



**CONVENTION ON
MIGRATORY
SPECIES**

Distribution: General

UNEP/CMS/COP12/Inf.27
13 September 2017

Original: English

12th MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES
Manila, Philippines, 23 - 28 October 2017
Agenda Item 19.2

**PRINCIPLES AND INITIAL SUGGESTIONS FOR A POSSIBLE REVISION
OF THE NATIONAL REPORT FORMAT**

(Prepared by the Secretariat)

Summary

This document provides additional background information in support of document UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.19.2 and the draft Decision contained in that document on revising the format for national reports.

The information and suggestions here draw *inter alia* on analyses and lessons learned from experience with the national reports to COP11 and COP12, and on work done by the CMS Strategic Plan Working Group.

In addition to giving the background to the recommendations arising from that work, the present document also provides an initial illustration of modifications that could be made to the existing format to give effect to the recommendations, while also achieving an overall streamlining of the format and hence helping to reduce the reporting burden experienced by Contracting Parties.

PRINCIPLES AND INITIAL SUGGESTIONS FOR A POSSIBLE REVISION OF THE NATIONAL REPORT FORMAT

1. Introduction

- 1.1. In COP Resolution 11.2 on the *Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023*, the Parties to CMS requested the Secretariat to “consider amendments to the format for National Reports, where necessary, in respect of assessing implementation of the Strategic Plan and those indicators for which such reports are identified as a potentially important source of information, and the scope for streamlining existing reporting processes to reduce reporting burdens, and to submit any proposed amendments to the Standing Committee for its consideration and transmission to the 12th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties”.
- 1.2 The request in Resolution 11.2 therefore principally involves two issues: (i) supporting the assessment of the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023 (SPMS) and (ii) streamlining the reporting process as a whole. Work on the first of these issues advanced in 2016 with the support of the Strategic Plan Working Group (SPWG) and a generous voluntary funding contribution from the Government of Germany. The Secretariat has subsequently worked further on the second issue, drawing *inter alia* on suggestions provided by UNEP-WCMC following the COP11 reporting cycle, and on the analysis of national reports submitted by Parties to COP12, as discussed separately in document UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.19.1.
- 1.3 Document UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.19.1 and the present document integrate the two lines of thinking into the basis for a single package of amendments that could be put forward for consideration by the Standing Committee and (subject to the Committee’s agreement) incorporation into a revised format to be used for reporting to COP13 and in subsequent reporting cycles.
- 1.4 Based on the COP11 mandate referred to above, the overall aim of a revision of the format for National Reports is to generate information that will be useful for making assessments of CMS implementation experience and progress towards achieving the goals of the Strategic Plan, while also being as efficient as possible by ensuring that the reporting burden on Parties is limited to those items that are most meaningful. This should therefore produce:
 - the essential picture of Convention implementation;
 - sufficient information to allow learning/adaptation;
 - the essential picture of progress towards objectives in the Strategic Plan;
 - maximum efficiency and worthwhileness.

2. Amendments to align the National Report Format with the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species

- 2.1 In the course of the development by the SPWG of indicators for the targets in the SPMS, the proposals made in several cases involved one or more indicators to be based on information to be provided by Parties in their triennial national reports to COPs. In many of these cases a question or questions in the existing National Report Format touches at least partly on the issue concerned; but in most cases, to align properly with the target and provide information that will help in assessing progress, some reformulation of the question(s) concerned would be required.
- 2.2 Accordingly, details of this cross-matching to the National Report Format, and suggestions for new or revised questions to address the Strategic Plan targets, have

been included in successive drafts of the “Indicator Factsheets for the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species” developed in two post-COP SPWG meetings, with input also from discussion in the CMS Scientific Council and Standing Committee, and from a public consultation undertaken during April-August 2016. A further public consultation on a revised (third) version of the Factsheets as a whole took place from April-June 2017, and further revised (fourth) version has been provided to COP12 in Information Document UNEP/CMS/COP12/Inf.26.

- 2.3 It is important to note that the proposals for National Report Format questions to underpin the SPMS indicators mostly do not consist of additional questions, but are instead modifications or replacements of the existing ones. In some places the proposed new question is shorter and less elaborate than the existing one, and more focused on what specifically needs to be known to assess the target; so already some useful streamlining has been identified. Overall in respect of the 16 targets, new questions are proposed for four of them, for two of them the proposed questions are slightly longer than the existing ones, for another two they are more or less the same, in seven cases they are shorter and simpler, and one question is proposed for complete deletion.
- 2.4 In 2014, the results of an analysis of national report information submitted to COP11 were presented in document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.19.3, “Analysis and Synthesis of National Reports”. The document made a general recommendation for the future to tailor all the National Report Format questions so that they would relate to specific objectives in the SPMS. The equivalent analysis presented to the present COP in document UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.19.1 reinforces the same conclusion, as does the document on implementation and monitoring of the SPMS, UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.15.
- 2.5 Within the CMS family, AEWA has updated its national report format in a way that takes the AEWA Strategic Plan into account and includes cross-references to Strategic Plan targets; although without going as far as a structural alignment. It may be of interest also to note that the Ramsar Convention Standing Committee at its 52nd meeting in June 2016 approved a revised National Report Format for Ramsar COP13 in 2018 in which there has been a systematic restructuring to group questions under each of the targets in the Ramsar Strategic Plan 2016-2024.
- 2.6 At its 45th meeting in November 2016, the CMS Standing Committee considered document UNEP/CMS/StC45/Doc.14 on the revision of the National Report Format. The document proposed that a revision of the National Report Format could be undertaken in two steps, with a first set of amendments (consisting mainly of integrating questions for the assessment of progress towards the targets of the Strategic Plan) being approved by the Standing Committee in time for use in the COP12 reporting cycle, and then a second set of amendments (taking into account the final outcomes of SPWG work on indicators and extending to a more in-depth revision of the format, including any appropriate streamlining) being prepared in time for consideration and approval by COP12. The specifics of the “first step” SPMS-related proposals (extracted from the Indicator Factsheets) were appended to the document.
- 2.7 After some discussion the Committee decided not to make changes in two steps, but instead to consider one overall revision at a later date. In the meantime for reporting to COP12 the existing (COP11) format has been used, with limited adjustments to take into account only the new Resolutions and species listings agreed by COP11.

3. Amendments to address other issues

- 3.1 Apart from the one point mentioned in section 2 above regarding alignment with the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species, the UNEP-WCMC analysis of national reports presented to CMS COP11 did not address the future shape of the Report Format itself. Subsequently however UNEP-WCMC did compile some observations on this, and these were submitted (to the Secretariat only) in October 2014, in a separate document entitled "Recommended improvements to the CMS National Report Format".
- 3.2 The 2016 Standing Committee paper referred to above contained various proposals for questions to be included in the National Report Format in relation to the targets in the Strategic Plan, but it did not make any proposals about what the format itself should look like; nor did it address any of the reporting issues that relate to implementation of the Convention in respects other than those covered by the Strategic Plan, and/or those that will require reporting on an on-going basis beyond the Plan's time-horizon (2023).
- 3.3 A Supplementary Note was therefore provided to the Committee at the same time (document UNEP/CMS/StC45/Inf.5) on "Principles and general approach for pursuing possible further work on the National Report Format between StC45 and COP12". This drew upon comments provided by UNEP-WCMC following their analysis of the reports to COP11, and pointed out that, in line with paragraph 11 of Resolution 11.2, it would make sense to use the opportunity of any SPMS-related adjustments to the National Report Format to address at the same time any other updating improvements that seemed desirable, in particular where possible to seek streamlining of the reporting burden on Parties, while maintaining the COP's crucial capability to monitor and evaluate the most central aspects of Convention implementation.
- 3.4 Subsequently, the lessons learned from the analysis of the reports to COP12 have generated further specific recommendations for factual corrections and adjustments for improved consistency and clarity in the questions in the National Report Format (see document UNEP/CMS/COP12/Inf.30).
- 3.5 CMS meetings during 2016 of the Standing Committee, the SPWG and the Working Group on the Development of a Review Process under the Convention on Migratory Species generated some other observations on the National Report Format and/or on national reporting, which have been taken into account. The Review Process Working Group *inter alia* considered national reports to be an important component in obtaining information for review (see document UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.22).
- 3.6 The ideas put forward in all of these documents have been consolidated and incorporated in the suggestions set out in the present paper, as a potential starting-point for any revisions that might be considered in future.

4. Specificity, clarity and "closed" questions

- 4.1 One general comment running through WCMC's 2014 analysis related to the specificity and clarity of the questions in the format. A considerable proportion of the information reported by Parties in the COP11 round was found to be of no direct relevance to the questions, due possibly to lack of clarity in those questions. Focusing on only the most relevant information will make reports more comparable with each other and should also contribute to reducing the overall burden of the process. In addition to careful wording, achievement of this can also be helped by using "closed" questions where pre-determined response options are provided, such as yes/no check boxes or drop-down menus of multiple-choice answers (at present a combination of methods is used).

