



**11th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the
Convention on Wetlands (Ramsar, Iran, 1971)**

“Wetlands: home and destination”

Bucharest, Romania, 6-13 July 2012

Ramsar COP11 DOC. 17

**Synthesis report of information and conclusions concerning
hosting arrangements for the Ramsar Convention**

Note: This paper is distributed by the Secretariat precisely as received from the Chair of the Ad Hoc Working Group on 2 April 2012.

Information Paper

A synthesis report of information and conclusions concerning
hosting arrangements for the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands
from the Ad Hoc Working Group on
Administrative Reform process

[Prepared for the Ad Hoc Working Group by Ms Helle Husum, Environment policy and law
consulting, Lausanne, Switzerland.]

March 2012

Table of Contents

Executive summary.....	3
1 Introduction.....	4
1.1 Background	4
1.2 Briefly about this paper – some readers guidance	4
2 The Ramsar Administrative Reform process to date and the two hosting options under consideration	6
2.1 Briefly about the Ad Hoc Working Groups deliberations and the main issues for consideration	6
2.2 The two hosting options under consideration	6
3 Tabular comparison of the pros and cons of the two options for hosting arrangements for the Ramsar Convention.....	7
3.1 Services and functions of the Secretariat	9
3.2 Human resourcing of the Secretariat.....	13
3.3 Visibility of Ramsar and the wetlands	18
3.4 Effect on the ground implementation (enhancing overall implementation).....	21
3.5 Cooperation between the Ramsar Convention and other Conventions and organisations	25
3.6 Access to funding	32
3.7 Costs of the operation of the Secretariat under the two options - one off and on-going	36
3.7.1 Specifically about the three scenarios presented by UNEP	37
3.7.2 Synthesis of information and conclusions concerning costing of the Secretariat under the two options.....	40
3.7.3 Questions from parties and answers by UNEP addressed during the 7th meeting of the AHWG.....	47
3.8 Effects on assessed contribution of Parties	47
3.9 Transitional issues – other than cost.....	50
 ANNEX 1 - Draft Resolution XI.1 setting out the two options for institutional hosting of the Ramsar Secretariat.....	 53
 ANNEX 2 – Annotated list of documentation reviewed for the present information paper.....	 56
 ANNEX 3 – Terms of Reference.....	 63

Executive summary

This document is submitted for INFORMATION under item XV of the Draft Agenda for the 11th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Wetlands (Ramsar, Iran 1971)¹.

The present paper is an information paper prepared to facilitate decisions by the Contracting Parties at the COP-11 regarding the future administration of the Ramsar Secretariat. Two options for institutional hosting of the Ramsar Secretariat are under consideration. One option is that the Ramsar Secretariat should continue to be hosted by IUCN. Another that is should be institutionally hosted by UNEP.

The Contracting Parties views differ as regards the future administration of the Ramsar Secretariat. As concluded in the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform to the most recent meeting (the 43rd) of the Standing Committee of the Ramsar Convention, which took place from 31 October to 4 November 2011, no consensus could be reached on whether the Ramsar Secretariat should be provided by UNEP or continue to be hosted by IUCN. This was even after discussions in nine meetings, and after careful and thorough review of the extensive information collected from UNEP, IUCN and the Ramsar Secretariat, including the most recent submissions².

The 43rd meeting of the Standing Committee decided by SC43-34 to transmit to COP11 two alternative Draft Resolutions (DR). According to DR XI.1 (alternative 1) the Ramsar Secretariat should continue to be hosted by IUCN. According to DR XI.1 (alternative 2) it should be institutionally hosted by UNEP. The two draft resolutions are for ease of reference attached hereto as Annex 1.

This information paper has been prepared at the request of the 43rd meeting of the Ramsar Standing Committee by an independent consultant. A draft version has been circulated to the Chair of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform as well as its Vice-Chairs. Their comments have been reflected in the present paper.

The paper provides a synthesis of information and conclusions on the main issues raised concerning the institutional hosting for the Ramsar Secretariat in the context of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform. All documents considered by Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform have been reviewed together with the report and relevant decisions and documents for 43rd meeting of the Standing Committee. For ease of reference Annex 2 lists the documentation considered for this information paper and where on the web site of the Ramsar Convention the documents could be found. The main issues addressed in the submissions by UNEP, IUCN and the Ramsar Secretariat have been outlined under each document.

UNEP and IUCN have repeatedly stressed that they are not interested in competing and that their main concern is providing the best possible service to the Ramsar Convention³.

¹ Hereinafter referred to as COP11.

² See DOC. SC 43-06 paragraph 5. The Report is available on Ramsar Convention website: http://www.ramsar.org/cda/en/ramsar-documents-standing-sc43/main/ramsar/1-31-41%5E25232_4000_0

³ Most recently during the 9th meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform, see page 4 of the report (http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AH-WG_report-9thmeeting.pdf).

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

The tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties⁴ to the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands⁵ established an open ended Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform. The basis for the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group is COP10 Resolution X.5 “facilitating the work of the Ramsar Convention and its Secretariat”⁶ which, inter alia, sets out the objective, mandate and work plan for the Ad Hoc Working Group.

The objective of the Working group was “to recommend efficient and effective measures to improve the capacity and operation of the Secretariat to support and facilitate the implementation of the Convention and serve the interests of the Contracting Parties.”

The mandate was to “recommend through approval by the Standing Committee to Contracting Parties and the Conference of the Parties whether the Secretariat should be provided by UNEP or continue to be hosted by IUCN, with the following issues fully addressed:

- a) The reasons for and benefits of a change in the status quo for the Secretariat and for Contracting Parties
- b) The costs and consequences for the operation of the Secretariat and its engagement with the Contracting Parties, including
 - i) staffing costs and composition of the Secretariat under the UN system, including any resources that will be provided by UNEP
 - ii) options for possible location of the Secretariat
 - iii) implications for any future budget of the Secretariat, including any transition costs
 - iv) role of the International Organization Partners (IOPs)
 - v) advantages and disadvantages of the institutional context in which the Secretariat would operate
- c) How this should be implemented, legally and administratively
- d) Ability to meet the future needs of the Convention
- e) Opportunities to further improve the implementation of the Convention
- f) Timeframe for the implementation of any reforms.”

1.2 Briefly about this paper – some readers guidance

This document is submitted for INFORMATION under item XV of the Draft Agenda for the 11th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Wetlands (Ramsar, Iran 1971).

The present paper is an information paper prepared to facilitate decisions by the Contracting Parties at COP-11 on one of the two options for institutional hosting of the Ramsar Secretariat under consideration. One option is that the Ramsar Secretariat should continue to be hosted by IUCN. Another that is should be institutionally hosted by UNEP.

⁴ Hereinafter referred to as COP 10. The meeting of COP 10 took place from the 28 October to 4 November 2008 in Changwon.

⁵ Hereinafter referred to as the Convention.

⁶ Resolution X.5 is available at: http://www.ramsar.org/cda/en/ramsar-documents-ad-hoc-group/main/ramsar/1-31-433_4000_0

Extensive information has been put forward by IUCN, UNEP and the Ramsar Secretariat on the various issues raised concerning the institutional hosting for the Ramsar Secretariat in the context of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform. Significant parts of this information have been submitted in response to requests of Parties following the “Consultant's report to the Working Group: comparative analysis of UNEP and IUCN reports, November 2009”⁷. Several Contracting Parties indicated during the 43rd meeting of the Standing Committee that the analysis in this report should be updated to provide a clear comparison of the two options and that submissions made by the Secretariat should be included⁸.

Against this background the present paper provides a synthesis of information and conclusions on the main issues raised in the context of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform concerning the institutional hosting for the Ramsar Secretariat. It has been drawn up in a tabular form to facilitate comparison of the two options and their implications. The headings differ slightly from those used in the 2009 consultant report to cater for issues brought up subsequent to the finalisation of this report. The present information paper does not contain any further analysis. It is fully referenced. All documents considered by Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform have been reviewed together with the report and relevant decisions and documents for 43rd meeting of the Standing Committee.

Outline of the Paper

This information paper is structured as follows:

Section 1 is this introduction.

Section 2 outlines the main issues for consideration by the Contracting Parties on the two hosting options. It also briefly outlines the Ad Hoc Working Group process to date.

Section 3 provides a tabular comparison of the pros and cons of the two options for hosting arrangements for the Ramsar Convention. The tabular comparison has been drawn up as a synthesis of information and conclusions concerning the institutional hosting for the Ramsar Secretariat contained in the documentation considered by the Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform, in the context of its nine meetings, as well as the documentation for the 43rd Standing Committee Meeting.

For ease of reference, the two alternative draft resolutions for the institutional hosting of the Ramsar Secretariat as set out in Draft Resolution XI.1 are appended to this paper as **Annex 1**.

Annex 2 lists the documentation considered for this information paper and where on the web site of the Ramsar Convention the documents could be found. The main issues addressed in the submissions by UNEP, IUCN and the Ramsar Secretariat have been outlined under each document.

Annex 3 contains the Terms of Reference for this information paper.

⁷ Available on the web site of the Convention http://www.ramsar.org/cda/en/ramsar-documents-ad-hoc-group/main/ramsar/1-31-433_4000_0 under Documents relevant to the third meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform, 3 December 2009.

⁸ See the Report of the 43rd Standing Committee meeting para 66 – 82, para 106, para, 109 and para 166. http://www.ramsar.org/cda/en/ramsar-documents-standing/main/ramsar/1-31-41_4000_0

2 The Ramsar Administrative Reform process to date and the two hosting options under consideration

2.1 Briefly about the Ad Hoc Working Groups deliberations and the main issues for consideration

The Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform has held nine meetings from January 2009 to September 2011. It has reported to three meetings of the Standing Committee, most recently the 43rd meeting of the Standing Committee⁹.

The Contracting Parties views differ as regards the future administration of the Ramsar Secretariat. As concluded in the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform to the 43rd meeting of the Standing Committee, “after discussions in nine meetings, and after careful and thorough review of the extensive information collected from UNEP, IUCN and the Ramsar Secretariat, including the most recent submissions, the WG was unable to reach consensus on whether the Ramsar Secretariat should be provided by UNEP or continue to be hosted by IUCN.¹⁰” Consequently the Ad Hoc Working Group presented two Draft Resolutions for the Standing Committee to consider, one advocating moving to UNEP and the other staying with IUCN¹¹.

The 43rd meeting of the Standing Committee decided by SC43-34 to transmit to COP11 the two Draft Resolutions contained in DOC. SC43-13 Rev. 1, as amended. The two draft resolutions are for ease of reference attached hereto as Annex 1.

The 43rd meeting of the Standing Committee also requested the Chair of the Ad Hoc Working Group to work with an independent consultant engaged by the Secretariat to prepare an information paper based on existing information to facilitate the decision of COP11.

This paper constitutes the said information paper requested by the 43rd meeting of the Standing Committee. An annotated list of the documentation considered for this information paper and where on the web site of the Ramsar Convention the documents could be found is contained in Annex 2 to this paper. The main issues addressed in the submissions by UNEP, IUCN and the Ramsar Secretariat are indicated under each submission. The focus of each of the nine meetings of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform is outlined.

2.2 The two hosting options under consideration

Alternative 1

Pursuant to Draft Resolution XI.1 (alternative 1) the Ramsar Secretariat would continue to be hosted by IUCN.

The Conference of the Contracting Parties requests the Standing Committee to establish at its 46th meeting a mechanism of the Contracting Parties that will, taking into account the needs of the Contracting Parties and the Ramsar Secretariat, facilitate negotiations between the Ramsar Secretariat and the Director-General of IUCN, evaluate the work already achieved and seek ways of improving the current operations of the Secretariat and enhancing the implementation of the

⁹ All documents are available on the Ramsar web site under the documents concerning the Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform http://www.ramsar.org/cda/en/ramsar-documents-ad-hoc-group/main/ramsar/1-31-433_4000_0

¹⁰ See DOC. SC 43-06 paragraph 5 <http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/sc/43/sc43-doc06-adhoc.pdf>.

¹¹ See DOC. SC43-13 <http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/sc/43/sc43-doc13-adhoc.pdf>.

Ramsar Convention, and provide the Standing Committee with a report on these negotiations at its 47th meeting¹².

Alternative 2

According to alternative 2 of Draft Resolution XI.1 the Ramsar Secretariat should be institutionally hosted by UNEP.

Alternative 2 also foresees that a negotiation mechanism be established taking into account the needs of the Contracting Parties and the Ramsar Secretariat, to “facilitate negotiations between the Ramsar Secretariat and the Executive Director of UNEP on the arrangements for an effective, cost-efficient and expeditious transfer of the Ramsar Secretariat to UNEP without undermining the achievement of the goals of the Convention as stated in the 2009-2015 Strategic Plan and consistent with the budget approved in Resolution [XI.xx], and to provide the Standing Committee with a report on these negotiations at its 47th meeting.”¹³

3 Tabular comparison of the pros and cons of the two options for hosting arrangements for the Ramsar Convention

This section provides a synthesis of information and conclusions on the main issues raised concerning the institutional hosting for the Ramsar Secretariat in the context of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform.

For the purpose of the present information paper, information and conclusions have, as per the terms of reference, been synthesised under the following headings (main issues):

1. Services and functions of the Secretariat
2. Human resourcing of the Secretariat
3. Visibility of Ramsar and the wetlands
4. Effect on the ground implementation
5. Cooperation and synergies between the Ramsar Convention, other Conventions and organisations
6. Access to funding
7. Costs - one off and on-going
8. Effects on assessed contribution of Parties
9. Transition issues

It has largely been drawn up as a tabular comparison synthesising the submissions made by IUCN and UNEP to the Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform, including information provided during its nine meetings. To the extent the Ramsar Secretariat has made submissions concerning any these nine main issues, these submissions have been reflected in the table¹⁴. Statements by the Contracting Parties have been synthesised in the beginning of the sub-

¹² See Ramsar COP11 DR1, alternative 1 para 7 and 9, attached hereto as Annex 1.

¹³ See Ramsar COP11 DR1, alternative 2 para 7 and 9, attached hereto as Annex 1.

¹⁴ The Ramsar Secretary General submitted on 29 November 2010 a letter and annex to the Co-chair of the ADWG, in which the Secretary General conveyed the comments of the Ramsar Secretariat to UNEP's report of 7 October 2010. The letter and annex was also forwarded to the members of the Standing Committee prior to its 42nd meeting. Some members have requested UNEP to provide a reaction to the letter and annex. UNEP has noted that the observations and comments made in the letter from the Ramsar Executive Secretary in a number of areas are based on misunderstandings therefore producing misleading conclusions. Consequently UNEP submitted some additional observations in response to this communication, as requested by some Parties (June 2011), although UNEP does not consider it appropriate and preferable to directly engage in an argumentative

sections below¹⁵. Reference to the specific paragraphs or pages of the documents has been made and a hyperlink to the relevant document as posted on the web site of the Ramsar Convention inserted.

discussion on comments of the Ramsar Secretariat. See paragraph 8 – 10 of UNEP's additional observations: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_UNEP_submission.pdf.

¹⁵ As indicated in Section 2, an annotated list of the documentation considered for this information paper and where on the web site of the Ramsar Convention the documents could be found is contained in Annex 2 to this paper. The main issues addressed in the submissions by UNEP, IUNC and the Ramsar Secretariat is indicated under each submission. The focus of each of the nine meetings of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform is outlined.

3.1 Services and functions of the Secretariat

It has been suggested that one of the key questions to be addressed, when deciding which is the better hosting options is: will the Secretariat of the Ramsar Convention, if administrated by UNEP in the present UN organisational set-up, enhance the functions of the Secretariat compared to the situation of today¹⁶?

The information submitted by IUCN and UNEP on the overall services, expertise and institutional capacity that the Secretariat would draw upon under administrative arrangement under respectively IUCN and UNEP has been synthesized in the table below.

Table 3.1: Synthesis of information and conclusions concerning services and functions of the Ramsar Secretariat

Issues for consideration	IUCN	UNEP
Functions	<p>IUCN concurs with UNEP in that the work of the Secretariat would remain directed by the Conference of the Contracting Parties.</p> <p>IUCN believes that under its administration, the Ramsar Secretariat will continue to be a more adaptive, nimble and cost-effective institution, well-equipped to strengthen wetland conservation and sustainable use in a rapidly changing world. It also holds that a move of the Ramsar Secretariat between now and 2020 would entail unnecessary bureaucratic upheaval during a time when all efforts should be focused on delivering conservation and wise use of ecosystem services.</p> <p>(See p 13 IUCN response June 2011: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_IUCN_submission.pdf)¹⁷ and IUCN comments to the 2009 consultant's report p 5 re Para 66 of the report: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/Koba_M_15_August_2011.pdf)¹⁸</p>	<p>The work of the Secretariat would remain directed by the Conference of the Contracting Parties. The Secretariat's powers, functions, rights and duties and legal personality at the international and national levels would be determined by the terms of the Ramsar treaty, the decisions of the Conference of Parties, the delegation of powers by the UNEP Executive Director to the Ramsar Executive Secretary and the relevant principles of international treaty law and international institutional law¹⁹. (See paragraph 22 UNEP additions Sep 2011 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/UNEP-Submission-Ramsar-to-Chair-AHWG-September-2011-FINAL.pdf)</p> <p>It is UNEP's firm view that under a cost-neutral scenario the Ramsar Secretariat will have similar or enhanced capacity, quality, services and facilities under UNEP hosting arrangements compared to the current administrative arrangements. (See paragraph 34 UNEP additions Sep 2011)</p>

¹⁶ See p 16 of the Report of the 43rd Standing Committee meeting (http://www.ramsar.org/cda/en/ramsar-documents-standing-sc43-report/main/ramsar/1-31-41%5E25486_4000_0).

