



1st meeting of AEWA Northern Bald Ibis International Working Group

19-22 November 2012, Jazan, Saudi Arabia



Meeting Report



Contents

Welcome & Introduction.....	4
Adoption of Agenda.....	4
Appointment of Chair Country.....	5
Confirmation of Observers.....	5
Terms of Reference.....	5
National Reporting.....	7
Synopsis of Presentations & Points Raised	
Presentations 1-13.....	7-13
Day 3 - Problem Tree	
Priority actions developed for each country/group.....	13
Discussion on establishment of new colonies.....	13
The critical site network for the NBI	14
Budget and funding	14
Web site.....	14
Miscellaneous.....	14-15
Next working group meeting.....	15
Support for 1 st meeting, Jazan.....	15
Group photo on front cover (names).....	15
Annex I - Meeting participants, their roles and contact email....	16
Annex II - Formalised representation to NBIWG by country.....	17

Welcome and Introduction

AEWA Technical Officer Sergey Dereliev welcomed the participants to the meeting on behalf of the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat. He thanked the hosts Saudi Wildlife Authority (SWA) for financial and logistical support and Jazan University for providing the venue for the meeting. Mr Omar Al Khushaim welcomed the delegates on behalf of His Highness Prince Bandar president of SWA and Dr Mohammed Shobrak added further words of welcome to the working group for this inaugural meeting.

The AEWA NBIWG co-ordinator, Chris Bowden also thanked SWA and Jazan University for hosting and making it possible for this inaugural meeting of the working group, and said he hoped this will lead to increased co-ordinated conservation efforts for the northern bald ibis. He highlighted the coordination efforts of the International Advisory Group for Northern Bald Ibis (IAGNBI), established in 1999, and how the formation of the new working group through AEWA is an exciting development which brings new impetus and opportunities for particularly for the national governments to implement measures needed for conserving this species.

Dereliev then gave an introduction to the status of AEWA International Single Species Action Plans and noted that the Northern Bald Ibis is one of four Critically Endangered species covered by AEWA. He explained the proposed structure with regional coordinators for the Eastern and Western populations and how the role of coordination comes under an MOU between the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat and BirdLife International. The NBIWG is one of the eight AEWA International Species Working Group established to date to provide international coordination to the implementation of AEWA single species action plans.

There followed round table introductions of all the attendees, who stated their name, affiliation and the country they represented. The full list of participants including roles and contact details is presented in Annex I.

Adoption of the Agenda

The annotated agenda was distributed to the participants which including some minor changes to those circulated prior to the meeting.

Decision: *The agenda was adopted.*

Appointment of Chair Country

Dereliev introduced the agenda item, and gave an overview of how the International Working Groups operate. Importantly, they include government as well as expert representation, which can come from academia or NGO, and have AEWA contracting parties as well as non-party range states. Although the host country is not a contracting party, AEWA would like to take this

opportunity to see Saudi Arabia continue to make steps to joining AEWA as an active country involved in conservation.

Since the NBI IWG is an inter-governmental group, the role of a chair shall be taken on by a range state. The work of the Chair will not only be restricted to chairing the meetings, but will also include a role in the intercessional period (close contact to the co-ordinator and the national representatives) However, much of the work will be done by the co-ordinator and it is not expected that the workload of the Chair will be very heavy. The UNEP/AEWA Secretariat further recommended that the Working Group consider establishing a rotating Chairmanship, with a new Chair elected at every meeting or every second meeting.

It was suggested that Saudi Arabia as a range state could act as Chair of the NBIIWG. Mr Omar Al Khushaim conveyed that His Highness Prince Bandar would be honoured if KSA be invited as Chair. Mohammed Shobrak graciously accepted the invitation to chair the AEWA NBIIWG on behalf of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Decision: there were no objections to Mohammed Shobrak taking the Chair of the Working Group and duly appointed.

