



Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals

Secretariat provided by the United Nations Environment Programme



37th Meeting of the Standing Committee

Bonn, 23-24 November 2010

CMS/StC37/7
Agenda Item 6 a

OPTIONS REPORT

SECOND STEP OF THE INTER-SESSIONAL FUTURE SHAPE PROCESS

Cover prepared by the CMS Secretariat

Report in Annex I compiled by the consultancy firm ERIC on behalf of the Inter-Sessional Working Group regarding the Future Shape of CMS (ISWGoFS)

1. 2009 saw the ISWGoFS as well as the CMS Family Secretariats involved in the first step of the Future Shape process, the final result of which was a report providing a general overview and basic assessment of the current CMS Family structure and operations.
2. A preliminary review was submitted to the 36th meeting of the Standing Committee in December 2009. The meeting endorsed the work done thus far and provided contributions to the review. All Party/Signatory representatives to CMS and its instruments also had the opportunity to provide inputs to the analysis through the regional representatives of the Standing Committee both prior and after the meeting.
3. The second step of this process started in early 2010. Its mandate consists of the elaboration of different proposals to improve current operations that will be then taken into account to formulate three scenarios for a future strategy of the CMS Family for COP10 in 2011.
4. ERIC, a UK-based consultancy firm, who was engaged to assist the ISWGoFS with the first step of the Future Shape process, was reappointed to pursue the work until 2011 thanks to a generous contribution from the Government of France.
5. ERIC based its work for the second phase on two main sources of information: assessment of the current CMS Family operations and views of the Parties and Signatories to the CMS instruments and their partner organisations.
6. To ease the consultation exercise, the UK and France (members of the ISWGoFS) developed three detailed questionnaires: (i) for member states, (ii) for MEAs and (iii) for partner organizations and research bodies. (Annex II).
7. Despite the efforts made both by the ISWGoFS in designing the questionnaires and those made by the Secretariat in circulating the questionnaires and collecting responses and sending out several reminders, the result of this exercise was not fully representative as the number of completed questionnaire was very low. In fact only 33 questionnaires in total (out of 253) were received: 28 (out of 144) from Parties to CMS and Agreements and Signatories to MoUs; 1 from MEAs (out of 5) and 4 (out of 104) partner organisations.

For reasons of economy, documents are printed in a limited number, and will not be distributed at the meeting. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copy to the meeting and not to request additional copies.

8. It was recognized that given the highly political nature of some questions, a full consultation with all governmental departments and agencies involved in the implementation of CMS instruments was difficult.
9. However, in order to make the best out of this exercise, ERIC was requested by the ISWGoFS to summarize the key issues raised in the questionnaires received without making a full analysis.
10. In parallel with the consultation through the questionnaires, in February, the Working Group requested ERIC to produce a wide list of options for restructuring CMS and the CMS Family whose viability or merits of each would be assessed at a later stage.
11. The CMS and its co-located Agreements Secretariats and UNEP extensively commented on the feasibility of the options in particular on legal aspects and practicality linked to their implementation and provided suggestions as to grouping and combining options.
12. In view of the second meeting of the ISWGoFS, which took place in Bonn from 1 to 2 July 2010 and was sponsored by the Government of France, and to speed up the process, ERIC was requested to narrow down the proposed options to a feasible level (7) and elaborate them in the light of their individual possible advantages and disadvantages and on the basis of the questionnaires' synopsis and the comments received.
13. The second meeting of the ISWGoFS considered the proposals presented by ERIC and decided to take the bullet points of Paragraph 3 of Resolution 9.13 as the starting point for further discussion and draw up a table to illustrate how the proposed activities met the mandate. The meeting also decided that ERIC, in view of the Standing Committee meeting in November 2010, would develop scoring and weighting systems to assess impacts and benefits of the activities identified by the ISWGoFS. The analysis would be then completed by costing each activity and group them under possible options.
14. Following up the decisions made by the meeting, ERIC selected some of these activities and, as suggested by the Chair of the ISWGoFS, grouped them into 4 possible options, namely "Concentration", "Decentralization", "Ideal" and "Low Cost". A methodology based on different foci (i.e. positive and negative impacts) and a related scoring system was also developed and applied to these activities.
15. At the beginning of September, after several rounds of consultations with the CMS Secretariat, in particular for the costing exercise, ERIC circulated a draft report to the ISWGoFS and the CMS Family Secretariats for review and comments.
16. Unfortunately due to the tight schedule, only few members of the ISWGoFS and the CMS Family Secretariats provided inputs.
17. Although ERIC made considerable efforts to incorporate many of the comments and proposed amendments in the short time available, it is still felt that not all concerns raised, had been addressed and reflected in the final version of the report.
18. Most concerns are related to the number of options (these being only 4); their titles as well as the selection and grouping of activities as alternative combinations would provide equally workable options and some activities could be listed under more than one option.
19. The analysis of the overall impact of each activity on the basis of the methodology, although it might assist the assessment, also does not seem fully clear and consistent throughout the report. After the submission of the final version of the report by ERIC, the CMS Secretariat, as instructed by the ISWGoFS, corrected a few factual mistakes,

mostly in the introductory section, which are currently highlighted in the report in track changes for sake of transparency.

20. The report, in accordance with the Addendum to Res.9.13 has to be submitted to the members of the Standing Committee a month before its 37th meeting. This is so that they have sufficient time to examine it before the discussion at the meeting. However, for the reasons indicated above, the ISWGoFS suggests that the report be considered as a working document as this would allow for further elaboration as suggested by the Standing Committee.

Action requested:

The Standing Committee is requested to consider and provide inputs to the proposals outlined in the report in Annex I and give further guidance to the ISWGoFS on how to proceed with the process and how to embark on Step 3 as set out in the Terms of Reference (Res. 9.13 Addendum).