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MEA Comparison Report

1. Background

As part of the Terms of Reference for the Review of the effectiveness and efficiency of the governance of the Ramsar Convention, SRI Executive was to undertake an external comparison of other multilateral environmental agreements (MEA Conventions) after the first Report on the Review of Ramsar’s Governance Structures and Procedures - Findings, using the assessment criteria of the Ramsar Convention Review.

The first Report mentioned above identified a number of Initial Findings in relation to the governance assessment criteria of Clarity, Legitimacy, Accountability, Effectiveness and Cost. These findings were drawn from a desk review of Ramsar governance documentation (attached as a separate document), one on one interviews with EWG approved stakeholders, and a survey sent to all Ramsar Convention Contracting Parties. The report presented these Initial Findings and Next Steps in relation to each governance body of the Ramsar Convention. Where relevant, this report refers to any of the Initial Findings of the first Report to show how other MEA Conventions have approached similar challenges with their own governance.

Together with the Effectiveness Working Group (EWG), a list of six MEAs were identified which were felt to be of comparable mission and mandate, as well as similar in governance structure and processes. These are:

- **London Convention and London Protocol (LC/LP)** - *Its objective is to promote the effective control of all sources of marine pollution and to take all practicable steps to prevent pollution of the sea by dumping of wastes and other matter.*

- **Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES)** - *Its aim is to ensure that international trade in specimens of wild animals and plants does not threaten their survival.*

- **International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC)** – *Its aim is to protect the world’s plant resources from the spread and introduction of pests, and promotion of safe trade.*

- **Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (UNESCO World Heritage)** - *Its objective is the protection, conservation and presentation of the cultural and natural heritage situated within its member state parties.*

- **Convention of Migratory Species (CMS)** – *Its objective is to provide a platform to ensure the conservation of migratory species, their habitats and migration routes.*
- **International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA)** - It aims to establish a global system to provide farmers, plant breeders and scientists with access to plant genetic materials and ensuring that recipients share benefits they derive from the use of these genetic materials.

To ensure as accurate a benchmarking exercise as possible, SRI Executive carried out a desk review of the current governance structures and processes of each of the MEA Conventions. The desk review consulted documents available publicly or shared with SRI Executive directly by the MEA Conventions.

This was coupled with semi-structured interviews with individuals holding governance roles within each MEA Convention. A full list of the persons interviewed can be found in *Annex A: Contacts Interviewed for MEA Comparison*. The interview questions (Annex C: Final Evaluation Questions) were the same as those used for the Ramsar Convention interviews, as approved by the EWG. The individuals interviewed were asked to give information in relation to governance aspects within their respective MEA Conventions which they felt were relevant for the question posed. In particular, interviewees were asked about challenges similar to those identified as Initial Findings in the first Report on the Review of Ramsar’s Governance Structures and Procedures. Interviewees were asked to reflect on challenges that were previously or currently being faced by the MEA Convention they worked for. The interviews were 1.5 hours in length. It was agreed with all interviewees that their responses would only be presented in this report in the form of collated and generalised findings across the MEAs, ensuring that no specific answer may be related back to a specific MEA, unless the information was already public.

2. **Scope of MEA Comparison**

   The aim of the MEA Comparison is to compare and benchmark the Ramsar Convention against other MEAs and identify governance arrangements and processes that could be explored for consideration by the EWG and wider CPs. In particular, this review sought to understand:

   - The composition of governance structures,
   - The timing and management of key governance processes,
   - And the governance principles that different MEAs follow.

The EWG also intended for this analysis, backed by qualitative interviews, to shed light on common areas of difficulty and areas where Ramsar or the other MEAs have succeeded in improving governance structures or processes.

SRI Executive carried out a desk review of the official governance documents available on the MEAs’ websites to understand the governance structure and processes that are currently in place. As agreed with the EWG, interviews were then held with the MEA’s secretariat governance officer and, where possible, the Chair of each MEA’s Standing Committee or a Chair of an equivalent alternative governance body to provide further insight into how the governance bodies function in practice.
To be able to present as much data as possible to the EWG, as well as draw findings from the qualitative interviews, the governance information collected through both the desk review and qualitative interviews is presented in two formats.

1) **Annex B.2: Comparison Table of MEA Conventions**, is a table that sets out description of each MEA’s governance structure and processes (confirmed by the interviews) in columns next to each other for ease of comparison.

2) **Findings of MEA comparison** (below) elaborates on insights gained from the qualitative interviews.

