



CONVENTION ON MIGRATORY SPECIES

Distr: General

UNEP/CMS/SA-2/REPORT

Original: English

SECOND MEETING OF THE SIGNATORIES TO THE
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING CONCERNING
CONSERVATION, RESTORATION AND SUSTAINABLE
USE OF THE SAIGA ANTELOPE
Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia, 9-10 September 2010

REPORT OF THE SECOND MEETING OF THE SIGNATORIES

Agenda Item 1: Welcoming remarks

1. Mr. Lkhagvasuren Badamjav (Conservation Director, WWF Mongolia), opened the Meeting and introduced Mr. Jargalsaikhan Choijantsan, Vice-Minister for Nature, Environment and Tourism of Mongolia. The Vice-Minister welcomed participants to the Second Meeting of Signatories and thanked the CMS Secretariat, the Secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES Secretariat) and WWF Mongolia for their efforts in convening the meeting. Mr. Jargalsaikhan outlined how the Mongolian saiga population had fortunately recovered to 8000 animals after a low of 750 individuals in 2004.

2. Mr. Marco Barbieri (Agreements Officer, UNEP/CMS Secretariat), noted the fact that most saiga populations appeared to be recovering which was a good omen for the 2010 International Year of Biodiversity and transmitted the greetings of the UNEP/CMS Executive Secretary, Ms. Elizabeth Maruma Mrema. He noted the tremendous effort that had gone into the meeting and expressed his gratitude to the Government of Mongolia and the Ministry of Nature, Environment and Tourism for hosting the meeting. An exceptional effort had been made by WWF Mongolia in providing organisation and logistical support for the meeting. Without the generous financial support from the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety and the MAVA Foundation the meeting would not have been possible. Finally, he thanked the IUCN/ Species Survival Commission - Antelope Specialist Group and the Saiga Conservation Alliance (SCA) for their invaluable input as technical advisers, as well as the CITES colleagues, who continued to work closely with the UNEP/CMS Secretariat on saiga conservation matters.

3. Mr. David Morgan (Chief, Scientific Services Team, CITES Secretariat), thanked the hosts and highlighted that the saiga was one of the target species of the CMS-CITES joint work programme. He congratulated signatories for the progress made but reminded participants that despite the initial success much remained to be done. He offered the Signatories the full support of the CITES community.

4. Mr. Chimed-Ochir Bazarsad (WWF Mongolia Resident Representative) noted the excellent technical workshop which had prepared participants well for the MoU meeting. He noted the recovery of the Mongolian saiga population, but warned that the remaining threats of overgrazing by livestock, as well as the illegal trade in saiga products, still needed urgent attention.

Agenda Item 2: Election of officers

5. The Meeting elected Mr. Batbold Dorjgurkhem (Director, International Cooperation Department, Ministry of Nature, Environment and Tourism of Mongolia and CMS National Focal Point) as Chair of the Meeting. He extended his welcome to all participants on behalf of Mongolia.

Agenda Item 3: Adoption of the agenda and meeting schedule

6. The Secretariat introduced the item. In line with the decisions of the First Meeting of Signatories of not requesting the Secretariat to develop formal rules of the procedure, the meeting accepted the proposal by the Secretariat to operate in the meeting following generally accepted rules for international fora. Decisions would be taken by consensus.

7. The Secretariat introduced the meeting documents (UNEP/CMS/SA-2/Doc/3). The final list of meeting documents is reproduced as Annex 2 to this report. The list of participants as Annex 6 to this report.

8. The agenda (UNEP/CMS/SA-2/Doc/1/Rev.1) was adopted without amendments and is reproduced as Annex 1 to this report.

Agenda Item 4: Opening statements

9. The Chair invited Signatories to the MoU to make their opening statements.

10. The representative from Kazakhstan extended his gratitude to the CMS Secretariat, Mongolia and all other supporters of the meeting. He noted that while there were noteworthy successes to report, unfortunately the mass mortality of 12,000 saigas in the Ural population in West Kazakhstan in May 2010 had undermined long-term conservation efforts. The assistance and response of the international community following the outbreak was much appreciated.

