

11th Meeting of the Advisory Committee

City of Luxembourg, Luxembourg, 8 – 10 May 2006

Record of the Meeting



1. Attendance

This is listed at **Annex 1** to the Record.

2. Opening remarks:

Mr. Peter Lina (Chair) opened the Meeting. He welcomed the participants and invited representatives of the host country (Luxembourg) to make opening remarks.

Dr. Laurent Schley, representative of the Administration des Eaux et Forêts, also welcomed everyone to Luxembourg, wished everyone a pleasant stay and hoped it would be a good meeting. He highlighted the cooperation between the Ministry of the Environment and the Nature Conservation Department in carrying out projects to benefit bats, and outlined several initiatives designed to help bats. He expressed pleasure that Government departments and the National Museum for Natural History, the new focal point for EUROBATS, were collaborating to improve the situation for bats in Luxembourg.

Mr. George Bechet, Director of the Museum of Natural History, expressed special pleasure in welcoming everyone on behalf of Ms. Octavie Modert, Secretary of State for Culture, Higher Education and Research, and wished the Meeting a successful time.

Mr. Jean Jacques Erasmy, Director of the Administration des Eaux et Forêts, welcomed everyone to Luxembourg on behalf of HE Mr. Lucien Lux, Minister of the Environment, and the Luxembourg Government. He expressed great interest in activities relating to bats and felt there was a need for more conservation projects. He wished everyone a good meeting and hoped they would have some time to see Luxembourg, the 2007 European Capital of Culture.

The Chairperson thanked the National Museum for Natural History for inviting EUROBATS to hold the AC Meeting in Luxembourg, a country that the late Sir Winston Churchill had described as the most beautiful country in Europe. Germany hosted the First Meeting of the Advisory Committee, and with only a few Parties in attendance, had

only required a small table. EUROBATS had grown substantially since then, thanks to the efforts of the Secretariat.

Mr. Jacob Duer delivered a welcoming statement on behalf of Mr. Bakary Kante, the Director of the Division of Environmental Conventions, UNEP. He wished the Meeting much success and thanked the Minister of the Environment and the Government of Luxembourg for hosting the Meeting. He highlighted Luxembourg's dedication to EUROBATS as one of the first members of the Agreement. He noted that the UNEP agenda included the implementation of International Conventions and Agreements and that UNEP and UNON were expected to deliver good administrative services. He was pleased to say that under the leadership of the Executive Secretary the Agreement had grown to 31 Parties and had the full support of UNEP in all his endeavours. He noted that 2006 was a landmark year, as it represented the 15th anniversary of the signing of the Agreement and the 10th Anniversary of the European Bat Night, demonstrating that interest in bats continued to grow. He also stressed that adequate financial resources were required to take the Agreement forward and noted that UNEP had already provided significant support to AEWA and CMS in connection with their respective Conference and Meeting of Parties. Furthermore, he emphasised UNEP's full support and trust in the EUROBATS Secretariat and its Executive Secretary. He looked forward to a successful outcome of the Meeting.

Mr. Robert Hepworth, the Executive Secretary of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (UNEP/CMS), expressed thanks for the opportunity to address this important Meeting. He recalled that he had been invited to the first meeting to discuss setting up the Agreement in 1987 and that EUROBATS had been the first fruitful and effective Agreement within the Convention and had contributed to strengthening the activity of CMS. He further recalled that Luxembourg had been one of the first seven signatories to this pioneering Agreement, signed in 1991, and was still showing a strong commitment to the Agreement today. He said he was looking forward to the development of an African Bats Agreement and that co-location would unite all the Agreements. He wished everyone a successful Meeting.

The Executive Secretary of UNEP/EUROBATS, Mr. Andreas Streit, thanked all the Luxembourg hosts for their kind hospitality and comments. He expressed great happiness to see so many people present and noted that the 5th Session of Meeting of Parties would also take place later in the year. He hoped that everyone would enjoy their stay in the wonderful country of Luxembourg and thanked the previous speakers for their encouraging and supportive words. He welcomed, in particular, those who were

attending a EUROBATS Meeting for the first time and felt confident that the good EUROBATS family spirit would soon make them feel comfortable. He remarked on the wonderful excursion that everyone had enjoyed on the previous day. He expressed thanks to the Governments of Luxembourg, UK and Germany for their substantial and continued voluntary contributions, which had helped to cover the growing costs of meetings that were far beyond the capacity of the EUROBATS budget, and without which it would not be possible to hold meetings. He also thanked the EUROBATS staff and mentioned the excellent work of Ms. Christine Boye, Ms. Ayhan Polat and Ms. Dessislava Krueger, who had become a really good team. He felt optimistic that it would be a very good and important AC Meeting.