¹⁷ IUCN submission in response to the letter of the Co-chair of 9 June 2011 and the Decision SC42-30 of the Ramsar Standing Committee (dated 20 June 2010) (See Ramsar web site: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_IUCN_submission.pdf). Hereinafter referred to as IUCN response June 2011.

¹⁸ IUCN's comments on the Report submitted to the Ramsar Convention Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform prepared by a consultant in November 2009, submitted 15 August 2011. See http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/Koba_M_15_August_2011.pdf. Hereinafter referred to as IUCN comments to the 2009 consultant's report.

Issues for consideration	IUCN	UNEP
<p>Services - access to technical scientific capacity and expertise</p>	<p>With it's on the ground presence in over 160 countries through its globally distributed Secretariat, Members and partners, IUCN can assist the Ramsar Secretariat in responding to the needs of its Contracting Parties. (See IUCN comments to the 2009 consultant's report p 5 re Para 56 of the report :http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/Koba_M_15_August_2011.pdf)</p> <p>The Ramsar Convention established the Scientific and Technical Review Panel (STRP) to provide a formal mechanism for delivery of scientific advice to the Convention. The STRP produces high quality guidance for the Contracting Partners and advice for the Secretariat. The current administrative arrangements ensure that top wetland scientists are represented and that STRP can operate with the minimum of bureaucracy. The lessons learned through IUCN's field activities are fed into the Ramsar STRP and used to provide guidance to Contracting Parties. In addition, Ramsar is able to call upon IUCN expertise from the Union's six scientific commissions which count over 12,000 representatives worldwide. These are the Species Survival Commission (SSC), World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA), Commission on Ecosystem Management (CEM), Commission on Environmental Economics and Social Policy (CEESP), Commission on Environmental Law (CEL) and Commission on Education and Communication (CEC).</p> <p>(See IUCN comments to the 2009 consultant's report p 3 re Para 29 of the report: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/Koba_M_15_August_2011.pdf) and p 12 IUCN response June 2011: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_IUCN_submission.pdf)</p> <p>IUCN, in the same submission²⁰ p 6, indicates that in addition to hosting the Ramsar Secretariat since its establishment in 1987, IUCN is the official advisory body on natural heritage to the World Heritage Convention, and provides scientific and technical advice to CBD and CITES, for example by</p>	<p>UNEP's set-up and institutional structure, including its regional offices with their regional legal officers and biodiversity focal points, and the expertise of the UNEP substantive divisions, UNEP collaborating centres and scientific advisory groups, will be at the disposition of the Ramsar Secretariat. It will also benefit from being able to be represented, through UNEP, in a variety of partnerships such as the collaborative Partnership on Forests and many other fora. The Convention would benefit from the distinct roles that UNEP plays apart from the administrative side of its multilateral environmental agreements, while furthering their causes. In addition, UNEP concentrates on issue-specific areas and the importance of identifying synergies and linkages between various multilateral environmental agreements, so as to facilitate greater coherence and collaboration with a view to achieving greater effectiveness in dealing with environmental issues. (See paragraphs E.1.c - E.1.d of UNEP's response Oct 2010 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/UNEP_Report-to-RamsarAHWG_cochairs_071010.pdf.)</p> <p>UNEP envisages that overall implementation of the Convention as elaborated in Goals 1, 2 and 4 of the Ramsar Strategic Plan 2009–2015 will benefit from an administrative arrangement under UNEP as UNEP's expertise, experience and capacity both at the global and regional levels will be readily available to the Ramsar Convention Secretariat. (See paragraph 10, UNEP additions Sep 2011 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/UNEP-Submission-Ramsar-to-Chair-AHWG-September-2011-FINAL.pdf and for further elaboration see paragraphs E.1.g.2, E.1.g.8, E.1.g.13 and E.1.g.18 of UNEP response Oct 2010 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/UNEP_Report-to-RamsarAHWG_cochairs_071010.pdf.)</p> <p>UNEP possesses excellent and up-to-date scientific expertise and adopts a science-based approach as the basis for all its operations. This is strongly underpinned by the work of the UNEP Chief Scientist and the Division of Early Warning and Assessment combined with UNEP's wide network of collaborating centres, scientific institutions and wider partners. Examples are the UNEP-World Conservation and</p>

¹⁹ Additions to the Consultant's Report of November 2009 prepared for the third meeting of the Ramsar Convention Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform submitted to the Chair of the Ramsar Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform (dated 12 September 2011). Hereinafter referred to as "UNEP additions Sep 2011". (See Ramsar web site: <http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/UNEP-Submission-Ramsar-to-Chair-AHWG-September-2011-FINAL.pdf>)

²⁰ See IUCN response June 2011: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_IUCN_submission.pdf

Issues for consideration	IUCN	UNEP
	<p>producing the Analyses of Proposals to Amend the CITES Appendices for each of the Conferences of the Parties. IUCN's knowledge tools such as the Red List Index have been adopted by the CBD as one of the indicators to measure progress towards the achievement of global biodiversity targets. IUCN underlines that it continues to be at the forefront of development and implementation of the international and national environmental law, and is a respected reference point for its science-based, impartial expertise.</p>	<p>Monitoring Centre (WCMC), the Global Resource Information Database (GRID), the information portals of UNEP and its scientific databases and inventories, as well as UNEP's work in the knowledge management area, in particular as it relates towards support of MEAs. UNEP publishes well-recognized high-quality scientific publications that include cutting-edge research, and is among others focusing on threats to ecosystems and their management, including wetlands. UNEP also provides summaries for policy-makers to translate scientific information into the policy arena, and to the broader public, in order to bring science to relevance outside the scientific community. Ramsar will be able to benefit directly from UNEP's growing expertise in this area, including the advisory capacity of the Chief Scientist, and relevant wetland status data might become easier available. Wetland observation systems might also be easier developed. (See E.1.g.2. of UNEP response Oct 2010 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/UNEP_Report-to-RamsarAHWG_cochairs_071010.pdf.)</p> <p>UNEP has longstanding experience in providing technical and capacity building support to MEA negotiators, in particular to those MEAs administered by UNEP, as part of its Programme of Work. Such support is likely to also include the Ramsar negotiators under a UNEP administered arrangement. Further, UNEP's integrated approach to environment and its dedication to link environment to related areas including poverty, food security, climate change and others, might benefit the implementation of the Ramsar Convention in its attempts to make wetlands part and parcel of decision-making processes in other areas, and to link and apply Ramsar mechanisms to other MEAs. UNEP's emphasis on the ecosystem approach is also fully supportive of Ramsar's objectives and Ramsar would be able to benefit directly from UNEP's work in that area through possibly joint activities at the national level. Also for invasive alien species, this subject is high on UNEP's agenda, in support of programmes and projects under the CMS and CBD, in GEF funded projects as well as in (scientific) publications such as in UNEP's African Environmental Outlook. Parties could be assisted in drawing up national inventories, and the foreseen increased collaboration with CBD to address in international regulation could be facilitated. (See paragraph 10, UNEP additions Sep 2011 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/UNEP-Submission-Ramsar-to-Chair-AHWG-September-2011-FINAL.pdf).</p> <p>As indicated by UNEP in its response of 7 October 2010 to the AHWG the regional initiatives in their current constellation as recognized in Resolution IX.7 on "Regional Initiatives in the framework of the Ramsar Convention", and as endorsed in that resolution and in later decisions, as well as the Guidelines for International</p>

Issues for consideration	IUCN	UNEP
		<p>Cooperation as included in Resolution VII.19, will not be affected by a move of Ramsar to UNEP. However, due to UNEP's strategic presence in the regions and the posting of Biodiversity Focal Points in the UNEP Regional Offices, UNEP believes that Ramsar will be able to better engage directly with existing initiatives, including monitoring of implementation and identify possible future regional initiatives. Furthermore the Biodiversity Focal Points can work directly with the Ramsar Regional Advisors, in support of their work and represent them and the interests of Ramsar in meetings in the regions, as appropriate. (See E.2.d.2. of UNEP response Oct 2010 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/UNEP_Report-to-RamsarAHWG_cochairs_071010.pdf.)</p>

3.2 Human resourcing of the Secretariat

3.2.1 Possibilities to retain the current staff

Ensuring the best possible arrangements and conditions for transfer of the Secretariat staff have been wide- shared concerns.

UNEP have repeatedly in its submission stressed and indicated that UNEP will undertake all that is possible to retain the current staff members, including negotiations with IUCN on transition possibilities. However, UNEP cannot guarantee that all Ramsar staff will automatically be granted a post through a UN recruitment process, since this would be contrary to UN rules and regulations, which operate from the principle of competitive recruitment.

UNEP have reported that there is no recent precedence of staff from external entities, such as Ramsar, having been offered a contract with the UN Secretariat without recruitment through the UN recruitment processes and staff selection system. It has however been suggested by UNEP that the Conference of the Parties may, however, request the UN Secretary General, through the UNEP Executive Director to seek an exceptional endorsement by the UN Secretary-General.

UNEP has also suggested that Parties may wish to consider other options related to the management of staff under a UNEP/Ramsar arrangement during a transitional period. These options anticipate that all new vacant and vacated posts will be advertised in line with UN rules and regulations²¹.

3.2.2 Overview of the key submissions made by IUCN and UNEP

The table below provides an overview of the key submissions made by IUCN and UNEP concerning human resourcing of the Secretariat. The Ramsar Secretary General's comments to UNEP's report of 7 October 2010, as well as UNEP's observations hereto have also been incorporated²².

The submissions have been grouped under the following sub-headings:

- Review the job classifications already undertaken by UNEP based on the positions and job descriptions of the Ramsar Secretariat
- Proposed classifications
- Staff status and provisions under the UN system regulations and IUCN respectively.

²¹ See paragraph 16 UNEP additions Sep 2011 <http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/UNEP-Submission-Ramsar-to-Chair-AHWG-September-2011-FINAL.pdf> and paragraph D.1.c and D.1.d of UNEP response Oct 2010 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/UNEP_Report-to-RamsarAHWG_cochairs_071010.pdf.

²² As indicated above, the Ramsar Secretary General submitted on 29 November 2010 a letter and annex to the Co-chair of the ADWG, in which the Secretary General conveyed the comments of the Ramsar Secretariat to UNEP's report of 7 October 2010. The letter and annex was also forwarded to the members of the Standing Committee prior to its 42nd meeting. Some members have requested UNEP to provide a reaction to the letter and annex. UNEP has noted that the observations and comments made in the letter from the Ramsar Executive Secretary in a number of areas are based on misunderstandings therefore producing misleading conclusions. Consequently UNEP submitted some additional observations in response to this communication, as requested by some Parties (June 2011), although UNEP does not consider it appropriate and preferable to directly engage in an argumentative discussion on comments of the Ramsar Secretariat. See paragraph 16 of UNEP's additional observations: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_UNEP_submission.pdf. UNEP's additional observations have been reflected in the table.

Table 3.2: Synthesis of information and conclusions human resourcing of the Ramsar Secretariat

Issues for consideration	IUCN	UNEP	Ramsar Secretariat
<p>Human resources - recruitment, salary and staff benefit</p>	<p>IUCN has reported that in accordance with the IUCN Global Human Resources Policy all recruitment in IUCN (which applies to Ramsar) is merit-based within the provisions of the IUCN Statutes and the principles of equal opportunity and non-discrimination that are a part of all our policies, procedures and practices.</p> <p>Furthermore on the basis of the agreement concluded in 1986 by and between the Swiss Federal Council and IUCN:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Non-Swiss IUCN staff members are exonerated from all direct federal, cantonal and communal taxes on salaries, income and indemnities paid to them by IUCN. - Non-Swiss staff members employed by IUCN are entitled to a work and residence permit in accordance with the law on foreigners (residence permit, B permit, or residence authorization, C permit). - IUCN staff members are covered by the Swiss social security system. <p>IUCN grants installation and repatriation allowances to compensate expatriates for the costs incurred in transferring from one country to another in order to take up an appointment, to return at the end of service, or for relocation to another country of assignment upon termination of the initial assignment.</p> <p>(See: Page 9 of IUCNs response June 2011: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_IUCN_submission.pdf)and page 4 of IUCNs additional comments dated 15 August to the 2009 Consultant's report http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/Koba_M_15_August_2011.pdf)</p>	<p>Concerning changes in staff status and provisions under the UN system regulations, UNEP has reports that staff members holding a contract with the UN-secretariat which includes UNEP are governed by the UN Staff Regulations (ST/SGB/2009/6) and the UN Provisional Staff Rules (ST/SGB/2010/6). Under the Charter of the United Nations, the General Assembly provides Staff Regulations which set out the broad principles of human resources policy for the staffing and administration of the Secretariat and the separately administered funds and programmes.</p> <p>UNEP has reiterated that under a UNEP/Ramsar arrangement the rights and entitlements in Switzerland for staff members holding a UNEP contract are governed by the host country agreement between the Swiss Government and the United Nations. UNEP, including the MEAs, are covered by this agreement. This agreement is attached to the UNEP's initial submission as Annex XIV. During the transitional period, staff members who will possibly be on loan from IUCN will remain to be governed by the IUCN staff rules.</p> <p>(See paragraph D.1.d of UNEP response Oct 2010 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/UNEP_Report-to-RamsarAHWG_cochairs_071010.pdf and UNEPs 2009 submission paragraphs D.5.1 and D.5.2 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar3-02a.pdf.)</p> <p>Concerning staff salary and benefit, UNEP has indicated that positions at the Professional (P) and Director (D) levels are considered internationally recruited. The base salary in accordance with the United Nations salary scale is complemented by a post adjustment component that varies by duty</p>	<p>-</p>

Issues for consideration	IUCN	UNEP	Ramsar Secretariat
		<p>station. It is subject to regular review, taking into account developments in the cost of living at the duty station and the exchange rate. The following entitlements are also included in the overall remuneration package: medical coverage, pension contribution, rental subsidy and, for staff members who are not nationals of the host country, education grant and home leave to the country of nationality every two years if Geneva is the duty station and once a year if Nairobi is the duty station. Professional staff members recruited from outside the duty station at the P and D levels are granted such entitlements as moving expenses, installation grant upon recruitment and separation grant upon separation. Positions at the General Service level are locally recruited. The salary component includes a pension contribution and medical coverage, and language allowance if the staff member so qualifies. The salary scales of General Service staff are subject to regular salary surveys in the host country. (See UNEPs 2009 submission http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar3-02a.pdf) Section D p 12 ff.)</p>	
Review the job classifications	-	<p>Following discussion with the Secretary General of Ramsar, UNEP has further reviewed the functions and duties of each of the posts contained in the Ramsar COP10 approved budget for the period 2009-2012. In UNEP's discussion with the Secretary General of Ramsar and in UNEP's review, particular focus has been attributed to: 1) The distribution of functions and responsibilities across the Secretariat; 2) Interactions between the post and external partners and actors as outlined in the approved job descriptions as well as possible future changes in these interactions; 3) Existing reporting lines; and 4) Supervisory responsibilities.</p>	-

Issues for consideration	IUCN	UNEP	Ramsar Secretariat
Proposed classifications	<p>IUCN finds that the UNEP proposed staffing represents a downgrading of the capacity of the Secretariat. IUCN holds that staffing costs for equivalent competence are generally lower than in the UN system. In IUCN's view therefore, the 'cost-neutral' scenario for a UN-administered Secretariat represents a downgrading of the capacity of the Secretariat. Not only would international staffing be diminished, but the translation of an M-grading at IUCN to a P4 classification in the UN is, in IUCN's view, incorrect. The competencies required for the Ramsar Senior Regional Advisors – as the Convention's main representatives in the regions tasked with liaison with Parties on key policy issues – have been underestimated. Likewise, the role of the Partnership Coordinator who is in charge of all fundraising and partnership activities at global level is underestimated by having its M-grade translated to a P4 in Cost Scenario 2 and P3 in Cost Scenario 3.</p> <p>(See: Page 10 of IUCN's response June 2011: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_IUCN_submission.pdf)</p>	<p>Based on the above review and compared to the classifications contained in UNEP's initial submission (Cost Scenario 1), UNEP proposes the following for consideration by the Contracting Parties:</p> <p>a) The positions of <u>Senior Regional Advisor</u> be classified at the P4 level. UNEP notes in particular that the Senior Regional Advisors have limited direct interaction with key actors at the ministerial and senior government level in the countries where Ramsar is active. Such interaction is mainly being performed by the Secretary General or by the Deputy Secretary General under the leadership of the Secretary General.</p> <p>b) The position of Partnership Officer is classified at the P4 level (Cost Scenario 2). UNEP notes in particular that the Partnership Officer is responsible for managing a large portfolio of external partners. In the event that the main responsibilities related to liaison with external partners are undertaken by the Secretary General, UNEP believes that the post of Partnership Officer could be classified at the P3 level (Cost Scenario 3).</p> <p>c) The positions of Assistant/Interns are upgraded to the P2 level, thereby significantly strengthening the capacity of the Secretariat. UNEP notes in particular that by establishing these positions as core posts within the Secretariat, more long-term, sustainable and technical capacity is created compared to the existing arrangement where the term of the Assistants/Interns is limited to an average of about 18 months.</p> <p>d) That the position of Administrative Officer is classified at the G7 level and reduced to a 50% position under Cost Scenario 2 and 3. With</p>	<p>The Ramsar Secretariat has provided the following comments to the classification proposed by UNEP. According to the Secretariat, Scenario 1 is the only scenario which comes close to equating to the current capacity and functioning of the Secretariat. There are other staffing scenarios, including the 2 proposed in the report, and whilst UNEP has discussed these with the Secretary General, it is UNEP's assessment that these are feasible. On page 7 UNEP asserts that the SRA positions should be classified at P4. The Secretariat would like to suggest that this might be worded as could, and asserts that this would be a capacity reducing scenario (possibly partly offset by the upgraded Assistants/Interns, but not at the upper technical and strategic end of the role of the SRA)</p> <p>Concerning the Documentation Officer - The 50% documentation officer is not a COP approved position, but it is CORE funded out of the staff costs budget. It is paid for out of the 1100 budget line in A.1.f, but NOT included in the UNEP scenarios. The result is that each of the UNEP scenarios omits this cost and function and reduces the existing capacity of the Secretariat.</p> <p>The 50% Admin Officer position reduction is also considered capacity reduction. This position does many important tasks in the Secretariat of which the management of the Internship programme is only a small part. The SG does not concur with UNEP's conclusions in D.2.a.3. He underlines that the Partnership Officer position is currently under recruitment. This position has not been fully classified by UNEP, but is included in Scenarios 1 and 2 at P4, and under scenario 3 at P3. The position has been offered to a current UN employee at the experienced P5 level. This highlights according to the Secretariat significant differences in perceived role of this and other posts. The Secretariat has furthermore submitted the following</p>