11. The representative from Uzbekistan thanked the organizers for convening the meeting and wished participants a successful meeting.

12. The delegate from Russia thanked the Mongolian Government, the CMS Secretariat and other Signatories of the MoU. The Meeting was of enormous importance to Russia, which signed the MoU one year ago. He hoped that the Meeting would provide concrete impetus to the ongoing conservation action.

13. The delegate from China shared with the meeting China's appreciation of the saiga conservation efforts in the past years, specifically by MoU Signatories, meeting participants and CITES and CMS Secretariats. Poaching needed to be addressed, in close collaboration with the MoU Signatories. The real reason for the recent sharp decline of saiga also needed to be accurately identified. In view of the fact that the Traditional Chinese Medicine (TCM) industry had a long history of use of this species, and that this had not changed significantly in recent years, considering poaching to supply TCM development as the main cause of the decline seemed not reasonable. He indicated that a Workshop on the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Saiga Antelope jointly convened by the CITES Management Authority of

China, the CITES Secretariat and the CMS Secretariat was scheduled to be held in late September in Urumqi. Participants in the MoU meeting were warmly invited to attend the workshop, which aimed at bringing together saiga Range States and TCM practitioners.

14. The Chair thanked China for their kind invitation.

15. The delegate from IUCN noted that saiga antelopes had received more conservation attention than any other antelope species. Substantial investments, especially in Kazakhstan and China, had made the significant progress since 2006 possible.

Agenda Item 5: Report of the Technical Meeting (7-8 September 2010)

16. Ms. E.J. Milner-Gulland, Chair of the SCA and Co-Chair of the Technical Meeting, thanked her Co-Chairs Mr. David Mallon, Co-Chair of the IUCN/SSC Antelope Specialist Group, and Mr. Lkhagvasuren Badamjav, Conservation Director of WWF Mongolia for their hard work. She gave an outline of the achievements of the past two days:

- (a) Presentations and discussions had covered a broad range of subjects, from protected area management within the Range States to market surveys in consumer countries.
- (b) There had been two special sessions, which had focussed on future disease monitoring and on population counting methodology respectively.
- (c) Three documents had been reviewed, revised and recommended to the MoU meeting (UNEP/CMS/SA-2/Doc/5/Rev.3, UNEP/CMS/SA-2/Doc/6/Add.1/Rev.1, UNEP/CMS/SA-2/Doc/7/Rev.1), thanks to the excellent input from participants of the Technical Meeting.

Agenda Item 6: Report of the Secretariat

Agenda Item 6.1: Status of signatures

17. The Secretariat introduced documents UNEP/CMS/SA-2/Doc/4 and UNEP/CMS/SA-2/Inf/2. It was noted that all Range States under the current coverage of the MoU had signed the MoU, with the Russian Federation signing on 24.6.2009. Seven governmental and non-governmental bodies had currently signed the MoU, and two further organizations had expressed interest in signing as Co-operating Organizations, which were then invited to provide brief oral statements.

18. The representative of the Saiga Conservation Alliance (SCA) introduced the organization and mission, which was to restore the saiga antelope as a flagship species of the Central Asian and pre-Caspian steppes, reflecting the species' cultural and economic value to local people and its fundamental role in the steppe ecosystem. The SCA had been a major contributor to the saiga MoU through the organization of technical meetings, preparation of documents and through monitoring MoU achievements in the "Saiga News" bulletin.

19. The representative of the Association for the Conservation of Biodiversity of Kazakhstan (ACBK) stated that while the overall mission of the Association was broad, ACBK had much experience in saiga conservation, especially through the Altyn Dala

Initiative. This initiative focussed on the Betpak-dala population and there were plans to expand efforts to the Ustiurt and Ural populations. In close liaison with the Kazakh authorities, temporary and permanent protected areas were being identified and designated. A hunting area of 1.3 million ha had been leased solely for saiga conservation purposes. ACBK also contributed to relevant legislation development.

