brouwer Envir. & Agric. Consultancy Niger Bird DataBase NiBDaB manager	Wildekamp 32 6721 JD Bennekom The Netherlands Tel: +31-318 - 413 468 BrouwerEAC@orange.nl
Tunisia	Hichem Azafzaf BirdLife Partner in Tunisia President of Les Amis des Oiseaux	P.O. Box: Bureau C208-209 Ariana Centre 2080 Ariana Tunisia Tel: + 21602302070238 azafzaf@gnet.tn
UK	Danaë Sheehan Senior Conservation Scientist RSPB Centre for Conservation Science	UK Headquarters, The Lodge, Potton Road, Sandy, Bedfordshire SG19 2DL United Kingdom Tel: +44 (0)1767 693134 Fax: +44 (0)1767 683211 Danae.Sheehan@rspb.org.uk
UK	Nicola Crockford International Species Policy Officer Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	UK Headquarters, The Lodge, Sandy, Bedfordshire SG19 2DL United Kingdom Tel: +44 (0)1767 693072

RSPB/BirdLife International

Fax: +44 (0)1767 683211
nicola.crockford@rspb.org.uk

UK

Phil Atkinson
Head of International Research
British Trust for Ornithology

The Nunnery, Nunnery Place
IP24 2PU Thetford, UK
+44 7763874167
+441842750030
phil.atkinson@bto.org

**UK Joint Nature
Conservation
Committee**

David A. Stroud
Senior Ornithologist
UK Joint Nature Conservation
Committee

Monkstone House, City Road
Peterborough PE1 1JY
United Kingdom
Tel: +44 (0) 1733 866810
Fax: +44 (0) 1733 555948
David.Stroud@jncc.gov.uk

REPRESENTATIVES OF MULTILATERAL ENVIRONMENTAL AGREEMENTS

**UNEP/AEWA
Secretariat**

Marco Barbieri
UNEP/AEWA Acting Executive
Secretary

AEWA Office
Hermann-Ehlers-Str.10
53113 Bonn
Germany
Tel: +49 228 815 2414
Fax: +49 228 815 2450
mbarbieri@unep.de

**Raptors MoU
UNEP/CMS**

Nick Williams
Programme Officer
(Birds of Prey – Raptors)

UNEP CMS Office - Abu Dhabi
c/o Environment Agency - Abu Dhabi
P.O. Box 45553, Al Muroor Road
Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates
Tel.: (+971) 02 6934 624
Mob: (+971) 502 605 569
Fax: (+971) 02 4997 252
nwilliams@cms.int

**UNEP/AEWA
Secretariat**

Sergey Dereliev
AEWA Technical Officer

AEWA Office
Hermann-Ehlers-Str.10
53113 Bonn
Germany
Tel: +49 228 – 815 2415
Fax: +49 (228) 815-2450
sdereliev@unep.de

UNEP/CMS SECRETARIAT

Borja Heredia

CMS Scientific and Technical Officer,
UNEP/CMS Secretariat

CMS Secretariat
Hermann-Ehlers-Str.10
53113 Bonn
Germany
Tel: +49 228 – 815 2415

Robert Vagg	Report writer, Editor, UNEP/CMS Secretariat	Fax: +49 (228) 815-2450 bheredia@cms.int CMS Secretariat Hermann-Ehlers-Str.10 53113 Bonn Germany Tel: +49 228 – 815 2415 Fax: +49 (228) 815-2450 rvagg@cms.int
Laura Aguado	Science Unit, UNEP/CMS Secretariat	CMS Secretariat Hermann-Ehlers-Str.10 53113 Bonn Germany Tel: +49 228 – 815 2415 Fax: +49 (228) 815-2450 laguado@cms.int

ANNEX II

PowerPoint Presentation by F. Bairlein – available online and in the posted version of the report. It has not been included here due to large data value.