Confirmation of observers

The UNEP/AEWA Secretariat had invited representative participation of the range of expertise within the International Advisory Group for Northern Bald Ibis (IAGNBI), to join the Working Group as observers. IAGNBI has been established and actively functioning since 1999 and experience shows that such observers can contribute substantially to the work of inter governmental groups. The Chair proposed maintaining flexibility in being able to invite observers to future meetings which could be incorporated in to the Terms of Reference. It was also agreed that maintaining strong links between the IWG and IAGNBI is important.

Decision: The status of The International Advisory Group for Northern Bald Ibis as observers to the group was approved. Any new proposals concerning observers will be communicated to Working Group members for consideration during the interim period or decided upon at the next working group meeting.

Terms of Reference (TOR)

A template for Terms of Reference previously posted has been adopted by AEWA Technical Committee and adapted for the AEWA NBIIWG. The specific goal of the Working Group will reflect the goal of the revised Species Action Plan once agreed.

SD presented the draft ToR which includes the election of a Chair as well as the appointment of a Co-ordinator to facilitate the day to day work of the group. The Working Group is intergovernmental in nature and for each range country should include a national expert nominated by the Government, as well as an official Government representative. Seven range

states are part of the working group. And there are five observer countries where (re)introduction projects are underway or planned.

Suggested that a face to face meeting is called every three years. In between, contact will be mainly by correspondence and the virtual communication platform to be provided by the Secretariat.

Reporting is an important element of the working group. The outline reporting format has been presented but will be further discussed during this workshop.

There is no provision for financial support for the operations and activities of the NBIWG from the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat. There is therefore an ongoing need to fundraise for the operation of the working group and we again thank Saudi Arabia and the Saudi Wildlife Authority, for providing the main funding for this initial meeting.

Discussion: SD suggested an amendment to the ToR to link the submission of national reports on NBI conservation activities to eligibility for receiving funding to attend the meetings of the NBIWG.

MS suggested the emphasis of the first draft of the ToR is heavily on the resident population and would better incorporate the migratory Eastern population, with some reference to stop-over sites and wintering areas.

CB clarified the co-ordination structure of the NBIWG. There is an MOU between the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat and BirdLife International under which BirdLife agrees to provide a part-time co-ordinator of the NBIWG and this has been designated to RSPB and Mr Chris Bowden on behalf of BirdLife International. There has been a further decision within BirdLife to delegate responsibility to regional coordinators for Eastern (BirdLife Middle East and Sharif Al Jbour) and Western (SEO/BirdLife and Jorge Orueta/Ramon Marti) populations. Together with the Chairman they will act as the co-ordination unit. Then the links to national co-ordinators. (note this structure and country representation given in Annex II)

MS & MN – both expressed a need for greater clarity on the role of the two groups, AEWA NBIWG & IAGNBI. Agreed that IAGNBI should be invited as an observer, but this did not describe them as a technical support group.

OK – queried whether there is a role for both groups and to compare Terms of Reference of IAGNBI.

CB – IAGNBI should be seen as a formal adviser to the AEWA NBIWG and input through their role as an official observer and suggested this should be formalised in the ToR. There may be a need to revisit the IAGNBI ToRs or composition in this light but it is unlikely to need to change dramatically.

Conclusion: *IAGNBI to be formalised as an observer to the group providing the key technical expertise required. (conclusion of this point is covered in confirmation of observers above)*

National reporting

Dereliev briefly presented the agenda point and sought comments. National reports need to be submitted to each NBIWG meeting, ie every three years. Monitors progress towards the agreed Species Action Plan goals, objectives and activities. There will be an on-line reporting system to make the process simple which will be further refined from the draft template so far available.

Discussion: MN – reporting needs to be in French to maximise input from Morocco and other French speaking countries. Dereliev confirmed this will be the case, as it has been requested. Completed official documents will be available in French as it is an official language of the AEWA. On-line system will be bi-lingual.