- 4.2 The suggestion was also made to make more/clearer use of “dependent questions”, where the response category selected for one question determines which follow-up question (if any) subsequently appears (for example answering “yes” brings up a follow-up question about more information, but answering “no” does not). This would shorten the report in respect of aspects that are not applicable to a given Party, and would help to avoid the confusion that was evident in the COP11 round where many Parties responded to questions that were not actually relevant to them.
- 4.3 Some compilers of reports have noted that open questions requiring subjective judgements and narrative responses increase the burden of effort required to respond, and they express a preference for “tick-box”-style questions wherever possible. Phrases like “please provide more details” should be made less vague and open-ended by asking instead “please provide a short summary”.
- 4.4 A potential ambiguity was noted in the analysis of COP12 reports which led to a recommendation that the wording of questions could usefully be adjusted to improve consistency/reduce ambiguity as to whether they are asking about actions undertaken “by the country” (i.e. the Party government) or “in/in relation to” the country (i.e. including actions by others, such as NGOs).
5. “Pre-filling” of reports by the Secretariat; and the time period being reported on
- 5.1 “Pre-filling” of certain report sections by the Secretariat prior to issuing the format to Parties probably helped national compilers to avoid a certain amount of re-originating of information they had provided on previous occasions. It appears however that many did not replace outdated information with updates, or did so in some sections and not in others, resulting in internal contradictions within the individual reports. Analysis was made problematic by an inability to distinguish pre-filled data (which may or may not still be correct) from data newly entered in the most recent reporting period.
- 5.2 If “pre-filling” of data is undertaken again in future reporting cycles, some method should be found to enable such pre-filled data to be readily distinguished from new data in the final submitted reports. In general it would help also for Parties to provide more specificity in all report sections concerning the time-period to which a given response relates, making a particular effort to focus on information about status, events and activities during the most recent triennium (since the last COP).
- 5.3 It would further be helpful for more of the questions to specify explicitly that the information to be reported should relate to the reporting period concerned, i.e. the triennium since the last COP. Any information that relates to previous triennia should be clearly distinguished as such. In some sections of the present format the questions do not specify that the results concerned should relate to the triennium being reported on, and reports vary considerably in the approach taken to this, with some seemingly referring back over the entire history of the country’s implementation of the issue concerned, others citing information from previous triennia, some implying that the information provided relates to the period since the last COP, but most giving no indication one way or the other as to the time period covered. Other ambiguities/internal contradictions concerning the inclusion of past/present/future status of activities (for example in the section on telemetry – see below) should also be addressed, by reformulating those questions.
6. Positive outcomes
- 6.1 There may be a case for modifying the questions that ask about “positive outcomes”, to allow Parties to report actions which were attempted but which turned out not to be successful (i.e. not only outcomes that are “positive”), since this can be an equally

useful area of lesson-learning. Scope should also be allowed for Parties to comment on the relative balance between positive and negative results.

7. Species data; and new Appendix listings

- 7.1 UNEP-WCMC made recommendations concerning the questions (II.6.1 and III.3.1) about potential new species listings on the Convention Appendices. Parties reported on species which they regard as qualifying for inclusion in the Appendices of the Convention but which are not yet listed. Several Parties misconstrued these questions or answered them incompletely. Again in the COP12 round there appears to have been some confusion about the species status information being used for this, possibly some confusion also about what the question is asking, and it seems that a number of Parties may be relying on out of date versions of the Appendix lists. In addition, on the basis of their threat status, nearly three quarters of the species put forward in the COP12 round would be rendered invalid if the eligibility guidelines in the Annex to Resolution 11.33 were followed. It has been recommended to add a hyperlink from the questions to the "Species+" and IUCN Red List databases to provide Parties with quick access to the correct qualifying species for their country.
- 7.2 Even in respect of genuinely unlisted taxa, a considerable mis-match has been revealed between intentions stated in the national reports concerning listing proposals and the actual proposals submitted to COP, although the reasons for this are unclear. It would be worth investigating any difficulties that Parties have experienced which may be the cause of the observed lack of alignment between positions on Appendix listing revealed in national reports, compared with those revealed by formal listing proposals.
- 7.3 In the English version of the format there is an error in the question which asks Parties to indicate whether they are a Range State for any other migratory species which are classified as endangered but which are not currently listed in Appendix I, where the word "not" has been inadvertently omitted before the words "currently listed". In theory this could allow a Party to interpret the question as meaning that they should indicate species which are on Appendix I and for which they are a Range State but on which they have not provided details in the preceding (taxonomic) parts of the report section. In principle however, details should have been provided in those preceding parts on all relevant species, so the working assumption is that all Parties have done so, and that they have read the question in the sense that it was intended, rather than the way it was written. In the French and Spanish versions the text is correct. The error in the English version should be corrected.
- 7.4 Concerning potential candidates for listing Appendix II, again there have been several instances where species are mentioned which are already on the Appendix, and again there is a notable difference between the national report answers concerning intentions to propose Appendix II listing on the one hand, and the actual formal listing proposals submitted to COP12 on the other.
- 7.5 The suite of species cited by one Party was identified from a systematic review of certain bird families, so in terms of the report format question, the country concerned is not necessarily regarding itself as a Range State for all of the species named. The approach they took is helpful nonetheless, despite not being strictly accommodated by the wording of the question. It is recommended accordingly that the question which asks about candidate species for adding to Appendix II should accommodate answers based on analyses undertaken by countries on species/species groups for which they are not necessarily a Range State, but in respect of which they may nevertheless have led the relevant international research.

- 7.6 Species-specific questions in Section II of the template are tailored to individual Parties according to which species occur in the countries concerned. UNEP-WCMC suggested that this approach could be extended also to the more general taxonomic group questions, based similarly on species distribution data. As above, a way of making the use of data for this as up to date as possible would be to link the on-line reporting platform dynamically to the “Species+” database, which in turn could be linked to the CMS species database. Discussions between UNEP-WCMC and the CMS Secretariat have already taken place on this latter linkage.
- 7.7 The Annex to the report format provides a list of all Appendix II species and asks Parties to indicate the status of each one in their territory, choosing one of four options (“Range State”, “not a Range State”, “no information available” or “extinct at national level”) and providing a published distribution reference. If the suggestion above is followed to link the on-line reporting platform to the “Species+” and CMS species databases, this would enable the information there to be displayed to the national report compilers, who would then only need to provide updates, rather than manually re-populating the whole Annex. The approach could be extended to Appendix I species as well as those on Appendix II.
8. Threats and pressures
- 8.1 The report format asks several questions about the status of Appendix I species in each country, for each of five taxonomic groups in turn, including the pressures facing these species and the obstacles impeding their migration. In practice, aspects of these latter two fields are commonly mixed together, so the distinction has not proved meaningful for analysis purposes. The questions suggest some possible types of threats (as well as allowing other types to be explained in a narrative) but in a way which is inconsistent between the different taxonomic sections.
- 8.2 All the resulting threat data need to be treated with caution because the tendencies appear to have been led to some extent by the way that priorities were suggested in the questions, and because (as mentioned above) the questions were not asked/prompts were not given in the same way for each taxonomic group (for example the extra question on management issues in the terrestrial mammals section is likely to have contributed to the greater prevalence of references to that issue in reported threats affecting that group).
- 8.3 Other questions in this section of the format asked about actions being taken to address the threats, and about the progress and success of those actions. Responses to this were reported in a variety of different ways, and there is no valid basis for quantifying or otherwise evaluating the priorities and significances among the actions described. Progress or success was sometimes mentioned, but more often the mention of an activity could not be distinguished from any comment about the progress achieved (“protection of habitat” or “raising awareness” for example could refer either to an activity or a result, or both). Apart from a few references to e.g. “breeding success improved” and one or two specific project results in particular areas, the “progress/success” answers have generally not provided any evaluation of conservation status outcomes.
- 8.4 In light of the issues identified above it would be advisable to rationalize the way in which questions are asked about threats affecting Appendix I species, in order to avoid bias in prompting the priorities expected, and to have greater consistency in these questions across the different taxonomic sections. A revised approach to this could perhaps draw on the categorization of threat types devised specifically for the analysis presented in document UNEP/CMS/COP12/Inf.30.

9. New Agreements

- 9.1 Parties are asked to indicate, for each of six taxonomic groups in turn, whether they have been involved in initiating or participating in the development of any new CMS Agreements (including Memoranda of Understanding) during the relevant reporting period. They are also asked about any future plans in this regard, and about any particular needs for assistance.
- 9.2 This is a somewhat problematic area of report information. It was apparent from details (where they were entered) that the majority of Parties providing “yes” answers in the 2017 round were not in fact answering the questions put. This may be because the questions were being mis-read, or it may be that Parties were simply taking the opportunity to provide other kinds of information they wished to provide about Agreements (i.e. those already in existence, rather than new ones in prospect or in development). Some answers were also entered in the wrong taxonomic section. Many Parties were in fact commenting only on existing Agreements rather than the development of new ones.
- 9.3 “Development” itself appears to have been interpreted in divergent ways. It could be that some respondents (who for example answered “yes” to developing new Agreement but then referred to hosting a Meeting of Signatories of an existing MOU) are interpreting “development” as including the development of implementation actions, and interpreting “new Agreements” as including “recently concluded” ones. Consideration should be given to the possibility of adding advice on the interpretation of the phrase “development of new Agreements” (or re-wording the questions on this subject), to clarify whether it includes actions to develop the application of newly-concluded Agreements, or only the development of proposals for concluding Agreements that do not yet exist.

10. Protected areas

- 10.1 The first question in the protected areas section of the report format asks whether migratory species are taken into account in the selection, establishment and management of protected areas in the country. The meaning of “taken into account” is not specified, and it appears to have been interpreted in different ways in different places. Some reports mention merely that migratory species occur in protected areas, while some go further and refer to systems that mention migratory species as a possible ingredient in site selection criteria. In a few cases Parties have been more explicit about migration-related factors playing a part. It is recommended that consideration be given to the possibility of adding advice on the interpretation of the phrase “taken into account” in the questions on protected areas (or re-wording the questions on this subject), to encourage a greater focus on aspects specifically related to the needs of migratory species.
- 10.2 A second part of the question asks Parties to “identify the most important national sites for migratory species, and their protection status”. Many Parties clearly find it difficult to isolate and account specifically for the migratory species component of wider conservation programmes on protected areas and ecological networks. Moreover, the question is asked separately in relation to terrestrial, aquatic and marine areas, and many Parties have found it difficult to split protected areas along these three-category lines. The split is more workable where species-based measures are concerned, but less workable where habitat- or ecosystem-based measures are concerned. Many areas will in particular have a mix of terrestrial and aquatic habitats.