Issues for consideration	IUCN	UNEP	Ramsar Secretariat
		<p>the abolishment of the existing Assistant/Internship programme, a significant portion of the responsibilities of the Administrative Officer will disappear and a full staff post would not be required. With a possible increase in extra-budgetary resources for project implementation, the Parties may wish to consider adding project related functions to the G7 post and funding the other 50% of that part from extra-budgetary resources.</p> <p>Finally, UNEP also recommends that the positions of Finance Officer and Administrative Assistant are funded from the PSC and not from the Ramsar core budget. The classified level of these posts is recommended at the same in all three scenarios. <i>(See paragraph D.1.c and D.1.d of UNEP response Oct 2010 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/UNEP_Report-to-RamsarAHWG_cochairs_071010.pdf)</i></p> <p>In response to the comments provided by the Secretariat, UNEP in making reference to the information, calculations and considerations contained in UNEP's reports of August 2009 and October 2010, UNEP fully believes that based on the approved budget 2009-2012, a change in institutional host to UNEP will not weaken but enhance the human resource capacity of the Secretariat; and will not diminish the quality of finance, budget, human resources, IT and other services provided by the current host. <i>(See page 4 and paragraph 11 in UNEPs additions Sep 2011 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/UNEP-Submission-Ramsar-to-Chair-AHWG-September-2011-FINAL.pdf)</i></p>	<p>specific comments on understanding of current functions within the Secretariat:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Executive Assistant to the SG – The Ramsar post #6 is assessed in all scenarios as G5. This is significantly below its current IUCN P1 grading and salary, and is inconsistent with other IUCN P1 positions graded G7 and P2/P3. On detailed review of all gradings, and or the functions and roles of the Executive Assistant, it does appear that the Executive Assistant to the SG may have been misgraded in all scenarios on the assumption that the level of responsibilities and functioning would remain unchanged. 2. Senior Regional Advisors - In D.2.a.3 UNEP asserts that the SRAs have “limited interaction with key actors at the ministerial and senior government level” and that “the senior interaction is mainly being performed by the SG or DSG”, as a basis for suggesting the positions they previously classified as P5 could be classified as P4, and this would make them comparable to similar positions in other MEAs. Senior staff of the Secretariat refute the first assertion and have requested evidence to support the suggestion that other MEA's perform with P4s. They are of the strong opinion that a P4 classification would likely reduce the capacity of the Secretariat to service Contracting Parties in the manner to which they have become accustomed. 3. Intern Programme – There are benefits of changing the current intern programme and providing resource with permanent P2 positions. A JPO funded position however may introduce insecure funding and reduce the possibility of using these positions to build capacity in developing environments. The reinforcement of the technical capacity for the regions would be welcome. (See Section E and G of Annex 1 of the Ramsar Secretariat's comments of June 2011 to UNEP's response to the letter from the Co-Chairs http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_Secretariat_submission.pdf).

3.3 Visibility of Ramsar and the wetlands

Many parties consider that one of the key issues concerning the administrative reform is to increase the visibility of the Ramsar Convention. The importance of how best to raise the political standing of the Convention, e.g. with CBD and GEF, has been underlined as an important aspect²³.

Some contracting parties take the view that it would be important for the Secretariat to be hosted by UNEP in order to increase visibility of Ramsar and the wetlands and ensure better integration with international environmental governance processes²⁴. Others are of the opinion that the Secretariat works well under the current hosting arrangement with IUCN and cannot see what the problem is that needs to be solved by moving the Secretariat²⁵.

The submissions by IUCN and UNEP have been synthesised in the table below.

²³ See e.g. paragraph 18, 23, 26, 27 of the Report of the first meeting of the ADWG. The reports are available on the Ramsar web site under the documents concerning the Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform http://www.ramsar.org/cda/en/ramsar-documents-ad-hoc-group/main/ramsar/1-31-433_4000_0 under documents concerning each of the nine meetings.

²⁴ Most recently see Report of the 43rd Standing Committee meeting, inter alia, paragraph 66: http://www.ramsar.org/cda/en/ramsar-documents-standing-sc43-report/main/ramsar/1-31-41%5E25486_4000_0. See also Report of the 42rd Standing Committee meeting, paragraph 153: http://www.ramsar.org/cda/en/ramsar-documents-standing-sc42-rpt/main/ramsar/1-31-41%5E25158_4000_0.

²⁵ See Report of the 43rd Standing Committee meeting, inter alia, paragraph 68 and 71: http://www.ramsar.org/cda/en/ramsar-documents-standing-sc43-report/main/ramsar/1-31-41%5E25486_4000_0.

Table 3.3: Synthesis of information and conclusions concerning visibility of the Ramsar Convention and the wetlands.

Issues for consideration	IUCN	UNEP
<p>Visibility (through institutional integration?)</p>	<p>IUCN takes the view that the Ramsar Convention has flourished under current hosting arrangements, with 160 Contracting Parties and 1,933 listed Wetlands of International Importance covering an area of over 189 million hectares—the largest protected area network in the world, virtually the size of Mexico. The track record of the Convention demonstrates according to IUCN that administration of the Secretariat by IUCN is not a barrier to success or constraint on ambition. (Ex summary paragraph 2 (p 4) of IUCNs response June 2011: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_IUCN_submission.pdf).</p> <p>IUCN finds that there are several opportunities in particular within the IUCN project portfolio, through which the image, visibility and recognition of the Convention could be further enhanced and the recognition of wetlands as important assets for conservation and sustainable development could be further enhanced.</p> <p>IUCN draws the attention to its regional and national projects on river basin management - and proposes a number of specific initiatives whereby the visibility of the Ramsar Convention could be enhanced through collaboration with these projects. E.g. development of joint IUCN/Ramsar communications and coordination of policy dialogue with inter alia national governments and river basin organisations. (See p 1 IUCN 2009 Report - Facilitating the work of the Ramsar Convention and its Secretariat: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar3-03.pdf).</p>	<p>UNEP maintains that institutional integration into UNEP, and therefore the United Nations system, as recognized by all those global conventions adopted after the Ramsar Convention, will have various positive effects for the image, visibility and recognition of the Ramsar Convention and for wetlands as vital assets for conservation and sustainable development. As the environment programme of the United Nations, UNEP has the lead mandate within the United Nations system to deal with the environment and achieving coherence. The role of wetlands as related to biodiversity conservation, climate change mitigation and adaptation, desertification control, food security, human health, tourism, poverty reduction and other economic and social activities would be further acknowledged and the Convention's profile, nationally and internationally, would be raised. (See paragraph E.1.a of UNEPs response of October 2010 to the letters from the Co-chairs of the AHWG http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/UNEP_Report-to-RamsarAHWG_cochairs_071010.pdf and paragraph 2-3 UNEP additions Sep 2011 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/UNEP-Submission-Ramsar-to-Chair-AHWG-September-2011-FINAL.pdf) and UNEPs 2009 submission paragraphs B.1.1 – B1.7. http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar3-02a.pdf).</p> <p>UNEP further envisages that having UNEP as host organisation of the Secretariat would bring enhanced political importance of the Convention among policy and decision makers as well as the general public, combined with strengthened convening power, image, visibility and recognition of the Convention at the national, regional and global levels through association with the United Nations (See paragraph 7 of UNEPs additional observations June 2011: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_UNEP_submission.pdf).</p> <p>UNEP emphasises that whilst the Ramsar Convention already cooperates closely with the other biodiversity-related conventions, and IUCN also is active in a variety of relevant fora, there remains a substantial difference between being part of the United Nations, and thus an equal partner in every aspect, or only cooperating with the United Nations, and its agencies and programmes. For instance, integration into the United Nations system would ensure full participation in and attendance of United Nations-based negotiations, as appropriate, because status as a United Nations multilateral environmental agreement automatically facilitates</p>

Issues for consideration	IUCN	UNEP
		<p>access to international meetings and conferences. (See also UNEPs response of October 2010 to the letters from the Co-chairs of the AHWG, : http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/UNEP_Report-to-RamsarAHWG_cochairs_071010.pdf</p> <p>In addition to raising visibility at the international institutional level, UNEP considers that the Convention's visibility among the general public would also be enhanced by becoming part of the United Nations system. (See UNEP 2010 response paragraph. E.2.e.2 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/UNEP_Report-to-RamsarAHWG_cochairs_071010.pdf and paragraph 3 of UNEP additions to the 2009 Consultant's report: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/UNEP-Submission-Ramsar-to-Chair-AHWG-September-2011-FINAL.pdf.)</p> <p>It has furthermore been suggested by UNEP that the improved visibility, standing and impact on international policymaking and dialogue as part of the United Nations system could furthermore increase the Ramsar Secretariat's ability to affect national implementation processes and discourse. (See paragraph B.2a.4 of UNEP 2009 submission to the AHWG: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar3-02a.pdf.)</p>

3.4 Effect on the ground implementation (enhancing overall implementation)

It has been suggested that one important issue when considering the two hosting options for the Ramsar Secretariat is: Can it be reasonably argued that an inclusion of the Secretariat in the UNEP family will enhance the role of Ramsar Convention in the global biodiversity context, compared to the present IUCN arrangement²⁶?

Several contracting parties have reiterated, both in the AHWG and in the Standing Committee meetings, and as part of one of the key arguments for a strengthened implementation and impact of the convention at the national level, that the priority and importance accorded to wetlands at the national level will be significantly enhanced if the Convention is under the UN umbrella²⁷. Contracting parties have also frequently stated that one of the most important considerations, in the administrative reform debate, is enhanced implementation. These parties have said that they are convinced that the Convention will enhance its implementation and therefore its impact at the national level under a UNEP administered arrangement, due to the attachment to the UN system but also due to an anticipated increase in substantive cooperation and support from UNEP to the Ramsar Secretariat at the programmatic level.

Other contracting parties have questioned whether a UNEP hosted Secretariat would allow for more efficiency in the Secretariat's work or whether it would lead to more effective implementation of the Ramsar Convention by the Contracting Parties. Some of these parties have found that the current configuration has allowed, and in some cases favoured, the implementation of actions and programmes to fulfil the objectives of the Convention²⁸.

IUCN and UNEP, in commenting on the comparative analysis by the 2009 Consultant's report, have provided additional and updated information on how overall implementation of the Ramsar Convention could be enhanced by them as host for the Secretariat. A synthesis of their arguments as well as their earlier submissions on this matter is provided in the table below.

²⁶ Most recently during the 43rd Standing Committee meeting. See p 16 of the Report (http://www.ramsar.org/cda/en/ramsar-documents-standing-sc43-report/main/ramsar/1-31-41%5E25486_4000_0_)

²⁷ See AHWG Report of the 3rd meeting, paragraph 23, 27, 31,32 and 39 (See http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar3_rpt_final.pdf)

²⁸ See AHWG Report of the 6th meeting, paragraph 4, 9,11 (See http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar6_rpt.pdf)

Table 3.4: Synthesis of information and conclusions concerning effects on the ground implementation

Issues for consideration	IUCN	UNEP
<p>Effect on the ground implementation - General</p>	<p>IUCN underlines the extent to which the Ramsar Convention is ratified to date, by 160 countries in which 1,933 sites are recognized as Wetlands of International Importance, with many more in the process of being listed. IUCN stresses that it has been pleased to assist Ramsar through its wide network of regional and country offices and Members whose expertise and presence is available to the Ramsar Parties and Secretariat.</p> <p>IUCN emphasises that this expertise and partnership have often been used to advance the Convention's implementation at the national level. As an example, IUCN's country office in Vientiane played a key role in supporting Lao PDR's accession to the Ramsar Convention as the 160th contracting party in July 2010 and designation of the country's first two wetlands of international importance on the Ramsar List.</p> <p><i>(See p11 of IUCNs response June 2011: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_IUCN_submission.pdf).</i></p>	<p>UNEP finds that having UNEP as host organization of the Secretariat would enhance the impact of wetlands conservation at the national level, in particular, through enhanced political importance and increased public awareness (See <i>paragraph 7 UNEP additions observations, June 2011</i> http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_UNEP_submission.pdf)</p> <p>UNEP holds that the overall implementation of the Convention as elaborated in Goals 1, 2 and 4 of the Ramsar Strategic Plan 2009–2015 will benefit from an administrative arrangement under UNEP, as UNEP's expertise, experience and capacity both at the global and regional levels will be readily available to the Ramsar Convention Secretariat. In this context, UNEP also considers that the Ramsar Secretariat would benefit from the UNEP institutionalized framework for MEA implementation, as well as its long-standing experience and expertise in providing assistance to parties and secretariat on effective compliance with, enforcement and implementation of conventions.</p> <p><i>(See paragraph 7 UNEP additions Sep 2011 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/UNEP-Submission-Ramsar-to-Chair-AHWG-September-2011-FINAL.pdf), UNEP 2009 response B.2a para.2 ,3 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar3-02a.pdf and UNEP 2010 response Para E.2.e.1 to E.2.e.2 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/UNEP_Report-to-RamsarAHWG_cochairs_071010.pdf)</i></p>
<p>- Site designation, management planning & the site ecological character</p>	<p>IUCN collaborates with the Secretariat at a technical level as well as with Contracting Parties on demonstration of wetland and watershed management. For example, the IUCN Water and Nature Initiative has contributed to better management in Ramsar sites as diverse as the Azraq Oasis in Jordan, the Stung Treng site in Cambodia and the Okavango Delta in Botswana.</p> <p>IUCN regional and country offices implement this portfolio of wetland management projects.</p> <p>As Ramsar national administrative authorities seek more help and guidance in responding to multiple pressures to listed wetlands, especially from development, water resource degradation and climate change, IUCN—with its</p>	<p>The implementation activities regarding site designation, management planning, and the site ecological character that parties have to undertake in order to foster compliance (Goal 2 of the Ramsar Strategic Plan 2009-2015, 'Wetlands of International Importance'), are issues UNEP MEAs have come across as well and lessons can be shared. The pivotal role of wetlands managers in maintenance of the site ecological character through planning and management is an also an issue of technical assistance and capacity building, which is one of UNEP's main areas of expertise, also by offering the possibility of utilizing UNEP's presence in and knowledge of the regions, including the regional biodiversity focal points placed in the UNEP Regional Offices in support of the MEAs at the regional and national level.</p> <p>Parties' implementation of and compliance with the Convention and its</p>

Issues for consideration	IUCN	UNEP
	<p>on the ground presence in over 160 countries through its globally distributed Secretariat, Members and partners—can assist the Ramsar Secretariat in responding to the needs of its Contracting Parties.</p> <p>Under the present arrangements, Ramsar Advisory Missions are key actions that are taken to support Contracting Parties in the management of wetlands with concrete results on the ground.</p> <p><i>(See p11 of IUCNs response June 2011: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_IUCN_submission.pdf).</i></p>	<p>management at the national level might further benefit from being of equal (UN) parentage as other conventions, and be therefore taken more seriously in their work with national counterparts and donors, and have easier access within governmental bureaucracies. <i>(See paragraph 12 UNEP additions Sep 2011 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/UNEP-Submission-Ramsar-to-Chair-AHWG-September-2011-FINAL.pdf, and UNEP 2009 Responses Para B.2a.6 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar3-02a.pdf)</i></p> <p>Furthermore UNEP, in making reference to its intergovernmental convening power, which is often used for promoting and facilitating transboundary cooperation, envisages that the identification of shared wetlands and the development of collaborative mechanisms, including joint management authorities, will benefit herefrom. In particular UNEP's longstanding experience with transboundary riparian ecosystem would be of direct relevance for the further development of the convention regime. The work on wetland dependent migratory species will be facilitated by a closer cooperation with the UNEP administered Convention on Migratory Species and its agreements and memoranda of understanding. <i>(See UNEP 2010 response Para E.1.g.16 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/UNEP_Report-to-RamsarAHWG_cochairs_071010.pdf)</i></p>
- tools to promote implementation of & compliance with the Convention	<p>IUCN draws the attention to a recent Memorandum of Cooperation between the Ramsar Secretariat and the Convention's International Organisation Partners signed in May 2011, according to which IUCN and Ramsar are collaborating on a wide range of joint activities, to support the implementation of the Ramsar Strategic Plan 2009-2015, including: 1) support to Parties in identification of priority wetlands for Ramsar-site and protected area Designation; 2) application of 'Key Biodiversity Area' assessment to further development of national wetland inventories; 3) support to Parties in identification of capacity development priorities for increasing site management effectiveness; 4) strengthening technical assistance to Parties on wetland policy and law-making by the IUCN Environmental Law Centre; 5) application of results from river basin demonstration projects to support national planning of wetland management by Parties and integration of wetlands into poverty reduction strategies; 6) integration of wetland conservation in national implementation guidance for Integrated Water Resources Management; 7) assistance to Parties in preparation of invasive alien species to Ramsar sites and national inventories of invasive alien species; 8) advocacy of the role of</p>	<p>UNEP underlines the need for reviews to determine effectiveness of management arrangements, as well as database development and implementation and monitoring status of the environment. All these elements, including governance aspects and the use of indicators are part of a wide array of tools to promote implementation of and compliance with the Convention. UNEP envisages that the required actions could be undertaken in collaboration with UNEP's collaborating centres and more jointly with other MEAs. UNEP's expertise in database development, knowledge management, assessment and monitoring would be more easy accessible for the Ramsar Convention and linkages at the national level could be more easily established, as well as strengthened coordination at the national level among biodiversity focal points. As for management of other internationally important wetlands, the experiences learnt under other MEAs are of great importance for wetlands that are not (yet) under Ramsar. In such cases, management of these areas to maintain their ecological character will benefit from Ramsar's direction, including areas that might fall under UNEP MEAs. <i>See paragraph 13 UNEP additions Sep 2011 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/UNEP-Submission-Ramsar-to-Chair-AHWG-September-2011-FINAL.pdf.</i></p>

