

13th Meeting of the Standing Committee

Stockholm, Sweden, 27 April 2017

Compilation of Comments received from Parties concerning the Future Scale of Contributions



Belgium:

Concerning the return to the UN Scale of contributions

Strongly favourable, considering it is the most fair distribution of the budget reflecting the economic evolutions in different countries, which is approved every year by the General Assembly.

Concerning the gradual move to the UN Scale of contributions

Preferably, it would be best to move immediately to the UN Scale of contributions, but because of the serious increase for certain parties a gradual increase in 25% steps over 4 year as mentioned in both scenarios will be supported.

Considering the current necessary withdrawals of trust fund reserves (which are unsustainable for another quadrennium) and the lack of inflation adjustments for over a decade, it is acceptable to keep the contributions of those Parties that would normally decrease, frozen at the present level for the next quadrennium.

Concerning the increase of the minimum contributions

Favourable on the condition of sufficient support of the parties concerned. To ease the transition a gradual increase in 25% steps a year will be supported.

Concerning the issue of the budget deficit

A budget deficit has arisen caused by the freezing of both the budget and the contributions for two quadrenniums. Although it was at the time the practical solution, in the long term a frozen budget is very bad for an agreement to keep functioning properly.

At the next MoP a new realistic and comprehensive budget for the next quadrennium need to be adopted based on the average actual expenditure of the current quadrennium.

(18.04.2017)

Finland:

Finland would be supportive to using UN scale to determine the level of contributions.

(24.04.2017)

Germany:

As already stated at the last StC in 2016 we comprehend the need to return to the application of the UN Scale for future budget periods but endorse a graduate shift solution. Therefore we fully support the document submitted (Doc.EUROBATS.StC13.12). Furthermore, we welcome the idea about adjusting the minimum contribution of the Parties to the level that has already been applied in AEWA. (21.04.2017)

Moldova:

On behalf of His Excellency, Mr. Valeriu Munteanu, Minister of Environment of Republic of Moldova, please be informed that Republic of Moldova will go for Scenario 2. (19.04.2017)

Norway:

Thanks for the information on the budget situation. As usual to be able to have an informed debate one need to see the whole budget for the next period and the status of the trust fund. However, judging from the statements here we would expect the future potential of continued withdrawal from the trust fund to be limited. Therefore the suggestions by the StC seem logical. In principle we are positive towards following the UN scale of distribution and therefore also support adjustments, possibly as suggested. Due to the low number of Parties to Eurobats the UN scale may be skewed towards those who bear the highest cost. Therefore one might expect suggestions for adjustments to accommodate their positions. Anyhow, the final choices will have to wait until the next MoP in 2018, as will our position. (05.01.2017)

We are supportive of your M.O. of a gradual increase over the triennium. (18.04.2017)

Poland:

We have got some doubts if there is a real need to apply the UN scale. Through years we were informed about very good financial situation of the Agreement. We are very interested to know the reason which have changed this situation. We guess that the debate on the new budget will take place in 2018, during next MOP? (05.01.2017)

Portugal:

Hereby I inform that Scenario 2 is supported by the Portuguese government. (24.04.2017)

Slovenia:

In principle, we are in favour for Scenario 1, Scenario 2 is conditionally acceptable and could be matter of further negotiations. (18.04.2017)

Switzerland:

In the letter of the 4th of January of this year, the Standing Committee asked the governments to communicate in writing their views on the two possible scenarios concerning the next budget period 2019 – 2022 before the Standing Committee, which is scheduled to take place in Stockholm, Sweden, in April 2017.

We understand the need for the Eurobats Secretariat to get budgetary stability and develop a four years planning of the foreseen contributions. We are aware that due to a growth of Switzerland's population in recent years our UN share has increased. Therefore we are glad to inform you that the increase of the level of contributions for the period 2019 – 2022 suggested in those two scenarios is acceptable for Switzerland. Even if we are not directly impacted by the difference between the two scenarios, we support the fact that the Agreement on the Conservation of Populations of European Bats should have healthy finances. We would also like to stress that ownership of parties in this process is linked to the willingness to pay a minimal contribution. In this sense we consider scenario 2 in annexe 3 to be preferable for Eurobats. (04.04.2017)

United Kingdom:

I refer to your letter of 4th January 2017 in which you sought the views of the UK Government on three possible scenarios that would allow funding contributions from the Parties to return to the application of the UN Scale of Assessment for further periods.

The principle of using the UN Scale of Assessment to apportion Parties contributions to International agreements is well established and one the UK fully supports. As such we strongly endorse Eurobats returning to using this scale.

Therefore, the UK's preferred option is returning to use of relevant UN Scale of Assessment at the earliest opportunity (Annex 1).

We recognise the approach that has been taken in AEWA to set a minimum contribution and that this could be adopted within Eurobats (Annex 3, Scenario 2). The UK sees some merit in this approach and if this acceptable to those Parties most affected this is an approach that we could accept.

While we do recognise that this might a rapid adjustment for some we are not attracted to a phased approach which does not fully return to the UN Scale of Assessment until 2022 (Annex 2, Scenario 1). However, if this was the clear preference of the majority, then we would not block agreement.

I am sorry that we are not able to be present in person to present our views at the next meeting of the Standing Committee in Stockholm. I note your request to communicate our views in advance of the meeting if this is the case and we would ask that you might ensure that our views are represented there. (20.04.2017)