Synopsis of presentations and points raised

1. NBI species status – general overview (Chris Bowden).

The situation for the two genetically distinct populations is quite different, with the main western population in Morocco maintaining a relatively stable if still small population, whilst for the eastern population the situation has deteriorated further towards the brink of extinction. Meanwhile there has been progress with captive and semi-wild and trial reintroduction populations in developing techniques that show potential for re-establishing populations within the former range.

2. Syria – country report (Sharif Jbour & Lubomir Peske)

Despite unstable conditions within the country, protection and monitoring work continues and one pair attempted breeding in 2012, but unfortunately was not successful. The three captive birds also attempted to breed for the first time.

CB – note that other threats such as oil exploration – all on hold due to the civil unrest. Also no hunting as carrying weapons would be risky so one threat has reduced for time-being.

MS – seems that NBI are spending some time in Saudi – so more than a migrant – they are using the area for prolonged time – what is the correct terminology? A need to standardise terms. Propose referring to the areas used as ‘staging areas’.

CB – Request to clearly define the key sites from the satellite tag data and it is a priority to do this, but using the more accurate satellite locations.

AF – can the key sites in Saudi, eg north of Jazan – be designated as protected areas. MS – will mention in his talk, but also discussion on final day

YM – delay in getting data quick enough, only get signals every two/three days.. LP - need time to process data from Argos, but we get the data as quick as the technology allows.

GE –could windfarms be a problem? LP – don't know the specific flying behaviour, but likely that birds fly mainly too high. JO – experience from Morocco suggests that they fly over windfarms.

MS – summary point that the need for data interpretation is key to identifying actions in staging areas and wintering sites in Saudi, Yemen etc.

3. Saudi Arabia – country report (Mohammed Shobrak)

There is earlier documented occurrence of NBI in Saudi Arabia, but the satellite tracking and subsequent survey work has demonstrated the high significance of staging areas for adult birds as well as juveniles which may spend extended periods. The threats in these areas include hunting (especially in the north) and powerlines, and one example showed how hunters can be converted to conservationists through awareness.

MK – have protected areas been established for certain species in Saudi? Yes, primarily for houbara, gazelle, oryx and also incorporates ex-situ work. Will be useful to check how NBI staging areas match current protected areas.

JF – Saudi Arabia has a clear role to play for the conservation of the species as the birds spend a lot of time in SA.

GE – does the profile of the species make it vulnerable to hunting? MS – the guy who shot the bird a few years ago targeted it as it had a transmitter.

JF – if hunters knew it was so rare, would they still hunt them? MS – some people don't know it is so endangered, but also targeted as they have a transmitter. Also, hunting is more acceptable and more pressure in the north than the south.

AF – how do you get the information about the birds out to the people on the ground so quickly? This is a challenge, but using network, calling up contacts and passing satellite data as well as the more general updates and locations given on RSPB webpage map.

OK – all hunting with guns is illegal in KSA. Only permitted using falcons and dogs

RO – is captive breeding part of the thinking in KSA. Currently not – but refer to later discussions.

RS – in the site visits in 2010, did you do an assessment of the key threats. Yes, noted the threats. It is clear that the number of feral dogs is high, disturbance is high, and also implications of agriculture activity.

RS – funding seems to be an issue – could BirdLife species champion approach be of value. OK – proposal to ‘Persica’? SJ – Prince Albert of Monaco funds work in Morocco, Turkey, Syria as a BirdLife Species Champion but clearly more funds needed and suggestions very welcome..

4. Turkey – country report (Taner Hatipoglu & Sureyya Cevat Isfendiyaroglu)

Semi-wild population at Birecik has had unusually good productivity in 2012 and total numbers finally reached 150 birds. Release trials have now involved 16 birds in 4 years, and only one bird confirmed to have returned so far. Tracking results have nevertheless been encouraging that naive birds could follow broadly similar behaviours to wild Syrian birds, and indeed visited Palmyra in one case. Significant awareness-raising has been carried out regarding responsible farming activities around Birecik. A new threat emerged that of zoo collections demand for the birds, and worryingly Ankara zoo population has by contrast to Birecik been largely lost.