20. The CMS Secretariat pointed out that the inclusion of new Signatories as Co-operating Organizations was considered an MoU amendment. Therefore, the signature of ACBK and SCA required the consensus of the Signatory States. The Secretariat had circulated the proposal to all Signatories before the meeting, requesting that possible objections should be submitted in writing before the meeting. No objections had been received from the Signatory States. As no objections were raised by the Signatories' delegations at the meeting, ACBK and SCA were invited to sign as new Co-operating Organizations.

Agenda Item 6.2: List of designated national contact points

21. The CMS Secretariat reported on the status of designation of national contact points, and requested national delegations to review document UNEP/CMS/SA-2/Inf/3 and to make any changes known to the CMS Secretariat. The updated list of designated national contact points is attached to this report as Annex 3.

Agenda Item 6.3: Any other matters

22. The Chair noted that no additional issues were raised by meeting participants.

Agenda Item 7: Proposal of MoU expansion to include all Saiga Antelope taxa

23. The CMS Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/SA-2/Doc/8 and highlighted that the MoU was currently restricted to *Saiga tatarica tatarica*. The Ninth Meeting of the CMS Conference of the Parties had listed all saigas to CMS Appendix II, following a proposal by Mongolia. It was therefore consistent to expand the MoU to cover all saigas and to amend the MoU title to "Memorandum of Understanding for the Conservation, Restoration and Sustainable Use of the Saiga Antelope (*Saiga* spp.)". This would mean that Mongolia would become a formal Range State to the MoU. The proposal had also the merit of being unequivocal about the taxonomic coverage of the MoU, irrespective of the taxonomic reference used. The Secretariat had circulated the proposal to all Signatories before the meeting, requesting that possible objections should be submitted in writing before the meeting. No objections had been received from the Signatories. The meeting welcomed and adopted the proposal.

24. The delegate from the Russian Federation made other delegates aware of the fact that Saiga MoU responsibility had shifted from the Ministry of Agriculture to the Ministry of Natural Resources of the Russian Federation at the beginning of the year. The meeting noted and endorsed the change in the competent authority in the Russian Federation and agreed to include this in the amendment protocol, as proposed by the Secretariat.

Agenda Item 8: Reports on MoU implementation

25. The Chair invited oral reports on MoU implementation from national delegations and observers.

26. The representative of Kazakhstan provided an overview of the ongoing conservation efforts for the three saiga populations which occurred in the country: Betpak-dala, Ustiurt and Ural populations. A state programme for saiga conservation had been adopted in 2010 and would be valid until 2014. Saiga hunting was banned until 2020. New protected areas had been created and existing ones expanded, in particular to protect calving and wintering sites, as well as migratory corridors. 183 million tenge (approximately € 950,000) had been allocated for saiga conservation in 2010. Both law enforcement measures and research had benefited from fitting satellite collars on saiga antelopes. In addition to the currently active 15 transmitters, a further 25 and 15 were foreseen for the Betpak-dala and Ustiurt populations respectively. Bilateral agreements on saiga conservation had been signed with Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, a further one with the Russian Federation was still in preparation. Overall saiga population size was increasing significantly, but the Ustiurt population continued to sharply decline.

27. The representative of Uzbekistan reported on law enforcement activities within the Ustiurt region, where a joint plan of activity with customs and the military was being implemented. Seminars for customs officers had been conducted. A one million hectare state reserve had been designated and the penalties for saiga poaching increased. With the assistance of several international organisations, an annual work plan for saiga conservation had been established. Relevant projects in the Ustiurt region focussed on landscape-planning and on facilitating biodiversity conservation in the region, which was heavily exploited for natural resources.