3. Adoption of the Rules of Procedure

The Rules (Doc.EUROBATS.AC11.4) were the same as those of the last and previous meetings and no changes were suggested. They were adopted by consensus.

4. Adoption of the Agenda

The Agenda was adopted unanimously.

5. Secretariat Report (Doc.EUROBATS.AC11.5)

a) National Reports and updates to National Reports.

The Executive Secretary strongly appealed to Parties to honour their obligations under the Agreement and to submit triennium National Reports no later than 90 days before this Session of the Meeting of Parties (6 June 2006). A new synthesis could then be produced. He hoped to have some good news for the Session of the Meeting of Parties regarding an online reporting system being developed for the whole CMS family, which would make it substantially easier to submit National Reports. He recognised that National Reports were a burden, given that many countries were members of several international treaties. He noted that the system was in the planning stage at present and would be made available as soon as possible.

b) Agreement membership (recruitment of new Parties).

The Executive Secretary commented that there had been an expected reduction in the number of countries acceding to the Agreement every year, because membership now covered most of the Agreement area. He noted that some countries were still having difficulties in joining the Agreement, for a variety of reasons. Following a promise at the last Meeting of Parties he was happy to be able to welcome Italy to the Agreement. He advised that work was continuing on recruitment of new Parties and some were in the

advanced stage of acceding to the Agreement. He urged Non-Party Range States to take this opportunity to report on their progress in acceding to the Agreement.

c) Ongoing projects.

The Executive Secretary advised that the number of projects being managed by the Secretariat was increasing every year, thanks to the continued support of the UK, Germany and Luxembourg. In particular the UK had established a record in providing outstanding support this year. He noted that so much could be achieved with relatively small amounts of money and appealed to all other Parties to consider making voluntary contributions as well for this purpose.

d) Publicity

The Executive Secretary advised that the 9th European Bat Night had been a great success. He also noted that the EUROBATS website was providing more useful information and would continue to be developed further. He was able to report that the Agreement continued to excite media and public interest.

6. Reports from Parties and Non-Party Range States as well as NGOs

Parties and Non-Party Range States made oral presentations regarding bat conservation measures. Germany highlighted the publication of results of a project on bat migration in Europe and also the publication of a book for all bat workers in Germany, outlining the EUROBATS Agreement Resolutions, the information in the German National Report, and guidelines on bat ringing and marking. The Chair urged other Parties and Non-Parties to produce a similar document for bat workers in their country. Latvia wished to record that monitoring in underground sites would no longer be supported by their government.

Non-Party Range States additionally informed the Plenary about the progress made in acceding to the Agreement. Armenia was continuing the process of accession. A letter had been prepared for the Minister in Armenia, together with a translation of the Agreement in Armenian. It was hoped that the process would be completed this summer and that something could be presented at MoP5. Austria has ratified the Convention on Migratory Species, but does not plan to join EUROBATS at present. It was hoped that greater pressure to join from within Austria would be successful. Azerbaijan expressed interest in becoming a Party to the Agreement. Bosnia and Herzegovina reported that little work had been done regarding accession. The Russian Federation was not able to report any progress on implementation of the Agreement.

Serbia and Montenegro had ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity but was still not a Party to the Convention on Migratory Species and its related Agreements.

All NGOs reported about their continuing activities in bat conservation.

Professor Paul Racey, newly re-appointed co-Chair of the IUCN Chiroptera Specialist Group noted that 4 years ago, at the Ninth European Bat Research Symposium in Le Havre, there had been support for the formation of BatLife Europe. Since then there had been insufficient progress because NGOs had been concerned by the resource implications of hosting BatLife Europe. Two NGOs were actively interested, Salamandra (Poland) and the Bat Conservation Trust (UK) and Professor Racey proposed to invite BCT to establish BatLife Europe in the first instance and agree with bat NGOs how to proceed in the future.