Issues for consideration	IUCN	UNEP
	<p>wetlands in climate change adaptation and support to Parties on preparation of Strategies for climate resilience 9) support for consensus building and institutional development for improved transboundary cooperation in river and wetland management.</p> <p><i>(See p 1 of IUCN's comments on the 2009 Consultant's Report (August 2011): http://www.ramsar.org/cda/en/ramsar-documents-ad-hoc-group/main/ramsar/1-31-433_4000_0)</i></p>	<p>UNEP finds that parties will benefit from the initiatives that are under way under UNEP and its MEAs on harmonization of reporting. It underlines that such efforts will increase the Convention bodies' effectiveness. National focal points will also benefit from increased contact with other MEA focal points at the national level.</p> <p><i>See paragraph 17 UNEP additions Sep 2011 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/UNEP-Submission-Ramsar-to-Chair-AHWG-September-2011-FINAL.pdf.)</i></p>

3.5 Cooperation between the Ramsar Convention and other Conventions and organisations

The ability of the Ramsar Convention to successfully cooperate equally with other biodiversity-related conventions and organisations in order to contribute to the overall goals on the global biodiversity agenda is deemed as one of the important issues to be considered when analysing the two options for institutional hosting of the Ramsar Secretariat.

Some contracting parties have on several occasions stated both in the AHWG and in the Standing Committee meetings that administration of the Ramsar Convention by UNEP would facilitate closer cooperation with other UN conventions and strengthen the Convention's integration into global environmental structures and process²⁹. Other parties have underlined that the Ramsar Convention works extensively with other MEA under the current IUCN arrangement and sought clarification on what the specific additional opportunities for cooperation would be³⁰.

The table below provides an overview of the key submissions made by IUCN and UNEP concerning cooperation between the Ramsar Convention, other Conventions and organisations under the two hosting options. The Ramsar Secretary General comments of the Ramsar Secretariat to UNEP's report of 7 October 2010, as well as UNEP's observations hereto have also been incorporated³¹.

The information concerning cooperation between the Ramsar Convention other MEAs and organisations has been grouped under the following sub-headings:

- Cooperation other MEAs and International Government Organisations (IGOs)
- Cooperation and/or partnership with International Organisation Partners (IOPs)
- Specifically concerning business partnerships

²⁹ See inter alia Report of the 3rd meeting of the AHWG paragraphs 20, 23, 32, 33 and 36: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar3_rpt_final.pdf and Report of the 6th Meeting of the AHWG, paragraphs http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar6_rpt.pdf. See also paragraph 66 of the Report of the 43 Standing Committee Meeting: http://www.ramsar.org/cda/en/ramsar-documents-standing-sc43-report/main/ramsar/1-31-41%5E25486_4000_0_.

³⁰ See inter alia Report of the 3rd meeting of the AHWG paragraphs 24 and 91 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar3_rpt_final.pdf and Report of the 6th Meeting of the AHWG, paragraphs 3, 4 and 30 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar6_rpt.pdf.

³¹ As indicated above, the Ramsar Secretary General submitted on 29 November 2010 a letter and annex to the Co-chair of the ADWG, in which the Secretary General conveyed the comments of the Ramsar Secretariat to UNEP's report of 7 October 2010. The letter and annex was also forwarded to the members of the Standing Committee prior to its 42nd meeting. Some members have requested UNEP to provide a reaction to the letter and annex. UNEP has noted that the observations and comments made in the letter from the Ramsar Executive Secretary in a number of areas are based on misunderstandings therefore producing misleading conclusions. Consequently UNEP submitted some additional observations in response to this communication, as requested by some Parties (June 2011), although UNEP does not consider it appropriate and preferable to directly engage in an argumentative discussion on comments of the Ramsar Secretariat. See paragraph 8 – 10 of UNEP's additional observations: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_UNEP_submission.pdf. UNEP's additional observations have been reflected in the table.

Table 3.5: Synthesis of information and conclusions concerning synergies between the Ramsar Convention and other Conventions and organisations

Issues for consideration	IUCN	UNEP	Ramsar Secretariat
Cooperation other MEAs and IGOs	<p>IUCN acknowledges the need for and actively promotes synergies among MEAs and institutions. At the same time, it is IUCN's firm view that enhanced collaboration among biodiversity-related conventions, which holds the key for greater coherence in the international environmental governance system overall, can be achieved regardless of administrative arrangements. IUCN considers that enhanced collaboration is already well underway. It underlines that Ramsar already has full membership in UN coordination mechanisms, including the Biodiversity Liaison Group and the Environment Management Group. The Ramsar Secretariat has also developed strong partnership activities with many UN entities including UN-WATER, UNESCO, UN Food and Agriculture Organization, UNEP, UN-HABITAT, the World Health Organization, the UN World Tourism Organization and the World Meteorological Organization, as well as with multilateral agencies such as the World Bank and the Global Environment Facility.</p> <p>IUCN holds that being administered by IUCN in no way limits Ramsar's ability to engage in formal and informal manner with the other environmental conventions and relevant organizations in the UN system and beyond. IUCN itself participates in these processes and has, for example, recently been requested by the four biodiversity-related conventions, including Ramsar, to help them map their activities in support of the CBD Strategic Plan.</p> <p>IUCN considers that the Ramsar Convention currently has good cooperation and collaboration with the other MEAs, particularly those related to biodiversity. In referring to the joint work plan that Ramsar has with the CBD and CMS, IUCN underlines that IUCN administration was no barrier to</p>	<p>UNEP while noting that the Ramsar Convention already cooperates closely with the other biodiversity-related conventions, and IUCN is also active in a variety of relevant fora, finds that, there remains a substantial difference between being part of the United Nations, and thus an equal partner in every aspect, or only cooperating with the United Nations, and its agencies and programmes, as has often been commented upon by delegates and others in the framework of the AHWG and its preceding discussions. For instance, integration into the United Nations system would ensure full participation in and attendance of United Nations-based negotiations, as appropriate, because status as a United Nations multilateral environmental agreement automatically facilitates access to international meetings and conferences. (See paragraph 3 UNEP additions Sep 2011 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/UNEP-Submission-Ramsar-to-Chair-AHWG-September-2011-FINAL.pdf).</p> <p>Enhanced cooperation between related conventions could also, according to UNEP, promote complementarity and mitigate the problem of institutional and legal fragmentation in international environmental law. Better collaboration could contribute to preventing conflicts of norms and duplication of work. (See paragraph B.1.10. of UNEP's 2009 submission: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar3-02a.pdf)</p> <p>Furthermore, UNEP notes that a large number of countries have repeatedly reiterated, both in the AHWG and in the Standing Committee meetings, and as part of one of the key arguments for a strengthened implementation and impact of the convention at the national level, that the priority and importance accorded to wetlands at the national level will be significantly enhanced if the Convention is under the UN</p>	<p>The Secretary General (SG) of the Ramsar Secretariat is of the opinion the benefits of a change in the hosting arrangements from IUCN to UNEP are potential only. The SG expresses the view that there is no guarantee that they will materialise, when analysed under the proposed cost neutral or reduced budget scenario³². He further notes that the Ramsar Secretariat is already participating in the work of, and contributing to, several UN-led processes, some of them under the umbrella of the Environmental Management Group (EMG) chaired by UNEP's Executive Director. The level of the Secretariats contribution is at present variable and depends entirely on, what is perceived by the SG, as the constrained capacity of the Secretariat. Therefore, the SG finds, that within the UN, it would be challenging for the Ramsar Secretariat to respond to requests made by UN agencies with the current capacity of the Secretariat. He advocates that the Secretariat would need additional human resources to take full advantage of the opportunities. (See p 2, paragraphs 2 – 3 of the letter from the Ramsar SG to the Co-chairs of the AHWG November 2010: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_Secretariat_submission.pdf).</p>

³² For further information concerning the proposed budget scenarios for UNEPs administration of the Ramsar Secretariat, see below sub-section 3.7.

Issues for consideration	IUCN	UNEP	Ramsar Secretariat
	<p>the establishment of these work programmes and is no barrier to their implementation.</p> <p>Similarly, UN administration is not a prerequisite for access to UNEP collaborating centres, such as the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) or Global Resource Information Database (GRID). IUCN stresses that IUCN's own Freshwater Biodiversity Unit is hosted by WCMC and itself collaborates on a daily basis with WCMC, all while collaborating productively with the Ramsar Secretariat.</p> <p>IUCN considers that if there are current weaknesses in collaboration between UNEP and the Ramsar Secretariat, these can be readily addressed through closer cooperation. IUCN finds that IUCN administration provides no barrier to partnership with UNEP.</p> <p><i>(See p 6 – 7, IUCN response June 2011</i> http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_IUCN_submission.pdf <i>and IUCN comments to the 2009 consultant's report p 3 re Para 23-25 of the report:</i> http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/Koba_M_15_August_2011.pdf)</p>	<p>umbrella. Countries have also repeatedly stated that their most important consideration in this debate is enhanced implementation. These countries have said that they are convinced that the Convention will enhance its implementation and therefore its impact at the national level under a UNEP administered arrangement, due to the attachment to the UN system but also due to an anticipated increase in substantive cooperation and support from UNEP to the Ramsar Secretariat at the programmatic level. A UNEP administrative arrangement for Ramsar would not only enhance integration with the other biodiversity related conventions and organizations, but also reach out to the wider UN-family. As the environment programme of the United Nations, UNEP reiterates that, it has a central role in the United Nations system in dealing with the environment and achieving coherence, through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Its membership of the United Nations Chief Executives Board chaired by the UN Secretary-General; (b) Its membership of the United Nations Development Group; (c) Chairing the Environmental Management Group and hosting its secretariat; (d) Participating in the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction and the Interagency Standing Committee; (e) Provision of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel Secretariat, an advisory body to the Global Environment Facility; (f) Supporting United Nations country teams in the common country programming and implementation processes; (g) Partnering with United Nations agencies and international institutions on priority issues, such as with the United Nations Development Programme in the Poverty and Environment Facility. <i>(See paragraph 3- 5 UNEP additions Sep 2011</i> http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/UNEP-Submission-Ramsar-to-Chair-AHWG-September-2011-FINAL.pdf, ; <i>paragraph 7 UNEP additional observations June 2011:</i> 	

Issues for consideration	IUCN	UNEP	Ramsar Secretariat
		<p>http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_UNEP_submission.pdf and paragraphs B.1.10 – B.1.17 and paragraphs B.2.a.4 of UNEP's 2009 submission: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar3-02a.pdf. as well as paragraph E.1.b of UNEP's October 2010 response to the Co-chairs of AHWG: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/UNEP_Report-to-RamsarAHWG_cochairs_071010.pdf</p> <p>Specifically concerning partnership with IGOs, UNEP has noted that the additional partnerships envisaged with entities in the UN system such as WHO, ITTO etc. will most certainly be easier to be achieved by joining the system of UN administered conventions (See paragraph E.1g.12 of UNEP's October 2010 response to the Co-chairs of AHWG: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/UNEP_Report-to-RamsarAHWG_cochairs_071010.pdf)</p>	
Cooperation /partnership with IOP	<p>IUCN draws the attention to the importance of cooperation with International Organisation Partners (IOPs). The IOPs of Ramsar engage actively in supporting implementation of the Convention. They provide guidance and advisory services to Contracting Parties, work jointly with Parties on demonstrations of wetland restoration and management, contribute to the Convention's Strategic Plan and provide their expertise on the Scientific and Technical Review Panel. IUCN underlines that none of the UN-administered MEAs have such arrangements in place. Each of the IOPs – namely Wetlands International, WWF, BirdLife International, the International Water Management Institute and IUCN – brings its own network of regional and national offices, collaborating institutions and member organisations. Collectively, this provides Ramsar with a comprehensive and global network of relevant experience, knowledge and expertise. The Secretariat, as well the Contracting Parties, regularly call upon this network and put it to active use in for example site assessments, regional initiatives, communications and joint knowledge products. Internal networks offered under UN</p>	<p>Concerning Ramsar's cooperation with its IOPs, UNEP stresses that it will not be negatively affected or have to undergo major changes. The relationship with the current IOPs can be recognized and maintained, especially as the organizations are already accredited to UNEP and/or UNEP MEAs. Joint activities can also include other relevant organizations working closely with UNEP. Finding other partners for high priority issues would benefit from the Convention being administered by UNEP. The UNEP scenario would also facilitate a closer working arrangement with the "intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services" (IPBES), an interface between the scientific community and policymakers that aims at building capacity for and strengthening the use of science in policymaking. This in its turn will strengthen the Ramsar Scientific and Technical Review Panel in order to assist parties based on timely, accurate, credible, relevant and consistent data and information. UNEP convened its first plenary meeting from 3-7 October 2011 in Nairobi. (See paragraph 20 UNEP additions Sep 2011 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/UNEP-Submission-Ramsar-to-</p>	-

Issues for consideration	IUCN	UNEP	Ramsar Secretariat
	<p>administration are not equivalent and provide no parallel to the IOP network available to Ramsar under the current administrative arrangements. (See page 11 last paragraph ff of IUCN response June 2011 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_IUCN_submission.pdf)</p>	<p>Chair-AHWG-September-2011-FINAL.pdf.</p>	
Specifically concerning business partnerships	<p>IUCN believes that implementing the Ramsar Convention and reversing the loss and degradation of wetlands worldwide is more successful when it is done in partnership between governments, NGOs, the scientific community and the private sector. (See paragraph 3, page 12, IUCN response June 2011 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_IUCN_submission.pdf)</p>	<p>UNEP envisages that cooperation between the Ramsar Secretariat and the private sector will remain as today, and could increase further to the benefit of the Convention as companies, in general, see it as a strong incentive to be able to be associated with the United Nations, and UNEP in particular. The 2009 “Guidelines on Cooperation between the United Nations and the Business Community” provide ample opportunity for working with the private sector, engaging them in wetlands management, and accepting funding from the business community. It is noteworthy that UNEP has very good experience in the private sector taking over suggested principles and approaches, such as in the banking and tourism sectors. The existing and foreseen partnership possibilities, including with the private sector, would be entirely feasible. (See paragraph 11 of UNEP’s additional comments to the 2009 Consultant’s report: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/UNEP-Submission-Ramsar-to-Chair-AHWG-September-2011-FINAL.pdf)</p> <p>UNEP has made the following observations, in response to statements and remarks made during the 42nd meeting of the Standing Committee. The Ramsar Partnership Coordinator stated that, while referring to potential business partnerships, there would be less flexibility under UNEP, and that some of her suggestions would not be possible in case Ramsar would be administered by UNEP. UNEP disputes this assertion. The existing and foreseen partnership possibilities, including with the private sector, would be entirely feasible. As elaborated in UNEP’s submissions, and after taking careful note of the contents of Doc. SC42-20,</p>	<p>During the 42nd Meeting of the Standing Committee, the Ramsar Partnership Coordinator provided a presentation on strategic fundraising and partnerships programme. A Contracting Party asked to what extent these ideas still would be admissible, if the Secretariat were to move to UNEP. The Coordinator responded that, “historically, there would be less flexibility under UNEP given the UN structures, but it is more a different way of working than a bad one. It’s true that some of her suggestions would not be possible under UNEP.” (See paragraph 182 – 184 of the Report of SC-42: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/sc/42/sc42-report-final.pdf).</p>

Issues for consideration	IUCN	UNEP	Ramsar Secretariat
		<p>one may even foresee that the current over-dependence upon one private sector donor, as noted in Decision 42-12, could be better addressed with the Secretariat being part of the UN system, since in UNEP's experience this may often act as an incentive for (business) partnerships. (See paragraph 13- 15, UNEP's additional observations June 2011: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_UNEP_submission.pdf).</p>	

3.6 Access to funding

Access to funding is seen as one of the main issue concerning the institutional hosting for the Ramsar Secretariat in the context of the Ad Hoc Working Group (AHWG) on Administrative Reform.

IUCN was asked by the letter from the Co-chairs of the AHWG how IUCN could assist the Secretariat and Contracting Parties to the Convention in gaining greater access to funds³³.

Contracting parties have been seeking clarification from UNEP on what the added benefits of a UNEP administrated Convention with regard to access to funding vis-à-vis the current situation, with Ramsar being administrated by IUCN³⁴.