RO – all birds being in one flock/area – is this a disease risk? TH – has been discussed – difficult to identify a suitable site. Also need permission direct from the Minister. Could maybe have a more robust population within a Turkish zoo. CB – a proper (re)assessment should still be done

RO – should we do more sat tracking? – birds are hunted in Saudi if they have tags, we know they are susceptible to electrocution, we know many of the key sites. What is the new information we would gain by more sat tracking? Answer – urgent need to know more about juvenile movements, but not needed for adults.

RM - has there been a study of the genetics between Syrian and Turkish birds? TH – no, but most likely no difference as they migrate over the Syria population. SJ - in 2009 samples given to Austrian team – but no results to date. CB – Work by Damien Broderick was completed ten years ago comparing genetics (microsatellite markers) but frustratingly still not published – still chasing for this but arguably needs duplicate work as not forthcoming.

5. Yemen – country report (Yousuf Mohageb)

Staging areas in Yemen have been used for significant periods (several weeks) in several years but the past two years the tagged birds have spent more time in southern Saudi Arabia. Birds have been located on the ground just once but achieving this is a huge logistical challenge due to lack of experienced observers.

OF – important to get the legislation in place, and also lack of awareness about how this gets implemented.

YM – Windfarm proposals are currently being proposed and information and outside involvement may be needed to prevent additional hazard to NBI and other migratory species. This to be drawn to attention of BirdLife and others (eg through Soaring Birds project).

6. Ethiopia – country report [no report received]

GE gave apologies on behalf of Ethiopian delegation who regret not being able to attend the workshop due to logistical problems. CB – efforts will be made to observe any birds at the main wintering site, and note that the two untagged birds seen last winter remain of unknown origin.

7. Morocco – country report (Mohammed Noaman)

Protection and monitoring continues by National Park with SEO support for the wardens. No major new threats emerged lately, but pressure for development and potential loss of feeding areas grows each year and requires increasing effort to withstand. Sharp drop in breeding productivity in 2012 is worrying, but understand that it is due to the extreme drought which affected Tamri population. JO – explained the two colonies had very different breeding success, with Souss-Massa relatively ok, but 100% failure at Tamri. Complete breeding failure in half the population in 2012 is worrying, but hopefully a one off year as exceptionally dry. Overall population trend since 1996 has increased by c45% - due to the dedicated protection effort and support – concerted effort still required and proves very difficult to fund. Increasing attention being given to local awareness work and with tourists, but no formalised system for showing the birds has yet been devised.

YM – how effective is the awareness raising programme? Difficult to assess, but target schools and also tourism/travel agency groups.

8. Algeria – country report (Amina Fellous)

More detailed work and assessment of former colony sites and data on last observations has been carried out. Interest in planning a reintroduction is there, and an agreement to receive birds from Rabat zoo as a basis for developing future reintroduction stock has been agreed. Plans are however not well developed and need clarification on the practicality and priority of such work before it can progress further.

CB – when will birds from Rabat Zoo be transferred to Algiers Zoo. FA – agreement needs to be finalised but this is being planned.

9. Brief conclusion on the status of the wild NBI populations (Chris Bowden)

Morocco continues to hold 99% of the wild pop, and is extremely important. Sharp drop in breeding in 2012 is worrying, but understand that it is due to the extreme drought. JO – explained the two colonies had very different breeding success, with Souss-Massa relatively ok, but complete failure at Tamri. Complete breeding failure in half the population in 2012 is worrying, but hopefully a one off year as exceptionally dry. But overall trend since 1996 has increased by c45% - due to dedicated effort and support – concerted effort still required. Agadir region – NBI 50km either side of Agadir – growing pressure for development, and will need further and continued efforts to keep development from happening and impacting on the main wild population. AEWA and BirdLife need to keep the support of NBI conservation work in Morocco.

