3rd Session of the Meeting of Parties
Bristol, United Kingdom, 24 – 26 July 2000

Record of the Meeting

1. Opening Remarks

Mr. Peter Lina (the Netherlands) opened the Meeting as acting Chairman. He welcomed the participants and invited a representative of the host country (UK) to make opening remarks.

Dr. Roger Pritchard (Head of the UK delegation) welcomed the delegates to the Meeting and expressed pleasure that the 3rd Meeting was being held in Bristol, as it had been the location for the 1st Meeting of the EUROBATS Agreement. He expressed his thanks to the Bat Conservation Trust and Woodchester Mansion Trust for organising such an interesting and enjoyable field-trip the day before the Meeting. He advised that there would be a joint Reception for the Delegates of EUROBATS and ASCOBANS Meetings, where they would be joined by the Minister for the Environment, the Rt. Hon. Chris Mullin MP. He wished everyone a useful and productive Meeting.

Mr. Peter Lina thanked the Department of Environment, Transport and the Regions and the Secretariat for organising the Meeting and providing excellent facilities and an excellent excursion.

Mr. Andreas Streit (Executive Secretary) welcomed all the participants to Bristol, and remarked that with the Agreement approaching its 10th Anniversary (2001) it was appropriate for the 3rd Meeting to take place in the UK because the Agreement was signed in London. He expressed his pleasure to see that all Parties were present and that a total of 28 countries was represented. He welcomed Romania as the 20th Party to the Agreement. He expected that other countries would join in the near future. He thanked the UK for providing the conference facilities and covering the cost of the conference. He also thanked Germany, the Netherlands, the UK and UNEP/CMS for the voluntary contributions they provided to finance the participation of delegates and observers from countries with economies in transition.
2. **Adoption of Rules of Procedure**

The Rules of Procedure (Doc.EUROBATS.MoP3.13) were adopted without amendment by consensus.

3. **Election of Chair and Vice-Chair**

Portugal nominated, and Hungary seconded, the UK to act as Chair for the meeting. Dr. Roger Pritchard took the Chair. The Netherlands nominated, and Ireland seconded, the Czech Republic to act as Vice-Chair for the Meeting. Ms. Eva Suchomelova took the Vice-Chair.

4. **Adoption of the Agenda**

The Chair suggested the Agenda be amended. After item 5, Chairpersons for the Administrative and Scientific Working Groups should be elected. After item 7, to insert an item (Draft Resolution 3.9) to formally recognise and give full rights to Romania as a Party. The Meeting adopted the Agenda as amended by consensus.

5. **Election of Chairpersons of the Administrative and Scientific Working Groups**

The Chair of the Meeting nominated, and Germany seconded, Mr. Peter Lina as Chair for the Scientific Working Group. The UK nominated, and Sweden seconded, Ms. Luisa Rodrigues (Portugal) as Chair for the Administrative Working Group.

6. **Establishment of the Credentials Committee**

The UK, the Netherlands, the FYR Macedonia and Poland were nominated as the Credentials Committee and were asked to meet at the earliest opportunity and report back to the Meeting on the credentials of participating countries.

7. **Draft Resolution 3.9: Exception to Article XII of the Agreement**

The Chair suggested that in the light of efforts made by the Romanian Government, Romania should be allowed to participate in the Meeting as a full voting Party even though the required 30 days between deposition of the instrument of accession and full rights being acquired had not lapsed. The UK sponsored and Portugal and Monaco jointly seconded the Resolution (Doc.EUROBATS.MoP3.15), which was duly adopted by consensus.
8. Admission of observers
The Meeting formally admitted all observers by consensus.

9. Welcoming addresses
Welcoming addresses were given by UNEP, the FYR of Macedonia and Lithuania.

Mr. Müller-Helmbrecht, Executive Secretary of UNEP/CMS, delivered an opening address on behalf of Dr. Klaus Töpfer, Executive Director of UNEP (Inf.EUROBATS.MoP3.39). He stressed that should EUROBATS decide to integrate in the UNEP/CMS Agreements Unit, policy development would remain the responsibility of the Parties.

The Macedonian delegate expressed on behalf of his government his gratitude that Macedonia was represented for the first time as Party. Activities regarding the implementation of the Agreement were included in their National Report.

The delegate from the Republic of Lithuania expressed his thanks to the countries financing his attendance and remarked that it was necessary to have the Agreement translated into Lithuanian in order to present the Agreement to his government. The accession of Lithuania to the Agreement would follow later this year.