### 3. Findings of MEA Comparison

Using the assessment criteria of Clarity, Legitimacy, Accountability, and Effectiveness, SRI Executive sets out the below findings from the MEA Conventions which show how the MEA Conventions have addressed their respective governance challenges. Where relevant, we indicate how these findings relate back to the findings in the first Report on the Review of Ramsar’s Governance Structures and Procedures – Findings. These findings will then be used to inform the list of measures and positive indications for the EWG to consider.

**Which challenges are shared, and which challenges have been mitigated by the MEAs?**

All the MEAs have similar governance structures to the Ramsar Convention, as can be seen in the diagrams set out in Annex B.1: Organograms of MEAs. For further information regarding the nature and role of specific bodies, and how their functions relate to those of Ramsar, see the table in Annex B.2: Comparison Table of MEA Conventions.

- Each MEA has an ultimate governing body comprised of all the countries which have signed the Convention
- Each have, in varying forms, an executive subordinate committee with representation from the member countries that takes decisions between the meetings of the ultimate governing body.
- All the MEAs also have subgroups or subcommittees, either permanent or ad hoc, that deal with various specific operational or management issues for the respective Conventions.
- All have, in varying forms, Rules of Procedures and internal guidelines that set out how the governance operates.
- Decisions are overall taken by consensus and at times through voting according to the rules for voting. Detailed information is available in Annex B.2: Comparison Table of MEA Conventions.

Despite the similar structures, it should be noted that there is a difference between the missions of all the MEAs, which for some of them (LC/LP, CITES, IPPC) has an impact on the implementation of the governance of these conventions. We believe this is important to note and refer to when relevant in the findings below, as although all the conventions have their own complexities in relation to implementation, our review indicates from the responses from LC/LP, CITES and IPPC that their focused and narrow missions enable for resolutions and decisions that set out clear and narrow implementation measures; this could be an explanation as to why, according to their responses, they do not experience significant issues in relation to the implementation of their governance.
Similarly, we also note a difference in responses received to the interview questions and the indications as to whether MEAs had carried out governance reviews or significant governance changes in regard to LC/LP, CITES and IPPC. The delegates that participate are often well-informed, prepared and technically strong in relation to the substantive work of the convention’s governance meetings and often have a continuous engagement with the convention between major governance meetings. It should be noted that this does not indicate that these conventions have a stronger success of operational implementation, as this has not been reviewed.

Overview of Challenges & Successes Across MEAs

The table below sets out an overview of the main challenges that all MEAs have in common with Ramsar. Successes indicate how certain MEAs have found solutions to challenges. Please refer to the Findings below in the text for further details of these ongoing challenges and successes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Ongoing Challenges – challenges that are similar across all reviewed MEAs that have not been resolved</th>
<th>Successes – where some MEAs have overcome challenges experienced by all reviewed MEAs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clarity</strong></td>
<td>Finding #1.1 Administration of resolutions passed at COP (CITES and CMS)</td>
<td>Finding #1.2 Clarity of mandate of subgroups (All Conventions except Ramsar and UNESCO World Heritage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finding #1.3 Separate Rules of Procedure for the different governance bodies (CMS, IPPC, UNESCO World Heritage, CITES)</td>
<td>Finding #1.4 Clarity of mandate and efficient commencement of work for Scientific Committees (CITES, CMS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legitimacy**
- Finding #2.1 Diversity of delegates’ capacity and knowledge at COP

**Accountability**
- Finding #3.1 No enforcement mechanism
- Finding #3.1 Rate of national reporting (Ramsar)

**Effectiveness**
- Finding #4.2 Process for preparation of Resolutions
- Finding #4.3 Lack of communication between COPS/GAs
- Finding #4.1 Support from Host Institutions (CMS, ITPRGFA, LC/LP)

### 3.1 Clarity

**Finding #1.1 – Administration of Resolutions**

Administration, follow-up and monitoring of Resolutions and Decisions passed at COP/GA is a significant factor in increasing clarity around governance structures and processes.

In the first Report on the Review of Ramsar’s Governance Structures and Procedures – Findings, Section 3.1 sets out that there is some lack of clarity in relation to implementation of tasks designated
to the subsidiary governance bodies or CPs in resolutions passed at the COP of the Ramsar Convention. This causes, at times, procedural issues to take prominence in agendas and deliberations in the place of substantive and technical discussions on wetland management.

One of the main findings of the MEA Comparison is that CITES has an interesting practice for how it manages the resolutions of the Convention. It was referred to by several of the Conventions as having a very strong administration of their resolutions and three years ago CMS adopted the CITES system.