- 10.3 The analysis of COP12 reports found that interpretations of “marine” varied, with for example some reports answering “yes” to marine where the country’s protected areas extend seaward only as far as intertidal estuarine areas, and others answering “no” even though some near-shore marine waters are included in their coastal protected areas. One or two answering “yes” to marine cited in this connection only protected areas consisting of offshore islands, and it is not clear in these cases whether marine habitat as such is really included or not. Quantitative comparisons between any of these categories therefore risk being highly spurious. It would therefore be worth re-examining the usefulness of attempting to ask for a disaggregation of information about aquatic, terrestrial and marine situations respectively, in questions relating to protected areas.
11. Satellite telemetry
- 11.1 The first question in this section asks “In the current reporting period, has your country undertaken conservation/research projects that use satellite telemetry”? Parties answering “yes” were also invited to say whether the projects concerned were completed, or still ongoing, or were “in preparation”. This last option may cause some confusion, as it seems rather unrelated to the question about projects that have been “undertaken”, and is more relevant to the separate question about future projects.
- 11.2 There may be some confusion concerning this aspect of the question too. For example, one Party answering “completed” nevertheless showed from other parts of their answers that a project was in fact still ongoing. Another Party ticked the box for “completed” but had also in the first question said that no projects took place during the reporting period. In this case they may have been interpreting “completed” as applicable to a project which took place prior to the reporting period – the question is ambiguous in this respect and it is not possible to know from the reports which interpretation any given Party may have followed. A different explanation must apply to the two Parties who indicated that no projects had been undertaken during the reporting period but then in apparent contradiction ticked the box for “ongoing”. A possible explanation might be that the first question asks whether the country has undertaken projects, and the responses might be drawing a distinction between this and projects undertaken by another entity, such as an NGO – this is speculation and there is no evidence in the reports either way; but it identifies another potential ambiguity in the wording of the question.
- 11.3 These interpretations are further complicated by the automatic pre-filling of the report format in many cases with data from previous cycles (see earlier above), so some of the apparent mis-matches in timeframes are likely to be a result of this earlier information persisting unchanged alongside partially-completed new information which then contradicts it.
- 11.4 Parties who have undertaken projects are invited to provide details. There is some suggestion that the animal tracking or telemetry projects being reported may not always have a satellite-related component. If a distinct section on telemetry projects is retained in the format in future, it may be helpful to remove the restriction to “satellite” telemetry, so that other relevant telemetry projects (that are not satellite-based) can also be reported.
- 11.5 The phrase “projects that use satellite telemetry” in the format question does not explicitly specify animal-based projects as opposed to habitat/landscape-based projects, and this perhaps points to another ambiguity, if some Parties have assumed the narrower scope (i.e. they have only reported projects addressing migratory species, as it seems nearly all have done) and others have assumed a broader scope (i.e. considering it relevant to report any kind of “conservation/research projects that use

satellite telemetry”, in the words of the question). If a distinct section on telemetry projects is retained, it would be helpful to clarify whether the questions are intended to embrace habitat/landscape-based projects, or to be restricted only to animal-based projects.

- 11.6 Some respondents indicated in answer to the question about “projects in preparation” simply that existing projects would continue. In principle if all Parties interpreted the question in the same way then this kind of answer should always match up with an “ongoing” response in the first part of the section. In practice this is not the case, and hence another ambiguity in the question is apparent, whereby some respondents appear to interpret “planned projects” only as new projects which have not yet started, and others interpret it to include the planned continuation of existing projects. (In fact, further mixing of past and future between answers to these two questions occurs in other ways too, with some Parties simply using one of the questions as the place in which to answer both of them).
- 11.7 As with some other sections in the format, this section asked for a description of the positive outcomes of any actions taken. Where a Party indicated that a project was “ongoing” and gave no response to the question about outcomes, it might reasonably be assumed that this is because it is too early for the project concerned to be showing any results; although it is not necessarily certain that this is the reason, and in such cases it would be preferable for the Party to indicate explicitly “N/A” (as many did for example in the situation where no projects had been undertaken).
- 11.8 One respondent in the 2017 round described some results, yet had indicated that no projects had been undertaken (and none were planned), so this also seems illogical. The interpretation in this case is probably that what was being described was a *desire or aspiration* for results that could be possible if a project was to be undertaken – if so, this could in theory also be the case for some of the other responses in this section, but it would not necessarily be clear that the results in such cases were “intended/hoped for” rather than actual.
12. Mobilization of resources
- 12.1 National report information at present does not quantify resource mobilization in a way which would shed light on progress towards achieving Strategic Plan Target 16 (on resource mobilization), nor does the information go beyond “activity reporting” into the question of assessing conservation outcomes.
- 12.2 The report format asks respondents to indicate the taxa that have benefited from the activities referred to in the context of resource mobilization. It appears that in most if not all cases the phrase “have benefited” is interpreted as “having been the target of activities”, rather than any attempt having been made to reflect an assessment of the actual conservation outcomes that resulted. In other words the taxa mentioned appear to be reported as the intended beneficiaries of the funded activities, rather than the answers strictly responding to the question in terms of whether actual benefits have resulted.
13. Implementation of COP Resolutions and Recommendations
- 13.1 Section X of the format asks about implementation of COP Resolutions and Recommendations, currently under 42 different headings. New Resolutions, Recommendations (and now also Decisions) from the most recent COP need adding each time the format is issued (and superseded ones need removing), so there is never full comparability here from one reporting cycle to another.

- 13.2 UNEP-WCMC suggested pruning the list down to a few high priority COP outputs on which it is most important to have progress information, and to structure the question in a more closed way, focusing on specific action points in the decision texts. The list is already selective, but the rationale for the selection (and for the structure of clustering which has been applied) is not clear.
- 13.3 If the Parties agree to consolidate COP decisions in the way proposed for COP12 (see Standing Committee Document UNEP/CMS/StC45/Doc.19/Rev.1 “Review of Decisions”), that process will have implications for the approach taken to questions in the National Report format about implementation of COP Resolutions. The development of these two strands of structural adjustment will therefore need to advance in tandem with each other.
- 13.4 An alternative approach may also be possible. An overlap/duplication between Section X and some other specific topics addressed elsewhere in the report format has been noted, for example the Resolutions relating to financial matters, ecological networks and development of new CMS Agreements (this is apparent also from the analysis against the SPMS targets presented in Document UNEP/CMS/StC45/Doc.14). If a Party has not said much about these issues in one of the places in the format where it has been asked to do so, it may have said more in the other. One suggestion is to allocate all questions about progress with (selected priority) Resolutions, Recommendations and Decisions to the relevant topic questions elsewhere in the format, which would then allow Section X to be deleted. Hyperlinks to the texts of the relevant Resolutions/Recommendations/Decisions (updated of course in light of any consolidation/repeals) could also be provided.
- 13.5 It would therefore be useful to discuss further (and to be more transparent about) the rationale for the choice of decisions to include in the section on Resolutions, Recommendations (and in future, Decisions), considering *inter alia* the areas of overlap between them, and the overlap with some of the other sections of the report format. The relationship between this section and possible future report format questions focused on targets in the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species also needs to be considered.
- 13.6 After the “Strategic and institutional matters” cluster of questions in the format there is a sub-heading “Other Resolutions/ Recommendations”, which can be read either as a sub-heading that introduces the clusters which follow, or as an information field in its own right. A few countries have interpreted it in this second way, and have inserted information on Resolutions/Recommendations not discussed elsewhere (or have inserted “not applicable” or “no comment”), while others used the final field “Other remarks” for such information. It would be desirable to remove this ambiguity from future versions of the format.
- 13.7 A few answers in this section of the reports suggest that there are different understandings about the extent to which some strategically–expressed COP decisions have a national implementation dimension to them; and advice on this may be necessary too.
14. Streamlining and synergies
- 14.1 A general concern has been noted regarding the complexity of the current format, and the desirability of streamlining it and making it more “user-friendly” (while not losing its ability to generate essential information in a consistent way across all Parties).

- 14.2 It may also be possible to identify similarities in the content of some of the questions being asked in the CMS process and in the national reporting processes of other MEAs, and to see whether there are ways in which countries which are Parties to multiple Conventions might be able to streamline their data-gathering and avoid duplication of effort. Reporting in CMS of course has to be directed specifically towards actions for the conservation of migratory species; but in the case of Ramsar, CITES and CBD for example there may be common interests with CMS where reporting approaches may at least helpfully converge to some extent. The Joint Work Plan for the CMS and Ramsar Conventions for 2015-2017 supported this idea with the inclusion of an item on streamlining and harmonization of reporting processes.
- 14.3 Suggestions have also been made regarding ways of reducing duplication of effort with the reporting processes under the individual instruments in the CMS Family.
- 14.4 In the CBD, the Parties in their Decision XIII/27 (COP13, December 2016) requested the finalization of a “resource manual” for the sixth round of CBD national reports, addressing for example guidance on common data sources, indicators and other relevant information provided by the Secretariats of other biodiversity-related Conventions. An analogous guidance resource for CMS Parties might be worth considering in future.
- 14.5 UNEP-WCMC has recommended a general check to ensure that there is no duplication between the National Report format questions and information provided by other means, so that Parties do not add unnecessary work to their reporting burden. The example cited was a question about contributions to the CMS Trust Fund; but the general principle is that revision of the format should take account of other relevant information flows under the Convention.
- 14.6 Another suggestion made from a different quarter on an earlier occasion was to consider a specific section in the Format seeking summary information from Parties about their implementation of each CMS instrument to which they are a Party or a Signatory, with a view to reducing duplication of effort with the reporting processes under the individual instruments.
15. The way forward; and an initial outline of possible revisions
- 15.1 Based on the work done to date and the ingredients described above, document UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.19.2 proposes that a revision should be developed of the National Report Format to be used by Parties in reporting to COP13 and in subsequent reporting cycles. A proposed Decision is appended to that document in which the mandate would be given to the Secretariat to develop the revised format intersessionally, for consideration and possible endorsement by the Standing Committee in time to be used for reporting to COP13.
- 15.2 Annex 1 to the present document provides an initial outline of suggestions for a revised format. It would be possible to make a few minor changes to the existing format simply to add questions that pick up (for example) reference to the 2015-23 Strategic Plan; but in order to achieve something more than that (for example in terms of streamlining and updated relevance), a more structural revision is offered here, taking account of all the issues raised above.

ANNEX 1

Initial outline of suggestions for a revised National Report Format

Note: The suggestions below at this stage show only the origins, the architecture and the principles of a possible revised format, and not yet the detail of wordings of questions (except to the extent that a number of wordings for questions related to the targets of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species have been previously circulated and discussed in that context). Alongside each suggested section of the format is a column showing the equivalent questions in the existing format. All sections of the existing format have been allocated to one or other of the proposed new sections, so that a complete audit-trail of changes should be possible. Some annotated comments and explanations are given in italic type.

