



**CONVENTION ON  
MIGRATORY  
SPECIES**

Distribution: General

UNEP/CMS/COP12/Inf.28  
16 October 2017

Original: English

12<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES  
Manila, Philippines, 23 - 28 October 2017  
Agenda Item 15

**STRATEGIC PLAN FOR MIGRATORY SPECIES 2015-2023:  
COMPANION VOLUME ON IMPLEMENTATION  
Executive Summary of guidance on implementing the Plan targets**

*(Prepared by the Strategic Plan Working Group)*

Summary:

Following a mandate given by COP11 in Resolution 11.2, the Strategic Plan Working Group, with support from the Secretariat, has developed a Companion Volume to provide guidance on implementation of the Strategic Plan. The Companion Volume has been developed as an online toolkit, aimed at compiling and making available to the Parties and other stakeholders all the guidance currently available within the CMS Family to help them implement the Strategic Plan, while allowing for regular updating and additions as new information becomes available. The Companion Volume is accessible at the URL <http://www.cms.int/en/strategic-plan/companion-volume>. More details on its development are provided in document UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.15.

Considering the vast amount of information included in the Companion Volume, an Executive Summary has been prepared with a view to giving key pointers to some of the most important ways in which this material can help in achieving the necessary outcomes.

## STRATEGIC PLAN FOR MIGRATORY SPECIES 2015-2023

# Companion Volume on Implementation

### Executive Summary of guidance on implementing the Plan targets

#### Introduction

The Strategic Plan for Migratory Species (SPMS) helps governments and others to organize priorities and coordinate efforts for the conservation of migratory species, on which many other benefits for people and ecosystems depend.

The Plan contains 16 targets which express the outcomes to be achieved by 2023. They aim to strengthen and focus implementation of the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) itself as well as the family of daughter Agreements established under the CMS. The targets have been aligned with related objectives adopted in other fora, notably the Aichi targets in the global Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020; so they do not duplicate those objectives but rather they direct them more specifically towards the conservation needs of migratory species.

Implementation of the SPMS targets therefore should also demonstrate how important migratory species conservation is for the delivery of multiple international objectives, such as those of the Convention on Biological Diversity, and also the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, particularly the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

The SPMS has consolidated objectives that have been recognized in the CMS framework for many years, and it demonstrates the political and scientific importance of migratory species issues for broader environmental and sustainability objectives. The targets represent an expanded and/or updated expression of existing objectives within the CMS Family and do not constitute additional commitments from the Contracting Parties. The existing commitments are however now firmly fixed within a defined timeframe for achievement and within a broader context. This brings an extra focus to the implementation efforts that are needed (with greater depth, intensity and/or speed in many cases) to achieve the objectives that have been defined within the CMS Family. The Strategic Plan also provides a basis for new levels of coherence and consistency between the various instruments and mechanisms of the CMS, and with other international biodiversity conservation efforts.

This new approach towards existing commitments and objectives has however created a need for the Parties to be given guidance on how to address them with existing tools. The COP therefore decided to develop a Companion Volume, and requested the Convention's Strategic Plan Working Group (SPWG) to develop a proposal for this for COP12 to consider.

The SPMS *Companion Volume on Implementation* contains an introduction on the rationale and interpretation of each of the targets, an overview of key tools and delivery mechanisms available, mutually supportive links to other processes and methods for monitoring implementation and assessing progress.

Although extensive, the material in the *Companion Volume* has been organized in a web-based resource centre, so that relevant help on specific topics can be rapidly found with the use of a matrix structure and automated search facilities. This matrix structure allows users to access a large amount of existing information in a targeted way.

To facilitate the use of the Companion Volume, the present *Executive Summary* gives key pointers

to some of the most important ways in which this material can help in achieving the necessary outcomes. For each of the Targets, a summary is provided of the key tools. For more details, the online Companion Volume can be consulted at <http://www.cms.int/en/strategic-plan/companion-volume> .

In line with the guidance of the SPWG, the French and Spanish versions only include excerpts in the respective language for those instruments for which an official language version exists.

The text in section F (on indicators) for each Target is based on that in the Annex to Document UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.15, and hence is subject to agreement by the COP.

## TARGET 1

People are aware of the multiple values of migratory species and their habitats and migration systems, and the steps they can take to conserve them and ensure the sustainability of any use.

*Note:* “Awareness” here is intended to be more than passive, and to include positive support and engagement at political levels, as well as among the public. It includes awareness of the values represented by the phenomenon of migration itself. The values concerned may be socio-economic, including cultural, as well as ecological.

### Benefits that will result from achieving this target

Awareness, support and engagement generate the levels of understanding and appreciation that are necessary conditions for changed behaviours by individuals, and for democratic mandates to governments for changed policies in society. These changes are also likely to be necessary to achieve the other targets in this Plan. Good achievement of Target 1 should result in *higher and more widespread levels* of awareness, support and engagement in 2023 than existed in 2014.

Several benefits would be expected to form part of this result, according to the target:

- Greater awareness by any one individual or group than before (“depth”).
- Awareness being widespread among more people than before (“breadth”).
- The content of the awareness to include the multiple values of migratory species and their habitats and migration systems.
- The content of the awareness to include also the steps people can take to conserve migratory species and ensure the sustainability of any use.
- Awareness apparent among individuals.
- Awareness apparent at the level of institutions.

### T1-A. Outreach, promotion and uptake of the Plan

In the case of Target 1, the Target itself is focused on awareness: hence implementation mechanisms and opportunities relating to “outreach, promotion and uptake” in this context constitute part of the actual delivery of the Target. Section B of the Companion Volume contains support for this aspect, and so it is not duplicated here.

### T1-B. The delivery framework

The CMS Communication, Information and Outreach Plan 2015-2017 (Resolution 11.8) defines specific actions for the Secretariats of the CMS and Family instruments, and for all other stakeholders a set of common communication principles are provided. Following these principles will provide assurance that actions are contributing to the implementation of Target 1 and in turn linking consistently to the goals of the SPMS, and should particularly enhance the likelihood of success with the broadening of impact.

A CMS Communication Strategy (under development) will also provide significant help in guiding delivery of this Target, including downloadable communications materials and templates which can be adapted and used as support for the implementation of the Target in different contexts.

Specific awareness campaigns such as World Migratory Bird Day (Resolution 11.9) and Marine Debris awareness (Resolution 11.30), offer international linkages, demonstrations of solidarity and sources of promotional materials that can be readily adapted for use at national level.

Several of the CMS Programmes of Work and Family instruments contain provisions on communication, education and public awareness (CEPA) which constitute already-adopted

principles and ideas for useful areas of action. These can be cited as strong official support for relevant initiatives, and they provide tried & tested activity suggestions which therefore do not need to be separately reinvented. National CEPA Programmes can be modelled to reflect this international thinking, and their implementation can usefully draw on the topical communication materials produced from time to time by the Secretariats of the CMS and its Agreements. The ASCOBANS Agreement in addition has its own CEPA Plan.

### **T1-C. Key partnerships and other supporting delivery frameworks**

No formal partnerships are specifically in place for the purpose of awareness-raising; but most CMS-related collaborations provide opportunities and a context for awareness about the multiple values of migratory species, their habitats and migration systems to be increased through transfer of knowledge and information at all levels. The non-government sector and civil society are significant sources of capacity for helping with delivery of Target 1.

Governments should benefit from the efforts that have been made to streamline mutual reinforcement between this target and Aichi Biodiversity Target 1 (which has essentially the same aim for biodiversity as a whole), and SDG 12.8 (ensuring people have information and awareness for living in harmony with nature). Other supporting frameworks at global level include the CBD's Programme of Work on CEPA, the Ramsar Convention's CEPA Programme, the biodiversity-related education work of UNESCO, and training initiatives organized by UNITAR and the UN University (which are relevant also to section D on capacity development below). If good coordination on these things at national level is assured, then no one sector or programme needs to bear the whole burden of delivering the necessary outcomes.

### **T1-D. Capacity development**

The CMS Capacity Building Strategy 2015-2017 (COP11 Doc 20.2) includes provisions relating to the creation and extension of CEPA tools, and for supporting eligible countries to build their capacity in communication and negotiation. Although the latter is directed towards participation in COPs, it should have benefits in terms of building capacity for awareness-raising in a wider sense, and hence should help to support Target 1.

Several of the CMS family instruments contain provisions for building capacity among government agencies and others to develop and deliver outreach programmes.