10. Report of the Chairperson of the Advisory Committee
Mr. Peter Lina drew attention to the written Report (Doc.EUROBATS.MoP3.4).

11. Secretariat Report
The Executive Secretary referred to the written Report (Doc.EUROBATS.MoP3.5) and gave an overview of developments in the past two years.

The Budget:
In 1998 all contributions were received.

In 1999 all contributions were received except one which represented 25% of the total budget. This presented financial difficulties between September 1999 and May 2000. The contribution was paid in May 2000. He expressed his thanks to the German Government for crediting the salaries of the Secretariat until May 2000. He remarked that the loss of 25% from such a small budget last year had prevented the production of Eurobat Chat and new information leaflets. It was
hoped there would be a new issue of Eurobat Chat after this Meeting containing information for the last two years.

In 2000 the Secretariat had already received contributions from the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Luxembourg, FYR Macedonia, Monaco, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Slovakia and Sweden, but some countries still had outstanding contributions and were requested to pay as soon as possible. Expenditure for 2000 was attached to the Report. The 1998 - 1999 audits were carried out by the German Government free of charge. The Executive Secretary thanked the German Government for hosting the Secretariat, for paying all the costs of the premises and office space and also for making a voluntary annual contribution of DEM 50,000, which in the past two years was partly used to fund the participation of countries with economies in transition at Meetings of the Agreement. The main part was used to organise bat detector workshops in Eastern European countries, carried out by Mr. Herman Limpens which were reported on later in the Meeting.

Staff changes:

The Executive Secretary thanked Mr. Eric Blencowe (former Executive Secretary), who left the Secretariat on 30 September 1998, for all his excellent work in establishing the Secretariat in Bonn and successfully promoting the Agreement. He thanked Mr. Jens Lützen (Administrative Assistant), who left in March 2000 for his excellent work as assistant. He welcomed Ms. Christine Hemer, who took up the post of Administrative Assistant in April 2000, and who has proved to be an excellent replacement.

Party Implementation Reports:

The Executive Secretary apologised that the new synthesis of Reports did not reflect information from all Parties but many Reports were received after the deadline for inclusion in the synthesis. He remarked that the synthesis would be updated after the Meeting to include all those Reports received just prior to and during the Meeting. Reports were received from Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Hungary, Luxembourg, FYR Macedonia, Monaco, the Netherlands, Portugal, Slovakia, Ukraine and the United Kingdom. A number of Non-Party Range States also submitted Reports including Azerbaijan, Belgium (Wallonie), Georgia, Lithuania, Romania and the Russian Federation.
New Parties:

In 1998 Slovakia acceded to the Agreement.

In 1999 Bulgaria, Finland, the FYR Macedonia, Monaco and the Ukraine acceded.

In 2000 Romania already has acceded. Croatia has ratified and only has to deposit the instrument of accession. Belgium may ratify this year and Italy is working on its accession but a change of government has delayed the procedure. Other countries are preparing for Accession maybe this year or early next year.

Publicity:

The European Bat Night continued to be the major event in raising public awareness of European bats. Between 1998 and 1999 participating countries increased from 13 to 19 and a further increase is expected in 2000. It is now a well established event and the Secretariat intends to further promote the event, produce posters and assist in information exchange. The severe financial problems already mentioned have prevented the publication of material other than for the European Bat Night. Posters and leaflets for the Bats Agreement are urgently required to answer growing requests for information from the public and it is hoped that the production of new material will be possible in the near future.

Co-operation with other Conventions:

The AEWA Secretariat was now co-located with the EUROBATS and ASCOBANS Secretariats in Bonn. At its 1st Session of the Meeting of Parties, AEWA had agreed to integration under the UNEP model. This would be an important consideration for EUROBATS at this Meeting. There has been a close co-operative relationship with the Bern Convention, with the adoption of two joint Action Plans in 1999, for the Greater horseshoe bat and the Pond bat, drafted in co-operation with the Advisory Committee to EUROBATS.

The Executive Secretary also thanked Belgium for considering making a substantial contribution for public awareness activities in Eastern and South-Eastern Europe. He mentioned it might be finalised at this Meeting to allow the contribution to become effective in the near future.

The Slovak Republic requested an amendment to the Secretariat’s Report to reflect the payment of their contribution in February 2000. The Report of the Secretariat was amended with apologies.

   The UK, as Depository, reported on the accessions to the Agreement within the past two years.