Suggested structure and questions	Equivalent questions in existing format
<p><u>ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION</u></p> <p>Name of Contracting Party. Date of entry into force of the Convention. Territories to which the Convention applies.</p> <p>Name and contact details of report compiler. Name (including institution name) and contact details of designated CMS National Focal Point. Details of representative on Scientific Council. Details of representative on Standing Committee (if applicable). Details of representative(s) on CMS Working Groups (if applicable). Please indicate where any of the names and contact details above constitute a change from your previous national report.</p> <p><i>[NB a question about national coordinating committees appears in the section on SPMS Target 3 below].</i></p>	<p>Introduction</p> <p>Please enter here the name of your country. Which agency has been primarily responsible for the preparation of this report? Please list any other agencies that have provided input.</p> <p>I(a). General Information</p> <p>Party Date of entry into force of the Convention in your country. Period covered Territories to which the Convention applies.</p> <p>Designated National Focal Point Full name of the institution Name and title of designated Focal Point Mailing address Telephone Fax E-mail</p> <p>Appointment to the Scientific Council Full name of the institution Name and title of contact officer Mailing address Telephone Fax E-mail</p> <p>Name and Signature of officer responsible for submitting national report Name: Address: Tel.: Fax: E-mail: Date of submission</p> <p>Membership of the Standing Committee (if applicable): Name: Address Tel Fax E-mail</p> <p>Implementation Competent Authority: Relevant implemented legislation:</p>

Suggested structure and questions	Equivalent questions in existing format
	<p>VIII. Global and National Importance of CMS <i>[This followed a question about increasing awareness of CMS]</i></p> <p>2. Identify the agency, department or organization responsible for leading on this action in your country:</p> <p>I(b). Information about involved Authorities</p> <p>Identify the ministry, agency/department or organization that is responsible for leading actions relating to Appendix I species</p> <p>1- Birds 2- Aquatic Mammals 3- Reptiles 4- Terrestrial Mammals 5- Fish</p>
<p><u>ACCESSION/RATIFICATION OF CMS AGREEMENTS/MOUs</u></p> <p>Other CMS instruments to which the country is a Party or a Signatory, or for which it is part-way through the process of acceding/signing.</p> <p>Details of the primary institution responsible in each case, and details of the principal contact person in each case.</p> <p>Links/cross-references to [appended copies of?] national reports submitted for the instruments concerned. <i>[Could perhaps use this mechanism also to populate other sections of the format where the same questions have been asked for an instrument report?].</i></p> <p>Information on involvement in the development of proposals for any new CMS Agreements/MoUs in the reporting period, and/or future intentions in this regard.</p> <p><i>[See also sections below on SPMS Targets 3 and 9 – still to consider further where best to ask about these issues].</i></p>	<p>Implementation</p> <p>Other relevant Conventions/ Agreements (apart from CMS) to which your country is a Party.</p> <p>National policy instruments (e.g. national biodiversity conservation strategy, etc.).</p> <p>CMS Agreements/MoU Please indicate whether your country is part of the following Agreements/MoU. [List given]. If so, please indicate the competent national institution.</p> <p>1. INFORMATION ON APPENDIX II SPECIES</p> <p>Information pertaining to the conservation of Appendix II species that are the object of CMS Agreements will have been provided in periodic Party reports to those instruments. It will suffice therefore to reference (below), and preferably append, a copy of the latest report that has been submitted to the Secretariat of each of the Agreement/MoUs to which your country is a Party.</p> <p>[List of agreements and MoUs, Asking in each case for: Date of last report. Period covered].</p> <p>2. QUESTIONS ON CMS AGREEMENTS</p> <p>Questions on the development of new CMS Agreements relating to [eg birds; and repeated for each taxonomic group]</p> <p>1. In the current reporting period, has your country initiated the development of any CMS Agreements, including Memoranda of Understanding, to address the needs of Appendix II <i>[eg birds; and repeated for each taxonomic group]</i>?</p> <p>2. In the current reporting period, has your country participated in the development of any new CMS Agreements, including Memoranda of Understanding, which address the conservation needs of Appendix II <i>[eg birds; and repeated for each taxonomic group]</i>?</p> <p>3. If your country has initiated or is participating in the development of a new Agreement or Memorandum of Understanding, what assistance, if any, does your country require in order to initiate or participate in the instrument's development?</p>

Suggested structure and questions	Equivalent questions in existing format
	<p>4. Is the development of any CMS Agreement for <i>[eg bird, and repeated for each taxonomic group]</i> species, including Memoranda of Understanding, planned by your country in the foreseeable future?</p> <p>X. Implementation of COP Resolutions and Recommendations Please provide information about measures undertaken by your country relating to recent Resolutions and Recommendations since the last Report. <i>Resolutions</i> Development of CMS Agreements (Res. 11.12)</p>
<p><u>SPECIES ON THE CONVENTION APPENDICES</u></p> <p><i>Appendix I</i></p> <p>Appendix I species for which the country is a Range State. <i>[To provide hyperlinks to the “Species+” and IUCN Red List databases to provide Parties with quick access to the correct qualifying species for their country, linked also to the CMS species database. Compilers should only need to provide updates.</i></p> <p><i>In response to consultee comments about confusion caused by inclusion of synonyms within the list of species, UNEP-WCMC recommended either putting synonyms in brackets following the accepted name or removing them altogether].</i></p> <p>Is your country a Range State for any other migratory species that is not currently listed in Appendix I and is categorized as Endangered, Critically Endangered or Extinct in the Wild according to the latest IUCN Red List? Yes No If yes, please list the species that may merit inclusion in Appendix I.</p> <p>Is your country taking any steps to propose the listing of any species on Appendix I? Yes No If yes, please provide details of the stage of proposal development.</p> <p><i>Appendix II</i></p> <p>Appendix II species for which the country is a Range State. <i>[To provide hyperlinks to the “Species+” and IUCN Red List databases to provide Parties with quick access to the correct qualifying species for their country, linked also to the CMS species database. Compilers should only need to provide updates.</i></p> <p><i>In response to consultee comments about confusion caused by inclusion of synonyms within the list of species, UNEP-WCMC recommended either putting synonyms in brackets following the accepted name or removing them altogether].</i></p> <p>Is your country a Range State for any other migratory species that is not currently listed in Appendix II but has an unfavourable conservation status and could benefit from the conclusion of an Agreement for its conservation? Yes No If yes, please list the species that may merit inclusion in Appendix II.</p> <p>Is your country taking any steps to propose the listing of any species on Appendix II? Yes No If yes, please provide details of the stage of proposal development.</p>	<p>1.2 Questions on specific Appendix I <i>[eg birds; and repeated for each taxonomic group]</i> species</p> <p>In the following section, using the table format below, please fill in each Appendix I <i>[eg birds; and repeated for each taxonomic group]</i> species for which your country is considered to be a Range State. Please complete each table as appropriate, providing information in summary form. Where appropriate, please cross-reference to information already provided in national reports that have been submitted under other conventions (e.g. Convention on Biological Diversity, Ramsar Convention, CITES). (Attach annexes as necessary.)</p> <p>1. Please provide published distribution reference: 2a. Summarise information on population size (if known): 2b. Summarise information on distribution (if known):</p> <p>6. LISTING OF OTHER ENDANGERED MIGRATORY SPECIES IN APPENDIX I</p> <p>1. Is your country a Range State for any other endangered migratory species currently listed in Appendix I? (according to the latest IUCN red data list). N.B.: States in which a species occurs as a vagrant (i.e. not "on its normal migration route") should not be treated as Range States. Please refer to Article 1 of the Convention for clarification. <i>[NB in question 1 above there is an error in the English version, where the word “not” has been inadvertently omitted before the words “currently listed”.]</i></p> <p>1a. Is your country taking any steps to propose listing any of these species?</p> <p>III. Appendix II Species 3. LISTING OF MIGRATORY SPECIES IN APPENDIX II</p> <p>1. Is your country a Range State for any migratory species that has an unfavourable conservation status, but is not currently listed in Appendix II and could benefit from the conclusion of an Agreement for its conservation? <i>[Also below in section on Target 8]</i> N.B.: States in which a species occurs as a vagrant (i.e. not "on its normal migration route") should not be treated as Range States. Please refer to Article 1 of the Convention for clarification. If Yes, please provide details:</p> <p>1a. Is your country taking any steps to propose the listing of this/these species in Appendix II?</p> <p>Annex: Updating Data on Appendix II Species</p> <p>1. The drop-down lists below contain the list of all species listed in Appendix II. New Parties which have acceded since COP10 in 2011 and Parties which did not submit a National Report in time in 2011 are requested to complete the entire form. Parties that did submit a timely report in 2011 are requested</p>