The submissions by IUCN and UNEP have been synthesised in the table below, together with the Ramsar Secretary General comments of the Ramsar Secretariat to UNEP's report of 7 October 2010. The information concerning access to funding has been grouped under the following sub-headings:

- General observations/findings
- Joint resource mobilization
- Voluntary contributions

³³ See question B.3 of Annex 1 to the letter dated 02 April 2009 to IUCN from the Co-chairs of the AHWG http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/IUCN_2-4-2009.pdf.

³⁴ See list of issues identified by the AHWG at its 6th meeting to be addressed by UNEP (question 6 under letter E): http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar6_rpt_annex.pdf.

Table 3.6: Synthesis of information and conclusions concerning access to funding

Issues for consideration	IUCN	UNEP	Ramsar Secretariat
<p>General on enhancing funding</p>	<p>IUCN in response to the question from the Co-chairs on how IUCN could assist the Secretariat and Contracting Parties to the Convention in gaining greater access to funds, made reference to the joint projects being undertaken with IOPs and private sector, in particular the projects undertaken with the Danone Group (See p 2 under section B.3 of IUCNs response July 2009: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar3-03.pdf).</p> <p>A Strategic Framework for Ramsar Partnerships is being drawn up and will be presented to COP-11. It provides the strategic context for charting out the Secretariat's future approaches in a consistent and coherent way, ensuring that partnerships and collaborative relationships contribute to and enhance the ultimate mission of the Convention. It is designed to provide the means for enabling partnerships that would help to implement the Strategic Plan and other decisions of the Convention. On the basis of the framework, a strategy will be developed for partnerships and resource mobilization work.</p> <p>IUCN reiterated the importance of partnership for funding for implementation of the Convention requirements and makes reference to a recent example of a successful partnership between Ramsar, IUCN and the Danone Group, a methodology on "Afforestation and reforestation of degraded tidal forest habitats" has been developed and submitted to the Clean Development Mechanism of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). This new methodology has just been approved and certified by the UNFCCC, opening opportunities for the private sector to invest in wetland management and restoration to mitigate climate</p>	<p>UNEP advocates that having UNEP as host organization of the Secretariat would bring enhanced funding for the implementation of the Convention anticipated through increased national priority setting and integration in national development plans and strategies including thorough enhanced funding possibilities through UNFIP, UNDA and the MDGs; possible access to sources of funding exclusively earmarked for UN organizations. (See paragraph 7 of UNEPs additions observations June 2011: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_UNEP_submission.pdf</p> <p>As further elaborated by UNEP, in its earlier submissions, it can be assumed that Ramsar, under a UNEP/Ramsar scenario, will continue to have access to minimum the same funding as today, including assessed contribution, voluntary contributions - as well as financial support from the private sector. In addition, Ramsar would be able to use the services of the UNEP Resource Mobilization Section, including its outposted staff at the UNEP Regional Office for Europe in Geneva and Brussels taking into consideration that Ramsar currently has no post dedicated to resource mobilization. It could also be anticipated that Ramsar will receive financial support from UNEP towards implementing activities in support of the Programme of Work of Ramsar and UNEP, as well as in-kind support such as legal services, administrative support services, IT services and public information services. (See paragraph 7 of UNEPs June 2010 response: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/UNEP_Report-to-RamsarAHWG_cochairs_071010.pdf)</p> <p>As indicated in sub-section 3.7, cooperation between the Ramsar Secretariat and the private sector will remain as today, and could increase further to the benefit of the Convention as companies, in general, see it as a strong incentive to be able to</p>	<p>While acknowledging that it is a matter for the Contracting Parties to evaluate and conclude upon, the Secretary General (SG) of the Ramsar Secretariat expresses the view that the Secretariat has not seen definite evidence of enhanced financial mechanisms that a change in host would present. (See p 3, paragraph 1 of the letter from the Ramsar SG to the Co-chairs of the AHWG November 2010: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_Secretariat_submission.pdf). However this position is further substantiated in the submission.</p>

Issues for consideration	IUCN	UNEP	Ramsar Secretariat
	<p>change and receive carbon credits. <i>(See P 12 paragraph 3, IUCN's June 2011 submission: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_IUCN_submission.pdf)</i></p>	<p>be associated with the United Nations, and UNEP in particular.</p>	
<p>Joint resource mobilisation</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>UNEP refers to the joint resource mobilization exercises for example for biodiversity-related activities, including under the UNEP MEAs which are successfully being undertaken. It envisages that new and additional financial resources will be explored, including funds earmarked for UN organizations and entities. A more transparent and efficient use of administrative and financial resources might occur through enhanced cooperation and coordination among the biodiversity related MEAs. <i>See paragraph 16 UNEP additions Sep 2011</i> http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/UNEP-Submission-Ramsar-to-Chair-AHWG-September-2011-FINAL.pdf.)</p>	
<p>Capacity building and cooperation projects (Voluntary contributions)</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>UNEP envisages that by being a UNEP administered convention, Ramsar will benefit from the resource mobilization capacity of UNEP, and its presence in the regions. UNEP has positive experience in working closely with the biodiversity conventions as well as chemicals and wastes related conventions towards successful capacity building. In addition, the work of the MEAs are normally raised during UNEP's annual bilateral consultations, and those consultations are used as an avenue for UNEP to promote the work of the conventions under its administration, as well as advocate for additional financing resources towards the implementation of the UNEP Programme of Work, including those activities that complement the POWs of the MEAs. Under a UNEP administration there will be an increased opportunity for securing additional funding for capacity building and cooperation projects being implemented by the Ramsar Secretariat, and an avenue of creating further coordination between the PoW of Ramsar and UNEP in their implementation at the national level. <i>(See paragraph E.2.a of UNEP response Oct 2010 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/UNEP_Report-to-RamsarAHWG_cochairs_071010.pdf.)</i></p>	

Issues for consideration	IUCN	UNEP	Ramsar Secretariat
		<p>Furthermore, under a UNEP administered scenario, the current project approval procedures and process under the Ramsar Convention will not be affected. The UNEP programme and project approval procedures and process will not apply to Ramsar, just as this is the case with the other UNEP conventions; thus it remains exclusively within the realm of the Ramsar. The same applies to decisions of financing for Ramsar projects. Those decisions rest entirely with the Ramsar Conference of the Parties and with the Ramsar Secretary General based on the COP approved Programme of Work. Under a UNEP/Ramsar scenario the use of financial resources will be undertaken in line with UN financial rules and regulations. These rules are similar to those currently used by IUCN/Ramsar. (See paragraph E.2.b.1 and 2 of UNEP response Oct 2010 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/UNEP_Report-to-RamsarAHWG_cochairs_071010.pdf.)</p>	

3.7 Costs of the operation of the Secretariat under the two options - one off and on-going

Cost implications of a possible change in institutional host for the Ramsar Convention Secretariat from an IUCN host arrangement (IUCN/Ramsar) to a UNEP host arrangement (UNEP/Ramsar), have been extensively discussed during the AHWG meetings. Many contracting parties were seeking clarification on transition costs. Others requested budget scenarios for further reducing the costs of a UNEP administrated Ramsar Secretariat³⁵. Consequently the 6th meeting of the AHWG (May 2010) drew up a list of issues to be addressed by UNEP. Several of these concerned the cost implications of possible change in institutional host for the Ramsar Convention Secretariat from an IUCN host arrangement (IUCN/Ramsar) to a UNEP host arrangement (UNEP/Ramsar).

The three scenarios presented by UNEP in its response of 7 October 2010 to the AHWG³⁶ are outlined below in section 3.7.1. UNEP's additional observations submitted 20 June 2011³⁷ providing, inter alia a response to the letter of the Ramsar Secretary General concerning administrative services, programme support costs and transition costs are synthesized in the table in section 3.7.2 together with relevant information provided by the Ramsar Secretariat/Ramsar Secretary General³⁸ and IUCN³⁹. The information concerning costing has been grouped under the following sub-headings:

- Overall findings
- Administrative services and cost comparison
- Transitional costs.

Questions from parties and answers by UNEP addressed during the subsequent 7th meeting of the AHWG are reflected in section 3.7.3.

³⁵ See inter alia Report of the 3rd meeting of ADWG, paragraph 42 – 86, http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar3_rpt_final.pdf, Report of the 4th meeting of ADWG, paragraph 6 -20 and paragraph 104 ff. for transitions cost, (http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar4_rpt_final2.pdf) and Report of the 6th meeting of ADWG, (http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar6_rpt.pdf) and (http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar6_rpt_annex.pdf) for the draft list of issues to be addressed by UNEP. As indicated in this report p. 4, UNEP wishes to encourage the members of the Ad Hoc Working Group not to refer to the budget, finance and staff figures contained in the documents previously submitted by UNEP and possibly also by Ramsar and the consultant to the Ad Hoc Working Group, as they may present information that is not entirely accurate.

³⁶ See Review of the possible change in institutional host for the Ramsar Secretariat UNEP's Response to the letter from the Co-chairs the Ramsar Convention Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform (dated 22 July 2010) including its three annexes (http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/UNEP_Report-to-RamsarAHWG_cochairs_071010.pdf). Hereinafter referred to as UNEP response Oct 2010.

³⁷ See UNEP's additional Observations addressed to members of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform on Review of the possible change in institutional host for the Ramsar Secretariat UNEP's Response to the letter from the Co-chairs the (See: <http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/UNEP-Submission-Ramsar-to-Chair-AHWG-September-2011-FINAL.pdf>). Hereinafter referred to as UNEP additional observations June 2011.

³⁸ See Ramsar Secretariat's comments to UNEP's response to the letter from the Co-Chairs of the Ramsar Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform dated 22 July 2010 (See: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_Secretariat_submission.pdf).

³⁹ See IUCN submission in response to the letter of the Co-chair of 9 June 2011 and the Decision SC42-30 of the Ramsar Standing Committee (20 June 2010) (See: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_IUCN_submission.pdf). Hereinafter referred to as IUCN response June 2011.

3.7.1 Specifically about the three scenarios presented by UNEP

The table below provides an overview of the total costs under a UNEP/Ramsar arrangement compared to the current approved Ramsar budget for the year 2011 as well as the specific assumptions made under each scenario.

Table 3.7.1 Overview of the three budget scenarios for a UNEP administrated Ramsar Secretariat presented by UNEP in its October 2010 response to the Co-chairs of the AHWG⁴⁰

UNEP Scenario 1 – Based on UNEP’s initial submission	UNEP Scenario 2 – Cost-neutral Scenario	Scenario 3 – Reduced budget Scenario (5%)
<p>Under this scenario the total costs under a UNEP/Ramsar arrangement is estimated at <u>USD 5,596 million which is 11% higher than the current approved Ramsar budget for the year 2011</u>. This scenario envisages that 16 international staff and 4 local level staff are funded under the Ramsar core budget.</p> <p>In addition to the general assumptions, this scenario makes the following specific assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the initial job classification as contained in UNEP’s initial submission and undertaken by UNEP, in consultation with UNON/HRMS, of 20 staff positions (including 16 international positions and 4 local level positions/general service) is maintained; • That the four Assistants/Interns will be upgraded to full-fledged international staff positions at the P2 level (Associate Programme Officers); • That no critical review of the structure of the Ramsar Secretariat and the functions and levels of each position currently funded under the core budget has been undertaken by UNEP; • That the administrative and finance staff (1 professional and 2 general service positions) will continue to be paid under the Ramsar core budget; • That Ramsar will pay a 13% Programme Support Cost (PSC) to UNEP for administrative services, in line with relevant and applicable UN Rules and Regulations, and that only a small percentage of these PSC is used for the Ramsar secretariat staffing. <p>(See paragraph A.1.b.1. - A.1.b.6. of UNEP response Oct 2010 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/UNEP_Report-to-RamsarAHWG_cochairs_071010.pdf.)</p>	<p>Under this scenario the total costs under a UNEP/Ramsar arrangement is estimated <u>at USD 5,022 million which is cost neutral compared to the current approved Ramsar budget for 2011</u> and additional costs for interns. This scenario envisages that 15 international staff and 2,5 local level staff are funded under the Ramsar core budget.</p> <p>In addition to the general assumptions, this scenario makes the following specific assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That a critical review has been undertaken of the structure of the Ramsar Secretariat and the current functions of each approved position, in line with UN rules and regulations and in comparison with the structure, functions and responsibilities of MEAs of a similar size. UNEP assesses that the Senior Regional Advisor positions should be classified at the P4 level compared to the P5 level under scenario 1; • That the position of Finance Officer and Administrative Assistant will be covered by the 13% PSC; • That the four Assistants/Interns will be upgraded to full-fledged international staff positions at the P2 level (Associate Programme Officers); • That the Administrative Officer position (at general service level, according to UN classification) will be reduced to 50% under the core budget, noting that significant parts of the functions of this post relate to the management of the Assistant/Internship Programme and to activities, which would be 	<p>Under this scenario the total costs under a UNEP/Ramsar arrangement is estimated at <u>USD 4,804 million which is 5% below the current approved Ramsar budget for 2011</u>. This scenario envisages that 14 international staff and 2,5 local level staff are funded under the Ramsar core budget.</p> <p>In addition to the general assumptions and the specific assumptions made under Scenario 2, this scenario makes the following assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That one of the positions of Assistants/Interns is changed to be a Junior Professional Officer position funded under the Junior Professional Programme of the United Nations. This would be dependent on voluntary donor funding for this purpose; • That the position of Partnership Officer is classified at the P3 level, noting that the representational functions of the Partnership Officer could be undertaken by the Secretary General and/or the Deputy Secretary General. <p>See paragraph A.1.d.1.- A.1.d.2 of UNEP response Oct 2010 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/UNEP_Report-to-RamsarAHWG_cochairs_071010.pdf.)</p>

⁴⁰ See Review of the possible change in institutional host for the Ramsar Secretariat UNEP’s Response to the letter from the Co-chairs the Ramsar Convention Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform (dated 22 July 2010) including its three annexes (http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/UNEP_Report-to-RamsarAHWG_cochairs_071010.pdf). The response is dated 07 October 2010.

UNEP Scenario 1 – Based on UNEP’s initial submission	UNEP Scenario 2 – Cost-neutral Scenario	Scenario 3 – Reduced budget Scenario (5%)
	<p>undertaken by UNEP HQ paid under the PSC;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That Ramsar will pay 13% Programme Support Costs to UNEP for administrative services, and that the Finance Officer and Administrative Assistant positions will be paid from these PSC, therefore largely utilizing the amount available to the Secretariat. <p>(See paragraph A.1.c.1.- A.1.c.2 of UNEP response Oct 2010 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/UNEP_Report-to-RamsarAHWG_cochairs_071010.pdf.)</p>	

The following general assumptions have been made by UNEP in order to ensure that comparable figures are presented in the three scenarios and vis-à-vis the approved Ramsar budget⁴¹:

General budget assumptions

- All budget figures relate to the year 2011, which are the latest budget figures available by UNHQ for the calculation of staff costs;
- As Ramsar’s budgets are in Swiss francs (CHF) and United Nations budgets are in United States Dollars (USD), UNEP has used one exchange rate for calculation purposes. As future exchange rates are difficult to estimate, and as there has been some fluctuation in the CHF-USD exchange rates in past weeks and months, UNEP has used as an exchange rate USD/CHF 1.000 that is close to the average USD/CHF exchange rate for the period 13 – 24 September 2010 as per rates published by the Swiss National Bank;
- That the staff costs of a UN trust fund do not include “staff assessment”;
- That the office maintenance costs, currently covered under the IUCN charges, are budgeted for in the UNEP/Ramsar budget;
- That audit costs currently paid by Ramsar will be covered in the UNEP PSC;
- That bad debt and exchange rate loss are included in the UNEP budget figures in line with UN financial rules and regulations and not accounted for separately as under Ramsar.

General human resources assumptions

- That only posts approved by the core budget are considered in the three scenarios;
- That the SPREP Officer is reflected under “international national staff” in all three budget scenarios;
- That the costs for the current arrangements for interns under Ramsar will increase by USD 128,000 with effect from 2011, based on changed rules and regulations by the host country.

Other general assumptions

- That office space at the International Environment House (IEH) in Geneva will be provided in line with prevailing office space norms for UNEP and its MEAs in IEH;
- That the Ramsar Secretariat will enjoy the same conditions as UNEP from the host country, namely rent-free premises and subsidy for maintenance costs;
- That the costs associated with office maintenance, electricity and cleaning, and security services are based on current applied figures.

⁴¹ See UNEP response Oct 2010, paragraph A.1.a.1 to A.1.a.3: the http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/UNEP_Report-to-RamsarAHWG_cochairs_071010.pdf.

The Ramsar-UNEP Financial Analysis as presented in the UNEPs Review of the possible change in institutional host for the Ramsar Secretariat⁴² (UNEP response of 07 October 2010 to the Co-chairs of the AHWG) has for ease of reference been inserted below.