28. The delegate from Turkmenistan provided an overview of past saiga occurrences in the country, where the Ustiurt population traditionally migrates to in harsh winter. Saiga calving had only been observed in the early 20th Century. Unfortunately, since 2006 only very few saigas had been observed and in the past decade there had been no mass migration on Turkmenistan's territory. The primary threat was poaching. Current conservation measures included listing the saiga on Turkmenistan's Red List, signing the MoU, banning saiga hunting, establishing two protected areas in the saiga's traditional winter range, identifying migration corridors and organizing community workshops. Future measures would include capacity building of rangers, further awareness raising in rural communities and improved pasture management.

29. The delegate from the Russian Federation reported that while the saiga antelope was listed as a game species under national law, hunting was banned until 2014. The Precaspian population appeared stable. Monitoring was conducted annually and benefited from field visits of state institutions and information provided by rangers. Conservation measures included captive breeding in three different regions (Kalmykian Autonomous Republic, Astrakhan and Rostov oblasts), satellite collaring of saigas, signing the MoU and convening the 29th Congress of the International Union of Game Biologists in Moscow in August 2009.

30. In the ensuing discussion, the International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW) sought clarity on the equipment of saiga rangers in Russia and their efficiency. Due to the severe lack of state funds, WWF Russia and IFAW had invested in equipment for the rangers to ensure that they could continue their work. The delegate from the Russian Federation

confirmed that state organisations responsible for saiga conservation are currently facing difficulties in fulfilling their mandate due to a lack of funds.

31. The delegate from China reported that saiga had gone extinct in the wild in China in the 1950s. There was anecdotal evidence to suggest that individual saigas were still present in the wild in the 1970s, but this remained unconfirmed. Saigas have been listed on category 1, the highest protection category in China. Any international trade and domestic use of saiga horn was subject to competent wildlife authority's regulation at national level. China was currently considering the release of saigas into the wild from the Gansu captive breeding centre in China, since captive population numbers were currently high and a population crash was expected on the basis of past experience. Regarding this potential releasing programme, China was seeking and welcoming technical support. As recommended by CITES, China had registered all stocks of saiga horn, however the verification work was still ongoing in eleven provinces. Based on the registered stock an annual quota was being set permitting the use of the horn. Priorities for saiga conservation action were firstly to strengthen cooperation and information exchange with range states, secondly to reintroduce captive saigas into the wild and thirdly to encourage the TCM industry to become a reliable conservation partner. China reiterated the importance and aims of the upcoming workshop in Urumqi and welcomed the participation of conservationists in the workshop to report on the grave situation faced by the saiga in Range States and in turn understand the perspectives of the TCM industry, with a view to establishing synergies that would benefit both human health and wildlife conservation. China was willing to promote the establishment of mechanisms enabling the TCM industry to involve into in-situ conservation work and was calling for reasonable conservation policies in range states. China clarified that none of the horn from the Gansu captive breeding centre was permitted to be used for TCM.

32. The delegate from Mongolia reported that the range of the Mongolian saiga had shrunk since 1930. Since 2007 the Swiss MAVA Foundation had assisted to address the threats of poaching, illegal trade and overgrazing. Community work with herders was central to the current work programme and there was close collaboration with local law enforcement agencies. Key achievements included new protected areas in the saiga range, improved awareness of the saiga situation among local communities and the first aerial survey just prior to the meeting. A feasibility study on captive breeding was being conducted.

33. The CITES Secretariat highlighted the report that had been submitted to the meeting (UNEP/CMS/SA-2/Inf/6.1). CITES Parties had discussed saiga at all Conferences of Parties and major meetings since 2006. A number of decisions had been endorsed by 175 Parties, which supported the MoU and its objectives. CITES Parties are required to report annually on international trade in saiga products. No legal trade in saiga horn by range states had been reported by exporting or importing states. It was noteworthy that the supply in horn in market countries appeared to be decreasing, whilst prices were increasing. Re-export of saiga horn from unclear sources was a problem, especially in China. There was a clear need for improvement in declaring the origin or re-exported stocks. Countries currently holding saiga stockpiles need to put in place regulations and enforcement mechanisms. The representative from China explained the complications encountered in regulating trade in saiga specimens, especially when they are incorporated into medicinal products. Particular difficulties arise when raw materials used in the ingredients of some medicinal products are derive from specimens of several CITES-listed species, including saiga, and when some of these materials are being exported, whilst others are being re-exported. The obligations of CITES normally require different permits and certificates for export and for re-export. China requested the assistance of the CITES Secretariat to resolve such complicated permitting situations in a satisfactory way.