Suggested structure and questions	Equivalent questions in existing format
	<p>to review and update the data (e.g. new published distribution references and details concerning species added to Appendix II at COP9 and COP10). Please choose the one that applies. [=“Range State”, “not a Range State”, “no information available” or “extinct at national level”].</p>
<p><u>LEGAL PROHIBITION OF THE TAKING OF APPENDIX I SPECIES</u></p> <p><i>[Question suggestions still to be formulated].</i></p> <p><i>[Taking of Appendix I migratory species, particularly where it is illegal or unregulated, is likely to constitute a direct pressure on these species and their habitats, and to affect their conservation status. It is therefore an issue which could potentially be considered in the proposed sections below on SPMS Targets 5 and/or 6 & 7. The pressure however arises from the activity of taking itself, and not inherently because an activity is illegal. This latter (regulatory) aspect is important to report too however, in addition to any reporting of actual pressures on the species concerned, not least because such regulation in itself is a matter of legal compliance with the Convention. Article III.5 requires Parties to “prohibit” taking of Annex I species (subject to certain exceptions), and this is therefore a more specific regulatory obligation than the obligation to undertake the various other conservation measures referred to in Article III.4. (Article III.4 measures are more suitable for reporting in the proposed section below on SPMS Targets 6 & 7).</i></p> <p><i>Accordingly this issue is given its own section in the proposed reporting format, because (like accessions and Appendix listings, covered in the preceding two sections) is different in nature from the issues otherwise covered under the SPMS Targets below].</i></p>	<p>II. Appendix I species</p> <p>1. General questions on Appendix I species <i>[this group of questions repeated for each taxonomic group]</i></p> <p>1. Is the taking of all Appendix I [bird etc] species prohibited by the national implementing legislation cited in Table I(a) (General Information)?</p> <p>If other legislation is relevant, please provide details:</p> <p>1a. If the taking of Appendix I [bird etc] species is prohibited by law, have any exceptions been granted to the prohibition?</p> <p>If Yes, please provide details (Include the date on which the exception was notified to the CMS Secretariat pursuant to CMS Article III(7):</p> <p>X. Implementation of COP Resolutions and Recommendations</p> <p>Please provide information about measures undertaken by your country relating to recent Resolutions and Recommendations since the last Report.</p> <p><i>Resolutions</i></p> <p>Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds (11.16)</p>
<p><u>ADDRESSING THE UNDERLYING CAUSES OF DECLINE OF MIGRATORY SPECIES BY MAINSTREAMING RELEVANT CONSERVATION AND SUSTAINABLE USE PRIORITIES ACROSS GOVERNMENT AND SOCIETY</u></p> <p><i>(SPMS Goal 1; Targets 1-4)</i></p> <p><i>[Should a question be asked at Goal level? The comment was made during discussion on SPMS indicators that some countries may wish to report at this level].</i></p>	
<p><u>AWARENESS</u> <i>(SPMS Target 1)</i></p> <p><i>[Question already included in Indicator Factsheets (as a version slightly amended from that also included in UNEP/CMS/StC45/Doc.14)]</i></p> <p>During the reporting period, have actions been taken by your country to increase people’s awareness of the values of migratory species, their habitats and migration systems?</p> <p>If yes,</p> <p>(a) Please provide a short summary.</p> <p>(b) Please indicate any specific elements of CMS COP Resolutions 11.8 (<i>Communication, Information and Outreach Plan</i>) and 11.9 (<i>World Migratory Bird Day</i>) which have been particularly taken forward by these actions.</p> <p>(c) How successful have these actions been in achieving their objectives? (Tick one box). (1 = very unsuccessful, 5 = very</p>	<p>VIII. Global and National Importance of CMS</p> <p>1. Have actions been taken by your country to increase national, regional and/or global awareness of the relevance of CMS and its global importance in the context of biodiversity conservation?</p> <p>If Yes, please provide details:</p> <p>3. Results - please describe the positive outcomes of any actions taken</p> <p>X. Implementation of COP Resolutions and Recommendations</p> <p>Please provide information about measures undertaken by your country relating to recent Resolutions and Recommendations since the last Report.</p> <p><i>Resolutions</i></p> <p>Outreach and Communication Issues (11.8) World Migratory Bird Day (Res. 11.9)</p>

Suggested structure and questions	Equivalent questions in existing format										
<p>successful).</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>(d) In what ways have these actions helped to raise people's awareness about the steps they can take to conserve migratory species and to ensure the sustainability of any use of these species?</p>	1	2	3	4	5						
1	2	3	4	5							
<p><u>MAINSTREAMING MIGRATORY SPECIES IN OTHER SECTORS AND PROCESSES</u></p> <p>(SPMS Target 2)</p> <p><i>[Questions already included in Indicator Factsheets (as a version slightly amended from that also included in UNEP/CMS/StC45/Doc.14)]</i></p> <p>Does the conservation of migratory species currently feature in any national or local strategies and planning processes in your country relating to development, poverty reduction and/or livelihoods? If yes, please provide a short summary.</p> <p>Do the values of migratory species and their habitats currently feature in national accounting processes in your country? If yes, please provide a short summary.</p> <p>Apart from national reporting processes associated with biodiversity conservation, do the values of migratory species and their habitats currently feature in any other national reporting processes in your country? If yes, please provide a short summary.</p> <p><i>[The questions in the existing National Report Format (see column on the right) about identifying involvement by government departments, devolved/overseas territory administrations, NGOs and the private sector are not yet reflected in the questions proposed here so far].</i></p> <p><i>[See comment in the section on Target 3 below about questions there on national committees and synergies with other MEAs, which also have some relevance to Target 2].</i></p>	<p>I(a) Involvement of other government departments/NGOs/private sector</p> <p>1. Which other government departments are involved in activities/initiatives for the conservation of migratory species in your country? (Please list.)</p> <p>2. If more than one government department is involved, describe the interaction/relationship between these government departments:</p> <p>3. Has a national liaison system or committee been established in your country? <i>[Also below in section on Target 3]</i></p> <p>4. List the main non-governmental organizations actively involved in activities/initiatives for the conservation of migratory species in your country, and describe their involvement.</p> <p>4a. Please provide detail on any devolved government/overseas territory authorities involved.</p> <p>5. Describe any involvement of the private sector in the conservation of migratory species in your country.</p> <p>6. Note any interactions between these sectors in the conservation of migratory species in your country.</p> <p><i>[Questions 4-6 above also have relevance to Target 3].</i></p> <p>3. Listing of migratory species in Appendix II</p> <p>IV. National and Regional Priorities</p> <p>3. Does the conservation of migratory species currently feature in any other national or regional policies/plans (apart from CMS Agreements)</p> <p>3.1. If Yes, please provide details:</p> <p>3a. Do these policies/plans cover the following areas? Economic development If Yes, please provide details</p> <p>4. Results - please describe the positive outcomes of any actions taken</p> <p>X. Implementation of COP Resolutions and Recommendations</p> <p>Please provide information about measures undertaken by your country relating to recent Resolutions and Recommendations since the last Report.</p> <p><i>Resolutions</i> Cooperation with Other Bodies and Processes (7.9) <i>[Also below in section on Target 3].</i></p>										
<p><u>GOVERNANCE, POLICY AND LEGISLATIVE COHERENCE</u></p> <p>(SPMS Target 3)</p> <p><i>[Questions already included in Indicator Factsheets (as a version slightly amended from that also included in UNEP/CMS/StC45/Doc.14)]</i></p> <p>Have any governance arrangements affecting migratory species and their migration systems in your country, or in which your country participates, improved during the reporting</p>	<p>I(a). General Information</p> <p>Involvement of other government departments/NGOs/private sector</p> <p>3. Has a national liaison system or committee been established in your country? <i>[Also above in section on Target 2]</i></p> <p>2. Questions on CMS Agreements</p> <p>Questions on the development of new CMS Agreements relating to [Bird] Species <i>[question</i></p>										

Suggested structure and questions	Equivalent questions in existing format										
<p>period? If yes, (a) Please provide a short summary. (b) To what extent have these improvements helped to achieve Target 3 of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species (“National, regional and international governance arrangements and agreements affecting migratory species and their migration systems have improved significantly, making relevant policy, legislative and implementation processes more coherent, accountable, transparent, participatory, equitable and inclusive”)? (Tick one box). (1 = minimal contribution, 5 = very significant contribution).</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>Has a national liaison system or committee been established in your country to address migratory species conservation issues? Yes No .</p> <p>Does collaboration between the focal points of CMS and other relevant Conventions take place in your country to develop the coordinated and synergistic approaches described in paragraphs 24-26 of CMS COP Resolution 11.10 (Synergies and partnerships)? If yes, please provide a short summary.</p> <p><i>[See also section above on “Accession/ratification of CMS Agreements/MoUs” – still to consider where best to ask about these issues].</i></p> <p><i>[The question above about a national liaison committee, and the one about synergy with focal points of other MEAs, could both be relevant also to Target 2 above, since there is an overlap between the issue of governance and the issue of different sectors working together. There may be different views on the best place to put these questions].</i></p> <p><i>[The existing National Report Format question (see column on the right) which asks “What priority does your country assign to the conservation and, where applicable, sustainable use of migratory species in comparison to other biodiversity-related issues” is probably not yet picked up in the proposals being made so far, and may need considering. It could be picked up here under target 3, or it might conceivably form the basis of a “Goal-level” question for Goal 1 (see above)].</i></p> <p><i>[NB This section and the section on Target 9 have some potential risks of overlap – the questions proposed in these two sections will need to be double-checked for clarity/complementarity].</i></p>	1	2	3	4	5						<p><i>repeated for each taxonomic group]</i></p> <p>1. In the current reporting period, has your country initiated the development of any CMS Agreements, including Memoranda of Understanding, to address the needs of Appendix II [Bird] Species? <i>[Relevant also to Target 9]</i></p> <p>2. In the current reporting period, has your country participated in the development of any new CMS Agreements, including Memoranda of Understanding, which address the conservation needs of Appendix II [Bird] Species? <i>[Relevant also to Target 9]</i></p> <p>4. Is the development of any CMS Agreement for [Bird] Species, including Memoranda of Understanding, planned by your country in the foreseeable future? <i>[Relevant also to Target 9]</i></p> <p>3. Listing of migratory species in Appendix II</p> <p>IV. National and Regional Priorities</p> <p>1. What priority does your country assign to the conservation and, where applicable, sustainable use of migratory species in comparison to other biodiversity-related issues.</p> <p>3. Does the conservation of migratory species currently feature in any other national or regional policies/plans (apart from CMS Agreements).</p> <p>3.1. If Yes, please provide details.</p> <p>3a. Do these policies/plans cover the following areas? Economic development If Yes, please provide details. Land-use planning. If Yes, please provide details.</p> <p>4. Results - please describe the positive outcomes of any actions taken.</p> <p>X. Implementation of COP Resolutions and Recommendations</p> <p>Please provide information about measures undertaken by your country relating to recent Resolutions and Recommendations since the last Report. For your convenience please refer to the list of COP Resolutions and Recommendations listed below:</p> <p><i>Resolutions [include]:</i> Development of CMS Agreements (Res. 11.12) Modus Operandi for Conservation Emergencies (10.2) Cooperation with Other Bodies and Processes (7.9) <i>[Also above in section on target 2]</i> Synergies and Partnerships / Cooperation with other Conventions (Res. 11.10) Relationship between the CMS Family and civil society (11.11) <i>[Also below under Target 15]</i> Future strategies of the CMS Family / “Future Shape” (10.9)</p>
1	2	3	4	5							
<p>INCENTIVES (SPMS Target 4)</p> <p><i>[Question already included in Indicator Factsheets (as a version slightly amended from that also included in UNEP/CMS/StC45/Doc.14)]</i></p> <p>Have any of the following measures been implemented in your country in ways which benefit migratory species?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elimination/phasing out of harmful incentives; 	<p>[No specific matching questions].</p>										