Exchange		1.000					
		Ramsar 2011 Budget	Ramsar 2011 Budget	Ramsar/UNEP 2011 Scenario 1	Ramsar/UNEP 2011 Scenario 2	Ramsar/UNEP 2011 Scenario 3	Details
		CHF	USD '000	USD '000	USD '000	USD '000	
SUMMARY, UNEP format							
1100	International staff (incl. SPREP Officer)	2,765,186	2,765	3,342	3,020	2,829	See A.1.g.
1300	Support staff	515,596	516	475	292	292	See A.1.g.
1200	Consultants	-	-	-	-	-	
1600	Travel	123,627	124	124	124	124	
2200	Subcontracts	100,000	100	100	100	100	
2300	Commercial contracts	170,000	170	170	170	170	
3100	Secr meetings Standing Committee	72,812	73	73	73	73	
3200	Meetings and Workshops re programme implem.	292,230	292	292	292	292	
4100	Expendable Equipment (Office supplies)	10,000	10	10	10	10	
4200	Non-Exp Equipment	12,000	12	-	-	-	
4300	Premises, rent and maintenance	-	-	88	84	82	See B.1.d.
5100	Misc: Other (rental of photocopy machine)	29,529	30	24	24	24	See B.1.d.
5200	Misc: Printing and Reporting	150,903	151	151	151	151	
5300	Misc: commun & postage	18,000	18	18	18	18	
5400	Misc: Hospitality	1,000	1	1	1	1	
5500	Misc: monitoring/evaluation/audit fees	18,000	18	-	-	-	Auditor fees paid from PSC
SUBTOTAL		4,278,882	4,279	4,867	4,360	4,166	
Programme Support Cost (PSC), 13%		-	-	633	567	542	
IUCN charges		556,255	556				
Reserves		75,000	75	96	96	96	
GRAND TOTAL (a)		4,910,137	4,910	5,596	5,022	4,804	
Other: Intern increase		128,000	128				
GRAND TOTAL (b)		5,038,137	5,038	5,596	5,022	4,804	
DIFFERENCE 2011 (UNEP vs Ramsar)				558	-16	-234	
DIFFERENCE 2011 IN % (UNEP vs. Ramsar)				11%	0%	-5%	

⁴² See paragraph A.1.f (page 9) in the UNEPs Review of the possible change in institutional host for the Ramsar Secretariat (See http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/UNEP_Report-to-RamsarAHWG_cochairs_071010.pdf. The breakdown of international staff and support staff budget lines 1100 and 1300 is presented in paragraph A.1.g. (p. 10 and 11 of the same report to which is referred.

3.7.2 Synthesis of information and conclusions concerning costing of the Secretariat under the two options

UNEP's additional observations submitted 20 June 2011 providing, inter alia, a response to the letter of the Ramsar Secretary General concerning administrative services, programme support costs and transitional costs are synthesized in the table below together with relevant information provided by the Ramsar Secretariat/Ramsar Secretary General and IUCN. The information concerning costing has been grouped under the following sub-headings:

- Overall findings
- Administrative services and cost comparison
- Transitional costs.

Table 3.7.2: Synthesis of submissions and conclusions concerning costing of the Secretariat under the two options

Issues for consideration	IUCN	UNEP	Ramsar Secretariat
Overall findings	<p>IUCN believes that under its administration, the Ramsar Secretariat will continue to be a more adaptive, nimble and cost-effective institution, well-equipped to strengthen wetland conservation and sustainable use in a rapidly changing world (See last paragraph on p 13 of the IUCN response June 2011 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_IUCN_submission.pdf).</p> <p>IUCN is furthermore of the view that IUCN staffing costs for equivalent competence are generally lower than in the UN system. In IUCN's view therefore, the 'cost-neutral' scenario for an UN-administered Secretariat represents a downgrading of the capacity of the Secretariat. Not only would international staffing be diminished, but the translation of an M-grading at IUCN to a P4 classification in the UN is, in IUCN's view, incorrect. The competencies required for the Ramsar Senior Regional Advisors – as the Convention's main representatives in the regions tasked with liaison with Parties on key policy issues – have been underestimated also according to IUCN. It therefore holds that an UN-</p>	<p>It is UNEP's firm view that under a cost-neutral scenario the Ramsar Secretariat will have similar or enhanced capacity, quality, services and facilities under UNEP hosting arrangements compared to the current administrative arrangements. (See paragraph 34 UNEP additions Sep 2011 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/UNEP-Submission-Ramsar-to-Chair-AHWG-September-2011-FINAL.pdf)</p> <p>In response to the letter from the Ramsar Secretary General, UNEP underlines and reiterates the following: "As described in both UNEP's reports and in our interaction with the Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform, UNEP has successfully demonstrated that a change in institutional host to UNEP can be accommodated within the existing budget for the operations of the secretariat and implementation of activities without decrease the capacity, quality, services and facilities. The actual composition of a streamlined, less top-heavy and strengthened organizational structure can be presented in multiple ways of which UNEP has only aimed at presenting a few. Other variations could be considered by the Parties for their decision taking". (See paragraph 11 of UNEP's additions observations June 2011: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_UNEP_submission.pdf)</p>	<p>It is the Secretary General and the Ramsar Secretariats assessment that scenario 1, reflecting the TORs of the existing staff, is the only scenario which come close to equating the current capacity and functioning of the Secretariat. The SG and the Secretariat agrees that other scenarios exist. However they find that while scenario 2 and 3 are cost neutral and reduced budget scenarios, they would entail that the capacity of the Secretariat would be reduced. (See last paragraph of page 2 and Annex 1 of the Ramsar Secretariat's comments of June 2011 to UNEP's response to the letter from the Co-Chairs http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_Secretariat_submission.pdf).</p>

Issues for consideration	IUCN	UNEP	Ramsar Secretariat
	<p>administered Secretariat will either be more costly to Parties, or it will lose vital capacity to support implementation. (See last paragraph on p 10 of the IUCN response June 2011 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_IUCN_submission.pdf).</p> <p>IUCN submissions relating to the administrative services, in particular under the Letter of Agreement on Provisions of Services between IUCN and Ramsar, 2009 are referred to further below in the table.</p>	<p>and UNEP response Oct 2010, paragraph A.1.e.1: the http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/UNEP_Report-to-RamsarAHWG_cochairs_071010.pdf.)</p>	
Administrative services & cost comparison	<p>IUCN provides administrative support services related to accounting and finance, information technology, facilities management, and human resources pursuant to the Letter of Agreement on Provision of Services between IUCN and Ramsar (See http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar3-04.pdf)</p> <p>IUCN indicates that administrative systems are set up to ensure that the highest standards of accountability are met, but avoiding complex and multi-layered bureaucratic structures. IUCN further opines that the Secretariat is able to operate free of many of the constraints and restrictions imposed by the UN, for example the mandatory requirement for business-class travel for trips over nine hours. In IUCN's view, the Secretariat is able to more effectively and efficiently meet the needs of Parties as a result. (See paragraph 2 on p 8 of the IUCN response June 2011 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_IUCN_submission.pdf).</p>	<p>UNEP charges 13 % Programme Support Costs based on incurred expenditures. This is the standard UN rate approved by the United Nations General Assembly. These funds provide the vital human resources, information technology, finance, budget and other support services required for the optimal functioning and operation of the Ramsar Secretariat. Through UNEP's concerted efforts working with the MEAs it administers, as well as the United Nations Office at Nairobi (UNON), those services are continuously being improved (See paragraph 33 UNEP additions Sep 2011 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/UNEP-Submission-Ramsar-to-Chair-AHWG-September-2011-FINAL.pdf and paragraph E.1 of UNEPs 2009 submission to the Co-chairs of the AHWG http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar3-02a.pdf). Paragraph E.1 (p 14- 16) of UNEPs 2009 submission also contains a detailed list and explanation of the services that are typically provided under the 13% PSC mechanism.</p> <p><i>The range of services includes but is not limited to:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Financial management services (e.g. project accounting; general accounting; financial reporting; receivables management; payroll; payments and fund 	<p>The Ramsar Secretary General has expressed concern that the administrative support services may be reduced under the three UNEP budget scenarios compared to the level of services that the Secretariat currently receives from IUCN. (See Annex 1 A.5 of the Ramsar Secretariat's comments of June 2011 to UNEP's response to the letter from the Co-Chairs http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_Secretariat_submission.pdf).</p> <p>These concerns and questions raised for clarification by the Ramsar Secretary General are further addressed in the row below together with the response provided by UNEP.</p>

Issues for consideration	IUCN	UNEP	Ramsar Secretariat
<p>Administrative services & cost comparison - continued</p>	<p>As further explained in the same submission (<i>Para 5</i>) IUCN provides full range of accounting and finance services to the Ramsar Secretariat. In 2010, accounting and finance costs were revised, resulting in a decrease of 20% (see Annex 3). IUCN applies the highest international auditing and oversight standards, including the establishment of due diligence processes and operational guidelines on issues related to procurement, partnerships, project performance and financial reporting.</p> <p>Finally concerning in the same submission IUCN in making reference to its information technology infrastructure currently being upgraded, envisages that the Ramsar Secretariat will benefit through a fully modern decision-making tool for finance planning, HR management, and other essential organizational needs, as well as the latest information and communication technologies. IUCN also states that information technology services costs charged by IUCN to Ramsar decreased by 10% from 2010 to 2011. (See paragraph 5 on p 8 and paragraph 1 of p 9 of the IUCN response June 2011 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_IUCN_submission.pdf) as well as page 2 second last paragraph of IUCNs additional comments dated 15 August to the 2009 Consultant's report http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/Koba_M_15_August_2011.pdf).</p> <p>For further information on IUCN charges to Ramsar from 2004 to 2008 reference is made to (http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar3-09.pdf) which provide an overview of the charges made by IUCN for administrative cost to Ramsar in CHF.</p>	<p>disbursements; recording of Convention pledges, contributions and other income; cash management; certification; certification functions to ensure adherence to the Financial Rules and Regulations of the United Nations and advisory services); 2. Numerous Human resources management services. 3. Various support services and corporate support services: 4. A wide range of quality assurance services and 5. A number of information and communication technology services. (Reference is made to Paragraph E.1 (p 14- 16) of UNEPs 2009 submission http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar3-02a.pdf for the precise content and full list of services provided).</p>	

Issues for consideration	IUCN	UNEP	Ramsar Secretariat
Transitions cost		<p>UNEP envisages that for transition arrangements, <u>one-time only costs may need to be reserved by the Parties</u>. However, it would only be possible to determine the additional costs a transfer would entail once the details of the administrative arrangements have been clarified, especially regarding the individual staff arrangements regarding transfer, remaining under IUCN, or a possible termination of contract. The maximum costs for staff indemnity payment will be USD 634,481.03 (indemnity costs provided by IUCN/Ramsar based on IUCN rules and regulations). This will only be the case in the unlikely event that all current Ramsar staff eligible to such termination payment would require such payment. However, as UNEP has indicated, it is likely that no indemnity payments will be required for any staff member (see also this paper subsection 3.2), if the Ramsar staff members will remain on board, and for those who are for example close to retirement, a transitional solution with IUCN could be agreed upon. Under the Ramsar reserves as per January 2010, CHF 135,000 has been specifically reserved for the purpose of staff termination and associated legal costs. In addition, Ramsar also has an amount of CHF 68,000 in reserve for staff repatriation purposes. (See UNEP response Oct 2010, Paragraph B.1.a. (p 13) http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/UNEP_Report-to-RamsarAHWG_cochairs_071010.pdf.)</p> <p><u>Other monetary costs</u> will according to UNEP include among others acquisition of new office furniture as well as IT equipment, platforms, applications and data transfer, office equipment, stationary, public relations costs, and moving costs. Other monetary costs could include costs associated with termination of lease or legal agreements, and of other contracts, if applicable; however, it is to be expected that these contracts mainly run through IUCN, and can be terminated without incurrance of costs when given sufficient notice.</p>	<p>The Ramsar Secretary General has expressed concern that there is no provision in UNEP's transition costs for staff counselling and negotiations that will be required by UNEP and IUCN on staff transition arrangements, nor for any legal support covering the technicalities of the major change in Convention texts, etc. (See Annex 1 A.6 of the Ramsar Secretariat's comments of June 2011 to UNEP's response to the letter from the Co-Chairs http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_Secretariat_submission.pdf).</p> <p>These concerns and questions raised for clarification by the Ramsar Secretary General are further addressed in the row below together with the response provided by UNEP.</p>

Issues for consideration	IUCN	UNEP	Ramsar Secretariat
		<p>For moving costs of the Secretariat, those will be mainly dependent on the size of volume of archives and records, of which UNEP is not aware, since currently all furniture and office equipment including computers, are the property of IUCN. Non-monetary costs foreseen would mainly be time and effort of Ramsar, IUCN as well as UNEP and UNON/HRMS staff. (See Paragraph B.1.b and c. (p 13) of UNEP response Oct 2010, http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/UNEP_Report-to-RamsarAHWG_cochairs_071010.pdf.)</p> <p>UNEP estimates that the transitional costs without indemnity payments may total : USD 193,823, with purchase of furniture and non-expendable equipment amounting to 133,523, moving costs 25,000 (estimated) Miscellaneous 40,000 (estimated) (See Paragraph B.1.d to B.1.e (p 14) of UNEP's response Oct 2010, http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/UNEP_Report-to-RamsarAHWG_cochairs_071010.pdf.)</p>	
Clarifying comments re. adm. services and costs	<p>As indicated above under overall findings, IUCN's is of the opinion that the 'cost-neutral' scenario for a UN-administered Secretariat represents a downgrading of the capacity of the Secretariat. (See also last paragraph on p 10 of the IUCN response June 2011 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_IUCN_submission.pdf).</p>	<p>Concerning Programme Support Costs(PSC), UNEP has in response to the letter from the Ramsar Secretary General (see column to the right) reiterated that the 13% PSC will provide the required vital HR, IT, finance, budget and other support services to the Ramsar Secretariat under all the scenarios presented. The capacity will be provided both through central services from UNON/UNEP and through human resources placed within the Ramsar Secretariat. Currently, the Ramsar Secretariat pays 13% PSC to IUCN for administrative services and the Finance Officer and other support functions are covered by the Ramsar core budget. Under a UNEP arrangement, all administrative services including the Finance Officer and other human resources for administrative purposes will be paid by the PSC.</p>	<p>As indicated above the Ramsar Secretary General has expressed concern that the administrative support services may be reduced under the three UNEP budget scenarios compared to the level of services that the Secretariat currently receives from IUCN. (See Annex 1 A.5 of the Ramsar Secretariat's comments of June 2011 to UNEP's response to the letter from the Co-Chairs http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_Secretariat_submission.pdf).</p> <p>In Scenarios 2 and 3, the Finance Officer and Admin Assistant would be financed out of the 13% PSC. In A.1.c.2 it is stated that this "would largely utilise the amount of PSC available to the Secretariat". The Secretariat assumes this would affect its access to vital HR, IT and other support services it currently</p>

Issues for consideration	IUCN	UNEP	Ramsar Secretariat
		<p>The administrative support to the Ramsar Secretariat under all scenarios will fully relate to the PSC paid. There will always be a correlation between expenditures (activities) and the administrative support. The more activities (expenditures), the higher PSC and the more support needed and provided.</p> <p>The legal support to be provided by UNEP to the Ramsar Secretariat will not come from the PSC directly but indirectly through the PSC withheld by UNEP for central functions. The exact type of legal support would be dependent on the need as expressed by the Ramsar Secretariat. The costs for legal support currently paid by Ramsar to consultants or others could be used for activities instead. For example, the Geneva-based Legal Officer has this year provided substantive support to the e.g. Secretariats of the Carpathian Convention and Tehran Convention on the Caspian Sea upon their request. (See paragraph 11 b page 6 of UNEPs additional observations June 2011 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_UNEP_submission.pdf)</p>	<p>gets from IUCN (and assumes in Scenario 1 would come from the PSC). Scenarios 2 and 3 would likely reduce the HR, IT and other support it currently receives. It would be helpful if UNEP could explain the functioning of the PSC and help ensure that false expectations do not arise.</p> <p>It is further noted by the SG: that “that the oft-promised “legal-support” from UNEP would not be part of the PSC and would come as part of a “supplementary support” that would not increase Ramsar’s budget. This is another point for clarification, both in terms of financial implications and the nature of the support.” (See Annex 1 A.5 of the Ramsar Secretariat’s comments of June 2011 to UNEP’s response to the letter from the Co-Chairs http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_Secretariat_submission.pdf).</p>
<p>Clarifying comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continued - Transition costs 	<p>IUCN has not made in specific submission or observation concerning the transposition costs.</p>	<p>In relation to transition costs and as indicated in the (UNEPs 2009 submission http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar3-02a.pdf), additional staff requirements related to the transition will be covered by UNEP, including legal support and staff counseling. UNEP has in its submission further proposed a detailed and personalized review of the transitional arrangements for each individual staff member. If the parties wish, UNEP has adequate legal capacity to advise on change in the convention text. (See paragraph 11 c page 7 of UNEPs additional observations June 2011 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_UNEP_submission.pdf)</p>	<p>The Ramsar Secretary General has expressed concern that there is no provision in UNEP’s transition costs for staff counselling and negotiations that will be required by UNEP and IUCN on staff transition arrangements, nor for any legal support covering the technicalities of the major change in Convention texts, etc. (See Annex 1 A.6 of the Ramsar Secretariat’s comments of June 2011 to UNEP’s response to the letter from the Co-Chairs http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_Secretariat_submission.pdf).</p>

3.7.3 Questions from parties and answers by UNEP addressed during the 7th meeting of the AHWG

Questions raised by Contracting Parties concerning specific aspects of the three budget scenarios presented by UNEP in its response of 7 October 2010 to the AHWG were addressed by UNEP during the 7th meeting of the AHWG.

One party sought clarification on the provision of administrative services and cost comparison under the three UNEP proposed scenarios, in particular what was to be understood by “vital HR, IT and other support services”. Other parties sought further information concerning the implications of the budgets being accounted for in USD or CHF.