Yemen and Saudi Arabia playing an important role of monitoring the migrating birds at staging areas – the challenge of responding in time to satellite tracking data remains. Threats along this route are recognised as significant and the work to overcome hunting should clearly continue and expand particularly in Saudi Arabia.

In Syria the work continuing despite the significant problems and hope the precariously small population pulls through.

Turkey has a hugely significant and growing role to play in the eastern population if we want to maintain the genetic purity of the eastern birds.

10. Re-introduction and supplementation of the NBI (Chris Bowden)

A brief history and summary showing early problems in breeding and particularly in release methodology and being largely overcome and major advances have occurred over the past ten years. The large captive stock (mainly of Moroccan origin) held in zoos remove some of the urgency to release birds and also bring added pressure to do so. They also represent a great source of potential support and awareness for the species.

11. Austria – advances in reintroduction (Johannes Fritz)

The trials in Austria and more recently extending to Bavaria in Germany have made very significant progress over the past three years. Birds are now independently and without supplementary food, developing their own migration route between the breeding areas and Italian wintering grounds, and the first birds have returned unaided to breed successfully. Unfortunately the threat of hunting in Italy is proving a significant issue and increased efforts are required (and are underway) to overcome this. There are funding proposals to further develop this work in line with a more formalised reintroduction.

SD – has the development of re-introductions and manipulation of birds been given permission by the Austria, Germany and Italy governments to allow implementation of a LIFE project? Not explicitly.

SI– would you be prepared to undertake human led migration in the Middle East!! Is this a relevant technique for the eastern population? JF – it may be too hazardous practically/politically but results from the work can have relevance for other areas too eg Algeria

GE – when do you start the human led migration JF – needs to be undertaken in the first year and in August.

12. Spain – advances in reintroduction methodology (Jose Manuel Lopez)

Major efforts have continued and now involve parent-reared as well as hand-reared birds. They started breeding in the wild in 2008 and are up to 10 breeding pairs in 2012 which fledged 8 young in 2011, and 2 in 2012 on cliff nest sites. Although 2012 breeding success was much lower, and possible reasons discussed included build up of parasites, but more probably relate to the unusually dry year (like Morocco?). There is no longer any hand-rearing, but some supplementation of parent-reared birds which would not have worked without the established (hand-reared) core population.

JF – a comment, it is not so simple to say that by using parent raised birds it is a cheaper option. JM counters that human raised birds takes a lot of staff time, so when this taken into account it is costly. MQ – human raised is necessary at the outset, but can move to other techniques once population is established. MS – this is an important issue with potential implications for the eastern population.

13. Supplementation – Lubomir Peske

The supplementation attempt in Syria was a huge logistical and political challenge, and with cooperation of all expertise and government and officials this came very close to succeeding. The critical timing involved and the short acclimatisation period of the birds after reaching Syria before setting off was probably the factor that ultimately meant the birds did not survive. Many lessons were learnt in the process, and if the political and practical issues again become feasible, this is an important option to repeat. Meanwhile the Turkish releases from Birecik have continued and despite the lack of success to date, more of this agreed as a priority.

TH - Barrier to supplementation of Syria population is now political and likely to remain a problem for a number of years.

MQ - But can Turkey continue to release birds?. TH – problem is not enough transmitters to gather data, only releasing 3-4 birds per year, need to release more. This was discussed further and agreed that half released birds should be satellite tagged. and that releasing up to ten is recommended. SI – with the higher number of birds at Birecik we should look at releasing larger numbers of birds as a flock as they can support each other..

JO – Have we adequately considered releasing birds in Ethiopia where the adults are so they could migrate back with others?. LP – the birds seen in 2006 in Ethiopia were only adults - juveniles never been seen in that site subsequently, so likely the birds aren't together, so releasing there would be very unsure of success.

KM - Is reintroduction of birds a priority for Algeria? Further discussions agreed that among the potential sites/countries for reintroduction, Algeria is the higher priority to progress at least with feasibility surveys and linking with the trials projects would be positive.