Suggested structure and questions	Equivalent questions in existing format
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reform of harmful incentives to minimize or avoid negative impacts; ● Development of positive incentives; ● Application of positive incentives. <p>If yes,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Please provide a short summary of the measures implemented and the time-period concerned. (b) Please describe the specific ways in which migratory species have benefited. 	
<p><u>REDUCING DIRECT PRESSURES ON MIGRATORY SPECIES AND THEIR HABITATS</u></p> <p>(SPMS Goal 2; Targets 5-7)</p> <p><i>[Should a question be asked at Goal level? The comment was made during discussion on SPMS indicators that some countries may wish to report at this level].</i></p>	
<p><u>SUSTAINABLE PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION</u> (SPMS Target 5)</p> <p><i>[Question already included in Indicator Factsheets (as a version slightly amended from that also included in UNEP/CMS/StC45/Doc.14)]</i></p> <p>During the reporting period, have you implemented plans or taken other steps concerning sustainable production and consumption which are achieving the results defined in Target 5 of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species (“keeping the impacts of use of natural resources, including habitats, on migratory species well within safe ecological limits to promote the favourable conservation status of migratory species and maintain the quality, integrity, resilience, and ecological connectivity of their habitats and migration routes”)?</p> <p>If yes,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Please provide a short summary of the measures implemented. (b) Please describe what evidence exists to show that the intended results are being achieved. <p>If no, what is preventing progress?</p>	<p>[No specific matching questions].</p>
<p><u>THREATS AND PRESSURES AFFECTING MIGRATORY SPECIES; INCLUDING OBSTACLES TO MIGRATION</u> (SPMS Targets 6+7)</p> <p><i>[Question already included in Indicator Factsheets (as a version slightly amended from that also included in UNEP/CMS/StC45/Doc.14). The categorization of threat types however is for illustrative purposes only and could usefully be revised further now to align it with the categorization used in the analysis of reports to COP12, as recommended in document UNEP/CMS/COP12/Inf.30]</i></p> <p>Which of the following pressures on migratory species or their habitats are important in your country? (Tick/comment on all those that apply):</p>	<p>II. Appendix I species</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. General questions on Appendix I species <i>[this group of questions repeated for each taxonomic group]</i> 2. Identify any obstacles to migration that exist in relation to Appendix I [bird etc] species: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - By-catch - Habitat destruction - Wind turbines - Pollution 2a. What actions are being undertaken to overcome these obstacles? 2b. Please report on the progress / success of the actions taken. 3. What are the major pressures to Appendix I [bird etc] species (transcending mere obstacles to migration)? <i>[List provided]</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3a. What actions have been taken to prevent, reduce or control factors that are endangering or are likely to further endanger [bird etc] species beyond actions to prevent disruption to migrating behaviour?

Suggested structure and questions			Equivalent questions in existing format
	Annex I species	Other migratory species	<p>3b. Please report on the progress / success of the actions taken.</p> <p>3c. Describe any factors that may limit action being taken in this regard:</p> <p>1.2 Questions on specific Appendix I species <i>[this group of questions repeated for each taxonomic group]</i></p> <p>3. Indicate and briefly describe any activities that have been carried out in favour of this species in the reporting period. (Please provide the title of the project and contact details, where available): <i>[List of types provided]</i></p> <p>5. Describe any future activities that are planned for this species.</p> <p>1.2 Questions on specific Appendix I [eg birds; and repeated for each taxonomic group] species</p> <p>In the following section, using the table format below, please fill in each Appendix I <i>[eg birds; and repeated for each taxonomic group]</i> species for which your country is considered to be a Range State. Please complete each table as appropriate, providing information in summary form. Where appropriate, please cross-reference to information already provided in national reports that have been submitted under other conventions (e.g. Convention on Biological Diversity, Ramsar Convention, CITES). (Attach annexes as necessary.)</p> <p>3. Indicate and briefly describe any activities that have been carried out in favour of this species in the reporting period. (Please provide the title of the project and contact details, where available): <i>[List of types provided]</i></p> <p>4. If no activities have been carried out for this species in the reporting period, what has prevented such action being taken?</p> <p>5. Describe any future activities that are planned for this species.</p> <p>3. Listing of migratory species in Appendix II</p> <p>IV. National and Regional Priorities</p> <p>3. Does the conservation of migratory species currently feature in any other national or regional policies/plans (apart from CMS Agreements)</p> <p>3.1. If Yes, please provide details:</p> <p>3a. Do these policies/plans cover the following areas?</p> <p>Pollution control If Yes, please provide details</p> <p>Planning of power lines If Yes, please provide details</p> <p>Planning of fences If Yes, please provide details</p> <p>Planning of dams If Yes, please provide details</p> <p>Exploitation of natural resources (e.g. fisheries, hunting, etc.) If Yes, please provide details.</p> <p>Other If Yes, please provide details</p> <p>4. Results - please describe the positive outcomes of any actions taken.</p> <p>X. Implementation of COP Resolutions and Recommendations</p> <p>Please provide information about measures undertaken by your country relating to recent Resolutions and Recommendations since the last Report. For your convenience please refer to the list of COP Resolutions and Recommendations listed below:</p> <p>Resolutions <i>[include]</i>:</p>
By-catch			
Poaching and other illegal taking, trapping or trade			
Over-exploitation			
Other fisheries impacts			
Other hunting impacts			
Electrocution			
Obstruction of migration (other than by collision - see next category) by physical barriers	<i>(Specify type(s) of barrier)</i>	<i>(Specify type(s) of barrier)</i>	
Collisions	<i>(Indicate separately for):</i> Fences Power lines Wind turbines Other infrastructure <i>(specify)</i>	<i>(Indicate separately for):</i> Fences Power lines Wind turbines Other infrastructure <i>(specify)</i>	
Pollution			
Other habitat damage, fragmentation or destruction	<i>(Specify habitat and damage type)</i>	<i>(Specify habitat and damage type)</i>	
Disturbance			
Other pressures	<i>(Specify type)</i>	<i>(Specify type)</i>	
<p>What actions are being taken to overcome these pressures? (Describe in relation to each element of your answer to question <i>[number ref: = the preceding one above]</i> where possible).</p> <p>Please summarize the progress of the actions taken, and the success or otherwise of the outcomes.</p> <p>Please add any further comments you may wish on the implementation of specific provisions in relevant CMS COP Resolutions, including for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resolutions 6.2, 8.14, 9.18 and 10.24 and Recommendation 7.2 on by-catch. • Resolutions 9.19 and 10.24 on underwater noise. • Resolutions 10.4 and 11.30 on marine debris. • Resolution 11.22 on live captures of cetaceans. 			

Suggested structure and questions	Equivalent questions in existing format
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Resolution 8.22 on adverse human induced impacts on cetaceans. ● Resolutions 7.5 and 11.27 on renewable energy. ● Resolutions 7.4 and 10.11 on power lines and migratory birds. ● Resolution 11.15 on poisoning of migratory birds. ● Resolution 11.16 on illegal killing, taking and trade of migratory birds. ● Resolution 11.31 on wildlife crime. ● Resolution 11.26 on climate change. ● Resolution 11.28 on invasive alien species. <p><i>[The approach being suggested here is that all information about conservation activities should be reported in this section, leaving the section below on Target 8 to focus purely on the <u>resulting conservation status</u> of the species. (Legal/listing status is a different matter and is covered in the section above on “Species on the Convention Appendices”). There is a need to double-check that this logic works and that everything is properly covered].</i></p> <p><i>[It still needs to be decided where to address the idea that is in the existing National Report Format questions cited in the column on the right here where they ask (as Q 2c) “What assistance, if any, does your country require in order to overcome these obstacles?” and (as Q 3d) “3d. What assistance, if any, does your country require to overcome these factors?”. UNEP-WCMC previously suggested removing these questions to a different place].</i></p>	<p>Electrocution of Migratory Birds (7.4 / 10.11) Renewable Energy and Migratory Species (7.5 / 11.27) Marine Debris (10.4 / 11.30) Poisoning Migratory Birds (11.15) Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds (11.16) Wildlife Crime (11.31) Adverse Anthropogenic Impacts on Cetaceans and other Biota (8.22 / 9.19 / 10.24) Bycatch (incl. Recommendation) (6.2 / 7.2 / 8.14 / 9.18 / 10.14). Migratory Species and Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza (8.27 / 10.22) Climate Change Impacts on Migratory Species (7.5 / 11.26) Invasive Alien Species and Migratory Species (11.28) Southern Hemisphere Albatross Conservation (6.3) Antarctic Minke, Bryde’s and Pygmy Right Whales (7.15) Concerted and Cooperative Actions (Res. 11.13) <i>[Also under Target 9]</i> Migratory Marine Species (9.9 / 10.15) Conservation of Migratory Sharks and Rays (11.20) Live capture of Cetaceans from the Wild (11.22) Conservation Implications of Cetacean Culture (11.23) Loggerhead Turtle in the South Pacific Ocean (11.21) Saker Falcon (11.18) Global Flyway Conservation (10.10/11.14) <i>[Also under Target 9]</i> Migratory Freshwater Fish (10.12) Contribution of CMS in Achieving the 2010 Biodiversity Target (8.7). Migratory Landbirds in the African Eurasian Region (11.17) <i>[Also under Target 9]</i> Conservation of the African Lion (11.32) Recommendations <i>[include]</i> Recommendation 7.6 - Improving the Conservation Status of the Leatherback Turtle (<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>) Recommendation 8.17 - Marine Turtles Recommendation 9.1 - Central Eurasian Aridland Mammals <i>[Also under Target 9]</i> Recommendation 9.2 - Sahelo-Saharan Megafauna Recommendation 9.3 - Tigers and other Asian Big Cats Recommendation 9.5 - Cooperative Action for the Elephant (<i>Loxodonta africana</i>) in Central Africa <i>[Also under Target 9]</i>.</p>
<p><u>IMPROVING THE CONSERVATION STATUS OF MIGRATORY SPECIES AND THE ECOLOGICAL CONNECTIVITY AND RESILIENCE OF THEIR HABITATS</u></p> <p><i>(SPMS Goal 3; Targets 8-10)</i></p> <p><i>[Should a question be asked at Goal level? The comment was made during discussion on SPMS indicators that some countries may wish to report at this level].</i></p>	

