



CONVENTION ON MIGRATORY SPECIES

UNEP/CMS/GOR-TC1/Doc.8
21 March 2011

Original: English

FIRST MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE TO THE AGREEMENT ON
THE CONSERVATION OF GORILLAS AND THEIR HABITATS
Kigali, Rwanda, 29-30 March 2011

Monitoring and Reporting System for the Gorilla Agreement

(Prepared by the UNEP/CMS secretariat)

Monitoring:

1. Article IV Section 1(a) of the Gorilla Agreement states that “each Party shall designate the Authority or Authorities to implement this Agreement that shall, inter alia, ensure cross-sectoral coordination and monitor all activities that could potentially impact the conservation status of gorillas within its territory;”
2. The first session of the Meeting of the Parties, adopted Resolution 1.1 on a Monitoring and Reporting System for the Gorilla Agreement, in which it was decided:

“ that a monitoring system will be adopted as part of the reporting system for the Agreement. The monitoring system will include two aspects. The first concerns the monitoring of population dynamics of gorillas, and the second will monitor law enforcement activities pertaining to the conservation of gorillas, including numbers of successful enforcement actions (seizures, successful prosecutions), including the outcome and follow-up of judicial decisions. The system will allow the Gorilla Agreement to effectively evaluate the extent to which management strategies and laws critical to the success of the Agreement, are implemented by the respective national judicial systems”.
3. The Meeting further decided to establish an ad hoc working group to develop the format of the monitoring system, called upon range states to nominate representatives to this group, and accepted the offer of WWF to facilitate its work.
4. An ad hoc meeting of the Gorilla Agreement was convened in the margins of the Frankfurt Gorilla Symposium, in June 2009, in Germany, to take advantage of the presence of range states and relevant experts. The meeting discussed the advantages of the Management Information System (MIST) as a monitoring tool, while questions remained about how range states could acquire the programme and whether it could be adapted.
5. At the meeting, the Secretariat reminded those present of the plan to establish a working group and encouraged range states to nominate members. WWF suggested that the working group could conduct its business electronically.

6. As nominations for the working group members were not forthcoming despite reminders to the national focal points to either the Gorilla Agreement or CMS, the Secretariat was not able to convene the working group. Instead it decided to focus on establishing this Technical Committee, which it was hoped would take this matter forward.

Possible options for consideration by the Technical Committee:

- a) Postpone discussions on a monitoring system until the Gorilla Agreement and its Technical Committee are better established.
- b) Establish a working group on monitoring comprising two members of the Technical Committee, two NGOs and the Secretariat to propose a way forward to the second session of the Meeting of the Parties.

Reporting:

7. Article IV Section 1(c) of the Gorilla Agreement states that “each Party shall prepare for each ordinary session of the Meeting of the Parties, beginning with the second session, a report on its implementation of the Agreement with particular reference to the conservation measures it has undertaken. The format of such reports shall be determined by the first session of the Meeting of the Parties...”.
8. Resolution 1.1, mentioned in paragraph 2 above, “calls upon Parties and invites other Range States to use the data derived through the (monitoring) system as a substantial part of their national report to the Second Meeting of the Parties to the Gorilla Agreement.”
9. It further requests the Secretariat to facilitate the integration of the national report format to the MOP into the national report format of the CMS Conference of the Parties.
10. Establishing a monitoring system focused on population dynamics and law enforcement will be challenging. However, developing a reporting system, as required by the Agreement, could be more feasible in the interim. At its simplest, a national reporting system might look at whether or not the relevant components of the Agreement Actions Plans have been implemented, and if so, with which activities.

Possible options for consideration by the Technical Committee:

- a) Develop an interim simplified reporting format to recommend to the second session of the Meeting of the Parties.
- b) If the committee decides to establish the working group, charge it with developing a reporting format along with the monitoring system.

Action requested:

The Technical Committee to discuss and agree on the process for developing a reporting system, and also to advise on how and whether to proceed to develop a monitoring system.