### **T1-E. Resourcing for biodiversity (including human, technical and financial resources)**

A number of existing decisions and instruments developed under the CMS Family provide for different resourcing mechanisms and opportunities aiming at:

- Exploring existing funding opportunities and submitting grant applications to support mass education and public awareness events;
- Involving public participation through incentive schemes;
- Using awareness raising as a tool to mobilize resources.

Using these international prompts and channels can help to suggest new ideas and opportunities, benefit from the experience of other countries and harmonise efforts that are pursued for example in transboundary contexts.

### **T1-F. Monitoring and evaluation, including indicators, milestones and feedback to the sub-targets, as well as headline measures of success by which overall success of the SPMS may be judged**

In theory this target should be measured by some kind of extensive attitude surveys among the public and various stakeholder groups. In practice, both conducting such research, and the framing of questions which would shed meaningful light on the changes the target seeks, are unlikely to be feasible or cost-effective. The three pragmatic indicators which have therefore been chosen, and which will give a partial picture of some selected aspects of this target, are:

- 1.1 Levels of engagement in World Migratory Bird Day and similar events.
- 1.2 Simple qualitative assessment by CMS Parties in triennial national reports.
- 1.3 Ad hoc case studies.

A few CMS MOUs and Action Plans list “indicators” for objectives concerning education and awareness. These are mostly statements of expected results rather than indicators as such, but some could be converted into numerical measures (e.g. number of awareness events organized).

#### **T1-G. Reporting on and review of progress at national level and by governing bodies such as the CMS COP**

Some reporting on this target is foreseen in the CMS Party reports to COP, in particular since Parties should report on national implementation of the Convention’s Communication, Information and Outreach Plan (Resolution 11.8). Information from these reports will also support the indicators for this target (see T1-F).

MOUs which have their own awareness-raising objectives (e.g. Great Bustard, Pacific Island Cetaceans, West African Cetaceans) will be able to review progress on those objectives through periodic implementation reports; and the same may apply to Action Plans which also contain such objectives (e.g. Central Asian Flyway, South American Grassland Birds).

## TARGET 2

Multiple values of migratory species and their habitats have been integrated into international, national and local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes, including on livelihoods, and are being incorporated into national accounting, as appropriate, and reporting systems.

*Note:* Actions towards this SPMS target may also contribute to SPMS target 13.

### Benefits that will result from achieving this target

This target responds to the challenge faced by many countries in realising successful ways of integrating the multiple values of migratory species and their habitats in various policy and planning contexts. Good achievement of the target will be manifested in a better degree of integration of these values beyond the environment sector in 2023 than was the case in 2014. The *content* of the strategies and processes mentioned in the target is therefore expected to change. This is a target intended to enable conservation impact, but it does not involve an expectation of that impact itself.

Target 2 makes a crucial link between migratory species conservation and sustainable development objectives, and hence it is connected to Target 11, which aims to ensure that the provision of relevant ecosystem services is maintained.

This target also needs to be read in conjunction with Targets 3 and 13. Target 3 seeks improvements in governance of any sector (environmental or otherwise) which affects migratory species. Target 2 seeks the integration of relevant values in processes that are specifically directed at development and poverty reduction. Target 13 expresses a similar idea in relation to strategies and plans addressing biodiversity (NBSAPs), and goes further by referring to implementation as well as planning.

A mere *mention* of migratory species/habitat values in the strategies and processes covered by Target 2 is unlikely to fulfil the target - what is sought instead is *integration* of those values, thus implying a deeper and more active level of reflection of the issue. As well as strategies and processes, the target also expects the same change to be seen in national accounting and reporting systems.

There are therefore several benefits that would be expected to form part of a successful result in achieving this target, namely:

- Identification and listing of the international, national and local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes (including on livelihoods) in which the expected integration of values relating to migratory species and their habitats should be visible.
- Multiple values of migratory species and their habitats integrated (not merely mentioned) to a better degree than before in the strategies and processes identified.
- These same values also incorporated into national accounting, “as appropriate”.
- These same values also incorporated into national reporting systems.

### T2-A. Outreach, promotion and uptake of the Plan

Communication work guided by the *CMS Communication Strategy* (under development) will support the implementation of Target 2. It will help governments and others to direct and focus their communication efforts to highlight the link between migratory species conservation and sustainable development and the issue of livelihoods. (For more on this, see under Target 1).

### T2-B. The delivery framework

A few of the CMS Family instruments contain objectives which refer in fairly general terms to strengthening sectoral measures at national level (for example agriculture, and economic development) in ways which integrate consideration of the conservation needs of migratory species and their habitats. These can be invoked as intergovernmentally-agreed aims in this regard, for example supporting national environment ministries in their negotiations with counterparts in other parts of government on joint and coordinated approaches.

Some delivery of this target may occur through strategies and planning processes designed to integrate the conservation of biodiversity in a more general sense, but measures specific to migratory species are in many cases likely to need further development. The target itself offers extra political impetus for pursuing such development, so for example those developing poverty reduction strategies or national accounting systems can invoke the target as a mandate for pursuing dialogue with migratory species conservation specialists and incorporating their advice (and a reflection of relevant CMS Family instruments) into the strategies and systems they develop.

### **T2-C. Key partnerships and other supporting delivery frameworks**

In the CMS context, the Action Plan for Migratory Landbirds in the African-Eurasian Region (Resolution 11.17) offers probably the most explicit model of a provision for encouraging partnerships with the poverty alleviation community in particular; but this should be assumed to be a necessary component of full implementation of this Target in other cases too. Implementers of other CMS instruments therefore can take this as encouragement to work with the poverty alleviation community in looking for ways in which that community and the instrument concerned can support each other's objectives.

There is mutual reinforcement between this target and Aichi Biodiversity Target 2 (which has essentially the same aim for biodiversity as a whole), and SDGs 14.7, 15.b, 15.c and particularly 15.9 (which address the contribution made to livelihoods by sustainable management of ecological resources). The CBD's "Chennai Guidance for the Integration of Biodiversity and Poverty Eradication" (2014) and its ongoing "Biodiversity for Development Initiative", as well as the UN's "System of Integrated Economic and Environmental Accounting" (SEEA) are also relevant frameworks that can support activities for delivering CMS objectives.

### **T2-D. Capacity development**

The Landbird Action Plan example mentioned under T2-C above refers to partnerships with the poverty alleviation community in a context of capacity development, and is again the most explicit existing provision in this regard.

Where the livelihoods dimension is related to conservation-friendly wildlife watching, CMS Action Plans concerning cetaceans emphasize the need for certification schemes to be underpinned by training programmes. Pooling information on these schemes and programmes through CMS (including through periodic reporting by Contracting Parties) will progressively increase the volume of intelligence and experience that can be drawn on, to mutual benefit.

### **T2-E. Resourcing for biodiversity (including human, technical and financial resources)**

A number of existing decisions and instruments developed under the CMS Family and reflected in the SPMS Companion Volume provide for different resourcing mechanisms and opportunities aiming at:

- Evaluating the socio-economic value of species and their services to commercial activities;
- Evaluating economic potential for commercial activities based on species;
- Developing alternative income generation activities.



**T2-F. Monitoring and evaluation, including indicators, milestones and feedback to the sub-targets, as well as headline measures of success by which overall success of the SPMS may be judged**

Global tracking of trends in all aspects of this target on a regularly repeating basis would be an over-ambitious aim. Work on biodiversity in general may address analogous questions (e.g. in relation to Aichi Target 2), although separately distinguishing a migratory species component is likely to be challenging. It is nonetheless important to capture information about progress on this front, and hence two pragmatic indicators have been chosen which will usefully give at least a partial picture of some selected aspects of this target, namely:

2.1 Single assessment study.

2.2 CMS National Report Format question (in the context of proposals at COP12 for streamlining and improving the Format).

The Pacific Island Cetaceans MOU proposes indicators on the number of relevant plans and processes which integrate actions supporting the MOUs objectives.

**T2-G. Reporting on and review of progress at national level and by governing bodies such as the CMS COP**

The current CMS National Report Format includes questions addressing (a) cross-departmental involvement in government action for migratory species and (b) reference to migratory species in sectoral plans and policies. Reviewing progress will depend on obtaining information from these other departments and sectors.

## TARGET 3

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.

*Note:* Reference to governance “affecting” migratory species here indicates that this is not limited only to conservation governance, but extends to other levels/sectors that may also have an effect.

### Benefits that will result from achieving this target

It is first assumed here that “governance arrangements and agreements affecting migratory species and their migration systems” can be readily identified and listed at national, regional and international levels. Responsibility for doing that will divide between authorities at each of these levels.