Suggested structure and questions	Equivalent questions in existing format																																																																																			
<p><u>CONSERVATION STATUS OF MIGRATORY SPECIES</u> (SPMS Target 8)</p> <p><i>[Question already included in Indicator Factsheets and in UNEP/CMS/StC45/Doc.14]</i></p> <p>What changes in migratory species conservation status have been recorded in your country in the current reporting period?</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Species/other taxon (indicate CMS Appendix where applicable)</th> <th>Change in status</th> <th>Source reference</th> <th>Comments</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="3">FISH</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">REPTILES</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">BIRDS</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">AQUATIC MAMMALS</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">TERRITORIAL MAMMALS</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">BATS</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>[The approach being suggested here is that all information about conservation activities should be reported in the earlier section on targets 6+7, leaving the present section to focus purely on the resulting conservation status of the species. (Legal/listing status is a different matter and is covered in the section above on “Species on the Convention Appendices”). Need to double-check that this logic works and that everything is properly covered].</i></p>		Species/other taxon (indicate CMS Appendix where applicable)	Change in status	Source reference	Comments	FISH													REPTILES													BIRDS													AQUATIC MAMMALS													TERRITORIAL MAMMALS													BATS													<p>3. Listing of migratory species in Appendix II</p> <p>1. Is your country a Range State for any migratory species that has an unfavourable conservation status, but is not currently listed in Appendix II and could benefit from the conclusion of an Agreement for its conservation? <i>[Also above in section on “Species on the Convention Appendices”]</i></p> <p>If Yes, please provide details.</p>
	Species/other taxon (indicate CMS Appendix where applicable)	Change in status	Source reference	Comments																																																																																
FISH																																																																																				
REPTILES																																																																																				
BIRDS																																																																																				
AQUATIC MAMMALS																																																																																				
TERRITORIAL MAMMALS																																																																																				
BATS																																																																																				
<p><u>COOPERATING TO CONSERVE MIGRATION SYSTEMS</u> (SPMS Target 9)</p> <p><i>[Question already included in Indicator Factsheets (as a version slightly amended from that also included in UNEP/CMS/StC45/Doc.14)]</i></p> <p>In the current reporting period, has your country initiated or participated in the development of any proposals for new CMS Agreements, including Memoranda of Understanding, to address the needs of Appendix II species?</p> <p>If yes, please provide a short summary. <i>[NB this effectively repeats a question that is currently included in the earlier section above on “Accession/ratification of CMS Agreements/MoUs” – need to decide the best way of handling this].</i></p> <p>In the current reporting period, have actions been taken by your country to encourage non-Parties to join CMS and its related Agreements?</p> <p>If yes, please provide a short summary.</p> <p>In the current reporting period, has your country participated in</p>	<p>2. Questions on CMS Agreements</p> <p>Questions on the development of new CMS Agreements relating to [Bird] Species <i>[this group of questions repeated for each taxonomic group].</i></p> <p>1. In the current reporting period, has your country initiated the development of any CMS Agreements, including Memoranda of Understanding, to address the needs of Appendix II [Bird] Species? <i>[Relevant also to Target 3].</i></p> <p>2. In the current reporting period, has your country participated in the development of any new CMS Agreements, including Memoranda of Understanding, which address the conservation needs of Appendix II [Bird] Species? <i>[Relevant also to Target 3].</i></p> <p>4. Is the development of any CMS Agreement for [Bird] Species, including Memoranda of Understanding, planned by your country in the foreseeable future? <i>[Relevant also to Target 3].</i></p> <p>VII. Membership</p> <p>1. Have actions been taken by your country to encourage non- Parties to join CMS and its related Agreements?</p>																																																																																			

Suggested structure and questions	Equivalent questions in existing format
<p>the development or implementation of concerted actions or cooperative actions under CMS (as detailed in COP Resolution 11.13) to address the needs of relevant migratory species?</p> <p>If yes,</p> <p>(a) please provide a short summary.</p> <p>(b) describe the results achieved so far.</p> <p>Have any other steps been taken which have contributed to the achievement of the results defined in Target 9 of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species (<i>all relevant States engaging in cooperation on the conservation of migratory species in ways that fully reflect a migration systems approach</i>)?</p> <p><i>[NB This section and the section on Target 3 have some potential risks of overlap – need to double-check the questions proposed in these two sections for clarity/complementarity].</i></p>	<p>X. Implementation of COP Resolutions and Recommendations</p> <p>Please provide information about measures undertaken by your country relating to recent Resolutions and Recommendations since the last Report. For your convenience please refer to the list of COP Resolutions and Recommendations listed below:</p> <p>Resolutions [<i>include</i>]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of Existing Agreements and Development of Future Agreements (8.5) Concerted and Cooperative Actions (Res. 11.13) [<i>Also under Targets 6-7</i>] Priorities for CMS Agreements (9.2 / 10.16) Global Flyway Conservation (10.10/11.14) [<i>Also under Targets 6-7</i>] Migratory Landbirds in the African Eurasian Region (11.17) [<i>Also under Targets 6-7</i>] <p>Recommendations [<i>include</i>]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendation 9.5 - Cooperative Action for the Elephant (<i>Loxodonta africana</i>) in Central Africa [<i>Also under Targets 6-7</i>].
<p><u>AREA-BASED CONSERVATION MEASURES</u> (SPMS Target 10)</p> <p><i>[Question already included in Indicator Factsheets (as a version slightly amended from that also included in UNEP/CMS/StC45/Doc.14)]</i></p> <p>Have all critical habitats and sites for migratory species been identified in your country?</p> <p>If not, which are the ecosystem types, taxonomic groups and/or geographical areas for which critical habitats and sites are:</p> <p>(a) most well documented;</p> <p>(b) least well documented?</p> <p>Please provide details of the number and extent of protected areas that are judged to be important for migratory species in your country:</p> <p>(a) Total number of relevant protected areas.</p> <p>(b) Total area of relevant protected areas (sq km).</p> <p>(c) Comments on how “importance for migratory species” has been interpreted in answering this question.</p> <p>In respect of protected areas in your country that are important for migratory species, are any assessments of management effectiveness undertaken?</p> <p>If yes, please describe.</p> <p>Are other area-based conservation measures (apart from protected areas) implemented in your country in ways which benefit migratory species?</p> <p>If yes, please describe.</p> <p>During the reporting period, have actions been undertaken in your country to implement specific provisions in CMS COP Resolutions 10.3 and/or 11.25 on ecological networks for migratory species?</p> <p>If yes, please provide a short summary.</p> <p><i>[Note that the suggestions above do not carry forward the previous practice of asking for quantification of areas separately in the terrestrial, aquatic and marine realms. As borne out by the analysis of reports to COP12, it seems highly problematic to</i></p>	<p>3. Listing of migratory species in Appendix II</p> <p>IV. National and Regional Priorities</p> <p>3. Does the conservation of migratory species currently feature in any other national or regional policies/plans (apart from CMS Agreements)</p> <p>3.1. If Yes, please provide details:</p> <p>3a. Do these policies/plans cover the following areas?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Designation and development of protected areas If Yes, please provide details - Development of ecological networks If Yes, please provide details. <p>4. Results - please describe the positive outcomes of any actions taken.</p> <p>V. Protected Areas</p> <p>1. Are migratory species taken into account in the selection, establishment and management of protected areas in your country?</p> <p>If Yes, please provide details:</p> <p>1a. Please identify the most important national sites for migratory species and their protection status:</p> <p>1b. Do these protected areas cover the following areas?</p> <p><i>Terrestrial</i></p> <p>If Yes, please provide details and include the amount of protected areas coverage and the number of protected areas.</p> <p><i>Aquatic</i></p> <p>If Yes, please provide details and include the amount of protected areas coverage and the number of protected areas.</p> <p><i>Marine</i></p> <p>If Yes, please provide details and include the amount of protected areas coverage and the number of protected areas</p> <p>2. Results - please describe the positive outcomes of any actions taken.</p> <p>X. Implementation of COP Resolutions and Recommendations</p> <p>Please provide information about measures undertaken by your country relating to recent Resolutions and Recommendations since the last Report. For your convenience please refer to the list of COP Resolutions and Recommendations listed below:</p> <p>Resolutions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecological Networks (10.3 / 11.25)

Suggested structure and questions	Equivalent questions in existing format
<p><i>extrapolate this distinction (which is currently operated in CMS for <u>species</u>) to apply it also to <u>areas</u>; and its utility in this context is questioned. This may however need further discussion].</i></p>	
<p><u>ENHANCING THE BENEFITS TO ALL FROM THE FAVOURABLE CONSERVATION STATUS OF MIGRATORY SPECIES</u></p> <p>(SPMS Goal 4; Targets 11-12)</p> <p><i>[Should a question be asked at Goal level? The comment was made during discussion on SPMS indicators that some countries may wish to report at this level].</i></p>	
<p><u>ECOSYSTEM SERVICES</u> (SPMS Target 11)</p> <p><i>[Question already included in Indicator Factsheets (as a version slightly amended from that also included in UNEP/CMS/StC45/Doc.14)]</i></p> <p>Has any assessment of ecosystem services associated with migratory species been undertaken in your country? If yes, please provide a short summary (including source references where applicable).</p>	<p>[No specific matching questions, except perhaps on Resolution 11.29 on marine wildlife watching].</p>
<p><u>SAFEGUARDING GENETIC DIVERSITY</u> (SPMS Target 12)</p> <p><i>[Question already included in Indicator Factsheets (as a version slightly amended from that also included in UNEP/CMS/StC45/Doc.14)]</i></p> <p>Are strategies of relevance to migratory species being developed or implemented to minimize genetic erosion of biodiversity in your country? If yes: (a) please provide a short summary; (b) describe the relevance to migratory species.</p> <p>Are any other steps being taken in your country to safeguard the genetic diversity of wild populations of migratory species? If yes, (a) please describe. (b) describe the results achieved so far.</p> <p><i>[Existing indicators are not well suited to addressing genetic erosion in wild animals. The most feasible course is probably to ask Parties to report on <u>activities</u> that relate to this target. Limiting this to strategies addressing only migratory species might narrow the scope too strictly; hence the reference to strategies that are “of relevance” to migratory species].</i></p>	<p>[No specific matching questions].</p>
<p><u>ENHANCING IMPLEMENTATION THROUGH PARTICIPATORY PLANNING, KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT AND CAPACITY BUILDING</u></p> <p>(SPMS Goal 5; Targets 13-16)</p> <p><i>[Should a question be asked at Goal level? The comment was made during discussion on SPMS indicators that some countries may wish to report at this level].</i></p>	