MN – shouldn't forget/neglect the western population is doing well and releases not a priority within Morocco. However, there are still important things to learn – such as 120 birds not known where they are in the early wintering period and tagging studies required.

RS - A lot of the knowledge that has been gained in western populations will be applicable to the eastern population – need to avoid duplicating work and apply knowledge from one part of the range to another.

SD – remember that AEWA has recently produced re-introduction guidelines as well as IUCN updated guidelines and we should all make reference to these in the context of this discussion.

Day 3 – Problem Tree.

Priority actions developed for each country/group.

The detailed output from these sessions will be included in the updated action plan which will be circulated and finalised in the very near future.

Discussion on establishment of new colonies - included the following areas:

Algeria reintroduction – whether any reintroduced population would have to be migratory or sedentary is unclear from climatic data. Needs to be part of a feasibility study.

For Turkey, the same question applies for other potential holding and release areas and agreed this was a key area to develop within the ten year period ahead.

Need to fully document details of the techniques and methodologies that have been tested (Spain and Austria) so they can be peer reviewed and the lessons developed further for other areas and scenarios.

Recognised the need for a technical discussion about future options/development priorities of re-introductions and population supplementation – possibly as an IAGNBI meeting in 2014?

Note: The details and final outputs from this session will be included in the updated Action plan which will be circulated shortly after this report. Also note that discussions of the priority for reintroduction work reflected a significant shift to agreement that they should be part of the action plan, but not with highest priority.

The critical site network for the NBI –

Site conservation approach is applicable. Use Important Bird Areas (IBAs) sites as a starting point.

The Group will maintain the list and keep this updated. This will be a publically available list agreed by the group.

No objections – *agreed*.

Budget and funding –

Co-ordination by BirdLife International is offered as staff time with some limited admin support from the AEWA office.

Implementation of activities needs to be funded by grants etc.

Coordinator will develop a list of funding opportunities and circulate to the group members. A start was made to this process at the meeting. Group members need to keep people updated on funding applications and opportunities.

Web-site –

No comments from the group but acknowledgement that having a website along the AEWA lines for other species will be an integral role in the functioning of the group in future. This will be undertaken in addition to the NBI pages within the AEWA website. Links will be made with IAGNBI and AEWA websites.

Miscellaneous

Recognised the need a thorough review, agreement and peer-reviewed publication as to what is the historical range of the species across Europe, North Africa and the Middle East (endorsed by IUCN re-introduction group).

Recognised the need for a strategic plan for re-introductions in Europe, North Africa and the Middle East. Where should the priorities be? Whilst there was agreement that Algeria was the higher among the current priorities, more detailed agreement is needed in this area.

Documenting the staging areas between Syria and Ethiopia recognised as an immediate priority but care needed in how this is published to avoid unwanted attention.

Any future tagging should use less visible satellite tags to avoid attention of potential hunters.

Next working group meeting

3 years time at a location to be decided, but note this may reflect the availability of funding.

Support for 1st Meeting, Jazan

We gratefully acknowledge the primary support for the meeting from the Saudi Wildlife Authority. The venue and associated facilities was kindly provided by Jazan University. Additional significant funding was provided by RSPB and logistical support by the BirdLife Middle East and AEWA offices.

Group photo on front cover: (names from left to right)

Mohammed Shobrak, George Eshiamwata, Sergey Dereliev, Sharif Al Jbour, Lubomir Peske, Zafar Ul Islam, Rob Sheldon, Sureyya Cevat Isfendiyaroglu, Miguel Angel Quevedo, Johannes Fritz, Moulay Melliani Khadidga, Jose Manuel Lopez Vasquez, Taner Hatipoglu, Chris Bowden, Omar Al Khushaim, Jorge Fernandez-Orueta, Ammar Momen, Mohammed Noaman, Amina Fellous, Jaber Harise, Ruben Moreno-Opo, driver, Fehmi Yuksel, Yousuf Mohageb.