Arrangements and agreements specifically directed at the conservation (or management, or exploitation) of migratory species and their migration systems will obviously be relevant; but so too will be any other arrangements or agreements, perhaps directed at a different sector altogether, which nevertheless directly or indirectly “affect” migratory species or their migration systems.

Arrangements or agreements relating specifically to development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes (including on livelihoods) should however not be considered here because they are covered separately by Target 2. Arrangements or agreements relating specifically to National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) should also not be considered here because they are covered separately by Target 13. There may be links with Target 9.

Although the target can be interpreted in different ways, the most practical approach is probably to assume that the improvement being sought consists of greater coherence, accountability, etc in the relevant policies, legislation and implementation processes. No benchmark standards of coherence, accountability etc are in common use, and again for the purposes of pragmatism (avoiding the challenges of definitions and so on), assessing the change expected by this target is inevitably going to be a matter of qualitative value-judgment.

It is however expected that success in achieving this target will involve a change being visible; and that more than simply achieving improvements, those improvements will be “significant” (i.e. the magnitude of the change is important).

### T3-A. Outreach, promotion and uptake of the Plan

Communication work guided by the *CMS Communication Strategy* (under development) will support the implementation of Target 3. It will help governments and others to direct and focus their communication efforts to highlight examples where governance arrangements for migratory species and their migration systems have improved significantly. Communication also plays a role in making implementation processes more coherent, accountable, transparent and participatory. (For more on this, see under Target 1).

### T3-B. The delivery framework

By their very nature, all CMS Agreements and MOUs are aiming to be a contribution to the achievement of this Target with almost everything they do; including moves to expand their Appendix listings. Where good progress is being made at national level with any of these, therefore, this will simultaneously help towards the achievement of Target 3.

Such Agreements and MOUs of course constitute in themselves a strengthening of governance

arrangements and agreements affecting migratory species and their migration systems; but a number of them also include specific provisions for promoting coordination at various levels and for reviewing relevant laws and policies with a view (where necessary) to improving coherence and compatibility with the aims of the CMS. National reviews of laws and policies in this context are therefore a concrete step which governments can take to ensure that such coherence and compatibility are being optimised.

Delivery mechanisms and opportunities of relevance to Target 3 in respect of laws, policies and cooperation concerning wildlife crime specifically are highlighted in Resolution 11.31 on that subject. CMS Parties are invited to report on measures they have taken in response to this Resolution in their national reports to meetings of the COP; and so a source is available there of information that can be exchanged between countries.

### **T3-C. Key partnerships and other supporting delivery frameworks**

Opportunities for developing or supporting partnerships with particular initiatives of relevance to the region(s) concerned, or with particular organizations of relevance to the issue or environment concerned (e.g. CITES for trade issues, RFMOs for marine environments) are highlighted in a number of CMS Family instruments. These are mostly intergovernmental processes or specialist technical bodies and programmes, but the private sector is also relevant and should not be ignored.

SDGs 14.c and 15.1 emphasise the role of international law in the conservation and sustainable use of ecosystems and natural resources, while SDG 6.5 refers particularly to transboundary cooperation for sustainable management of resources in water environments, on which support is also provided by the UN Watercourses Convention, the UNECE Water Convention and the Ramsar Convention. Implementers of the CMS and CMS instruments can therefore take advantage of the opportunity to build stronger relationships with these bodies and processes, so as to lend extra legal and political strength to their efforts for conserving migratory species.

### **T3-D. Capacity development**

Several of the CMS Family instruments acknowledge the need to provide training and support to develop policies and laws relevant to the conservation of migratory species. Resources such as the CMS Family Manual and the “e-community” for CMS Family National Focal Points may offer help with this. In some cases the need for an assessment of capacity building needs is also mentioned - such assessments are a useful step that governments can take at national level, and they may help to strengthen the case for external support that is made in any relevant international project proposals, for example.

The CMS National Focal Point Manual provides guidance for CMS NFPs to become more engaged within national and international policy and decision-making processes. There are opportunities for NFPs to use this important resource as a basis for promoting understanding and collaboration among wider circles of agencies and stakeholders within their own national contexts.

### **T3-E. Resourcing for biodiversity (including human, technical and financial resources)**

Existing decisions and instruments developed under the CMS Family provide only limited guidance as yet on mechanisms and opportunities for resourcing that are specifically linked to governance arrangements and agreements. This may suggest a useful area in which to launch some work on the development of new guidance.

### **T3-F. Monitoring and evaluation, including indicators, milestones and feedback to the sub-targets, as well as headline measures of success by which overall success of the SPMS may be judged**

The main prospect for evaluating progress with this target is likely to lie simply with qualitative opinions by Contracting Party governments on the overall picture of national progress towards achieving the target, and otherwise a specific dedicated study may be required. The two indicators chosen for this target accordingly are:

3.1 CMS National Report Format question (in the context of proposals at COP12 for streamlining and improving the Format).

3.2 Single assessment study of the CMS Family of instruments.

### **T3-G. Reporting on and review of progress at national level and by governing bodies such as the CMS COP**

The current national Report Format includes questions on cross-departmental liaison and reference to migratory species in sectoral plans, which should contribute to reviewing progress with the migratory species conservation objectives expressed in Target 3. A new question specifically on improvements in governance however might better address the intention of the target. One of the indicators proposed in section T3-F would be based on such a question.

## TARGET 4

Incentives, including subsidies, harmful to migratory species, and/or their habitats are eliminated, phased out or reformed in order to minimize or avoid negative impacts, and positive incentives for the conservation of migratory species and their habitats are developed and applied, consistent with engagements under the CMS and other relevant international and regional obligations and commitments.

*Note:* The precise approach to this will vary, in some cases sub-nationally, according to specific local circumstances.

### Benefits that will result from achieving this target

Assessing the achievement of this target *does not* rely on being able to know about the harm caused by harmful incentives or the benefits caused by positive ones. Instead it simply relies on two other things.

The first is knowing which relevant incentives exist. Specific individual incentives (including subsidies) harmful to migratory species/habitats and positive incentives for the conservation of migratory species/habitats therefore need to be identified and listed.

The second is the expectation expressed in the target that certain *events* should occur in relation to those incentives, namely:

- Elimination/phasing out of harmful incentives;
- Reform of harmful incentives to minimize or avoid negative impacts;
- Development of positive incentives;
- Application of positive incentives.

No scale of achievement is specified, so in principle, any extent or frequency of occurrence of these four types of events is capable of constituting achievement of the target. The first two are alternatives to each other, but either of those two *plus both* of the other two must occur for the target to be fully achieved.

### T4-A. Outreach, promotion and uptake of the Plan

Communication work guided by the *CMS Communication Strategy* (under development) will support the implementation of Target 4. It will help governments and others to direct and focus their communication efforts to raise awareness of the potential impacts of harmful incentives and the case for reforming them, while also advertising the availability of positive incentives where these exist, and promoting their uptake. (For more on this, see under Target 1).

### T4-B. The delivery framework

The main incentive and subsidy regimes concerned in implementing this target will be framed within laws and policies at national and/or regional level, and so delivery will rely on appropriate implementation and (where necessary) reforms at these levels. Various CMS instruments, plans and guidelines contain provisions supporting the reform of harmful incentives, and suggestions regarding types of positive incentives that may be used in appropriate circumstances, such as:

- product lifecycle stewardship schemes;
- certification of environmental standards;
- tax incentives/disincentives;
- direct (conditional) subsidies;
- deposit-refund schemes;
- creation of markets eg for products derived from recycled waste;
- creation of markets to support switching to more sustainable products;

- salary bonus schemes;
- awards and public recognition.

Implementers of the CMS and CMS instruments are encouraged to explore options in their own contexts for utilising any or all of these mechanisms, backed by the imperatives expressed in CMS instruments, to achieve regimes which support migratory species conservation objectives rather than undermining them.

#### **T4-C. Key partnerships and other supporting delivery frameworks**

While CMS Family instruments and tools making reference to partnerships or related frameworks do not specifically mention incentives as an issue that can benefit, general support for stronger links for example with “green economy” experts, finance ministries and productive sectors should encourage implementers of the CMS and CMS instruments to develop relationships in these areas which will support the delivery of this target.

There is mutual reinforcement between this target and Aichi Biodiversity Target 3 (which has essentially the same aim for biodiversity as a whole). Opportunities for collaboration may lie with bodies such as the World Business Council for Sustainable Development, the International Society for Ecological Economics, the Green Economy Coalition, the Shaping Sustainable Markets research group of IIED, the Business and Biodiversity Offsets Programme and others in this field.