Suggested structure and questions	Equivalent questions in existing format
<p><u>NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS</u> (SPMS Target 13)</p> <p><i>[Question already included in Indicator Factsheets (as a version slightly amended from that also included in UNEP/CMS/StC45/Doc.14)]</i></p> <p>Are priorities for the conservation and management of migratory species, their habitats and migration systems addressed by your country's national biodiversity strategy or action plan?</p> <p>If yes:</p> <p>(a) please identify the elements in the plan/strategy that are particularly relevant;</p> <p>(b) please highlight any specific references to CMS and/or its agreements and action plans;</p> <p>(c) please add comments on the implementation of the strategy or action plan concerned.</p> <p><i>[The "note" added under this target in the Strategic Plan said "Other types of national plans and strategies, such as those for the implementation of other Multilateral Environmental Agreements or national development plans, may also be highly relevant" - but this aspect is not asked about in the question suggested here. Still to consider whether it should be, or whether it will dilute/confuse the picture to be obtained specifically about linking CMS to NBSAPs].</i></p>	<p>3. Listing of migratory species in Appendix II</p> <p>IV. National and Regional Priorities</p> <p>2. Are migratory species and their habitats addressed by your country's national biodiversity strategy or action plan?</p> <p>2.1. If Yes, please indicate and briefly describe the extent to which it addresses the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minimizing or eliminating barriers or obstacles to migration <i>[Also relevant to Target 7]</i> - Transboundary co-operation <i>[Also relevant to Target 9]</i> - Conservation, sustainable use and/or restoration of the habitats of migratory species, including protected areas <i>[Also relevant to Target 10]</i> - Conservation, sustainable use and/or restoration of migratory species <i>[Also relevant to Target 8]</i> - Research and monitoring of migratory species <i>[Also relevant to Target 15]</i> - Actions to prevent, reduce or control factors that are endangering or are likely to further endanger migratory species (e.g. alien invasive species or by-catch) <i>[Also relevant to Target 7].</i>
<p><u>TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE, INNOVATIONS AND PRACTICES OF INDIGENOUS AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES</u> (SPMS Target 14)</p> <p><i>[Question already included in Indicator Factsheets (as a version slightly amended from that also included in UNEP/CMS/StC45/Doc.14)]</i></p> <p>Have actions been taken in your country to foster respect for the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities that are relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of migratory species, their habitats and migration systems?</p> <p>If yes, please provide a short summary.</p> <p>Have actions been taken in your country to foster full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities in the conservation and sustainable use of migratory species, their habitats and migration systems?</p> <p>If yes, please provide a short summary.</p> <p>To what extent overall have any actions in your country of the kind described in questions <i>[number]</i> and <i>[number]</i> above <i>[ie the preceding two questions for this target]</i> helped to achieve Target 14 of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species (<i>"The traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of migratory species, their habitats and migration systems, and their customary sustainable use of biological resources, are respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations, with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, thereby contributing to the favourable conservation status of migratory species and the ecological connectivity and resilience of</i></p>	<p>X. Implementation of COP Resolutions and Recommendations</p> <p>Please provide information about measures undertaken by your country relating to recent Resolutions and Recommendations since the last Report. For your convenience please refer to the list of COP Resolutions and Recommendations listed below:</p> <p>Resolutions <i>[include]</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity Building Strategy (9.12 / 10.6) <i>[Also under Target 15].</i>

Suggested structure and questions	Equivalent questions in existing format												
<p><i>their habitats</i>)? (Tick one box). (1 = minimal contribution, 5 = very significant contribution).</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>(Not applicable)</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	1	2	3	4	5	(Not applicable)							
1	2	3	4	5	(Not applicable)								
<p>KNOWLEDGE, DATA AND CAPACITY-BUILDING (SPMS Target 15)</p> <p><i>[Question already included in Indicator Factsheets (as a version slightly amended from that also included in UNEP/CMS/StC45/Doc.14)]</i></p> <p>In the current reporting period, which steps taken in your country have contributed to the achievement of the results defined in Target 15 of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species (<i>"The science base, information, training, awareness, understanding and technologies relating to migratory species, their habitats and migration systems, their value, functioning, status and trends, and the consequences of their loss, are improved, widely shared and transferred, and effectively applied"</i>)?</p> <p>(a) Please provide a short summary.</p> <p>(b) Please comment in particular (where applicable) on aspects relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Training; - Sharing and transfer of information and technologies; - Improving the science base; - Effective application of improved understanding. <p><i>[The next question was also included in the same Factsheets/Standing Committee paper, but was originally under Target 16, on the basis that "resources" mentioned in that Target could be taken to be more than financial, and thus to include human capacity. Target 15 however also mentions "training", and it now seems preferable to re-locate the question here instead of in the section on Target 16 below. This may however be worth further discussion].</i></p> <p>Have steps been taken in your country to implement the CMS Capacity Building Strategy 2015-2017 (UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.20.2)? If yes, please provide a short summary.</p> <p><i>[NB the suggestions for this section involve deleting the previous National Report Format questions relating specifically to satellite telemetry projects. Respondents will still be able to report on such projects in response to the question above, but it seems perhaps disproportionate to devote a separate additional question just to that one topic, and respondents have not always confined themselves to its specific scope in any event].</i></p> <p><i>[The "assistance required" questions from the existing National Report Format were originally noted as relevant to Target 16 on the same basis as described above regarding the question about capacity building; but they have now been moved to be cross-referred here (in the column on the right) instead. Something still needs adding to the new proposed questions (in this left-hand column) however to address the "assistance required" aspect].</i></p>	<p>II. Appendix I species</p> <p>1. General questions on Appendix I species <i>[this group of questions repeated for each taxonomic group]</i></p> <p>2c. What assistance, if any, does your country require in order to overcome [obstacles to migration that exist in relation to Appendix I species]?</p> <p>3d. What assistance, if any, does your country require to overcome [factors that are endangering or are likely to further endanger [bird etc] species beyond actions to prevent disruption to migrating behaviour]?</p> <p>2. Questions on CMS Agreements</p> <p>Questions on the development of new CMS Agreements relating to [Bird] Species <i>[this question repeated for each taxonomic group]</i></p> <p>3. If your country has initiated or is participating in the development of a new Agreement or Memorandum of Understanding, what assistance, if any, does your country require in order to initiate or participate in the instrument's development?</p> <p><i>[The preceding "assistance required" questions (II.1, II.2c, II.3d, 2 and 3) have been noted here on the basis of their relevance to the "capacity" element of Target 15. There are other places where they could conceivably be picked up, but the suggestion for the time being is to address this issue here].</i></p> <p>VI. Policies* on Satellite Telemetry</p> <p>1. In the current reporting period, has your country undertaken conservation/research projects that use satellite telemetry? If yes what is the state of those projects? Please provide details.</p> <p>2. Are any future conservation/research projects planned that will use satellite telemetry? If Yes, please provide details (including the expected timeframe for these projects).</p> <p>3. Results - please describe the positive outcomes of any actions taken.</p> <p><i>*[Is it possible that the word "policies" here was intended instead to read "projects"? There is no reference to policies in the questions themselves].</i></p> <p>IX. Mobilization of Resources</p> <p>4. Has your country provided technical and/or scientific assistance to developing countries to facilitate initiatives for the benefit of migratory species? If Yes, please provide details (Indicate the migratory species that have benefited from these activities).</p> <p>X. Implementation of COP Resolutions and Recommendations</p> <p>Please provide information about measures undertaken by your country relating to recent Resolutions and Recommendations since the last Report. For your convenience please refer to the list of COP Resolutions</p>												

Suggested structure and questions	Equivalent questions in existing format
	and Recommendations listed below: Resolutions <i>[include]</i> : CMS Information Priorities (9.3) <i>[Also under Target 1]</i> . Capacity Building Strategy (9.12 / 10.6) <i>[Also under Target 14]</i> . Relationship between the CMS Family and civil society (Res. 11.11) <i>[Also under Target 3]</i> .
<p>RESOURCE MOBILIZATION (SPMS Target 16)</p> <p><i>[Question already included in Indicator Factsheets (as a version slightly amended from that also included in UNEP/CMS/StC45/Doc.14)]</i></p> <p>During the reporting period, has your country made financial or other resources available for conservation activities specifically benefiting migratory species in your country? If yes, please provide a short summary (and identify the migratory species that have benefited).</p> <p>During the reporting period, has your country made financial or other resources available for conservation activities specifically benefiting migratory species in other countries? If yes, please provide a short summary (and identify the countries concerned).</p> <p>During the reporting period, has your country received financial or other resources for conservation activities specifically benefiting migratory species? If yes, please provide a short summary (and identify the source(s) of support).</p> <p><i>[NB See note in the section on Target 15 above concerning a question on capacity-building, which was originally in this section and has now been moved].</i></p>	<p>IX. Mobilization of Resources</p> <p>1. Has your country made financial resources available for conservation activities having direct benefits for migratory species in your country? If Yes, please provide details (Indicate the migratory species that have benefited from these activities): . Has your country made voluntary contributions to the CMS Trust Fund to support requests from developing countries and countries with economies in transition?</p> <p>3. Has your country made other voluntary financial contributions to support conservation activities having direct benefits for migratory species in other countries (particularly developing countries)?</p> <p>5. Has your country received financial assistance/support from the CMS Trust Fund, via the CMS Secretariat, for national conservation activities having direct benefits for migratory species in your country?</p> <p>6. Has your country received financial assistance/support from sources other than the CMS Secretariat for conservation activities having direct benefit for migratory species in your country?</p> <p>X. Implementation of COP Resolutions and Recommendations</p> <p>Please provide information about measures undertaken by your country relating to recent Resolutions and Recommendations since the last Report. For your convenience please refer to the list of COP Resolutions and Recommendations listed below: Resolutions <i>[include]</i>: Financial and Administrative Matters and Terms of Reference for the Administration of the Trust Fund (11.1)</p>