UNEP in response hereto, stated that in terms of the “vital HR, IT and other support services”, there would be no difference in the type of services that would be provided to the Convention bodies and the parties compared to the current situation. HR, IT, finance, budget and other support services to the Ramsar Secretariat under all the scenarios presented will be provided both through central services from UNON/UNEP and through human resources placed within the Ramsar Secretariat. Currently, the Ramsar Secretariat pays 13% service charge to IUCN for administrative services and the Finance Officer and other support functions are covered by the Ramsar core budget. Under a UNEP arrangement, all administrative services including the Finance Officer and other human resources for administrative purposes will be paid by the PSC. There will be no change in terms of the administrative support provided and there will be no reduction or decrease in the capacity of the Secretariat⁴³.

Further to the 7th meeting of the AHWG, UNEP further elaborated on the implications of a change in functional currency from CHF to USD under a UNEP scenario, including implications of exchange rate fluctuations for the budget and financing. Under a UNEP scenario, the majority of the costs for operations under the Ramsar Convention, including its global operations and staff costs, would be budgeted and accounted for in USD. As with the CHF, if the USD weakens against the currencies in which costs are incurred, the purchasing power of Ramsar's budget will be constrained. This is likely to present a risk in terms of the Convention's CHF spending. However, since the USD is a more widely used reserve currency, and is the currency to which many developing countries' currencies are linked (if not actually pegged), a USD budget may facilitate a more predictable global operation, with fewer conversion costs. In respect of staff costs, it is worth noting that the base salary of all UN staff is calculated in USD whereas the post adjustment (a duty-station specific cost-of-living allowance) is more closely linked to exchange rates and inflation. Considered over an extended period, there are likely to be few predictable operational differences between the use of the USD vis-a-vis the CHF. A USD budget may experience fewer income fluctuations as a result of exchange rate variations but may experience more purchasing power fluctuations, particularly in respect of its CHF costs. These differences can be addressed in the budget process⁴⁴.

3.8 Effects on assessed contribution of Parties

It has been suggested by the Co-chair of the Ad Hoc Working Group, inter alia, during the 6th meeting of the AHWG that many of the Parties are worried about an increase in contributions, should the Ramsar Secretariat be institutionally hosted by UNEP, and this appears to be a major

⁴³ See paragraph 13 of the Report of 7th meeting of the AHWG
http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar7_rpt.pdf

⁴⁴ See paragraph 21 – 24 of in UNEP's additional observations addressed to members of the AHWG in June 2011: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_UNEP_submission.pdf.

reason for not moving to UNEP⁴⁵. Therefore one of the issues, identified by the ADWG at its sixth meeting to be addressed by UNEP, was the assessed contributions of each Party under each cost scenario (i.e. under the present arrangement and under a UNEP administration⁴⁶).

An overview of contributions of each Contracting Party under each of the three cost scenarios has been prepared by UNEP in response to the letter from the Co-chairs of the Ramsar Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform dated 22 July 2010. It is contained in Annex 3 to the UNEP response of 7 October 2010⁴⁷. The assessed contributions have been calculated based on the existing scale of contribution as provided by the Ramsar Secretariat⁴⁸.

UNEP reasons, with reference to the information, calculations and considerations contained in UNEP's reports of August 2009 and October 2010, that based on the Ramsar approved budget 2009-2012, a change in institutional host to UNEP will not increase the budget; will not impact the assessed contribution⁴⁹.

Currently, Ramsar's budgets are in Swiss francs (CHF) whereas the United Nations budgets in United States Dollars (USD), in line with UN financial rules and regulations. Parties have sought clarification on what a change in exchange rate between the two currencies would mean for the assessed contribution of the Parties⁵⁰.

As stated by UNEP in its additional observations addressed to members of the AHWG in June 2011, in an approved USD budget the currency of assessment (or apportionment between Parties) will be the USD. In respect of income to Convention trust funds, currency fluctuations will affect the amounts owed from countries that do not use USD as their national currency in the same way that currency fluctuations presently affect the amounts owed by countries that do not use the CHF as their national currency. To the extent that the contribution due from the USA (annual contribution 2009: USD 941,094) exceeds the amount due from Switzerland (annual contribution 2009: USD 51,998) the income side of a USD budget may be less affected by currency fluctuations. It is worth underlining that the main impact on parties in terms of the assessed contribution will be the exchange rate between their national currency and the USD and

⁴⁵ See paragraph 14 ff of the Report of 6th meeting of AHWG http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar6_rpt.pdf.

⁴⁶ See Annex 1 (A.2) of the Report of 6th meeting of AHWG.

⁴⁷ See http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/FINAL_Annex3.pdf

⁴⁸ As stated in paragraph A.2.b of UNEP response Oct 2010, http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/UNEP_Report-to-RamsarAHWG_cochairs_071010.pdf. In calculating the assessed contributions, UNEP builds on the following assumptions in scenarios 1, 2 and 3: It is not expected that any new party to the Ramsar Convention will have a significant impact on the assessed contributions to be paid by existing parties; The minimum contribution per party will remain USD 1,000 as currently is the case (CHF 1,000); The year 2011 is used in calculating the assessed contributions although a UNEP/Ramsar scenario would not come into effect until 2013 at the earliest; That under a IUCN/Ramsar scenario, the Parties would approve the increased costs for the four Interns/Assistants (CHF 128,000) as part of the core budget with effect from 2013; That yearly accrued interests of CHF 12,000 are continued to be deducted from the budget in calculating the assessed contributions; That the annual actual Swiss tax refund would be CHF 200,000 which is expected to be closer to reality compared to CHF 250,000 which is currently used for budgetary purposes in the approved Ramsar budget for 2011.

⁴⁹ See paragraph 35 UNEP additions Sep 2011 <http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/UNEP-Submission-Ramsar-to-Chair-AHWG-September-2011-FINAL.pdf>.

⁵⁰ See inter alia paragraphs 43 ff., 48, of the Report of 7th meeting of the AHWG http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar7_rpt.pdf and Report of the 43rd meeting of the Standing Committee: http://www.ramsar.org/cda/en/ramsar-documents-standing-sc43-report/main/ramsar/1-31-41%5E25486_4000_0.

not between USD-CHF. Consequently:

- if the USD weakens against the national currency of a given Party, the assessed contribution in the national currency will be less;
- if the USD strengthens against the national currency of a given Party, the assessed contribution in the national currency will be more;
- for countries paying their contribution in USD, exchange rate fluctuations will not impact their assessed contribution⁵¹.

⁵¹ See paragraphs 17 – 20 in UNEP’s additional observations addressed to members of the AHWG in June 2011: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_UNEP_submission.pdf.

3.9 Transitional issues – other than cost

Finally, as observed by Contracting Parties – most recently at the SC43 meeting, differing views have been expressed concerning transitional arrangements, in particular the length of time required for transition of the possible provision of the Ramsar Secretariat by UNEP⁵². Submissions and observations concerning transitional issues – other than transitional costs have been synthesised in the table below.

The section on transitional issues includes a sub-section on timing and timeline e.g. vis-à-vis Rio+20 the process. Several Contracting Parties take the view that it would be reasonable to await clear guidance from the Rio+20 process before deciding on one of the two options for institutional hosting of the Ramsar Secretariat⁵³.

Table 3.9: Synthesis of information and conclusions concerning transitional issues – other than transition costs

Issues for consideration	IUCN	UNEP	Ramsar Secretariat
Transitional issues	IUCN considers that a move of the Ramsar Secretariat between now and 2020 would entail unnecessary bureaucratic upheaval during a time when all efforts should be focused on delivering conservation and wise use of ecosystem services.	UNEP has put forward a number of proposals for transitional arrangements, including costing, both as they relate to the Secretariat and to the staff. Those somewhat elaborate proposals are contained in UNEP's submission. (See UNEP's 2009 submission http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar3-02a.pdf) Part B p 13 ff. and Part D p 18 ff.)	The Ramsar Secretary General is of the opinion that loss of operational efficiency during possible transition Ramsar Convention Secretariat from an IUCN host arrangement (IUCN/Ramsar) to a UNEP host arrangement (UNEP/Ramsar) will be significant. (See p 3 of the Ramsar Secretariat's comments of June 2011 to UNEP's response to the letter from the Co-Chairs http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_Secretariat_submission.pdf).
- Staff	Transition of the Secretariat to UN administration is likely to swallow most if not all of triennium's work of the Convention. Human and financial resources will be channelled to transitioning bureaucracy instead of supporting action on implementation. (See paragraph 5 on p 13 of the IUCN response June 2011 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_IUCN_submission.pdf).	UNEP maintain that a transition to a UNEP administered convention can be done with none or minimal consequences to the ongoing work of the Convention. The impact to staff, if any, will depend on the decision taken by the Parties based on the proposals put forward by UNEP. UNEP believes that in close consultation with IUCN and the Ramsar Secretariat staff a personalized flexible approach is possible in order to have a smooth transition period	
- Consequences to ongoing work of the			

⁵² See inter alia paragraph 109 and 105 of the Report of the 43rd Standing Committee meeting: <http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/sc/43/sc43-report.pdf>

⁵³ See inter alia paragraph 19, Annex A of Report of the 7th meeting of the AHWG: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar7_rpt.pdf and paragraph 80, 81 and 105 of the Report of the 43rd Standing Committee meeting: <http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/sc/43/sc43-report.pdf>

Ramsar		<p>with the best possible staff arrangements. (See paragraph 39 UNEP additions Sep 2011 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/UNEP-Submission-Ramsar-to-Chair-AHWG-September-2011-FINAL.pdf, and (p 5 of UNEPs additional observations June 2011 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_UNEP_submission.pdf)</p>	
<p>Transition issues - Timing/ duration</p>	<p>IUCN has not made any specific comment on the possible transition period or timing hereof.</p>	<p>UNEP foresees that the physical move of the Ramsar Secretariat as part of the transition arrangements can be organized with minimum disruptions, including the possibility of delaying the physical move in the short and medium term.</p> <p>UNEP further underlines that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the transition arrangements are partly bound by legal requirements and practicalities due to the time schedule of meetings, including COP12, UNEP GC/GMEF etc; - The duration of the transition arrangements for staff will largely depend on the decisions taken by the Parties in terms of staff contracts and on the understandings reached between UNEP and IUCN. - That the transition period would rather be an issue of months than years <p>(p 5 of UNEPs additional observations June 2011 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_UNEP_submission.pdf) and p 4 of th Report of the 9th meeting of the AHWG: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AH-WG_report-9thmeeting.pdf).</p>	<p>The Ramsar SG has made any specific submission or observations concerning the transition period. The Ramsar Secretary General is of the opinion that the transition period would be significantly longer than the one and half year transposition period outlined in the UNEP report. (See p 3 of the Ramsar Secretariat's comments of June 2011 to UNEP's response to the letter from the Co-Chairs http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_Secretariat_submission.pdf).</p>
<p>- linkages to Rio+20 process</p>		<p>Concerning linkages to the Rio+20 process, UNEP indicates that in June 2012, about two weeks prior to the 11th Meeting of the Ramsar Contracting Parties, the United Nations Conference on Environment and Sustainable Development will take place in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. It has been suggested by some SC members that perhaps there would be not enough time to absorb the Rio+20 outcome into the foreseen COP decision on administrative arrangements of the</p>	

Ramsar Secretariat. (See paragraph 25 page 10 of UNEPs additional observations June 2011 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_UNEP_submission.pdf)

UNEP is, in the same submission, making reference to “the institutional framework for sustainable development” (one of the two main themes of the Rio+20 Conference), UNEP points to that directions have already been indicated in the preparatory process. Many delegations have expressed the view that reforms to institutional arrangements will be based on the existing structure, while enhancing coordination, coherence, and synergies. It has been identified by a number of countries that strengthening international environmental governance is a key element and condition for improving the institutional framework for sustainable development, and that the options for broader institutional reform identified in the Nairobi-Helsinki Outcome will have to be taken into account. UNEP further underlines that many states have pointed to the urgent need for enhanced coordination and cooperation among all international organizations, agencies and conventions, so as to ensure implementation of commitments, promote synergies and allow the participation of major groups.

According to UNEP, the above governmental statements of direction, all point towards a direction where MEA Secretariats will have to work closer together. Although the Ramsar Secretariat is already closely cooperating with other relevant MEA Secretariats, it is easy to see that attachment under a same institutional host would make even closer cooperation more readily accessible.

(See paragraphs 26 - 28 page 10 ff. of UNEPs additional observations June 2011 http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_UNEP_submission.pdf)

ANNEX 1 - Draft Resolution XI.1 setting out the two options for institutional hosting of the Ramsar Secretariat



11th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Wetlands (Ramsar, Iran, 1971)

“Wetlands: home and destination”

Bucharest, Romania, 6-13 July 2012

Agenda item XV

Ramsar COP11 DR1

Draft Resolution XI.1

Institutional hosting of the Ramsar Secretariat

Note: The 43rd meeting of the Standing Committee, in Decision SC43-34, “determined to transmit to COP11 the two Draft Resolutions contained in DOC. SC43-13 Rev. 1, as amended, and to request the Ad Hoc Working Group to work with an independent consultant engaged by the Secretariat with funds provided by Australia to prepare by the end of January 2012 an information paper based on existing information to facilitate the decision of COP11.”

See also the COP11 Information Document which provides this further information concerning the two alternative options presented in this Draft Resolution.

Draft Resolution XI.1 (alternative 1)

Institutional hosting of the Ramsar Secretariat under the administration of IUCN

Submitted by the Standing Committee

1. CONFIRMING that the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands is an international treaty deposited with the United Nations and that activities mandated by its Conference of the Parties for the implementation of the Convention are activities carried out under the legal authority of an international treaty and its Contracting Parties;
2. RECALLING the adoption of the Strategic Plan 2009-2015 by Resolution X.1 as the basis for the future implementation of the Convention;
3. RECALLING that Resolution X.5 (2008) in the Conference of the Contracting Parties established an Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform with the objective of

recommending efficient and effective measures to improve the capacity and operation of the Ramsar Secretariat to support and facilitate the implementation of the Convention and serve the interests of the Contracting Parties, and whether the Secretariat should continue to be hosted by IUCN or should be institutionally hosted by UNEP;

4. EXPRESSING APPRECIATION to the Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform and the Standing Committee, as well as to the Ramsar Secretariat, IUCN, and UNEP, for the significant work that has been carried out on this matter;
5. RECOGNIZING the need to successfully conclude the consultative process on this matter and that a decision should be taken at the latest by the 11th meeting of the Conference of the Parties; and
6. RESOLVING to facilitate the current and future work of the Ramsar Secretariat without further delay;

THE CONFERENCE OF THE CONTRACTING PARTIES

7. DECIDES that the Ramsar Secretariat should continue to be hosted by IUCN;
8. REQUESTS the Secretary General of the Ramsar Convention to inform the Executive Director of UNEP and the Director-General of IUCN of this decision;
9. REQUESTS the Standing Committee to establish at its 46th meeting a mechanism of the Contracting Parties that will, taking into account the needs of the Contracting Parties and the Ramsar Secretariat, facilitate negotiations between the Ramsar Secretariat and the Director-General of IUCN, evaluate the work already achieved and seek ways of improving the current operations of the Secretariat and enhancing the implementation of the Ramsar Convention, and provide the Standing Committee with a report on these negotiations at its 47th meeting; and
10. CALLS UPON the Contracting Parties to cooperate with the Ramsar Secretariat, as appropriate, to enhance collaboration and coordination between IUCN and the Convention.

Draft Resolution XI.1 (alternative 2)

Institutional hosting of the Ramsar Secretariat under the administration of UNEP

Submitted by the Standing Committee

1. CONFIRMING that the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands is an international treaty deposited with the United Nations and that activities mandated by its Conference of the Parties for the implementation of the Convention are activities carried out under the legal authority of an international treaty and its Contracting Parties;
2. RECALLING the adoption of the Strategic Plan 2009-2015 by Resolution X.1 as the basis for the future implementation of the Convention;

3. RECALLING that Resolution X.5 (2008) in the Conference of the Contracting Parties established an Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform with the objective of recommending efficient and effective measures to improve the capacity and operation of the Ramsar Secretariat to support and facilitate the implementation of the Convention and serve the interests of the Contracting Parties, and whether the Secretariat should continue to be hosted by IUCN or should be institutionally hosted by UNEP;
4. EXPRESSING APPRECIATION to the Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform and the Standing Committee, as well as to the Ramsar Secretariat, IUCN, and UNEP, for the significant work that has been carried out on this matter;
5. RECOGNIZING the need to successfully conclude the consultative process on this matter and that a decision should be taken at the latest by the 11th meeting of the Conference of the Parties; and
6. RESOLVING to facilitate the current and future work of the Ramsar Secretariat without further delay;

THE CONFERENCE OF THE CONTRACTING PARTIES

7. DECIDES that the Ramsar Secretariat should be institutionally hosted by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP);
8. REQUESTS the Secretary General of the Ramsar Convention to inform the Executive Director of UNEP and the Director-General of IUCN of this decision;
9. REQUESTS the Standing Committee to establish at its 46th meeting a mechanism of the Contracting Parties that will, taking into account the needs of the Contracting Parties and the Ramsar Secretariat, facilitate negotiations between the Ramsar Secretariat and the Executive Director of UNEP on the arrangements for an effective, cost-efficient and expeditious transfer of the Ramsar Secretariat to UNEP without undermining the achievement of the goals of the Convention as stated in the 2009-2015 Strategic Plan and consistent with the budget approved in Resolution [XI.xx], and to provide the Standing Committee with a report on these negotiations its 47th meeting; and
10. CALLS UPON the Contracting Parties to collaborate with the Ramsar Secretariat, as appropriate, to ensure the smooth transfer of the Ramsar Secretariat from IUCN to UNEP.