#### **T4-D. Capacity development**

CMS Family instruments and tools do not make specific reference to capacity building concerning incentives. In general, there are excellent opportunities for capacity on this issue to be enabled by linking institutions with expertise on migratory species conservation and institutions with expertise on environmental economics, for example by joint initiatives (see also under T3-C on partnerships).

#### **T4-E. Resourcing for biodiversity (including human, technical and financial resources)**

Reform of harmful incentives could provide opportunities for redirecting funds towards more beneficial purposes, in support of the conservation of migratory species. Making adequate provision for operating regimes of positive incentives therefore need not necessarily imply a net addition to national budgets.

Some CMS instruments also point out the possibility of funding relevant schemes from fines for non-compliance and from levies on productive activities such as hunting and ecotourism.

For the reasons explained above, progress towards the achievement of this target may also help with the achievement of Target 16.

#### **T4-F. Monitoring and evaluation, including indicators, milestones and feedback to the sub-targets, as well as headline measures of success by which overall success of the SPMS may be judged**

In principle the removal of harmful incentives and creation of positive incentives should be prominent events (identifiable e.g. as changes in national legislation) and so should be relatively easy to monitor. Questions of effectiveness are more difficult: strictly speaking such questions are not raised by the target; but nonetheless a proxy for the scale of impact might be measurable in terms of quantities of financial flows.

Indicators proposed for the corresponding Aichi Target will not tell a story that is specific to migratory species, so the approach chosen for the SPMS is the following single indicator:

4.1 CMS National Report Format Question (in the context of proposals at COP12 for streamlining and improving the Format).

**T4-G. Reporting on and review of progress at national level and by governing bodies such as the CMS COP**

The indicator identified for this target is to be based on information provided in CMS Party reports to COP. Given the importance of mobilizing resources for migratory species through positive incentives, and the need to address negative incentives, it is necessary to be able to monitor and report on this issue in the CMS context. Since the current National Report Format does not address the issue, proposals have been made to include a new question in the future Format, as part of wider proposals to assist Parties by rationalising and streamlining the reporting process.

## TARGET 5

Governments, key sectors and stakeholders at all levels have taken steps to achieve or have implemented plans for sustainable production and consumption, 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.

*Note:* Where there is uncertainty about what constitutes a “safe ecological limit” in a given case, a precautionary approach should be taken.

### Benefits that will result from achieving this target

Successful achievement of this target will involve a sequence of three linked results, as follows:

- Governments and others implement plans or take other steps to achieve sustainable production and consumption.
- Governments and others keep natural resource use impacts on migratory species well within safe ecological limits.
- Keeping impacts within safe limits leads to favourable conservation status and integrity etc of migratory species, habitats and migration routes.

The first of these results involves certain *events* occurring, namely the taking of steps/the implementation of plans. In principle, this is a measurable aspect, but it is a process rather than an outcome. It does not depend on being able to define “sustainable production and consumption”, since that is a matter left to the steps and plans concerned.

The second and third results may not need to involve a change, if impacts are within safe limits and conservation status etc. is favourable at the outset. If impacts are not within safe limits and conservation status etc. is unfavourable, then this *would* be expected to change. The achievement of these latter two results therefore involves benefits in relation to:

- The impacts of use of natural resources, including habitats, on migratory species.
- Safe ecological limits for the impacts described above.
- Favourable conservation status of migratory species (this needs data on population dynamics/distribution etc. for the species concerned).
- Quality, integrity, resilience, and ecological connectivity of the habitats and migration routes used by migratory species.

### T5-A. Outreach, promotion and uptake of the Plan

Communication work guided by the *CMS Communication Strategy* (under development) will support the implementation of Target 5. It will help governments and others to direct and focus their communication efforts to explain and promote the concepts, methods and benefits of sustainable production and consumption. (For more on this, see under Target 1).

### T5-B. The delivery framework

Several CMS action plans, guidelines and family instruments express principles concerning advocacy for good practice standards within other relevant sectors, notably marine fisheries (where there may be direct and indirect impacts on migratory species) and in respect of illegal killing, taking and trade of migratory birds.

In this way, implementers of the CMS and CMS instruments can use the mechanisms of the CMS Family to help the delivery of this target through appropriate activities by the productive and consumptive sectors themselves (and through consumer choices on the part of the public at large),



in addition to what the migratory species conservation sector does in its own right.

Opportunities for achieving this will arise for example in national coordination platforms for greening business practices, occasions for reform of national policy or industry environmental standards, development of new environmentally-friendly technologies, etc. Involvement of migratory species conservation interests in processes such as these will make a key contribution to the achievement of Target 5.

### **T5-C. Key partnerships and other supporting delivery frameworks**

Implementers of the CMS and CMS instruments will be able to generate more political and technical support from others who can help to achieve Target 5, by demonstrating that there is mutual reinforcement between this target and Aichi Biodiversity Targets 4 and 7. Furthermore, the UN Sustainable Development Goals include SDG 12 specifically on sustainable consumption and production, but the issue is also addressed by SDG 2 on sustainable agriculture and food security, SDG 6 on sustainable water management, SDG14 on conservation and sustainable use of marine resources and SDG 15 on terrestrial ecosystems.

CMS texts cite the UN Food & Agriculture Organization as an important authority on issues of relevance to this target, for example through its Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries; and the UN Environment Programme through the contribution it is able to make as a moderator between different stakeholder groups in the maritime industry.

The CMS within its own auspices has convened an Intergovernmental Task Force on Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds in the Mediterranean, which brings together governmental representatives of CMS Parties and non-CMS Parties as well as relevant international organizations and networks.

### **T5-D. Capacity development**

CMS Family instruments and tools do not make specific reference to capacity building concerning sustainable production and consumption. A key way of developing requisite capacities will involve good use of the partnerships mentioned under T5-C, and other mechanisms for collaborating directly with organizations operating in relevant production and consumption sectors, such as agriculture and fisheries.

### **T5-E. Resourcing for biodiversity (including human, technical and financial resources)**

Existing decisions and instruments developed under the CMS Family do not specifically address resourcing issues associated with sustainable production and consumption. Resolution 11.25 may offer some support however, through its encouragement for resources to be provided to underpin and strengthen ecological network initiatives (since appropriate management of ecological networks may involve sustainable production and consumption). Protected area management authorities for example may be able to invoke this in developing funded schemes for certification of sustainable products from areas that are protected for migratory species.

Where production is already fully “sustainable” in an economic sense as well as an environmental (and social) sense (for example certain traditional and indigenous subsistence harvesting practices), there may not necessarily be any implication of a need for any special additional resourcing.

### **T5-F. Monitoring and evaluation, including indicators, milestones and feedback to the sub-targets, as well as headline measures of success by which overall success of the SPMS may be judged**

Target 5 encompasses a range of different elements that contribute to CMS objectives. Indicators which may be realistically operable in this area are only going to be able to touch upon some selected example aspects of the picture. The two indicators which have been defined so far for doing this however will provide important insights into the progress being made, without creating excessive burdens of monitoring and evaluation. The two indicators are:

5.1 Red List Index (impacts of utilisation on migratory species).

5.2 CMS National Report Format question (in the context of proposals at COP12 for streamlining and improving the Format).

#### **T5-G. Reporting on and review of progress at national level and by governing bodies such as the CMS COP**

One of the two indicators identified for this target would be based on information provided in CMS Party reports to COP. The current National Report Format does not address the issue, so proposals have been made to include a new question in the future Format.

The CMS Intergovernmental Task Force on Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds in the Mediterranean may be expected periodically to review information on progress in combating these particular forms of unsustainable consumption of migratory birds, and to report to the CMS Parties as a whole.

## TARGET 6

Fisheries and hunting have no significant direct or indirect adverse impacts on migratory species, their habitats or their migration routes, and impacts of fisheries and hunting are within safe ecological limits.

*Note:* Achievement of this target will require that migratory species are managed and harvested sustainably, legally and through the use of ecosystem-based approaches. Overexploitation of migratory species must be avoided, and recovery plans and measures should be in place for all depleted species. Where there is uncertainty about what constitutes a “safe ecological limit” in a given case, a precautionary approach should be taken.

### Benefits that will result from achieving this target

When this target is achieved, not only will fisheries and hunting be undertaken in ways which are designed to be sympathetic to migratory species, but the species themselves (and their habitats and migration routes) should be demonstrably unaffected to any significant adverse extent, either directly or indirectly. Determining the achievement of the target therefore requires information on the ecological outcome, not just on the activities that may affect it. Moreover, this outcome must be attributable (at least in some degree) to the practice of safe hunting and fisheries.