CITES introduced two types of decisions. **Resolutions** are only for interpretation of the Convention and the application of its provisions through policy direction. Meanwhile, **decisions** are for all activities directed to the CITES Committees, Contracting Parties or the Secretariat that are short term actions which end when the tasks they set out to achieve have been completed. All the resolutions are listed in reverse chronological order and classified per COP and decisions are listed on the website under thematic headings. Before each COP, a reconciliation is carried out of the list of decisions. Any decision with activities that should be continued (upon request of a CP) beyond the next COP must be expressly extended in a new decision. Otherwise the decision, and any subgroup/working group set up under it, is disbanded and removed.

As stated by CITES and CMS, this has provided a significant difference to the clarity of the activities that are to be undertaken after a COP. In addition, it has improved the clarity for the Contracting Parties and their delegates when communicating back to their home governments about decisions of the COP. In the respondent’s view, it also provides a good platform for anyone new to the Convention to quickly find and learn about any subject matter within the Convention.

It was noted that the administrative burden on these Conventions’ Secretariats is very heavy at times, but the level of clarity is felt to outweigh the burden of that work.

**Finding #1.2 – Mandates of Subgroups**
Clarity around mandates and reporting of Subgroups is recognised by all the Conventions as important for more efficient operations of the MEA Convention’s governance.

In the first Report on the Review of Ramsar’s Governance Structures and Procedures – Findings, sections 4.3-4.5 describe the Initial Findings for the Ramsar Convention Subgroups. These sections show that according to the desk review of Ramsar Convention documentation, subgroups’ mandates were found to be clear, although the interviews and survey responses showed a request by some CPs for easier and clearer access and understanding of the mandates.

All the MEA Conventions (except UNESCO World Heritage) stated that they have very clear mandates for their permanent subgroups, and that ad hoc working groups are only set up specifically for the duration of the sessions between the COPs/General Assemblies, and are disbanded once their reports are submitted to the COP. The Secretariat of UNESCO World Heritage stated that they have for the last 10 years become very involved in creating clarity regarding governance processes for subgroups, but that there is still a great challenge in keeping track of how many subgroups actually exist and are dormant.

The interviews with the MEA’s governance officers showed that CPs are often well-prepared and engaged quickly in the subgroups of which they are members or which are of interest to them due to the clarity gained in their creation of mandates through resolutions or decisions at the COP/GA. This is ultimately a contributing factor for more efficient support to governance processes of the MEA Conventions.
Finding #1.3 – Separate Rules of Procedure

A majority of the MEAs reviewed have Separate Rules of Procedure for the different governance bodies.

As stated above, all the MEAs have Rules of Procedure for their governance bodies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Separate Rules of Procedure</th>
<th>One Rules of Procedure applied mutatis mutanda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMS (Separate rules for COP, Standing Committee, and Scientific Committee)</td>
<td>ITPGRFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPPC (Separate rules for Commission, Standards Committee, and Implementation and Capacity Development Committee);</td>
<td>LC/CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO World Heritage (Rules for General Assembly; and for Committee)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITES (Separate rules for COP, Standing Committee, Animals Committee and Plants Committee)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the MEAs reviewed two thirds have adopted separate Rules of Procedure for their various governing bodies, as compared to the Ramsar Convention which applies its Rules of Procedure for its Conference of Parties *mutatis mutanda* to the other governing bodies (Report on the Review of Ramsar’s Governance Structures and Procedures – Findings, section 4.2, page 19).

All the MEA Secretariats’ interview responses show that a preference is for clear, separate rules of procedure for each governing body. The LC/LP Secretariat have just recently commenced an internal review of their Rules of Procedure to see how to include, as a separate and distinct section, the function of their Bureau, which has existed since the Protocol was adopted, but has not been expressly set out in the Rules of Procedure.

Responses from the interviews with CMS indicate that the introduction of a separate Rules of Procedure increased the clarity, and thereby the effectiveness of the work to be done. UNESCO World Heritage noted that this is an area of ongoing deliberation at their GA meetings, with their Rules of Procedure continuously evolving for the different governing bodies to improve running of meetings and nomination processes in particular. They noted that clarity of terms of reference and procedures for sub-committees and subgroups are clearly set out in decisions from the GA meeting.

Finding #1.4 – Efficient commencement of Scientific Committee work

Clarity of mandate and efficient commencement of work for Scientific Committees supports more informed debates and action at COP/GA meetings.

We have noted findings from the desk review and the interviews regarding the scientific support committees or subgroups which the reviewed MEAs have. The desk review shows that appointments to these committees or subgroups are made by the all the MEAs at COP/GA meetings.

Over the course of our review, we noted that CMS carried out a restructure of its Scientific Committee in 2014 as a response to the need for the Scientific Council to work more efficiently. In comparison to Ramsar, the CMS Scientific Council has members from all its Contracting Parties (130) and was found to be too large. Therefore, a Sessional Committee of the Scientific Council was set up with fewer members, appointed at each COP meeting, which meets between COP meetings and is responsible for
the implementation of the mandate assigned to the Scientific Council at the COP. The workplan for the Scientific Council is also approved through a resolution at the COP.