Dr. Katie Parsons (BCT) reported a presentation on a successful two day workshop run in the UK and funded by Defra, with attendance by 31 delegates from 15 European countries. Work was carried out on the EUROBATS monitoring guidelines and on further developing a pan-European project to conduct surveillance of bats in underground sites. A draft report has been produced and BCT is now drafting a proposal for a feasibility study. Some governments have expressed interest in funding the project.

7. Administrative matters:

a) Organisational arrangements for the Secretariat since 1 January 2001

The Executive Secretary noted that this would be the last time this item would appear under administrative matters. Following six years under UNEP administration with the CMS Secretariat and other co-located Agreements, this was now a very comfortable arrangement.

b) Report on income and expenditure as well as Trust Fund status

(Inf.EUROBATS.AC11.4, Inf.EUROBATS.AC11.5 and Inf.EUROBATS.AC11.6)

The Executive Secretary referred to the written report and wished to state that there had been very outstanding and reliable support for the Agreement, with Parties paying their contributions reliably. The Secretariat had never faced a situation where outstanding contributions had slowed or stopped work. The Executive Secretary expressed thanks that in 2006, the Secretariat was already in receipt of a significant part of the contributions. He drew attention to Inf.EUROBATS.AC11.4.Annex2, which showed the actual expenditure for 2005 in EUR. He noted that the financial report in USD was made

available in the course of the Meeting and that they would reflect the same figures as in Annex2 but in USD.

The Executive Secretary noted that the Trust Fund was administered by UNEP in Nairobi. He advised that the fund was quoted in USD and drew the attention of the Meeting to the Trust Fund reserve under point F, the reserve as of end of 2005, which showed a voluntary contributions reserve resulting from interest gains accrued over the past years of nearly 30,000 USD. He advised the Meeting that there was an opportunity to make use of the reserve to finance MoP5, because funds in the regular budget were insufficient to cover the actual costs. The Parties agreed with the proposition.

The Executive Secretary requested UNON to report on the perception of how the EUROBATS budget had been managed. UNON advised that the financial situation had been reported correctly and the fact that EUROBATS was on target for finishing implementation of the Agreement in this period was another sign of correct management by the Secretariat.

c) Staffing situation in the Secretariat

The Executive Secretary advised that Ms. Christine Boye, one of the part-time administrative assistants, would be taking maternity leave until January 2007. He explained that the Secretariat would need a full complement of staff to manage the Meeting of Parties and informed the Meeting that the post of Ms Dessislava Krueger would be transformed to a full-time one for this period. This will be financed using the moderate savings that were made the previous year and there will be no additional contributions required from the Parties. In line with the financial rules and regulations of the United Nations the Executive Secretary is entitled to carry forward savings from previous financial years and to allocate them to budget lines of the following financial year where needed. The Parties expressed their agreement.

d) Move of the Secretariat to new premises

The Executive Secretary reported an imminent move of the Secretariat to very pleasant new offices, on the same floors as the CMS Secretariat, in a new campus for all UN agencies located in Germany. He advised that the new address would be circulated, but the old address would still be applicable for 6 months after the move. Telephone numbers and email addresses would remain the same. He expressed sincere thanks to Germany for the excellent facilities in the new premises, which had involved a huge investment.

e) Financial issues related to MoP5

The Executive Secretary thanked the Meeting for their agreement that the accrued voluntary contribution interest be used to pay for MoP5. He noted, however, that this might not be sufficient and if necessary there was the option to take up UNEP's generous offer.

f) Date and venue of the 6th Session of the Meeting of Parties

The Executive Secretary introduced the item and requested offers from Parties to host the 6th Session of the Meeting of Parties. The Czech Republic kindly responded with an offer.

The Executive Secretary advised that this would normally be on the agenda for the Meeting of Parties, but had been included because consideration had to be given to saving money now in order to cover the ever increasing costs. He also noted that the huge work programme and possible additional work at the next MoP and further remarked that some decisions made in the past had not yet been implemented. He recommended that the Parties should consider, for one occasion only, having a 4 year term between 5th and 6th Sessions of the Meeting of Parties to facilitate implementation of the Resolutions for Parties and so that Meetings will not take place in the same year as those of the CMS and ASCOBANS. This would require commitment from the Parties to use the time effectively.

g) Future structure of the Advisory Committee and possible establishment of a Standing Committee (Doc.EUROBATS.AC11.20)

The Executive Secretary drew attention to the written document and listed the benefits of the suggested new arrangements. There were concerns expressed as to the value of changing the arrangements and whether there would be any added value to the EUROBATS Agreement. There were also concerns expressed about the costs of travel to two separate meetings for countries that only ever sent one representative to meetings, because of budgetary concerns. The Executive Secretary advised that this was the usual format in nearly all Conventions and Agreements, and had been the case in the CMS from start. A daughter Agreement, AEWA had switched to this arrangement 3 years ago because of the growth of the Agreement. For EUROBATS the AC Meetings were becoming as large as the MoPs and this had not been a consideration when estimating the budget costs.