As with Target 5, the outcome sought by Target 6 may not need to involve a change, if impacts are within safe limits and are negligibly adverse at the outset. If impacts are not within safe limits and adverse impacts are significant, however, then this would be expected to change.

### T6-A. Outreach, promotion and uptake of the Plan

Communication work guided by the *CMS Communication Strategy* (under development) will support the implementation of Target 6. It will help governments and others to direct and focus their communication efforts to explain and promote the concept of safe ecological limits for fisheries and hunting, and the particular impacts that may be caused to migratory species by these activities. (For more on this, see under Target 1).

The CMS Programme of Work for the Central Asian Mammals Initiative suggests a concept of “citizen informant networks” as a way of engaging the public in helping to address illegal hunting.

### T6-B. The delivery framework

One important type of negative impacts on migratory species from fisheries and hunting arises from by-catch. CMS Family instruments addressing aquatic mammals, reptiles and fish, as well as bird groups such as albatrosses and petrels, all contain provisions aimed at mitigating the impacts of by-catch, including targeted measures in recovery plans for individual species groups. In addition, Resolutions of the COP (notably Resolutions 9.18 and 10.14) provide extensive guidance on cross-cutting principles and approaches concerning the issue of by-catch. The issue of safe ecological limits has been explored *inter alia* in workshop reports produced under the ASCOBANS Agreement. Parties and others can draw on these frameworks to ensure that international standards on mitigating by-catch are met, and to locate sources of information on appropriate technical adaptation methods, for example in fisheries.

Advice on addressing other forms of exploitation which may exceed safe limits is contained in COP Resolutions on poisoning of migratory birds (Resolution 11.15) and the illegal killing, taking and trade of migratory birds (Resolution 11.16). Support is provided in these and other CMS Family texts for governments to review national laws and policies with a view to ensuring that hunting and harvesting are appropriately regulated (bag limits, close seasons, prohibition of indiscriminate killing methods, limiting numbers of hunters through licencing, use of non-toxic ammunition, competence conditions, enforcement against poaching, etc.).

### **T6-C. Key partnerships and other supporting delivery frameworks**

CMS instruments emphasise that achievement of objectives for avoiding impacts on migratory species from unsustainable use of marine resources are assisted significantly by implementation of the UN Food & Agriculture Organization's International Plans of Action for Reducing the Impacts of Longline Fisheries on Seabirds and the Conservation and Management of Sharks (and the national Plans of Action developed under these), as well as the FAO Guidelines on Reducing Sea Turtle Mortality in Fishing Operations and the International Guidelines on Bycatch Management and Reduction of Discards. National Focal Points for CMS and CMS Family instruments will be able to make efficient progress towards the achievement of Target 6 by working in close partnership with the respective National Focal Points who are responsible for these FAO mechanisms.

Collaboration with Regional Fisheries Management Organizations and National Focal Points for CITES will similarly offer scope for supportive synergies on relevant issues covered by those bodies.

Participation by implementers of the CMS and CMS instruments in relevant countries in the Intergovernmental Task Force on Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds in the Mediterranean (convened under CMS auspices) offers a platform for joint attention to enforcement of bird hunting regulations.

Implementers of the CMS and CMS instruments will also be able to generate more political and technical support from others who can help to achieve Target 6 by demonstrating that there is mutual reinforcement between this target and Aichi Biodiversity Target 6, as well as SDG 14 (which addresses sustainable use of marine resources, including sustainable fisheries) and SDG 15 (which addresses sustainable use of terrestrial and inland freshwater ecosystems).

### **T6-D. Capacity development**

CMS Family instruments emphasise the value of capacity-building for training personnel such as anti-poaching rangers, on-board fishery observers, port-based vessel inspectors, wildlife trade enforcement officers and members of hunting associations, so that migratory species impact mitigation and species recognition skills etc can be enhanced.

Good use of the partnerships mentioned under T6-C will also help in developing requisite capacities for achieving this target.

### **T6-E. Resourcing for biodiversity (including human, technical and financial resources)**

Regimes for monitoring and enforcement of resource-use restrictions require resources and personnel, but much of what is required to achieve this for migratory species can be done in conjunction with efforts relating to biodiversity more generally, as long as the migratory species component is explicitly identified. It is desirable as far as possible for the costs of this to be internalised within the resource-use sectors concerned (e.g. fisheries) rather than coming from nature conservation budgets. In some cases, provision may also be made by means of levies, for example on recreational hunting.

Where the impact of fisheries and hunting is reduced by switching to non-exploitative activities (such as wildlife watching and environmentally sustainable ecotourism), this may be more economically beneficial to local communities in the long term than extractive activities that progressively deplete the wildlife resource. Studies of the relative costs and benefits of such situations can therefore be a useful contribution to achieving Target 6.

### **T6-F. Monitoring and evaluation, including indicators, milestones and feedback to**

**the sub-targets, as well as headline measures of success by which overall success of the SPMS may be judged**

Relevant monitoring mechanisms mentioned in CMS Family instruments include on-board fishery observer programmes, port-based vessel inspections, wildlife trade control documentation and other related processes operated by FAO, CITES, hunting organizations and others as mentioned under T6-C. It will be useful for those responsible for implementing SPMS Target 6 to establish data-sharing relationships with these bodies and programmes, and where necessary to ensure that migratory species are explicitly addressed in the datasets concerned.

Demonstrating the full achievement of the target will require information (in a given context, eg national, regional, global) on:

- The presence or absence of adverse impacts on migratory species due directly to fisheries or hunting.
- The presence or absence of adverse impacts on migratory species due indirectly to fisheries or hunting.
- The presence or absence of adverse impacts on migratory species habitats due directly to fisheries or hunting.
- The presence or absence of adverse impacts on migratory species habitats due indirectly to fisheries or hunting.
- The presence or absence of adverse impacts on migratory routes due directly to fisheries or hunting.
- The presence or absence of adverse impacts on migratory routes due indirectly to fisheries or hunting.
- Safe ecological limits for the impacts of fisheries and hunting.

Although data exist in some places on some “outcome” aspects of this target (such as fish stocks that are regarded as overexploited), the two indicators which have been defined thus far for assessing progress towards the target take the pragmatic approach of assessing activities that are relevant, and making a reasoned assumption about the effect of these activities on the ecological outcome. The indicators concerned are:

6.1 Trends in implementation of measures designed to minimize impacts of fisheries and hunting on migratory species, their habitats and their migratory routes.

6.2 Red List Index (impacts of fisheries on migratory species).

Several additional indicators of relevance, specific to the contexts concerned, have been defined in the Whale and Dolphin Action Plan 2013-2017 for the MOU on Pacific Island Cetaceans, in the Action Plan for small cetaceans of Western Africa and Macaronesia under the West African Aquatic Mammals MOU, and in the International Single Species Action Plan for the Argali.

**T6-G. Reporting on and review of progress at national level and by governing bodies such as the CMS COP**

The current CMS National Report Format includes questions addressing coverage of natural resource exploitation in national or regional policies/plans which feature the conservation of CMS Appendix I species (and their results), and the implementation of COP Resolutions and Recommendations on by-catch. As part of proposals at COP12 to assist Parties by rationalising and streamlining the reporting process, these aspects have been integrated into a proposal which would replace these questions with new ones covering both Targets 6 and 7 together.

Reporting processes operated by FAO, CITES, hunting organizations and others mentioned under T6-C will make a contribution to reviewing progress against Target 6, wherever they specifically identify migratory species.

## TARGET 7

Multiple anthropogenic pressures have been reduced to levels that are not detrimental to the conservation of migratory species or to the functioning, integrity, ecological connectivity and resilience of their habitats.

*Note:* The pressures concerned may include those relating to climate change, renewable energy developments, power lines, by-catch, underwater noise, ship strikes, poisoning, pollution, disease, invasive species, illegal and unsustainable take and marine debris.

### Benefits that will result from achieving this target

This target directly addresses the factors that may jeopardise the achievement of favourable conservation status for migratory species and their habitats.

The target does not expect a total inventory of all anthropogenic pressures on migratory species and their habitats, and it does not necessarily expect all such pressures to be reduced to non-detrimental levels. It may instead be fulfilled by reducing to such levels a sub-set of pressures that are selected for this attention (for example because they are the most urgent, or the best understood, or the most amenable to change, or for some other reason).

While the target therefore does not create an expectation of change in all relevant pressures, there should be a demonstrable change in a good number of them (“multiple”).