Moreover, CITES has adjusted its Rules of Procedure to clarify the division of policy development and the support function of scientific advice and expertise. Their Scientific Council had previously reported directly to the COP which had the effect of blurring the line between science and policy in resolutions. Now, all Scientific Committee reports and proposals are first reviewed by the Standing Committee.

This is similar to the Ramsar Convention’s decision to shift the STRP workplan to be developed post-COP, and also to move the appointment of STRP members to the MWG (as part of the Standing Committee). However, in the first Report on the Review of Ramsar’s Governance Structures and Procedures – Finding 4.6, it was noted in the desk review and the survey responses that it takes more than 6 months (COP 13 in June 2018, STRP workplan approved at SC57 in June 2019) to approve the STRP workplan which reduces the amount of time it is able to work on its tasks significantly.

The representatives on the CITES Scientific Committees are appointed by the COP meeting, and their workplan is created through a decision of the COP in broad terms (with finalisation and budget provided by the Secretariat post COP meeting). This means they can begin clearly defined work very quickly after the COP meeting.

Overall, the desk review and the interviews did not highlight any other specific governance challenges for the reviewed MEAs in relation to their Scientific Committees (or similar committees).

3.2 Legitimacy

Finding #2.1 – Diversity of delegates

The challenge of diversity of the delegates’ capacity at COP/GA is common to all the MEA Conventions, and difficult to solve.

All of the MEA Conventions mention a similar struggle in relation to perceived legitimacy as set out in the first Report on the Review of Ramsar’s Governance Structures and Procedures – Findings in section 3.2 (page 8). The perception of a diversity of capacity of delegates has been voiced by most Conventions.

The only MEA Convention that noted it had a strong level of capacity of the delegates and therefore rich and fruitful debates in its COP was CITES. This strength was explained by the fact that there is financial interest in the trade that the Convention regulates, which in turn draws national attention and also high degree of interest from civil society.

CITES and CMS both noted their strong governance documentation management in relation to resolutions and decisions (as mentioned in Finding #1.1 above). They note that the way in which information is presented on their respective websites makes it easily accessible and CPs are able to inform themselves quickly of an area of interest.

LC/LP noted that the fact that they are hosted by the IMO (International Maritime Organisation) means that CPs have close access to their national experts within the larger IMO to support the work to prepare for LC/LP meetings. They also hold capacity building workshops for new delegates and participants.

None of the MEA Conventions had a faultless and effective solution to the challenge of individual delegate capacity, recognising it as a part of the nature and culture of multilateral agreements. However, as noted above, certain MEAs feel they have less of an issue in relation to legitimacy.
3.3 Accountability

Finding #3.1 – Lack of enforcement mechanism

The lack of an enforcement mechanism is common to all six MEA Conventions. The support of Compliance Committees and inspections help, but are not effective enough.

None of the MEA Conventions have enforcement mechanisms, except CITES, which can ban trade against a contracting party and to a certain extent LC/LP which gives permits for dumping waste and monitors the compliance of those permits. However, LC/LP cannot bring any enforcement action against a Contracting Party directly under the Convention or Protocol, another Contracting Party would have to bring enforcement action under international law.

The MEA Conventions, therefore, rely heavily on national reporting, and what some referred to as “name and shame” in the COP or Standing Committee meetings. Many of the Conventions (UNESCO World Heritage, LC/LP, CITES, and ITPGRFA) have compliance groups or committees which they feel are important in the role of monitoring, inspecting and guiding implementation.\(^1\) The reporting rates of the other Conventions were not as high as that of the Ramsar Convention (at last COPs/GA meetings, Ramsar had an 88% reporting rate; LC/LP had 50-60% of CPs report; CMS had a 70% reporting rate). All noted that reporting was not a satisfactory compensation for other ideas (such as “no fee – no vote”) for ensuring compliance with resolutions and decisions.

3.4 Effectiveness

Finding #4.1 – Support from Host Institution

Support from Host Institution is a significant factor for effective management of governance processes.

A factor that was identified as significant by some of the MEA Conventions (CMS, ITPRGFA, LC/LP) is the support services given by the Conventions’ host organisation. LC/LP is hosted by the International Maritime Organisation (IMO) which provides all meeting recording and reporting tools, meeting logistics and communication services. The interviewee stated that it helps the efficiency of the administration of LC/LP’s governance. ITPRGFA and CMS are hosted by FAO and both Conventions are very much integrated into FAO’s management tools and systems for reporting both for governance and operations. For these MEA Conventions, a great deal of the governance administrative burden is lessened (in relation to cost and efficiency), which is a great help.