The new structure would enable AC Meetings to concentrate on scientific work and for the Standing Committee to concentrate on administrative matters, with much reduced

representation in years between MoPs. This small group of 6 – 8 people would have the mandate to agree any spending issues on behalf of other Parties. He explained that there were excellent conference facilities, free of charge, in Bonn at the Secretariat and the small StC could meet there each year. Under these circumstances, the Secretariat would not have to travel and these measures could reduce costs of AC Meetings by at least 50% and increase the efficiency of both meetings. In MoP years a full combined StC/AC Meeting would be required to draft Resolutions. For the small group of Parties that only send one representative, a budget could be agreed or the Secretariat could pay the costs of travel for all members of the Standing Committee, which would still be a considerable reduction in costs compared with the costs of the existing Advisory Committee arrangements.

h) Implementation Mechanism for the Agreement

The Executive Secretary drew attention to the document and introduced the subject. Several countries including France, Hungary and Estonia strongly supported the proposal, as did NABU, although France wanted to ensure no additional costs to the Agreement would be incurred in adopting such a mechanism. Others, including the UK and Croatia, welcomed the proposal and supported it in principle, but requested more detail concerning the type of cases that were being discussed and whether such a mechanism was really required in the EUROBATS Agreement, given that most countries had their own means of ensuring the Agreement was being implemented. Germany was against the proposal on the grounds that the mechanism for assessment and enforcement should sit within the CMS and cover all the daughter Agreements.

The UNEP/CMS representative felt that the Executive Secretary had suggested a sound way forward. He thought it was important from the CMS aspect to comment on the suggestion of a more general enforcement mechanism. CMS was operating at a more strategic level and implements the convention through the species Agreements, which were crucial to the objective of delivery. The only mechanism of gathering Parties' experts together was through the Agreements. If a mechanism was set up for the CMS as a whole, then there would be many cases from many areas covering a wide range of species. The approach needed to be focused at a more local level. The EUROBATS mechanism would be providing a prototype.

Following discussions on both items the following decisions on Standing Committee and Implementation mechanism were agreed:

1. Have separate small StC Meetings with suggested 8 members, the four main contributors having permanent seats and rotation of other seats among Parties to

ensure as much as possible good geographical coverage of the Agreement area. This StC Meeting will be held each year back to back with the Advisory Committee. Duration of Meetings will be one day.

2. The Advisory Committee to deal with scientific issues with one scientific representative from each country (more if the country wishes to send them). Duration of the Meeting will be two days.
3. In years when there is a Session of the Meeting of Parties a full Advisory Committee Meeting and StC Meeting would be held, in the form of the existing Advisory Committee.
4. Countries with economies in transition would only have one member in each of the Committees funded by the Secretariat.
5. EU Member States would not be eligible for funding by the Secretariat and would have to apply to the EC for funding to attend Meetings if required.
6. A selected small group of experts may be invited to attend AC Meetings, paid for by the Secretariat.
7. The Secretariat would develop further a proposal for an implementation mechanism, for consideration at MoP5.

i) Draft Resolution 5.1: Financial and Administrative Matters (Budget 2007 – 2009)
(Annex 4), closed meeting

The Executive Secretary presented the draft budget to the Meeting for consideration. Some Parties were concerned about the proposed increase to the budget. Parties agreed to request an extraordinary audit of the EUROBATS Secretariat, before the next MoP, in line with similar requests within the CMS family, which was also welcomed by the Secretariat. After extensive discussions, including two closed sessions, it was decided to carry the draft Budget Resolution forward to the MoP as prepared by the Secretariat; however, concerns remained and as a result a small number of Parties requested the Secretariat to provide an alternative budget in time for consideration at the MoP (**Annex 9**).