Annex I - Meeting participants, their roles and contact email

Country/Function/Name	Init	Role on IWG	Email
Algeria			
Moulay Melliani Khadidga	MK	National Expert Govt Focal Point Rep	kadi662000@yahoo.fr
Amina Fellous	AF	Observer IAGNBI technical expert	fellousa2000@yahoo.fr
Austria/Italy/Germany			
Johannes Fritz	JF	Observer IAGNBI technical expert	jfritz@waldrapp.eu
Morocco			
Mohammed Noaman	MN	Govt. Focal Point	noaman_md@yahoo.fr
K Saudi Arabia			
Mohammed Shobrak	MS	Meeting Chair	mshobrak@gmail.com
Omar Al Khushaim	OK	National Expert	khushaim2006@hotmail.com
Ammar Momen	AM	Observer	
Jaber Harise	JH	Observer	jaber12009@hotmail.com
Zafar Ul Islam	ZI	Observer	zafar@nwrc-sa.org
Spain			
Ruben Moreno-Opo	RO	National Representative	rmorenoopo@gmail.com
Jose Manuel Lopez Vasquez	JL	National Expert	josem.lopez.vazquez@juntadandalucia.es
Turkey			
Fehmi Yuksel	FY	National Representative	[To add]
Taner Hatipoglu	TH	National Expert	thatipoglu@yahoo.com
Sureyya Cevat Isfendiyaroglu	SI	Observer IAGNBI technical expert	sureyyaisfendiyaroglu@dogagernegi.org
Yemen			
Yousuf Mohageb	YM	Independent expert	aet@y.net.ye
Coordination			
Chris Bowden	CB	Coordinator	Chris.Bowden@rspb.org.uk
Sharif Al Jbour	SJ	Regional Chair Eastern population	sharif.jbour@birdlife.org
Jorge Fernandez-Orueta	JO	Regional Chair Western population (Representative)	jorueta@seo.org
Sergey Dereliev	SD	AEWA	sdereliev@unep.de
Regional expertise/coordination			
Lubomir Peske	LP	Observer IAGNBI technical expert	LPeske@seznam.cz
Miguel Angel Quevedo	M Q	Observer IAGNBI veterinary expert	maquevedo@colvet.es
Rob Sheldon	RS	Observer RSPB Species Recovery	robert.sheldon@rspb.org.uk
George Eshiamwata	GE	Observer - Rep African BirdLife Partnership	George.Eshiamwata@birdlife.org

**Annex II - Formalised representation to NBIIWG by country
(November 2012)**

Country	Govt Focal Point	National Expert	Signatory to AEWA
Eritrea	Yacob Yohannes	Dawit Tesfai	Yes
Ethiopia	Kifle Argaw	Mihret Ewnetu	No
Morocco	Noaman Mohamed	Widade Oubrou	Yes
Saudi Arabia	HHP Bandar bin Saud bin Mohammad Al-Saud	Mohammad Al-Salamah	No
Syria	Muhannad Abutarab	Ruba Alssarhan	Yes
Turkey	Dir General Nature Protection & Nature Parks	Taner Hatipoglu	No
Yemen	(Not yet appointed)	(Not yet appointed)	No
Algeria	SALHI Hamida	MOULAY Melliani Khadidja	Yes
Spain	Rubén Moreno-Opo	José Manuel López	
Austria	(Not yet appointed)	(Not yet appointed)	No
Italy	(Not yet appointed)	(Not yet appointed)	No
Germany	(Not yet appointed)	(Not yet appointed)	

Coordination		
AEWA	Sergey Dereliev	Bonn AEWA Secretariat
Coordinator	Chris Bowden	RSPB UK - Nominated on behalf of BirdLife International
Regional Chair Eastern population	Sharif Al Jbour	BirdLife International Middle East Regional Office
Regional Chair Western population	Ramon Marti /Jorge Orueta	BirdLife/SEO