This finding is being brought forward to highlight the importance of efficient support from host institutions to MEA Conventions and significantly their Secretariats. In the first Report on the Review of Ramsar’s Governance Structures and Procedures – Findings in section 4.8 (page 27) on the the Ramsar Secretariat, the CPs response showed that the Ramsar Secretariat is fulfilling its governance mandate and tasks in a proper manner. However, it was recognised that the Secretariat needed more resources to be more efficient, as it was often constrained in relation to time and manpower in relation to supporting the administration of the institution’s governance.

The MEAs are hosted as set out below:

\(^1\) The Compliance Groups or Committees mentioned above are broadly mandated to consider information submitted regarding non-compliance with the Convention and offer advice or assistance to the Contracting Parties to better comply with obligations set out in the Convention. For full details on each body, please refer to the links in the text above.
Finding #4.2 – Review of resolutions
Support from specific bodies in reviewing draft resolutions increases the effectiveness of passing the resolutions, and supports more effective post-COP/GA implementation.

UNESCO World Heritage, LC/LP, CITES, CMS and ITPGRFA have strong involvement from their respective Secretariats to try to review and manage resolutions and reports before they are submitted to the COPs or General Assemblies (and also review final resolutions after the COP or General Assembly meeting). They all mentioned that the need to ensure cross referencing to earlier resolutions or decisions to ensure consistency and limitation of overlap has become a strong focus in the last few years. This is not a kind of support authors for the proposed draft resolution in the Ramsar Convention gets as a standard procedure. The CITES has started a procedure on creating consolidated resolutions. The Ramsar Convention decided at COP 13 to create a process similar.

At UNESCO World Heritage, any resolution must refer to earlier resolutions or decisions of one of its subgroups that are relevant to it. The Secretariat of the LC/LP enforce strict deadlines for submission of documents to their General Assembly, with no documentation permitted after the deadline has passed (13 weeks prior to the COP).

All proposals submitted by CPs to be put forward to the CPM (Commission on Phytosanitary Measures) at IPPC are reviewed by a Task Force on Topics with members from its Bureau, Scientific Committee and Implementation Committee to help ensure the proposal can be adopted unanimously, or to be able to identify where further work is needed before the CPM meeting.

However, overall all MEAs still find this area challenging, with responses from the governance officers at the MEA secretariats referring to lack of time and resources as the main obstacle to being able to support CPs in a better way.

Finding #4.3 – Communication to CPs
Communication to CPs between COP/GA is a common challenge, where clear and helpful publication on websites is seen as the most used solution.

IPPC has a Communication Strategy recognised in the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 as a core activity. The IPPC Secretariat noted that this has increased engagement of CPs as it aims to highlight IPPC’s role within global plant health and improve the implementation of the Convention overall. The other MEA Conventions mentioned that all their information is available on their websites, and similarly to the Ramsar Convention, it is up to the Contracting Parties to access the information as and when they need it. All the MEA Conventions mentioned that they accept a certain level of disparity in which some CPs engage more than others. As such, one interviewee mentioned that it is an important role for the Chair of the meetings to ensure the members who may not be prepared are given the opportunity to speak as well.
4. Governance Reviews

All the 6 MEAs were asked if they had carried out governance reviews and/or reforms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEA</th>
<th>Recent Governance Reviews/ Reforms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO World Heritage</td>
<td>UNESCO General Assembly created an Open-Ended Working Group in 2015 to gather all the previous work on reviewing the governance structure and working processes of UNESCO. Since 2016 the progress of reviewing the governance is a fixed agenda item at the General Assembly and is ongoing. As can be seen, UNESCO is reviewing a large number of governance structures and practices including some for the World Heritage Convention. See the latest progress report <a href="#">here</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/ LP</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPPC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITPGRFA</td>
<td>ITPGRFA is currently carrying out a review of their subsidiary bodies and how they work together to support the governing bodies, but no recommendations have been made so far.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITES</td>
<td>CITES has ongoing review of governance procedures at its COP meetings (included as specific agenda items at each COP).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the six MEA Conventions were also asked if smaller governance changes had taken place and all responded that smaller changes to procedures have occurred over time but none that stood out as significant changes. The governance officers interviewed stated that to their knowledge, audit reports had not highlighted significant governance issues which have had to be addressed. Through a spot check of audit reports for each of the reviewed MEAs, no significant governance changes have been noted.