### T7-A. Outreach, promotion and uptake of the Plan

Communication work guided by the *CMS Communication Strategy* (under development) will support the implementation of Target 7. All efforts to raise awareness of the types of anthropogenic pressures that may be relevant (some obvious, some less so) and the nature of the vulnerability of migratory species (e.g. their dependence on connectivity) will help towards the achievement of the target. (For more on this, see under Target 1).

Individual CMS Family instruments and programmes (including the Central Asian Mammals Initiative Programme of Work, the Saiga Medium-Term Work Programme and the Conservation plan for the Sharks MOU) include provisions encouraging publicity campaigns and other awareness-raising activities concerning relevant anthropogenic pressures, and they help to identify the most important pressures affecting the species groups concerned.

### T7-B. The delivery framework

Several CMS COP Resolutions give extensive advice on addressing particular types of pressures on migratory species and their habitats, including poisoning of birds (Resolution 11.15), illegal killing, taking and trade of birds (Resolution 11.16), climate change (Resolution 11.26), by-catch (Resolutions 6.2, 8.14, 9.18, 10.14 and Recommendation 7.2), marine debris (Resolution 11.30), underwater noise (Resolutions 9.19 and 10.24), power lines (Resolution 10.11), renewable energy (Resolutions 7.5 and 11.27), wildlife crime (Resolution 11.31), oil pollution (Resolution 7.3), live capture of cetaceans (Resolution 11.22), other impacts on cetaceans (Resolutions 9.19 and 10.24), marine wildlife watching (Resolution 11.29) and habitat fragmentation (Resolutions 10.3 and 11.25).

Individual CMS Family instruments, action plans and decisions by MOPs/MOSs include further specifics relating to the species groups concerned in each case.

In addressing pressures on migratory species and their habitats therefore, implementers of the CMS and CMS instruments can draw on these sources for international best practice principles where applicable both according to the type(s) of pressure involved in a given case and the type(s) of

migratory animals involved.

Assessment of potential impacts of the pressures concerned is also a key part of implementing this target, and for this, the guidance in CMS Resolution 7.2 on Impact Assessment and Migratory Species provides important guidance.

### **T7-C. Key partnerships and other supporting delivery frameworks**

Implementers of the CMS and CMS instruments can usefully build collaborative relationships (or use existing networks and liaison mechanisms) with the individual sectors from which particular anthropogenic pressures on migratory species and their habitats may arise (e.g. water, energy, agriculture, industry, recreation, infrastructure development, etc.) – both in terms of the relevant government policy departments and in terms of private business interests.

Support for the implementation of this target can be drawn from synergies with work undertaken towards Aichi Biodiversity Targets 8 (on pollution) and 10 (on anthropogenic pressures on coral reefs) as far as impacts on migratory species are concerned. Joint work between CMS and CITES provides efficient approaches for addressing pressures arising from trade in wild animals, and National Focal Points for the two Conventions should mirror this by working closely together at national level.

CMS Resolution 7.2 points to the International Association for Impact Assessment as an important partner on issues of impact assessment, and its advice can be drawn upon for example in reviewing the adequacy of national EIA laws and policies to support the reduction of anthropogenic pressures on migratory species and their habitats.

In respect of illegal killing, taking and trade of migratory birds, the CMS has convened an Intergovernmental Task Force on these issues in the Mediterranean region, which brings together governmental representatives of CMS Parties and non-CMS Parties as well as relevant international organizations and networks.

### **T7-D. Capacity development**

The CMS Capacity-building Strategy 2015-2017 emphasizes the value to CMS National Focal Points of cooperating with various national stakeholders to enhance capacity for addressing anthropogenic pressures. The NGO sector can usually contribute significantly to overall joint capacity in this area, as can civil society engagement in (formal or informal) monitoring and surveillance activities.

Good use of the other partnerships mentioned under T7-C will also help in developing requisite capacities for achieving this target.

Among several CMS tools and programmes mentioning capacity development, the Programme of Work on climate change (Resolution 11.26) is an example that cites specific measures to consider, such as developing partnerships, organizing training courses, translating and disseminating examples of best practice, sharing and implementing protocols and regulations, transferring technology, and promoting the use of online and other tools.

### **T7-E. Resourcing for biodiversity (including human, technical and financial resources)**

Existing decisions and instruments developed under the CMS Family do not specifically address resourcing issues associated with addressing anthropogenic pressures. It may be noted however that experience indicates that responding *post-hoc* to the results of negative impacts on migratory species and their habitats (through recovery programmes, remediation, compensation, restoration, etc) in general proves to be more costly than investment in preventing such impacts in the first place

(through protection, prevention, avoidance, incentives, choice of less damaging alternatives, etc).

This also reinforces the importance of implementers of the CMS and CMS instruments being involved in the planning and coordination of policies and programmes in other sectors, so that CMS objectives are integrated in those sectors (see also Targets 2 and 3).

**T7-F. Monitoring and evaluation, including indicators, milestones and feedback to the sub-targets, as well as headline measures of success by which overall success of the SPMS may be judged**

Fully assessing the achievement of this target will require information on:

- The agreed definition of a range of types of pressures that can be assessed in this way.
- The presence of a detectable reduction in the “level” of a given pressure (which may involve a change in its magnitude, intensity, severity, duration, cumulative impact, geographical spread or some other relevant parameter), perceived relative to a defined baseline state.
- The “level” of a given pressure that constitutes the threshold between detrimental and non-detrimental effects on migratory species.
- The “level” of a given pressure that constitutes the threshold between detrimental and non-detrimental effects on the functioning, integrity, ecological connectivity and resilience of the habitats of migratory species.
- The relationship at a defined point in time between the actual levels of pressure described above and the “threshold” levels described above.

If the “threshold” levels as described above can be known or plausibly proposed, then there is no need to assess the achievement of this target by direct measurements of the conservation status of the migratory species concerned, or of the functioning, integrity, ecological connectivity and resilience of their habitats (sometimes referred to as the “receiving environment”). If on the other hand in a given instance it proves more practical to measure these “ecological outcome” parameters, then the extent to which they are attributable to a reduction in the level of relevant pressures will need to be known.

Target 8 is concerned with the same ecological outcomes as Target 7 (and conceivably Target 8 is wider, being concerned in theory also with outcomes that are driven by non-anthropogenic pressures as well as those driven by anthropogenic ones). Notwithstanding the explanation above that Target 7 involves an “ecological outcome” result as well as a “reduced pressure” result, it makes sense to avoid duplication between indicators for Target 7 and Target 8, and accordingly a single indicator has been defined for Target 7, concentrating purely on pressure-reduction. The indicator is:

7.1 Trends in selected threats to migratory species, their habitats and migratory routes. (For an explanation of how this would operate, see the separate “Indicator Factsheets” document).

Several additional indicators of relevance, specific to the contexts concerned, have been defined in a number of the CMS Family instruments covered in the SPMS Companion Volume.

**T7-G. Reporting on and review of progress at national level and by governing bodies such as the CMS COP**

The current CMS National Report Format includes questions addressing different lists of selected types of pressure facing each taxonomic group of CMS Appendix I species (and actions taken in response), as well as questions on the implementation of a selected list of COP Resolutions and Recommendations on specific types of threat. As part of proposals at COP12 on the reporting process, these aspects have been integrated into a proposal which would replace these questions with new ones designed to assist Parties by considerably rationalising and streamlining the coverage of the issues addressed in Targets 6 and 7.



Processes for reporting on trends in pressures such as those operated by CITES (for trade) and the Ramsar Convention (for wetlands) will make a contribution to reviewing progress against Target 7, wherever they specifically identify implications for migratory species. Reporting under CMS Family instruments can be expected to do likewise, and relevant National Focal Points will find it efficient to harmonize the information used for this with the information used for national reporting to CMS.

## TARGET 8

The conservation status of all migratory species, especially threatened species, has considerably improved throughout their range.

*Note:* Actions towards this SPMS target may also contribute to SPMS target 11.

### Benefits that will result from achieving this target

The achievement of this target will represent a change (“considerable improvement”) in ecological outcomes. The target is not concerned with the reasons for this change; it concerns simply the status of species.

An improvement in part of the range of a species is not sufficient to satisfy the target, since it expects the improvement to be “throughout their range”. A small improvement is also not sufficient, since it must be “considerable”, although this term has not been defined and is open to interpretation.

In a CMS context, improvement in conservation status should mean moving closer to the state of “favourable conservation status” as defined by the Convention; which involves parameters concerning population dynamics, range, habitat sufficiency, distribution and abundance.