ANNEX III

Presentation by Samuel Temidayo Osinubi

<p style="text-align: center;">Draft Action Plan Overview: Improving the Conservation Status of Migratory Landbirds in the African- Eurasian Region</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Dr. Samuel Temidayo Osinubi AEMLWG Coordinator (BirdLife International)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">1</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Vision and goals• Definition of migratory landbirds• Range states and taxonomic scope <p style="text-align: center;">2</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Conservation Needs and Threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Habitat conservation and management• Human-wildlife conflict• Climate change• Wildlife diseases• Information gaps <p style="text-align: center;">3</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Priorities for Conservation Action</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Habitat conservation• Species conservation• Capacity building• Cooperation – (inter)national <p style="text-align: center;">4</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Control measures• Synergies• Timeline• Next steps <p style="text-align: center;">5</p>	

ANNEX IV

REVISED SIMPLIFIED MODEL STRUCTURE OF THE ACTION PLAN

1. INTRODUCTION

Vision and goals

2. DRIVERS FOR CHANGE

3. GEOGRAPHIC & TAXONOMIC SCOPE

Range

Species:

Target Species:

Definition of migratory landbirds
Selection criteria

4. ACTION PLAN

Issues and Responses

Habitat loss and degradation

Climate change and life cycle mismatch and distribution range changes

Establishment of ecological networks of critical sites

Energy

Taking, hunting, illegal taking & trade and poisoning

Knowledge: habitat data (flyways) site data, species data

Others:

Diseases

Implementation

Capacity Building

Incentives for conservation

International cooperation

Stakeholders, partnerships and synergies

5. NEXT STEPS

Annex V

Thematic Working Group: Africa

Actions

Habitat loss through unsustainable agricultural practices, land use, poverty population pressure infrastructural development

Develop of integrated nature reserve management systems at all levels

Development of effective legislation for sustainable agriculture

Habitat restoration in degraded areas (e.g. desertified areas) and control of invasive species

Promote the adoption and implementation of the CMS guidelines related to power networks.

Development of guidelines for renewable energy farms

Collecting, generating and communicating the value of ecosystem services

Information gaps concerning species ecology e.g. stop over areas wintering sites

Promoting networking and information sharing between stakeholders e.g. data base establishment and maintenance

Identify research priorities into key species ecology e.g. stop over and wintering areas along the flyways.

Building capacity

Threats (unsustainable hunting, trapping and trade)

Develop appropriate utilization systems

Pollution and pesticides

IAS

Annex VI

Thematic Working Group: Knowledge Gaps

Members: F. Bairlein, J. Kralj, F. Spina, S. Balachandran, L. Aguado, S. Naidoo, P. Atkinson

Fifteen participants had raised issues concerning knowledge gaps and these included: using existing data; connectivity; gaps of knowledge stopover sites; status of species and drivers; specific data on central Asia; migration patterns; and monitoring.

Based on existing data, produce a module study case for the implementation of the AP, the selection of priorities for action and as a contribution to optimize efforts to improve our knowledge of the still largely unknown flyways.

1. Understanding patterns and connectivity along flyways
 - a. response
 - i. using existing data sets
 - ii. starting new international collaborative projects
 - b. feasibility and time scale
 - i. a.i 2 yrs (easy as for feasibility)
 - ii. a.ii max 5 yrs for starting new collaborative projects, which should however continue. Build on existing experience. See experience fro e.g. ESF network project, see also existing standardised protocols and also mention capacity building
2. Ecological requirements
 - a. data on habitats, based on already existing data from non-breeding grounds (stopover sites and wintering areas, see 3.5.1 + 3.5.2.)
 - i. use existing data.
 - b. feasibility and time scale
 - i. time scale explore existing data sets for data which can immediately be analysed. Based on this, possible to perform preliminary analyses within 2 yrs
 - ii. starting new international collaborative projects
3. Monitoring
 - a. compile existing schemes, involve EBCC, explore through comparative analyses the various schemes across range. This is important also to know more on the intra-African systems, e.g. comparing resident vs migratory species within Africa
 - i. using existing data, but urgent need for monitoring data from: Middle East, Central Asia, Indian sub-continent, Africa
 - b. feasibility and time scale
 - i. information already available through EBCC. In Africa (especially in East Africa) most of the existing data would relate most to open habitats (not necessarily so in Southern Africa). Long-term
4. Understanding causes of population change
 - a. Need to understand demographic mechanisms underlying populations changes, consider by taking into account also carry-over effects
 - b. Link to environmental factors (e.g. existing metadata on land-use, NDVI, etc). in order to better understand general mechanisms
 - c. Understanding the driving factors for changes in the environment
 - i. Based on existing data: 2 years
 - ii. Initiating more targeted studies: through selection on “indicator species”: ongoing