5. Concluding Remarks and Next Steps

The following findings are seen to be most noteworthy from this MEA comparison. In relation to the findings in the first Report on the Review of Ramsar’s Governance Structures and Procedures – Findings, we would encourage that the EWG give these findings specific consideration when developing the Governance Draft Resolution, taking into consideration the specific context of the Ramsar Convention’s governance structures and processes, which differs at times from that of other the MEAs:

Finding #1.1: Administration of resolutions
Finding #1.3: Separate Rules of Procedure
Finding #1.4 – Efficient commencement of Scientific Committee work
Finding #4.1 Support from Host Institutions; and
Finding #4.2: Review of Resolutions.

Following this report, SRI Executive will be putting together a Report on measures and positive indications to the EWG for its deliberations, in order for the EWG to draft its proposal for a resolution to be submitted to Standing Committee 59.
Annex A: Contacts Interviewed for MEA Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contacts</th>
<th>UNESCO</th>
<th>CMS</th>
<th>London Convention (LCLP)</th>
<th>IPPC</th>
<th>ITPGRFA</th>
<th>CITES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contacts</td>
<td>Miray Hasaltun Wosinski, Chair World Heritage Committee</td>
<td>Frederique Aubert, Head of Unit Policy and Statutory Meetings Unit</td>
<td>Melanie Virtue, Head Aquatic Species Team, CMS Secretariat</td>
<td>Javier Arriaga (Chair of Commission on Phytosanitary Matters)</td>
<td>Artur Shamilov, Agricultural Officer, IPPC Secretariat</td>
<td>Carolina Caceres, Chair Standing Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No response from former Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Francisco Lopez and Aya Idemitsu (Treaty Technical Officers)</td>
<td></td>
<td>David Morgan, Chief Governing Bodies and Meetings Services, Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex B.1: Organograms of MEAs
Annex B.2: Comparison Table of MEA Conventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ramsar</th>
<th>UNESCO World Heritage Convention</th>
<th>CMS</th>
<th>London Convention (LCLP)</th>
<th>IPPC</th>
<th>ITPGRFA</th>
<th>CITES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Body name &amp; Mandate/ Scope</td>
<td>Conference of the Parties • Determines policies and strategies for preserving wetlands</td>
<td>General Conference • Determines policies and strategies of relevant to preservation of cultural heritage</td>
<td>Conference of the Parties • Reviews implementation relating to conservation of migratory bird species</td>
<td>General Assembly • Reviews implementation relating to marine dumping</td>
<td>Commission on Phytosanitary Matters • Reviews implementation relating to protection of plant species</td>
<td>Governing Body • Reviews and provides policy direction relating to food security &amp; Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>• 171 member states</td>
<td>• 193 members and 11 Associate members</td>
<td>• 130 member states</td>
<td>• 87 members of Convention and 53 members of Protocol</td>
<td>• Over 180 member states</td>
<td>• 147 member states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection Process</td>
<td>• CoP host country acts as Chair</td>
<td>• Conference country acts as Chair. Vice chairs in alphabetical order among bureau members</td>
<td>• Chair and Vice Chair elected by the parties at previous CoP</td>
<td>• Candidates to be elected nominated by Secretariat</td>
<td>• Chair and up to two Vice Chairs elected by Commission for two-year term</td>
<td>• Chairs elected at end of each session for following period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other attendees?</td>
<td>• Observers for non-member states, IOPs and other</td>
<td>• Observers for non-member states, IGOs, NGOs, with permission</td>
<td>• Observers for non-member states, IGOs, NGOs, with permission</td>
<td>• Observers for non-member states, IGOs, NGOs, with permission</td>
<td>• Observers for non-member states, IGOs, NGOs, with permission</td>
<td>• Observers for non-member states, IGOs, NGOs, with permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure for Decision Making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 months: Secretariat notifies parties of COP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 months: CPs submit draft resolutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 months: WGs submit proposed DR to the SC for consideration and adoption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months: SC pre-COP meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional pre-COP meeting immediately prior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules of Procedure adopted with or without changes every COP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 weeks: Draft proposals to DG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Days: DG considers draft proposals admissible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Days: Parties appeal against inadmissible draft proposals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules of Procedure reviewed every two years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 days: Draft amendments to Exec Sec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 days: Exec Sec submits scientific amendments to Scientific Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 days: Non-technical draft amendments to Exec Sec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 days: Exec Sec sends all documents to CoP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring: Submission dumping statistics to Scientific groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 week: Reports to Compliance Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoP: CPs approve report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 weeks prior to CoP: Amendment to Protocol (Annexes) &amp; Resolutions on Technical Guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions published beginning following year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals for new Standards usually brought by Standards Committee, at times by CPs but always through Standards Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All proposals discussed and agreed at inter-sessional regional meetings before annual meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions taken by consensusOn average have 2 Conceptual standards, 5-7 Diagnostic Practices, and 4 Treatment Practices per meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months: Draft amendments circulated to CPs by Secretary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All amendments made by consensus at CoP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 days after: Approved amendments actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 days: Draft resolutions and decisions to Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretariat monitors both resolutions and decisions, providing background docs to all resolutions and decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolutions and Decisions are reviewed at COP and are EXPLICITLY extended or removed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accountability Mechanism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rely on national reporting at COP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A CP can list an endangered Ramsar site within their own territory on the Montreux record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can list a UNESCO site as ‘endangered’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of this process affected by political will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced a review mechanism at COP 12 – inspection teams can be sent to a CP if notice is given of infringements of Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can implement trade sanctions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strict adherence to deadlines for submission of Resolutions or Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting of compliance with permits published and those who have not reported –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No specific enforcement mechanism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced a surveillance activity but it takes up to 5 years for a standard to be reviewed globally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use the threat of not being able to trade as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Reporting Figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERSIGHT BODY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standing Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Carries out interim CoP activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensures flow of information between parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Body Name &amp; Mandate/Scope</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oversight Body</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 regional members elected at the CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECRETARIATES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Composition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mandate &amp; Activities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing Subgroups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equivalent Subgroups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standing Subgroups</th>
<th>Ramsar</th>
<th>UNESCO</th>
<th>CMS</th>
<th>London Convention (LCLP)</th>
<th>IPPC</th>
<th>ITPGRFA</th>
<th>CITES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standing Subgroups</td>
<td>• Executive Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Compliance Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Working Group on Compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strategic Planning Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No ad hoc working groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discussion groups in Strategic Planning Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ad hoc working groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Full list here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standing Subgroups</th>
<th>Ramsar</th>
<th>UNESCO</th>
<th>CMS</th>
<th>London Convention (LCLP)</th>
<th>IPPC</th>
<th>ITPGRFA</th>
<th>CITES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standing Subgroups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No ad hoc working groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discussion groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Name</td>
<td>Composition &amp; Selection Process</td>
<td>Scientific Council</td>
<td>Scientific Groups</td>
<td>Expert Working Groups (EWG)</td>
<td>Scientific Advisory Committee on the Global Information System</td>
<td>The Plants Committee &amp; The Animals Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRP</td>
<td>Made up of 18 scientific and technical expert members, nominated by the CPs and observers and appointed by the SC.</td>
<td>Consists of 15 regional representatives (three from each CMS region) proposed by CPs and appointed at the COP.</td>
<td>In theory they are one LC and one LP group, but they meet as one, annually in spring and then report to autumn session of contracting parties.</td>
<td>Standards Committee selects experts from national and regional organisations 6–10 representative participants, including member of Standards Committee</td>
<td>Up to 2 scientific experts from each Region, nominated by the Vice-chairpersons of the Governing Body of each respective Region</td>
<td>Representative of CITES six regions, as well as one specialist on nomenclature on each of the two committees. Elected by the COP with consideration for regional diversity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mandate & Activities