34. The Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) reported that since signing the MoU in 2006 as a Co-operating Organization WCS saiga conservation efforts had targeted the Mongolian subspecies. The focus had been on monitoring and telemetry studies to assess long-range movements and the identification of bottlenecks within the species range. An MoU had been signed by WCS Mongolia and WWF Mongolia to coordinate and assist national activities. There was ongoing research on the reproductive ecology and disease transmission between wildlife and livestock. A lack of resources currently limited the width of the saiga research and conservation work.

35. Fauna & Flora International (FFI) reported that the organisation had a long-standing commitment to saiga conservation, especially in the Ustiurt region. Past small-scale projects had focussed on community projects, awareness raising, Saiga Friends clubs and local monitoring. Currently planned FFI activities included the re-designation of the Saigachiy Sanctuary in Uzbekistan, custom officer and border policy training and satellite collaring. These activities were facilitated by United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and Darwin Initiative grants.

36. The Frankfurt Zoological Society (FZS) reported that the organisation was committed to long-term conservation of saiga antelopes and other key steppe species, especially in Kazakhstan through the Altyn Dala Conservation Initiative. During the 2011-2015 work period, emphasis would be placed on protected area development with an aim to reduce habitat fragmentation, management of existing hunting areas, assistance with national law enforcement and development of a predictive population model for the saiga antelope.

Agenda Item 9: Review of MoU and Medium Term International Work Programme (MTIWP) implementation

Agenda Item 9.1: Saiga antelope conservation status within the agreement area

37. Introducing this agenda item, the Secretariat explained that the experience of reviewing the conservation status of saiga antelope populations and the implementation of the MoU had been a positive one in 2006 and that the 2010 meeting would retain this practise. He pointed out that the information provided in the draft Overview Report (UNEP/CMS/SA-2/Doc/6/Add.1) had been reviewed and amended at the Technical Workshop prior to the meeting. He thanked the Co-Chairs for their hard work and Ms. Lushchekina and Mr. Neronov for producing the Russian translation of the amendments.

38. Mr. Mallon presented a summary of the conservation status of saiga populations in 2010 as outlined in the Overview Report (UNEP/CMS/SA-2/Doc/6/Add.1/Rev.1). He explained that the document had been compiled mainly from national and project report forms submitted prior to the meeting. Overall the conservation status of populations had improved with four out of five populations either stable or increasing. However, the baseline was very low compared to population levels several years ago. The range was retreating, which was particularly visible in Turkmenistan where no mass migration had been observed in the past 10 years. The Ustiurt population was the only one which continued to decline.

Agenda Item 9.2: Status of implementation

39. Mr. Mallon provided a brief overview of key achievement regarding MoU

implementation. It was excellent that Russia had signed the instrument in June 2009 and that the MoU would be expanded to cover all saiga populations. Several other agreements, especially those for transboundary populations, were noted. Since saiga was a highly migratory species and calving and rutting areas tended to vary annually, it was difficult to protect the species within individual protected areas. Networks of very large protected areas would be needed. It was therefore promising that the total protected area size for the saiga antelope had increased and that connectivity was improving.

40. The meeting took note and endorsed the Overview Report in the understanding that several final amendments, which had been raised by participants, would be made. The final document incorporating amendments adopted by the meeting is attached as Annex 4 to this report.