The Parties noted that at any time when they requested answers or information on particular items relating to administrative, budgetary or other financial issues, the Secretariat was in a position to reply promptly and in a satisfactory manner.

The Executive Secretary provided some background information to the alternative budget option as requested by that small group of four Parties and which he had

already produced during the Meeting and made available to all participants. He explained that four budget lines were affected (1303 Secretary, 1601 Travel of Secretariat staff, 3301 Meeting of Parties and 3302 Meeting of the Advisory Committee) and that the suggested minimum contribution of 1,000 EUR would affect a total of 16 Parties, which meant more than half of all Parties. He also recalled to the Parties that both the staff cost figures as well as the UN scales of contributions were based on decisions made by their own governments at the UN General Assembly and that therefore a EUROBATS Meeting was not the appropriate forum to express dissatisfaction with these scales. The Executive Secretary furthermore outlined that all budget figures presented could now only be of information character as they would become key subject of the requested audit and that the Secretariat had to seek advice from the auditors before being able to produce new formal proposals for the MoP.

In his conclusion on this agenda item the Executive Secretary highlighted the excellent support that had been received before and during the AC Meeting from UNEP and UNON, both being represented.

8. Intersessional Working Groups

The convenors of the Intersessional Working Groups reported about progress achieved. Some groups also submitted written reports. During the Meeting some IWGs convened for further discussion and their reports are outlined in **Annex 2**. A revised table listing the members of the IWGs is attached (**Annex 3**).

Report of the Intersessional Working Group (IWG) on the transboundary programme – habitats: Data compilation (Doc.EUROBATS.AC11.9.Rev.1)

A report was provided for the Meeting and presented by the convenor. Since producing the report a list of sites had been received from Luxembourg, and progress had been made in obtaining lists from France and Italy.

Draft management guidelines had been produced and a final draft would go to MoP5 for agreement and publication, once comments had been received from Germany. A draft resolution on the management of underground sites was under preparation. The group convened during the Meeting.

Report of the IWG on the Geographical Scope of the Agreement (Doc.EUROBATS.AC11.10)

A report was provided for the Meeting and presented by the convenor. The group was convened during the Meeting.

Report of the IWG on Review of Guidelines for the Issue of Permits for the Capture and Study of Captured Wild Bats

The convenor provided a verbal report to the Meeting. He noted that a ring size accepted for three medium-sized Rhinolophid bat species at MoP4 was causing damage and Annex 2 to the Resolution would need to be amended.

Draft Resolution 5.5: Amendments to Resolution 4.6: Guidelines for the Issue of Permits for the Capture of Wild Bats (Doc.EUROBATS.AC.11.23.Rev.1), was prepared and approved by the Advisory Committee.

Report of the IWG on Producing Guidelines on Bat Monitoring Methods to Assess Population Trends at Different Levels (Doc.EUROBATS.AC11.11)

A report was provided for the Meeting and presented by the convenor. The IWG met during the Meeting and prepared a draft Resolution for monitoring bats across Europe. Draft Resolution 5.4: Monitoring Bats across Europe (Doc.EUROBATS.AC.11.22) was prepared and was accepted for taking forward.

Report of the IWG on Bat Conservation and Sustainable Forest Management (Doc.EUROBATS.AC11.18)

The convenor provided a report for the Meeting. The IWG met during the Meeting and agreed to produce guidelines at high level for MoP5.

Report of the IWG on Bat Migration

The convenor was not able to take part in the Meeting. The IWG has been waiting for the publication of the Atlas of Bat Migrations in Europe and so the work has been postponed.

Report of the IWG on Autecological Studies for Priority Species (Doc.EUROBATS.AC11.17)

A report was provided for the Meeting and presented by the convenor. The questionnaire on roost choice was approved and will be circulated after the Meeting. The convenor furthermore gave a presentation of the French Life project on the three priority species (*Rhinolophus euryale*, *Myotis capaccinii* and *Miniopterus schreibersii*), that was prepared by Ms. Mélanie Némoz (Société Française pour l'Etude et la Protection des Mammifères).