### T8-A. Outreach, promotion and uptake of the Plan

Communication work guided by the *CMS Communication Strategy* (under development) will support the implementation of Target 8. Efforts to raise awareness of the species that are especially threatened will help to support the focused implementation of the target. By comparison with some of the other targets in the SPMS, improvement in conservation status of species is a relatively straightforward message to communicate and explain, and so Target 8 lends itself well to outreach activities in general for promoting migratory species conservation objectives as a whole. (For more on this, see under Target 1).

### T8-B. The delivery framework

Most of the implementation mechanisms and opportunities noted throughout the other parts of the SPMS Companion Volume have as their ultimate purpose the improvement of the conservation status of migratory species, i.e. the same purpose as that described by Target 8. The additional aspects of delivery that may be regarded as the focus of Target 8 itself are those concerned specifically with monitoring and assessing the conservation status of the species concerned (see under T8-F).

Several CMS Family instruments include specific provisions on monitoring the conservation status of the species they cover, for example the MOU on West African Aquatic Mammals, the IOSEA Marine Turtle MOU, the Dugong MOU, the ASCOBANS Conservation Plans for Harbour Porpoises and the Action Plan for African-Eurasian Migratory Landbirds.

In addition to the Appendices of the Convention, a basis for identifying particularly threatened species/species in need of conservation status improvement lies with the CMS Family instruments established thus far, and with the taxa covered by decisions on concerted and cooperative actions (see CMS Resolution 11.13). CMS Resolutions 10.19 and 11.26 on climate change and migratory species also make reference to the need to identify the migratory species most severely threatened by climate change and those that have special connectivity needs.

### T8-C. Key partnerships and other supporting delivery frameworks

The partnerships and other frameworks for supporting delivery of most of the other Targets in the

SPMS have as their ultimate purpose the improvement of the conservation status of migratory species, i.e. the same purpose as that described by Target 8. Key partnerships and other frameworks that may be regarded as supporting delivery of Target 8 itself are those concerned specifically with monitoring and assessing the conservation status of the species concerned, such as the consortia of conservation organizations responsible for operating the Red List Index, the Living Planet Index and the Wild Bird Index, as well as (more generally) the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (see under T8-F).

#### **T8-D. Capacity development**

Most of the other Targets in the SPMS have as their ultimate purpose the improvement of the conservation status of migratory species, i.e. the same purpose as that described by Target 8. The main capacity needs relating to the implementation of Target 8 itself may be regarded as those concerned with monitoring and assessing the conservation status of the species concerned. Some of the most significant capacity support for implementers of the CMS and CMS instruments on this subject will come from collaboration with the indicator-related partnerships mentioned under T8-C.

#### **T8-E. Resourcing for biodiversity (including human, technical and financial resources)**

Given the relative simplicity, directness and popular appeal of communication messages concerning the conservation status of migratory species (see T8-A), outreach activities associated with this Target offer potentially good prospects for fundraising (hence supporting Target 16).

The emphasis in the target on giving priority to threatened species provides a basis also for prioritizing the mobilization of resources, as reflected for example in CMS Resolution 11.13, which urges Parties particularly to provide the in-kind and financial means required to support conservation measures for the species listed for Concerted and Cooperative Actions under the Convention.

Much of the resourcing for relevant monitoring and assessment activity at international level will lie with the indicator-related partnerships mentioned under T8-C, but these depend on continued provision of support from a variety of sources including governments and multilateral institutions.

#### **T8-F. Monitoring and evaluation, including indicators, milestones and feedback to the sub-targets, as well as headline measures of success by which overall success of the SPMS may be judged**

This target expects a change (“considerable improvement”) in ecological outcomes, and can therefore be measured directly by monitoring the status of species. In a CMS context, improvement in conservation status should mean moving closer to the state of “favourable conservation status” as defined by the Convention; which involves parameters concerning population dynamics, range, habitat sufficiency, distribution and abundance. Another cruder but simpler measure used in some other contexts is based instead on categorical shifts between the IUCN “Red List” population-based extinction risk categories.

Target 8 expects the “considerable improvement” result to be visible for all migratory species. Full measurement of this may not be very practical to achieve. The target’s emphasis on “especially threatened species” therefore indicates a way of focusing on the most important priorities.

Target 8 is concerned with the same ecological outcomes as Target 7 (and conceivably Target 8 is wider, as explained in T7-F). It makes sense to avoid duplication between indicators for Target 7 and Target 8, so accordingly a single indicator has been defined for Target 7, concentrating purely on the reduction of pressures on migratory species. For Target 8, the chosen indicators focus instead on the conservation status outcomes, as follows:

##### 8.1 Red List Index for migratory species.

- 8.2 Living Planet Index for migratory species.
- 8.3 Wild Bird Index for migratory birds.
- 8.4 Trends in distribution of migratory species.

The first three of these indicators have been proposed as disaggregations of existing indicators that are currently in operation. The fourth is a suggestion for an additional measure that could be developed with further work. Reporting on these indicators should be designed to cross-refer specifically (where appropriate) to the CMS Appendices and/or species lists in CMS Family instruments.

#### **T8-G. Reporting on and review of progress at national level and by governing bodies such as the CMS COP**

The current CMS National Report Format includes questions addressing pressures on migratory species – while this is an element of their conservation status and hence relevant to Target 8, pressures are the specific focus of Targets 6 and 7, and comments on this aspect are mainly made in the sections of the Companion Volume addressing those targets. The Report Format does not directly address improvements in species numbers/distribution etc (i.e. the ecological outcome of an improvement in conservation status, as sought by Target 8). As part of proposals at COP12 for rationalizing and streamlining the relevant questions in the Report Format, a new simpler question has been proposed on change in status of relevant species.

Synthesis reports from the bodies operating the indicators referred to under T8-F will also contribute to reviewing progress against this target.

## TARGET 9

International and regional action and cooperation between States for the conservation and effective management of migratory species fully reflects a migration systems approach, in which all States sharing responsibility for the species concerned engage in such actions in a concerted way.

*Note:* The Convention on Migratory Species, being “concerned particularly with those species of wild animals that migrate across or outside national jurisdictional boundaries”, emphasizes that “conservation and effective management of migratory species of wild animals require the concerted action of all States within the national jurisdictional boundaries of which such species spend any part of their life cycle”. This would include the necessary capacity building as a key component of trans-boundary cooperation. Target 9 seeks more complete engagement by all of the States who share joint responsibility in such circumstances.

### Benefits that will result from achieving this target

As amplified by the “note” adopted with this target, the change it seeks is a more complete level of engagement by relevant States in the actions described, compared to the levels of engagement existing at the time of the adoption of the Strategic Plan. The target also expresses a completed end-state, namely all the States sharing responsibilities in the circumstances described should be engaging “in a concerted way”. It is implied that some improvement over current conditions is necessary in order to reach this state.

Some interpretation may be needed as to what it means to “engage in a concerted way”. There may also be other additional elements of the judgment about “fully reflecting a migration systems approach” which need further elaboration. There may be links with Target 3.

### T9-A. Outreach, promotion and uptake of the Plan

Communication work guided by the *CMS Communication Strategy* (under development) will support the implementation of Target 9. States which are already examples of those following a “migration systems” approach in their cooperation with others for migratory species conservation will have particularly useful experiences and insights to share and promote. (For more on this, see under Target 1).

### T9-B. The delivery framework

CMS Family instruments (such as the West African Aquatic Mammals MOU, the Dugong MOU and the IOSEA Marine Turtle MOU) contain objectives for regional and international collaboration and cooperation, which can be cited by implementers of the CMS and CMS instruments in transboundary and other relevant contexts as extra support for strengthening concerted, migratory systems-based approaches to joint action between States.

Examples of measures which will make useful contributions to the implementation of this target, and which are encouraged by CMS instruments or decisions, include consistency and coordination of management and policy responses from one place to another (CMS Resolution 11.25 on ecological networks); effective exchange of information and creation of a regional database (Dugong MOU); formalising arrangements for cooperative management of shared populations (IOSEA Marine Turtle MOU); establishment of transboundary protected areas using ecological rather than political boundaries (IOSEA Marine Turtle MOU, and Conservation and Management Plan for Marine Turtles of the Atlantic coast of Africa); sharing best practice and lessons learnt, and promoting flyway-based policy responses (CMS Resolution 11.14 on the Flyways Programme of Work); and concerted international action in response to emergency situations (Raptors MOU).