   Germany extended thanks to the UK Government for hosting the Meeting and providing German translation facilities. The German delegate commented on the late submission of their Implementation Report but stated that he was proud of the teamwork that had contributed to the comprehensive nature of the report. He explained that their main European Bat Night activities were arranged for 2 and 3 September 2000 and that delegates were welcome to attend.

   Germany drew attention to the joint project they are undertaking with Poland and the Czech Republic into safeguarding and improving bat roosts on both sides of the Oder River (Inf.EUROBATS.MoP3.35). There are other projects and activities being carried out, many of which are funded by the Federal States or individuals interested in bat conservation. The results of the “Bats in Forests” project will be published in the coming months. There was also a project looking into the difficulties faced by bats as a result of timber treatment work (Inf.EUROBATS.MoP3.41). Details of projects were in the German National Implementation Report.

   Belgium gave a short update on their progress towards implementation of the Agreement. They are aiming to ratify before the end of this year. In advance of this, a range of activities across the country have been organised for European Bat Night and a number of sites are proposed to be included in Natura 2000.

   Poland reported that one more species of bat was added to its red list of endangered animals. The results of the VIIIth European Bat Research Symposium will be published in 3 volumes, and Poland had participated in a project to prepare an atlas of Carpathian bats together with the Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia, Romania and the Ukraine. A Meeting on Sacral Architecture in Animal Protection will be held in Poland next October to which delegates are invited.

14. **Report of the Credentials Committee**

   An interim report was given by the Chair of the Credentials Committee (Ms. Christine Tucker), stating that 18 Parties had submitted their credentials. Regrettably, 2 Parties were not in a position to do so, those being the Czech
Republic and Slovakia. The UK advised that the Committee would check details of the credentials provided and report back.

The Czech Republic apologised for being unable to supply their credentials and explained that there had been insufficient time to secure the agreement of the necessary Ministers. The Slovak Republic reported similar difficulties.

15. Allocation of Tasks to the Working Groups

Following suggestions from the Chair, the draft Resolutions for discussion by the working groups were allocated as follows:

**Administrative working group**

i) Resolution 3.1: Integration of the EUROBATS Secretariat into the UNEP/CMS Agreements Unit.


iii) Resolution 3.3: Format of National Implementation Reports.

iv) Resolution 3.6: Terms of Reference for the Advisory Committee.

v) Resolution 3.7: Amendment of the Agreement.


**Scientific working group**

i) Resolution 3.3: Format of National Implementation Reports.

ii) Resolution 3.4: Guidelines for the issue of permits for bat ringing activities.

iii) Resolution 3.6: Terms of Reference for the Advisory Committee.

iv) Resolution 3.7: Amendment of the Agreement.


It was agreed that draft Resolution 3.5 on the International Year of the Bat should be discussed during the plenary session. In respect of draft Resolution 3.8, Germany requested that the scientific group also take the opportunity to consider the implementation of the existing Resolutions to find out whether additional measures need to be taken towards bat conservation.

16. German Project Presentations

Germany gave two oral presentations, summarising their work on the project, “Bat conservation expert training and data collection in South-East Europe”
17. **Final Report of the Credentials Committee**

The Chairperson of the Credentials Committee gave the final Report of the Committee. Credentials had been received from 18 out of the 20 contracting Parties, including Romania. The Czech Republic and Slovakia had not presented credentials. The Chair of the Meeting reminded the Parties that the issue of presenting the correct credentials was vital to allow voting to take place.


19. **Draft Resolution 3.1: Integration of the EUROBATS Secretariat into the UNEP/CMS Agreements Unit (Doc.EUROBATS.MoP3.6.Rev.2)**

This Resolution was discussed by the Administrative Working Group. The Chairperson of this group (Ms. Luisa Rodrigues) explained that two amendments had been made to this Resolution as recorded in the Report of the Working Group. The amended Resolution was adopted by consensus.


This Resolution was extensively discussed by the Administrative Working Group. Some changes in Annexes 1, 2 and 4 were proposed, as recorded in the Report of the Working Group.

A number of Parties expressed concern about the proposed significant increase of the budget and therefore suggested reducing the amounts allocated to a number of budget lines (see Annex 1 of this record).

Norway suggested that the Secretariat for the next Session of the Meeting of Parties should look into the possibility of setting a minimum contribution from each Party covering the actual expenses incurred by the Secretariat towards each Party.