Report of the IWG on Protection of Overground Roosts (Doc.EUROBATS.AC11.13)

The convenor of the working group gave a brief presentation and summary of the written report. The report summarises the results from the overground roost

questionnaire, provides an overview of suitable protective measures, and explores the interactions between bats and buildings of cultural heritage importance. A number of case studies are included to illustrate how conflicts between bats and cultural heritage have been successfully resolved. Further work needs to be done to have this document finalised for presentation at MoP5. In particular, all Parties and non-Party Range States are requested to examine the report and to provide final comments by 15 June 2006 at the latest. Additional case studies that illustrate the protection of overground roosts, especially cases from cultural heritage buildings, would also be welcome by that date. The final report, together with a draft resolution, will be circulated in advance of the MoP.

Report of the IWG on Impact on Bat Populations of Use of Antiparasitic Drugs for Livestock (Doc.EUROBATS.AC11.14)

The convenor presented a brief overview of the 16 questionnaire responses received so far. A more detailed analysis will be completed for inclusion in the report for MoP5.

Report of the IWG on Wind Turbines and Bat Populations (Doc.EUROBATS.AC11.15.Rev.1)

A report was provided for the Meeting and presented by the convenor. The group met during the Meeting. Comments on the draft guidelines should be provided by 15th June.

Report of the IWG on the CBD/CMS Joint Work Programme

This IWG has been suspended.

Report of the IWG on the Conservation and Management of Critical Feeding Areas and Commuting Routes (Doc.EUROBATS.AC11.16)

The convenor provided a written report for the Meeting. The IWG was convened during the Meeting.

9. Working Group to prepare a new Conservation and Management Plan for MoP5

A Working Group was established and met twice during the Meeting. The group was convened by Dr. Tony Mitchell-Jones and attended by Ms. Luisa Rodrigues, Mr. Jacques Pir, Ms. Edmée Engel, Dr. Peter Boye, Dr. Stéphane Aulagnier, Dr. Katie Parsons, Ms. Jean Matthews, Mr. Branko Karapandza, Mr. Primož Presetnik, Dr. Christine Harbusch, Ms. Marie-Jo Duborg-Savage, Dr. Guido Reiter, Dr. Linda Poots, Dr. Ferdia Marnell, Ms. Abigel Szodoray-Paradi, Dr. Laurent Schley, Mr. Per Ole Syvertsen, Mr. Tony Hutson, Dr. Karen Haysom, Ms. Anna-Nele Herdina.

Using the existing plan as a starting point, a draft Conservation and Management Plan for the next Session of the Meeting of Parties was developed. Proposed activities included the completion of outstanding work, the development of further work on Bats and Forestry and the use of bats as indicator species. One new project relating to the CBD's 2010 biodiversity target was proposed.

10. Presentation “Bat Migrations in Europe – A Review of Banding Data and Literature”

Dr. Rainer Hutterer, curator of the Zoological Museum Alexander Koenig, gave a presentation on the work carried out to produce the publication ‘Bat Migrations in Europe’, which was distributed to all AC members. This work was carried out by a EUROBATS Intersessional Working Group in the first instance. The Secretariat expressed his thanks to Germany for the very good publication, the work of the whole team and the uncounted number of voluntary bat conservationists who contributed records for the publication. The work of the past is bearing fruit and producing convincing arguments for more research and conservation work in the future. This work had highlighted the urgent need of close cooperation between European countries.

11. EUROBATS Publication Series

The Executive Secretary wanted to take the opportunity to introduce the start of a EUROBATS publication series with two publications already in the pipeline. The first was the 15th Anniversary publication, for which many contributions had already been received. He made a strong appeal to those countries that have so far not sent a contribution to the Secretariat, with articles praising the work done, but also critical articles, highlighting future requirements and improvements to the Agreement. The publication should provide the possibility to give a good picture to the whole of Europe.

The second volume of the series would be the guidelines on underground site management, being published through a generous voluntary contribution from the UK. The guidelines were being produced in three languages, but this was an exceptional situation. The Secretariat did not have the budget to be able to do the same for future publications. It was decided to publish the booklet in the three languages separately. Germany offered to prove arrangements for the printing of the German version without costs to the Secretariat.

12. Bats as Bioindicators

A presentation on bioindicators was given by Dr. James Williams, Chair of the SEBI2010 Species Expert Group. This was followed by a presentation from Dr. Karen Haysom (BCT) on the documentation form for indicators, submitted by EUROBATS to the SEBI2010 Species Expert Group.

The Executive Secretary thanked Dr. Williams for coming to the Meeting and thanked Dr. Karen Haysom and Ms. Dessislava Krueger for the work they had done in this area and expressed pleasure in EUROBATS being involved in this important initiative.