41. The meeting agreed that the Technical Workshop had already reviewed the substantial Progress Report on the implementation of the MTIWP (UNEP/CMS/SA-2/Doc/5/Rev.3) and that therefore further amendments would not be discussed within the plenary of the Meeting of Signatories, but should be submitted in writing to the UNEP/CMS Secretariat within two weeks. The Secretariat would then finalise the document together with the technical advisers and make it available on the meeting webpage as a revised version of the meeting document.

42. Ms. E.J. Milner-Gulland, Co-Chair of the Technical Workshop, proposed that future MoU progress monitoring should make use of the following sources: national reports, project reports, peer-reviewed papers and the “Saiga News” bulletin. Each statement should be fully referenced to such a source in future progress reports.

43. The meeting endorsed the proposal and agreed to the two week deadline for submitting comments on the Progress Report.

Agenda Item 10: Future implementation and further development of the MoU and MTIWP

Agenda Item 10.1: Review and adoption of 2011-2015 MTIWP

44. Ms. E.J. Milner-Gulland introduced the draft 2011-2015 MTIWP (UNEP/CMS/SA-2/Doc/7/Rev.1), which had been prepared on behalf of the UNEP/CMS Secretariat by the Saiga Conservation Alliance. The Technical Meeting had already reviewed and recommended a revised draft to the meeting.

45. In the ensuing discussion, the Overall Goal and individual sections of the MTIWP were amended (UNEP/CMS/SA-2/Doc/7/Rev.1). The final document incorporating amendments adopted by the meeting is attached as Annex 5 to this report.

Agenda Item 10.2: National reporting and information management

46. The Secretariat noted that no specific document had been prepared for this agenda item. The expected outcome would be for Signatories and other bodies to inform the Secretariat as to whether the reporting format was adequate or if they had identified difficulties and would like to propose changes. It was noted that coordination mechanism for the MoU (agenda item 10.3) might provide for a novel reporting mechanism, but that a detailed debate on the matter was preliminary. Decisions could also be taken intersessionally.

47. Mongolia noted that the current national report form was short and straightforward and should be kept.

Agenda Item 10.3: MoU coordination

48. The Secretariat introduced the relevant document (UNEP/CMS/SA-2/Doc/9) on the experience and perspectives concerning the practice of MoU coordination mechanisms. It was stressed that under such mechanisms the official Secretariat function would remain with the UNEP/CMS Secretariat, outsourced “MoU coordinators” acting in a purely technical capacity. Coordinators, at least in part, were generally foreseen to catalyze project development and funding under an MoU’s Action Plan, support the preparation of regular meetings of the Range States, and undertake range-wide communication efforts to raise awareness and share information. The experience of MoU coordination illustrated that, where it has been possible to establish them, coordination mechanisms had generally significantly contributed to the implementation of MoUs and their associated Action Plans. In that regard, possibilities to establish such mechanisms for the saiga MoU were worth exploring. However, outsourcing the coordination of MoUs had not been without difficulties. It had been in particular difficult to sustain external MoU coordination over extended periods of time due to a lack of long-term resources. Delegations were invited to share their views on the subject.

49. The representative of ACBK informed the meeting that ACBK in collaboration with the SCA was willing to propose the cooperative coordination of the MoU. It had become clear that there were gaps in the implementation of the MTIWP which urgently needed to be covered to improve MoU monitoring, coordination and cooperation. ACBK went on to propose the following tools for MoU coordination:

- (a) An information and communication mechanism facilitated via the bulletin “Saiga News”.
- (b) A web-based e-library, where information material would be collected, stored and made freely available to interested parties.
- (c) A new and improved MoU monitoring and reporting mechanism, possibly via the e-library. Country action would be clearly presented in a more comparative format.
- (d) Assistance of capacity building at the national and regional level.

50. ACBK appealed to Signatories to contribute to the coordination efforts and highlighted that in kind or fundraising assistance would also be welcomed. It was envisaged that one part-time MoU coordinating officer would be based with ACBK in Astana and another part-time MoU coordinator with the SCA in Tashkent. Funding for these two people would have to be discussed in more depth. Terms of Reference would need to be drafted, as well as a working programme, but firstly the meeting should decide whether the proposed mechanism would be acceptable.