The Secretariat clarified that two minor changes had been made to Annex 3. The bank account number had been changed and more details were given of the bank address to enable payments to be made to the correct account, and a change to
Paragraph 18 in this Annex requested by UNEP to delete the phrase “except for salaries” from the end of the paragraph was made.

France and Monaco regretted that the budget was not in a European currency and would also like to see UNEP bringing more help to the Secretariat.

The Netherlands said that co-operation between the various Secretariats to the Agreements should be better in the future and proposed an additional text regarding this in the preamble after the 4th paragraph.

Monaco and Sweden supported the Netherlands on this line.

The resolution was adopted by consensus with the amendment proposed by the Netherlands.


This Resolution was discussed by both Working Groups. Both Working Groups were happy with the wording of the Resolution and agreed it. The Chair declared that this Resolution was adopted by the Meeting without any amendments by consensus.

22. Draft Resolution 3.4: Guidelines for the issue of permits for bat ringing activities (Doc.EUROBATS.MoP3.9.Rev.1)

The Scientific Working Group suggested alterations. The Chair of the Working Group explained the very small changes made as recorded in the Report of the Working Group. He also said that a working group has been established to draft the guidelines. The members of this working group are listed in the Report of the Scientific Working Group.

After a minor spelling correction in the text, the Resolution was adopted by consensus.

23. Draft Resolution 3.5: International Year of the Bat (Doc.EUROBATS.MoP3.10)

The Chair of the Advisory Committee explained to the meeting that as 2001 was the 10th anniversary of the Agreement it was hoped that each country will promote further bat conservation measures. In addition, the Secretariat explained that this Resolution was already presented to the 5th Advisory Committee Meeting in Zagreb and that the Committee accepted this proposal to be forwarded to the 3rd MoP. He proposed to use the event to raise public awareness and suggested that
it would be a good instrument to declare it as the International Year of the Bat as
NGOs in North and South America as well as Africa were also expressing their
interest. Interested countries on these continents will also be invited to join and
couraged to do similar work in their regions. It is still to be worked out what
should be done.

The Bat Conservation Trust noted that the next International Bat Research
Conference was to be held in Kuala Lumpur (Malaysia) in 2001 and suggested
that efforts could be joined. The Meeting adopted the Resolution without any
amendment by consensus.

24. Draft Resolution 3.6: Terms of Reference for the Advisory Committee
(Doc.EUROBATS.MoP3.11)

This Resolution was discussed by both Working Groups. After a minor correction
the Resolution was adopted by consensus.

25. Draft Resolution 3.7: Amendment of the Agreement
(Doc.EUROBATS.MoP3.12.Rev.4)

The proposed Amendment to the Agreement was put forward by the United
Kingdom and discussed by both Working Groups. The Chairperson of the
Administrative Working Group explained the changes made to the Resolution as
recorded in the Report of her Working Group. The Chairperson of the Scientific
Working Group explained the changes made to the Resolution as recorded in the

Norway asked to consider the Resolution now and not to wait till the amended
Annex to this Resolution was be available. However, it was decided to let
everyone see the final text, including the amended Annex, before approval. The
final text being provided including a French and a German translation was then
adopted by consensus.

Plan (Doc.EUROBATS.MoP3.14.Rev.1)

This Resolution was also discussed by both Working Groups. The Scientific
Working Group proposed to add a paragraph about the Greater horseshoe bat and
the Pond bat Action Plans in the preamble. Further, it was proposed to add
references to the respective actions in Annex 1 to corresponding actions as
established by Resolution No. 8 on the Implementation of the Conservation and
Management Plan, agreed at the 2nd Session of the Meeting of Parties. After some additional text revisions proposed by both Working Groups, the draft was presented to the Plenary.

Germany explained that the 5th Meeting of the Advisory Committee in Zagreb had set up a working group to draft a resolution on a revised Conservation and Management Plan. Germany had the impression that no Party present could fulfil all the points in the given timeframe. It should be focused on clear steps that could be followed in principle by all Parties. It is up to Parties to go beyond and work in favour of the conservation of bats. The Resolution then was adopted by consensus.

27. Arrangements for the 4th Session of the Meeting of Parties

The Executive Secretary informed that he had received a letter from the Bulgarian delegate, Ms. Maria Karadimova, in which she stated that the Bulgarian Government would be willing to host the 4th Meeting of the Parties in 2003. The United Kingdom welcomed this and offered to make a financial contribution towards the costs of arranging this event. The United Kingdom also called upon the other Parties to consider voluntary contributions for this purpose. It was then agreed that the next Session of the Meeting of Parties will be held in Bulgaria in 2003.