ANNEX 2 – Annotated list of documentation reviewed for the present information paper⁵⁴

Documents, decisions and report of the 43rd meeting of the Ramsar Standing Committee

- *Ramsar COP11 DR1, Draft Resolution XI.1 Institutional hosting of the Ramsar Secretariat* (identical to SC43-13 add.1 which has not yet been reissued). It is for ease of reference attached to this paper as Annex 1.
- *Report of the 43rd meeting of the Standing Committee (December 2011)* (See: <http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/sc/43/sc43-report.pdf>)
- *Decision SC43-34.* (See <http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/sc/43/sc43-decisions-e.pdf>)

“Decision SC43-34: The Standing Committee determined to transmit to COP11 the two Draft Resolutions contained in DOC. SC43-13 Rev. 1, as amended, and to request the Ad Hoc Working Group to work with an independent consultant engaged by the Secretariat with funds provided by Australia to prepare by the end of January 2012 an information paper based on existing information to facilitate the decision of COP11.”

- *Document SC43-06 Report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform.* (See <http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/sc/43/sc43-doc06-adhoc.pdf>)

In which it is inter alia reported that after discussions in nine meetings, and after careful and thorough review of the extensive information collected from UNEP, IUCN and the Ramsar Secretariat, including the most recent submissions, the WG was unable to reach consensus on whether the Ramsar Secretariat should be provided by UNEP or continue to be hosted by IUCN. Consequently the Ad Hoc Working Group presented two Draft Resolutions for the Standing Committee to consider, one advocating moving to UNEP and the other staying with IUCN. (See para 5-6).

Reports of the Ramsar Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform
The Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform was established pursuant to Resolution X.5 of the Conference of the Parties. In accordance with its objective to recommend efficient and effective measures to improve the capacity and operation of the Ramsar Secretariat to support and facilitate the implementation of the Convention and serve the interests of the Contracting Parties, the Working Group developed a detailed work-plan and agreed on a list of activities to guide its work. The Group between January 2009 and June 2011 held nine meetings.

⁵⁴ As per the Terms of reference the following data sources have been reviewed:

- See http://www.ramsar.org/cda/en/ramsar-documents-ad-hoc-group/main/ramsar/1-31-433_4000_0
All Documents
- Document SC43-06: http://www.ramsar.org/cda/en/ramsar-documents-standing-sc43/main/ramsar/1-31-41%5E25232_4000_0
- Report and decisions of SC43: see http://www.ramsar.org/cda/en/ramsar-documents-standing/main/ramsar/1-31-41_4000_0
- Email distributed to Parties at SC43 with updated compilation.

- Report of the *1st Meeting* of the AHWG, 19 January 2009
The Working Group, guided by the three items under “Work Required” in the Annex to Resolution X.5 identified the immediate actions that could be taken to resolve the 10 problems identified under Option 1 (improved status within IUCN) in Table 2 (COP10 DOC 20, add. 1, page 7). The Group further agreed that the Co-Chairs should send a letter to UNEP requesting additional information and that the Secretariat would continue to work with IUCN to gather additional information. (See: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg-ar1-1.pdf)
- Report of the *2nd Meeting* of the AHWG, 24 March 2009
At the second meeting, the Working Group focused on its work programme and the wording of the letters sent to both UNEP and IUCN. The purpose of the letters was to solicit from both organizations detailed and specific information on the costs and benefits to the Convention on whether the Convention should continue to be hosted by IUCN or change to be institutionally hosted by UNEP. In addition, the second meeting was devoted to identifying measures to improve the administration of the Convention under Option 1 (improved status within IUCN) (See: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg-ar2-rpt.pdf)
- Report of the *3th Meeting* of the AHWG, 03 December 2009
At the meeting the Working Group focused on the responses submitted by both IUCN and UNEP in reply to the questionnaires sent by the Co-Chairs in April 2009, and the report of the consultant. The members of the Working Group welcomed the responses of IUCN and UNEP and the report of the consultation and the presentations and agreed that they provided a basis for the Group’s deliberations on the two options. The Working Group noted that the presentations provided a comparison of the Ramsar Convention under each of the two organizations; however, some members raised a number of issues and felt that the Group should consider additional information not presented in the responses and in the consultant’s report. (See: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar3_rpt_final.pdf).
- Report of the *4th Meeting* of the AHWG, 26 January 2010
The meeting was devoted to seeking clarifications to the queries of Contracting Parties raised at the third meeting. The Working Group also discussed the table of budget comparisons under the present arrangement and under UNEP administration. The Co-Chairs explained that numbers 1 and 2 under “Work Required” of Resolution X.5 were completed during the previous meetings and that number 3 on drafting a recommendation to the Standing Committee was the only remaining work required of the Working Group. The Working Group agreed that the ten putative problems raised during the second meeting should be revisited to determine the current status for each of the problems, agree on a draft recommendation and plan a report to be submitted to the Standing Committee. (See: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar4_rpt_final2.pdf). The Working Group discussed the 10 problems on the basis of a table prepared under the direction of the Co-Chairs comprising four columns, namely: problem; explanation of problem; current status, and conclusions. (See: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg-ar4-problems.pdf)
- Report of the *5th Meeting* of the AHWG, 29 March 2010

The meeting focused on reviewing the draft report and drafting recommendations to the 41st meeting of the Standing Committee.

(See: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar5_rpt.pdf)

- *Report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform to the 41st meeting of the Standing Committee*

The report contains the following recommendation to the 41st meeting of the Standing Committee (page 8): “After careful review of the information that has been collected, the Ad-hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform could not reach consensus on whether the Ramsar Secretariat should be provided by UNEP or continue to be hosted by IUCN.

A large majority of States at the above Working Group concluded that there is strong evidence that a Ramsar Secretariat provided by UNEP would more effectively implement the Ramsar Convention and recommend that the Secretariat be hosted by UNEP.

Several States at the above Working Group concluded that there is not enough evidence to suggest that if hosted by UNEP the Ramsar Secretariat would more effectively implement the Ramsar Convention and recommend that, at this time, the Secretariat continue to be hosted by IUCN.

Some States at the above Working Group did not express a view.”

(See http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/sc/41/sc41_doc33.pdf and for the two annexes to the report: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/sc/41/sc41_doc33_anx01.pdf; http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/sc/41/sc41_doc33_anx02.pdf as well as the comments by some member of the ADWG http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar5_comments.pdf)

- *Report of the 6th Meeting of the AHWG, 28 May 2010*
The meeting drew up a list of issues to be addressed by UNEP on issues related to the possible change in institutional host for the Ramsar Convention Secretariat from an IUCN host arrangement to a UNEP host arrangement.
(See: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar6_rpt.pdf for the report of the meeting and http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar6_rpt_annex.pdf for the list of issues to be addressed by UNEP.
- *Report of the 7th Meeting of the AHWG, 14 January 2011*
The meeting was primarily a question and answer session relating to the UNEP Report: Review of the possible change in institutional host for the Ramsar Secretariat UNEP’s Response to the letter from the Co-chairs the Ramsar Convention Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform (dated 22 July 2010) including its three annexes. The Report which is dated 7 October 2010 responds and provides further clarification on:
 - Further options for reducing the costs of a UNEP administered Ramsar Secretariat;
 - Transition arrangements;
 - Timing and a timeline for implementation;
 - The best possible staff arrangements; and
 - The added benefits to the Convention

(See: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar7_rpt.pdf)

- Report of the *8th Meeting* of the AHWG, 6 June 2011
The meeting addressed the Standing Committee meeting decision SC42-30 on administrative reform, in particular the next steps of the work of the AHWG. Further to decision SC42-30 it was decided to request IUCN, UNEP and the Ramsar Secretariat to provide any additional information they saw relevant by Monday 20th June 2011.
(See: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar8_rpt.pdf)
- Report of the *9th Meeting* of the AHWG, 29 June 2011.
The meeting concluded that WG was unable to reach consensus on whether the Ramsar Secretariat should be provided by UNEP or continue to be hosted by IUCN. Consequently it was agreed that Ad Hoc Working Group would present two Draft Resolutions for the Standing Committee to consider, one advocating moving to UNEP and the other staying with IUCN.
(See: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AH-WG_report-9thmeeting.pdf)

Submissions by UNEP

- *UNEP submission to the co-chairs of the Ramsar Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform Operational implications of a possible change in institutional host*
(See web Ramsar web site under the documents concerning the Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar3-02a.pdf)

By this submission UNEP answers to the questions posed in annex I attached to the letter of the co-chairs of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform to Mr. Achim Steiner, dated 2 April 2009. (See: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/UNEP_2-4-2009.pdf). This UNEP submission also contains a large number of Annexes addressing various aspects of hosting arrangements (See: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/UNEP_2-4-2009.pdf).

This submission has been summaries and analysed in the 2009 Consultant's Report.

- *Review of the possible change in institutional host for the Ramsar Secretariat UNEP's Response to the letter from the Co-chairs the Ramsar Convention Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform* (dated 22 July 2010) including its three annexes
(See Ramsar web site under the documents concerning the Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform under "Documents relevant to the briefing on 5 October 2010" http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/UNEP_Report-to-RamsarAHWG_cochairs_071010.pdf for the main report and for the three annexes see: <http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/FINAL%20Annex1.pdf>, http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/FINAL_Annex2.pdf and http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/FINAL_Annex3.pdf)

The purpose of this document is to respond to and provide further clarification on the issues contained in Annex 1 of the above-mentioned letter. Those issues are categorized under the following headings:

- A. Further options for reducing the costs of a UNEP administered Ramsar Secretariat;
- B. Transition arrangements;
- C. Timing and a timeline for implementation;
- D. The best possible staff arrangements; and
- E. The added benefits to the Convention.

As indicated in this report p. 4, UNEP wishes to encourage the members of the Ad Hoc Working Group not to refer to the budget, finance and staff figures contained in the documents previously submitted by UNEP and possibly also by Ramsar and the consultant to the Ad Hoc Working Group, as they may present information that is not entirely accurate.

- *Additional Observations addressed to members of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform on Review of the possible change in institutional host for the Ramsar Secretariat UNEP's Response to the letter from the Co-chairs the Ramsar Convention Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform* (dated 20 June 2011)

(See: <http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/UNEP-Submission-Ramsar-to-Chair-AHWG-September-2011-FINAL.pdf>)

This submission is an response to the letter from the Chair of the Ramsar Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform (AHWG), dated 9 June 2011, in which IUCN, UNEP and the Ramsar Secretariat are invited to provide to the Working Group additional information believed to be useful to inform the decision making of the Parties in this process.

It is *inter alia* a) summarizing in an Executive Summary the key findings as contained in UNEP's previous submissions (see para 6 ff); b) providing response to the letter of the Ramsar Secretary General concerning e.g. administrative services, programme support costs and transitions cost (see para 8 – 13); c) providing observations, in response to statements and remarks made during the 42nd meeting of the Standing Committee concerning i) partnerships (para 14-15), ii) Ramsar Secretariat Staff (para 16) iii) Exchange rates (implications on budget and assessed contributions) (para 17 – 24) and iv) Linkage to RIO+20 (para 25-28).

- *Additions to the Consultant's Report of November 2009 prepared for the third meeting of the Ramsar Convention Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform submitted to the Chair of the Ramsar Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform* (dated 12 September 2011).

(See <http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/UNEP-Submission-Ramsar-to-Chair-AHWG-September-2011-FINAL.pdf>)

In this submission UNEP provides updated information in response to AHWG meetings in the form of comments and additions to November 2009 Consultant's Report to the AHWG primarily concerning the following issues i) institutional hosting(para 1- 6); ii) enhancing overall implementation of the Convention (para 7-20) iii) legal personality (para 21- 25); iv) staff (para 26- 32); v) Administrative service and cost comparison (para 33- 35); location alternatives (para 57-60) and vii) transitional issues (para 38- 39).

These three submissions, provided upon request by the co-chairs of the AHWG, have all been prepared after November 2009 and are thus not part of the 2009 Consultant's Report.

Submissions by IUCN

- *IUCN Report to Ramsar - Facilitating the work of the Ramsar Convention and its Secretariat* (dated July 14, 2009) See: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar3-03.pdf

By this submission IUCN answers to the questions posed in annex I attached to the letter of the co-chairs of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform to Mrs Marton-Lefevre, dated 2 April 2009. (See: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/IUCN_2-4-2009.pdf)

IUCN has submitted a number of supporting documents together with its response to the AHWG concerning various aspects of hosting arrangements

- IUCN Global Human Resources Policy:
http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar3-05.pdf,
- IUCN Human Resources Procedures Manual
http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar3-06.pdf,
- IUCN Conditions of Service for HQ (Switzerland)
http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar3-07.pdf
- IUCN Guidelines and Procedures for Expatriates
http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar3-08.pdf
- Summary of charges made by IUCN to Ramsar 2004-2008
http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar3-09.pdf

This submission has been summarised and analysed in the 2009 Consultant's Report (http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg_ar3-10.pdf).

- *IUCN submission in response to the letter of the Co-chair of 9 June 2011 and the Decision SC42-30 of the Ramsar Standing Committee (dated 20 June 2010)*
(See: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_IUCN_submission.pdf)
- *IUCN's comments on the Report to the Ramsar Convention Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform prepared by a consultant in November 2009 (dated 15 August 2011)*
(See web Ramsar web site under the documents concerning the Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform http://www.ramsar.org/cda/en/ramsar-documents-ad-hoc-group/main/ramsar/1-31-433_4000_0 under "Documents Following the Ninth Meeting")

These two submissions, provided upon request by the co-chairs of the AHWG, have all been prepared after November 2009 and are thus not part of the 2009 Consultant's Report.

Submissions by the Ramsar Secretariat

- *Ramsar Secretariat's comments to UNEP's response to the letter from the Co-Chairs of the Ramsar Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform dated 22 July 2010*
(See: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/adwg/AHWG_Secretariat_submission.pdf)
The submission from the Ramsar Secretariat is made on 29 November 2010.

To support the discussions by the ADWG the Secretariat have provided the following documents:

- *Summary of agreements and current negotiations with IUCN regarding the Provision of Services, Headquarters Facilities and Delegation of Authority*
(See http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/mtg/mtg_adhoc_wg-ar2-2.pdf)
Provided for the Second Meeting of the ADWG, 24 March 2009
- *Delegation of authority and additional note, 1993*

(See: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/moc/iucn_delegation_1993.pdf) and *Memorandum of understanding on Headquarters Facilities, 1991*

See: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/moc/iucn_facilities_1991.pdf)

Provided for the First Meeting of the ADWG, 24 March 2009

COP 10 documents

- Resolution X.5: Facilitating the work of the Ramsar Convention and its Secretariat (See http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/res/key_res_x_05_e.pdf) by which the Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform is established.
- COP10 DOC. 20: Review of Ramsar Secretariat legal status options (See: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/cop10/cop10_doc20_e.pdf)
- COP10 DOC. 20 addendum: Additional information concerning the legal status of the Ramsar Convention Secretariat (See: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/cop10/cop10_doc20_add1_e.pdf)
- COP10 DOC. 35: Report on the Legal Personality of the Ramsar Secretariat, Lal Kurukulasuriya, 20 October 2008, without salary information (See: http://www.ramsar.org/pdf/cop10/cop10_doc35_e.pdf).

Considered by the first meeting of the ADWG.

Other

- Consultant's report to the Working Group: comparative analysis of UNEP and IUCN reports, November 2009 (See: http://www.ramsar.org/cda/en/ramsar-documents-ad-hoc-group/main/ramsar/1-31-433_4000_0 under documents relevant to the third meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform, 3 December 2009)
- Email distributed to Parties at SC43 with updated compilation of submissions from IUCN, UNEP and the Ramsar Secretariat (submitted in August and September 2011).

ANNEX 3 – Terms of Reference

Independent Consultant to prepare an Information Paper to facilitate Parties' COP11 decisions regarding future hosting arrangements for the Ramsar Secretariat

Reporting to: Chair of Ad-Hoc Working Group on Administrative Reform (Mr. Mohammad Koba)

Funded by: Government of Australia

Deadline: Draft report to Chair by 07 February 2012, final report to Chair and Secretariat (for translation) by 22 February 2012.

Language: English

Report/information paper requirement: A synthesis of information and conclusions from the sources below, without further analysis or opinion, to aid Parties required to take a decision on this matter at COP11. Fully referenced, easy to read and to understand, catering to a broad audience of Contracting Parties with different cultural and technical backgrounds.

Contents:

- Executive Summary – how a change will enhance the ability of the Convention to protect and wisely use wetlands, responding to Resolution X.5 , Annex 1, task 3 a to f.
- Background to the matter
- Tabular comparison of pros and cons of the two options considered, with clear, easily comparable and referenced information. The consultant will need to build a list of main issues, to be considered in the comparison, relevant to CPs from the data sources and agree this with the Chair. It should include, inter alia, service and functions of the Secretariat, human resourcing of the Secretariat, visibility of Ramsar and wetlands, effect on on-the-ground implementation, access to funding, working with other Conventions, cost (one-off and ongoing) and effect on assessed contributions of Parties.
- Suggested modifications to the DRs, including how to include a negotiating mechanism into the relevant DR.

Data sources:

- See http://www.ramsar.org/cda/en/ramsar-documents-ad-hoc-group/main/ramsar/1-31-433_4000_0 All Documents.
- Document SC43-06: http://www.ramsar.org/cda/en/ramsar-documents-standing-sc43/main/ramsar/1-31-41%5E25232_4000_0
- Report and decisions of SC43: see http://www.ramsar.org/cda/en/ramsar-documents-standing/main/ramsar/1-31-41_4000_0

- Email distributed to Parties at SC43 with updated compilation