- Mandated to provide scientific and technical guidance to the COP, SC and Secretariat
- Technical and Scientific input provided by external Advisory bodies (IUCN, ICCROM, ICOMOS)
- The Council makes recommendations to the COP on substantive and research issues related to conservation of migratory species.
- Annual obligation of CPs to report on waste dumped at sea. The scientific groups are not independent, they are made up of national delegations of scientists.
- Draft international plant standards which are approved for consultation by the Standards Committee
- Provides guidance on the development and strengthening of the Global Information System, to facilitate the exchange of information on scientific, technical, and environmental matters
- Fills gaps in biological and other specialized knowledge regarding species of animals and plants that are (or might become) subject to CITES trade controls. Their role is to provide technical support to decision-making about these species

### Finance Mechanism

#### Body Name & Composition

**Subgroup on Finance**
- 1 CP from each region, Chair elected from this group, incumbent Chair attending

**Finance & Administrative Commission**

**The Finance & Budget Subcommittee**
- Elected by and reports into the Standing Committee

**The Financial Committee**

**The Financial Committee**

**The Financial Committee**

**Subcommittee on Finance and budget**

#### Mandate & Activities

- Mandated to deal with all financial matters of the Convention and report and make recommendations on these matters to the Standing
- Deals with financial and administrative questions. Reports to the Executive Board
- Deals with financial matters of the Convention and reports to the
- The LCLP is housed within the IMO, and IMO parties absorb cost of LCLP
- Secures financial transparency and appropriateness throughout planning and budgeting processes
- Financial matters discussed in the Bureau during the inter-sessional period. Terms of reference for the in-session
- Fee is paid by each party, mostly fundraising by Secretariat. ‘Voluntary’ contributions by parties that are assessed culturally, they are scaled. Some parties...
Standing Committee operations.