Germany noted that the last MoP had adopted the Resolution on Bat Conservation and Forest Practices, where Parties had expressed a will to develop bats as indicator species, particularly for forest habitats. An Intersessional Working Group, convened by Dr. Karen Haysom (BCT, UK) was set up to examine further the relevance of this topic to EUROBATS and how bioindicators might be developed.

13. Bats and Forestry (Application of the EU Habitats Directive Article 12) / Interaction between Bats and Humans (follow up)

The UK presented a short summary of an informal meeting on the interaction between bats and humans, held at AC10. The group discussed topics relating to bats in dwelling houses and the effects of developments and the different approaches across Europe in relation to dealing with these situations. A similar informal meeting to discuss approaches to bats and forestry was organised during this Meeting, attended by 22 delegates. Discussion centred on the developments of good practice guidelines for bats and forestry and a presentation was given by the UK. Issues relating to the presence of bats in houses were discussed and the group agreed that these needed special consideration. A proposal to communicate the views of the group to the EU Working Group on Article 12 of the Habitats Directive received much support.

14. Bats and Climate Change (Inf.EUROBATS.AC11.30)

Mr. Tony Hutson (IUCN Chiroptera Specialist Group) described the contents of a UK Defra report 'Climate Change and Migratory Species', which had been circulated at the CMS COP8 in Nairobi last November. The topic has been the subject of a workshop. Inf.EUROBATS.AC11.30 includes web addresses for viewing this document, which includes a section on bats. The report suggests that no direct studies of bats and climate change have been carried out in Europe. The recommendations are discussed in the same document.

15. Draft Resolution 5.2: Bats and Rabies in Europe (Doc.EUROBATS.AC11.8)

The Chair gave a short background to the drafting of this Resolution.

Germany commented that the draft Resolution would require a great deal of work from Parties. The German delegation has limited possibility to fulfill all the obligations in the foreseeable future. The recommendations of the Resolution do not share in a fair way the responsibilities for this work between bat workers and those working in the public health sector.

UK, France and the Netherlands all commented that there were effective surveillance programmes operating in their countries, with good working relationships between authorities and bat workers.

Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg and Sweden all supported the draft Resolution, because it was helpful in providing information and raising the profile of the issue to their governments.

The decision was taken to carry forward the draft Resolution, with minor modifications.

16. Review of the Annex to the Agreement (Doc.EUROBATS.AC11.6, Doc.EUROBATS.AC11.21, Inf.EUROBATS.AC11.13)

The changes to the Annex were outlined by Mr. Tony Hutson. Following a short discussion the changes were adopted.

17. Date and venue of the 12th Meeting of the Advisory Committee

Hungary expressed interest in hosting the next AC Meeting, but advised that the new government was being established and no decision had been taken. Hungary hoped to present an official invitation at the next MoP.

18. Any other business

There was no other business.

19. Adoption of the Record of the Meeting

The Record of the Meeting was adopted.

20. Close of Meeting

In his closing remarks the Executive Secretary sincerely regretted that despite his appeals on the first day, this Meeting consistently had been so much overshadowed by another recent meeting, with problems that were not at all related to EUROBATS.

However, he was happy to see how much substantive progress had been achieved in this Meeting and thanked all participants for their most valuable contributions as well as his team for the excellent support.

The Chair expressed his thanks towards the Luxembourg hosts, Ms. Edmée Engel, Mr. Laurent Barschi, Dr. Laurent Schley and Mr. Jacques Pir, who were supporting the Secretariat with the selection of the venue and together with Ms. Mymy Simon for the organisation of several side events during the Meeting. He also thanked the Executive Secretary, Mr. Andreas Streit, and his staff members, Ms. Christine Boye, Ms. Dessislava Krüger and Ms. Ayan Polat, for the excellent organisation of the Meeting, and Ms. Jasmin Kanza of UNON, Mr. Robert Hepworth, Executive Secretary of CMS, and Mr. Jacob Duer of UNEP for their helpful support with difficult issues. Furthermore, he expressed his gratitude towards the Vice-Chair, Ms. Luisa Rodrigues for her support and Dr. Jessamy Battersby for her effort as rapporteuse of the Meeting.

The Meeting was then closed at 01.10 h on 11 May 2006.