28. Any Other Business

No other business was proposed.

29. Adoption of the Report of the Meeting

The Chair of the Administrative Working Group commented on the difficulty in preparing a report which accurately reflected all the discussions of the Meeting. She explained that owing to time constraints, it had been decided to draft a concise report, which reflected the main items of discussion. It was agreed that a memorandum should be prepared for the next Advisory Committee Meeting on how the report writing could be best carried out in the future.

In response to France’s query on the application of UN rules and suggestion to have a simultaneous translation of the proceedings in French, the Executive Secretary stated that the Secretariat had no budget line for this purpose. Mr. Arnulf Müller-Helmbrecht (UNEP/CMS) advised that Agreement Parties are autonomous and that it was their responsibility to decide upon the working language of the
Agreement. The Secretariat was given the task of looking into the costs of providing simultaneous translations in French and German at both Advisory Committee Meetings and Meetings of Parties. A report on the findings is to be submitted to the next Advisory Committee Meeting.

Norway expressed concern that the Report of the Administrative and Budgetary Working Group did not reflect the lengthy discussion on the budget. The Executive Secretary agreed to include Norway’s suggested amended text in the main body of the report. It was agreed that where important statements are not fully reflected in the report, amended text should be offered to the Secretariat for inclusion. Subject to the amendments being made as agreed, the report and its annexes were adopted by consensus.

30. Close of Meeting
The Executive Secretary expressed his happiness at the successful outcome of the Meeting and thanked the Chair for his sympathetic and adroit handling of the proceedings. He also stated that substantial decisions had been made to strengthen the Agreement, amongst other things by joining the UNEP Agreements Unit and in passing the Amendment to the Agreement. He hoped that Governments and NGOs would join together to work towards better bat conservation.

The Chair thanked the Executive Secretary and his Assistant for their excellent work in preparation for and during the Meeting. He also expressed thanks to the Vice-Chair, and Chairs of the Working Groups for their assistance, to those who helped to organise the field trip and members of DETR staff who helped behind the scenes. Finally, he thanked the delegates for their co-operation and commitment to bat conservation in Europe. He concluded that their hard work augured well for the future of the Agreement.

The Chair then declared the Meeting closed at 11.30 a.m. on Wednesday 26 July 2000.
Report of the Administrative & Budgetary Working Group

The Working group had been asked to review Draft Resolutions 3.1 (Doc. 3.6), 3.2 (Doc. 3.7), 3.3. (Doc. 3.8.), 3.6. (Doc. 3.11), 3.7 (Doc. 3.12) and 3.8 (Doc. 3.14).

Before analysing these resolutions, the Working Group took into consideration the Audit Reports for 1998 and 1999 (Inf. 3.6 and Inf. 3.7).

i) Draft Resolution 3.1: Integration of the EUROBATS Secretariat into the UNEP/CMS Agreements Unit.

Some changes in the preamble were proposed.

Changes suggested:

New paragraph. After the third paragraph, it was inserted ‘Acknowledging as well that the AEWA Secretariat took the lead in the establishment of the Agreements Unit from 1 July 2000’.

Para 5. ‘Second Session’ (line 1) was changed by ‘Second and Third Sessions’.

Para 5. ‘(Bonn, July 1998)’ (line 3) was changed by ‘(Bonn, July 1998 and Bristol, July 2000)’.

Upon request of the Working Group, the Secretariat presented a draft job description for the post of Executive Secretary of the Agreement under UNEP terms. The Working Group approved this draft.


Some changes in Annexes 1, 2 and 4 were proposed.

Changes suggested in Annex 1:

Line 1301 (Secretary (G4)). Would be reduced to $21,750 in 2000 and to $22,250 in 2002, but would remain as originally proposed in 2003.

Line 3301 (Meeting of Parties). Would be reduced to $18,000 in 2003.

Line 3302 (Meetings of the Advisory Committee). Would be reduced to $12,000 in each of the three years

Line 5201 (Information material (including European Bat Night)). Would be as originally proposed in 2001 but would be reduced in 2002 and 2003 to $7,500 in each year.