- 4 members selected by, and including at least one member of, the CPM Bureau
- budget committee of the Governing Body are under development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ramsar</th>
<th>UNESCO</th>
<th>CMS</th>
<th>London Convention (LCLP)</th>
<th>IPPC</th>
<th>ITPGRFA</th>
<th>CITES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has Conducted Past Governance Review?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Working Group on Governance, established by the Conference in 2015 <a href="#">here</a></td>
<td>No governance review been carried out</td>
<td>For IMO but not for LCLP specifically</td>
<td>No governance review although discussions ongoing.</td>
<td>Yes for subgroups, see details <a href="#">here</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Has never carried out a full governance review</td>
<td>Governance procedures reviewed <a href="#">here</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Overall Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Governance</th>
<th>OEQ1 What are the critical success factors and ways of working?</th>
<th>MEQ1.1 Which top 3 governance-related skills and/or practices do you feel the various governance bodies need to have and do well in order for them to best support Ramsar’s ability to deliver on its Vision and Mission?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MEQ1.2 Beyond the Rules of Procedure, which standard governance-related procedures do you feel are needed within and between the governance bodies in order for them to best support Ramsar’s ability to deliver on its Vision and Mission?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Clarity - Mandate, tasks and responsibilities for decisions and actions in the Convention are clearly delineated, allocated and accepted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarity - Mandate, tasks and responsibilities for decisions and actions in the Convention are clearly delineated, allocated and accepted</th>
<th>OEQ2 What level of clarity exists around the bodies' roles and responsibilities?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEQ 2.1 Do the governance bodies have clear delegated mandates allocated to them? Are there gaps or overlaps that you are aware of?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEQ 2.2 Do the Party representatives of the governance bodies clearly understand how, and the extent to which, they contribute to the governance of Ramsar?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEQ 2.3 Do the Party representatives on the governance bodies understand the requirements and obligations of the positions they are filling based on clear information which is expressly stated and accessible for all?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEQ 2.4 Are decisions that are taken, or recommendations made, by any of the governance bodies clear and enacted in a manner that follows agreed-upon rules?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Legitimacy - All parties to the Convention are fairly represented and are informed and empowered to validate or question all decisions taken by the Convention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legitimacy - All parties to the Convention are fairly represented and are informed and empowered to validate or question all decisions taken by the Convention.</th>
<th>OEQ3 What is the perceived legitimacy of the governance?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEQ 3.1 Is each governance body representative of the Convention’s Parties?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEQ 3.2 Are all contracting parties informed and empowered to take decisions at Conference of CPs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEQ3.3 Are the Party representatives on the governance bodies chosen and appointed in a representative manner?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEQ 3.4 Are decisions and actions clearly related to issues discussed at the meetings of the governance bodies and accepted by all parties?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accountability - The decision-making bodies of the Convention are accessible to their stakeholders, who are informed and empowered to question decisions taken. All parties are seen as responsible and accountable for the decisions they take.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OEQ4 What is the extent to which the bodies are held accountable for fulfilling their mandates?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEQ.4.1 Are decision-making bodies [COP, SC] of the Convention accessible and accountable for the decisions they take?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEQ.4.2 Does the governance structure include a review mechanism to objectively assess bodies' fulfilment of their functions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEQ.4.3 How successful are the mechanisms currently in place for supporting Parties’ abilities to enhance their implementation of the Convention including through its resolutions? Is there opportunity for improvement?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effectiveness - The governance bodies deliver, in a timely and effective manner, on the objectives set out by their mandates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OEQ5 How well reflected in the Convention’s governance-related performance are the desired key skills or practices needed of high performing convention bodies?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEQ.5.1 Were any of the major factors influencing the achievements of the Convention’s objectives in the last trimester related to governance actions or practices?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEQ.5.2 Do governance bodies have a good mix of skills, knowledge and experience to deliver on their duties? If not, what is missing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEQ.5.3 Do Parties have access to key information needed to make informed decisions, with information freely available and accessible to those who will be responsible for implementing such decisions and their respective enforcement?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OEQ6 What is the level of effectiveness of current governance-related processes in supporting critical functions?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEQ.6.1 Do the governance-related processes that are in place today support the governance bodies, and the Convention more broadly, to be effective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEQ.6.2 Where a governance body relies on subgroups to contribute on issues related to governance, are they used wisely, in a timely and effective manner?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEQ7 How does Ramsar's governance support the Convention's sustainability?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>