51. The delegate from the SCA added that ACBK and SCA had excellent complementary skills and outlined details of the proposed E-library as a tool for MoU implementation. Publications, videos, photos, as well as national and project reports could be stored here. Experts could add information and review the available information.

52. During the ensuing discussion the meeting endorsed and encouraged the overall proposal by ACBK and SCA, but noted that specific points of coordination such as an interagency memorandum and Terms of Reference would still need to be discussed. Funding sources were also yet unclear.

53. The Chair thanked the two organizations for their generous offer to support the UNEP/CMS Secretariat and international conservation work.

Agenda Item 11: Signing ceremony

54. The Secretariat explained that following the agreement to expand the MoU to *Saiga* spp., Mongolia had become a range state and could now sign the MoU in a capacity as a Range State. The Amendment Protocol which had been prepared also included the change of competent Ministry in the Russian Federation discussed under agenda item 7, and the possibility of signing the MoU by ACBK and SCA discussed under agenda item 6.1. Representatives from the two non-governmental organizations signed the MoU as Co-Operating Organizations at a signing ceremony held at the beginning of the morning session on 10 September 2010. The Chair and the representative of the Secretariat added their signatures to the Amendment Protocol in reflection of the meeting's decision to amend the MoU. Mr. Batbold signed the MoU on behalf of the Ministry of Nature, Environment and Tourism of Mongolia at the meeting's evening reception on 10 September 2010.

Agenda Item 12: Upcoming Saiga Antelope Workshop, Urumqi, China

55. The delegate from China provided delegates with an overview of the aims and the agenda of the Urumqi workshop (27-29 September 2010), which was jointly organised by China, the CITES Secretariat and the CMS Secretariat. The primary aim was to bring together the saiga range states and the TCM industry to share information and to collaborate on saiga conservation needs as outlined in section 3.9 of the 2011-2015 MTIWP (Annex 5 to this report). The outcomes of the Ulaanbaatar meeting would be reported at the Urumqi meeting. The meeting welcomed this initiative.

Agenda Item 13: Next meeting of the Signatories

56. The Secretariat invited comments from participants regarding the current format of Meetings of Signatories, their timing and the back-to-back organization with a Technical Meeting. He noted that according to the MoU text the Second Meeting of Signatories had been due in 2008, but that due to a lack of funds the meeting had been delayed. Delegates agreed that it would be premature to meet again for the Third Meeting of Signatories in 2012, but that either 2014 or 2015 would be suitable in line with the working period of the 2011-2015 MTIWP. An intersessional Technical Meeting, as well as one immediately prior to the Meeting of Signatories, would be beneficial.

Agenda Item 14: Any other business

57. The CITES Secretariat noted that the saiga experts present could make the CITES Animals Committee and CMS Scientific Council aware of their views on the discrepancy between the saiga taxonomy and nomenclature used under CITES and CMS (*Saiga tatarica*,

Saiga borealis) and in some of the scientific literature (*Saiga tatarica tatarica*, *Saiga tatarica mongolica*). The matter needed to be clarified because, amongst other things, CITES Parties use standardized species nomenclature on their import and export permits.

Agenda Item 15: Closure of the meeting

58. There being no other business, Mr. Barbieri (CMS Secretariat) thanked participants for their cooperative spirit, which had been essential in considering all agenda items effectively. The meeting outcomes provided a good basis for further significant progress in saiga conservation. He thanked the hosts and the local organizers of the meeting, the WWF Mongolia, for their support and generosity. The quality of the technical input had been very high, not least thanks to the technical advisers, Ms. E.J. Milner-Gulland and Mr. David Mallon. The CITES Secretariat thanked all participants and the Chair. The meeting was declared closed according to the agenda timetable.