Annex VII

Thematic Working Group: Habitats

<p style="text-align: center;">Key habitats/habitat priorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grasslands <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Steppe – Traditional low-intensity pastoral landscapes (Europe) – Africa: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High level grasslands • low/savannah • Woodlands (& scrub) • Reed beds • Coastal hotspot bottlenecks • [Oases – critical bottlenecks – knowledge gaps?] <p style="text-align: center;">1</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intensification of use – change of structure/function etc. (possibly subtle) • Conversion to other habitats • Drivers of change: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Consequences of general pressures – Specific policies (sometimes perverse incentives) <p style="text-align: center;">2</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to identify win-win situations where actions that benefit birds also deliver human needs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – e.g. range of policies to reduce demand for firewood • External national footprints driving environmental change in other countries • Spatial planning needs: esp. re wide-scale land-use and changes <p style="text-align: center;">3</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Principles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mainstreaming – need for intra-governmental co-ordination and communication • Development of shared agendas (or influencing) other international players: MEAs, WB, IMF, donor/aid communities • Energy demand – key issue: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Opportunity to work with/through range of sectors <p style="text-align: center;">4</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ?Standards (“landbird friendly” product labelling) • Tourism? 	<p style="text-align: center;">Research needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spatial info – habitat maps • Birds <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Where are they? – What they need? • Stopovers – where/ importance • Research networks/ data sharing protocols • Top 10 research needs? [What is critical vs what is interesting?!!] • Consequences of habitat loss – advocacy support tools?

5	6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Twinning type arrangements between countries • Misleading conclusions based on incomplete knowledge 	<p>Education and awareness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local communities • Public • Governments • Trans-nationals and corporates <i>etc.</i> <p>+ building capacity within NGOs and governments re issues</p>
7	8

Annex VIII

Thematic Working Group: Killing

Definitions – types of legal but unsustainable hunting, taking and crop protection etc

Illegal killing

Trade the main driver of some hunting

Methods

Shooting, trapping poisoning falconry decoys

Sports, food (inc for sale and subsistence , trophies, trade, control of pests

Table of regions, knowledge, occurrence of hunting type – something where the Coordinator could help. BLI-AEWA project on Middle Eastern hunting. Bern Convention (and illegal bird killing in the Mediterranean region) meetings in June 2012 and 2013 – and mandate for mentioning this at Bern StC.

Turtle dove illegal and legal taking

Mid East trapping for food

Main gaps: how high is the harvest in Africa? Falconry and Houbara bustard – although this is being dealt with elsewhere.

Categories 1 and 2 – one for highest concern and one for small threatened populations (plus a third category for least concern) and see how national legislation shapes up.

Category 1 species would qualify for a SSAP. Category 2 – only an adapted plan for legally hunted species.

Actions designed to be compatible with modular approach. Key issue is enforcement and one good outcome would be enforcement guidance to national authorities and enhanced cooperation between authorities internationally – good ones to buddy weaker one.

Trade – legal and illegal – is driving unsustainable take – CITES and other existing instruments. Human livelihood and sustenance – offer alternate work and protein – see the AEWA Plan of Action for Africa.