Changes suggested in Annexes 2 and 4:

Since these annexes are a reflection of the values of Annex 1, they were changed accordingly.
The total effect of the suggested changes would be to reduce the overall budget in 2001 to $191.253 (a reduction of $31.357 or 14% on the original proposal), in 2002 to $173.060 (reduced by $36.555 or 17.4%), and in 2003 to $222.497 (reduced by $17.063 or 7.1%). The overall triennium budget would be reduced to $586.809 (a reduction of $84.976 or 12.6%).

iii) Draft Resolution 3.3: Format of National Implementation Reports.
It was accepted without changes by the Working Group.

iv) Draft Resolution 3.6: Terms of Reference for the Advisory Committee.
One change in Annex 1 was proposed.
Change suggested:
Para 7. ‘parties’ (line 4) was changed by ‘Parties’.

v) Draft Resolution 3.7: Amendment to the Agreement.
Some changes were proposed.
Changes suggested:
Para 1 of preamble: ‘all species of CHIROPTERA in Europe and non-European Range States’ (line 1) was changed by ‘all populations of Chiroptera species in Europe and in their non-European Range States’.
Para 1. ‘extend’ (line 1) was changed by ‘change’.
Para 1. ‘of Bats in Europe and in their non-European Range States’ (line 2) was changed by ‘of Populations of European Bats’.
Para 3. After CHIROPTERA (line 1) it was inserted ‘species’.
Para 4. It was deleted.

The Working Group analysed the document prepared by the Scientific Working Group. Some changes in the resolution and in Annex 1 were proposed.
Changes suggested:
Para 3 of preamble. ‘Bern Convention’ (line 3) was changed by ‘Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (Bern Convention)’.
Para 6 of preamble. ‘EC Habitats and Species Directive’ (line 3) was changed by ‘EC Habitats Directive’.
Para 1. After this sentence, it was inserted ‘and notes that this Action Plan superceded the Action Plan made under Resolution 8 at the 2nd Session of the Meeting of Parties’.
Para 4 of Annex 1. ‘undertaken’ (line 3) was changed by ‘started’.
Report of the Scientific Working Group

The Working Group had been asked to review Draft Resolutions 3.3. (Doc. 3.8.), 3.4. (Doc. 3.9), 3.6. (Doc 3.11) 3.7 (Doc. 3.12) and 3.8 (Doc. 3.14).

i) Draft Resolution 3.3: Format of National Implementation Reports.

The Resolution was supported by UK and France and accepted without changes by the Working Group. The Working Group suggested that the Secretariat provide a list of the Resolutions when requesting National Reports.

ii) Draft Resolution 3.4: Guidelines for the issue of permits for bat ringing activities.

Concerns were expressed about the problems of disturbance at times of year other than hibernation.

Changes suggested:

Para 1. of Preamble (Aware of…) ‘during …expended’ be deleted and replaced with ‘to disturbance at certain stages of their life cycle’.

An expert working group to draft guidelines for the next Advisory Committee Meeting was proposed. This comprised Peter Lina (Netherlands; Co-ordinator), Jacques Fairon (Belgium), Tony Mitchell-Jones (UK), Peter Boye (Germany), Dainius Pauza (Lithuania), Matti Masing (Estonia), Paul Racey (UK), Roger Ransome (UK), Edouard Yavrouian (Armenia) and Luisa Rodrigues (Portugal).

Parties and Range States were asked to submit available information to the Secretariat.

Wider concerns about handling and trappings were raised, but it was concluded that these matters would be a subject for future discussions.

iii) Draft Resolution 3.6: Terms of Reference for the Advisory Committee.

It was accepted without changes by the Working Group.

iv) Draft Resolution 3.7: Amendment to the Agreement.

After discussion with alternative suggestions for the title of the Agreement it was agreed to leave it as it is.

Changes suggested:

Para 4. Remove from ‘and lies…(line 3) to end of para.

Para 7. This was considered unnecessary since the matter was already covered by the Law of Treaties.

Para 8. Authors and year of publication should be added to the species names.
It was agreed that the list of families should be in systematic order, viz. Pteropodidae, Emballonuridae, Rhinolophidae, Vespertilionidae and Molossidae. Tony Hutson agreed to check with ICZN for an opinion of the correct spelling of (a)egyptiacus. It was agreed that the generic classification should follow Wilson & Reeder in line with IUCN policy. It was agreed to delete brackets from *Pipistrellus pygmaeus*, but include a footnote to state that the nomenclature is awaiting confirmation from ICZN.


After the main working group meeting, a smaller working group looked in detail at this resolution. A proposal for a revised version was prepared.