### T9-C. Key partnerships and other supporting delivery frameworks

The main partnerships and delivery frameworks which will help to deliver this target are the

Agreements, MOUs, Action Plans and Concerted and Cooperative Actions (see Resolution 11.13) of the CMS Family itself. Full participation by CMS Family experts in these frameworks will be the key to success.

Implementers of the CMS and CMS instruments will also find support for the delivery of this target from participation in and application of ecological networks that are relevant to migratory species (for a review of these networks see CMS COP11 Document 23.4.1.2, and for policy principles applying to this see CMS Resolution 11.25).

#### **T9-D. Capacity development**

Activities in support of the development of capacity for implementing this target are framed within the CMS Capacity-building Strategy 2015-2017. A few CMS Family instruments also provide encouragement for the idea of technical workshops and training events involving two or more countries at a time.

#### **T9-E. Resourcing for biodiversity (including human, technical and financial resources)**

International and regional conservation projects involving collaboration between States are prime candidates for resourcing from multilateral funding bodies such as the Global Environment Facility and the European Union. This also links with Target 16.

#### **T9-F. Monitoring and evaluation, including indicators, milestones and feedback to the sub-targets, as well as headline measures of success by which overall success of the SPMS may be judged**

Assessing the achievement of this target will require information on the following aspects:

- Individual instances of international and regional action and cooperation between States for the conservation and effective management of migratory species need to be identified.
- All States sharing responsibility for the species concerned need to be identified.
- The individual instances of action and cooperation referred to above need to be assessed to evaluate the extent to which they fully reflect a migration systems approach, with all the relevant States engaging in a concerted way.

Although the target seeks a more complete level of engagement by States in relevant actions than was the case at the time of the adoption of the Strategic Plan, it may not be necessary to quantify these existing levels, because the target also expresses a completed end-state, namely all the States sharing responsibilities in the circumstances described should be engaging “in a concerted way”. It is implied that some improvement over current conditions is necessary in order to reach this state. Thus even if a comparison with the baseline condition cannot be made, a comparison with this end-state (the “distance to target”) can be assessed.

The main prospect for evaluating progress with this target is likely to lie with a specific dedicated study, and with information from CMS Party Governments on the steps they have taken (or activities in which they have participated) which in their opinion represent meaningful progress in the desired direction. The two indicators chosen for this target accordingly are:

- 9.1 Single assessment study of concerted engagements reflecting a migration systems approach.
- 9.2 CMS National Report Format question (in the context of proposals at COP12 for streamlining and improving the Format).

The West African Aquatic Mammals MOU is one CMS family instrument which has also defined indicators of relevance to this target (in its Action Plan for small cetaceans), based on the numbers of international organizations, processes and frameworks incorporating the needs of the species

concerned, and the numbers of international partnerships created to support implementation of the Action Plan.

**T9-G. Reporting on and review of progress at national level and by governing bodies such as the CMS COP**

Reporting processes under individual CMS family instruments on the implementation of those instruments (and on other cooperation activities such as Concerted and Cooperative Actions) should provide opportunities for reviewing progress with this target.

The current CMS National Report Format includes questions addressing accession to Agreements and MOUs, and activities to develop new Agreements and MOUs. As part of proposals at COP12 for rationalizing and streamlining the Report Format, revised questions on this subject have been proposed, including a new question referring specifically to Target 9 (in support of one of the two indicators for this target referred to under T9-F).

## TARGET 10

All critical habitats and sites for migratory species are identified and included in area-based conservation measures so as to maintain their quality, integrity, resilience and functioning in accordance with the implementation of Aichi Target 11, supported where necessary by environmentally sensitive land-use planning and landscape management on a wider scale.

### Benefits that will result from achieving this target

This target does not expressly describe a change, but it defines an intended end-state which clearly would represent significant progress over current conditions - at least in respect of the element specifying 100% coverage ("all" critical habitats and sites for migratory species being covered by the measures described).

This is a complex target with several component parts (see explanation under T10-F). Although full achievement of it can consist only of full realisation of all these parts, the target should be a principal engine of progress in general towards better coverage and effectiveness of protected areas and other area-based conservation measures for migratory species, both on land and at sea.

### T10-A. Outreach, promotion and uptake of the Plan

Communication work guided by the *CMS Communication Strategy* (under development) will support the implementation of Target 10. Protected areas are an easy concept to promote, and coverage (only one part of the target, but an important one) is an easy indicator message to communicate. Progress in various parts of the world is highly likely to be recorded, and so at least part of the communications story about this target will be a positive one. Loss and degradation of habitat however remains of course one of the biggest factors threatening migratory species, but this "negative" aspect of the story is also readily communicable, and is a powerful one for raising public awareness and mobilizing support. (For more on this, see under Target 1).

### T10-B. The delivery framework

Unlike some other biodiversity-related Conventions (see T10-C) the CMS does not create a system of designated sites for the conservation of the habitats of migratory species. It does however cover habitat protection in other ways, and most of the Agreements and MOUs under the Convention contain provisions for identifying key sites and/or implementing area-based habitat protection for the species they cover. Some of these provisions point to specific types of measure that are applicable in the particular context (eg Marine Protected Areas, management plans, restoration programmes, Environmental Impact Assessment); and some (Monk Seal MOU, Siberian Crane MOU and IOSEA MOU) establish networks of important sites for the species concerned.

The AEWA Agreement has developed a Critical Site Network Tool which provides a web portal for flyway-level information on waterbirds and the sites they use, in the AEWA region. This will help implementers of the CMS and relevant CMS instruments in the region by underpinning planning and management for migratory waterbirds at the site level, and by putting "critical" sites in their wider context.

CMS Resolutions 10.3 and 11.25 provide guidance on the issue of ecological networks, which will help SPMS users to frame strategic approaches to the implementation of Target 10. Other Resolutions provide guidance on issues of relevance to the aspect of the target which deals with environmentally sensitive land-use planning and landscape management, for example Resolution 7.2 on Impact Assessment, Resolution 10.11 on power lines, Resolution 11.26 on climate change and Resolutions 7.5 and 11.27 on renewable energy.



### **T10-C. Key partnerships and other supporting delivery frameworks**

Target 10 refers directly to Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 which addresses the same issue for biodiversity as a whole, and so implementers of the CMS and CMS instruments will be able to gain support from synergies with the wider efforts being made towards this Aichi target, including through the CBD's Programme of Work on Protected Areas. Support also comes from the mutual reinforcement between these targets and Aichi Target 5 (on combating habitat loss and degradation), and SDGs 14 (conservation and sustainable use of marine resources) and 15 (terrestrial ecosystems).

Since the CMS does not establish its own specific system of designation of important/protected areas for migratory species, delivery of Target 10 will take place through incorporation of migratory species interests in existing systems of protected areas and other area-based conservation measures established at national level, and internationally through site networks such as those of the Ramsar Convention, the World Heritage Convention, the legally-backed Natura 2000 Network in the European Union and others.

Further avenues for implementation of this target are provided by a range of ecological networks, a guide to which is provided in CMS COP11 Document 23.4.1.2. A systematic basis for identifying candidate areas to add to all of these systems and networks exists in inventories of important sites operated by relevant scientific consortia, including Important Bird Areas (IBAs), Alliance for Zero Extinction (AZE) sites and Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs).

A range of Protected Area Management Effectiveness (PAME) assessment tools are available to support the implementation of this aspect of Target 10, including those developed and used by WWF, the World Bank, the GEF, the Ramsar Convention, ASEAN Heritage Parks and the World Heritage Convention. A global database on protected area management effectiveness is hosted by UNEP-WCMC.

### **T10-D. Capacity development**

Helpful expressions of support for developing capacity for area protection (e.g. training of reserve wardens) can be found in CMS instruments such as the Conservation Plan for the West African Turtles MOU, the Central Asian Flyways Action Plan and the Argali Action Plan.

### **T10-E. Resourcing for biodiversity (including human, technical and financial resources)**

Implementers of the CMS and CMS instruments who are seeking resources for measures towards Target 10 can cite the direct appeal to governments, collaborating organizations and the private sector for financial resources and in-kind support expressed by the CMS COP in Resolution 11.25 on ecological networks.

Habitat-based conservation measures are often a tangible and visible category of conservation actions which can be attractive to supporters and can readily form the basis of bounded projects as a basis for funding applications. This may be a useful subject on which to develop some specific international advice in future in the CMS context.

### **T10-F. Monitoring and evaluation, including indicators, milestones and feedback to the sub-targets, as well as headline measures of success by which overall success of the SPMS may be judged**

This is a complex target with several component parts. Assessment of progress on the whole of it would require information on:

- A shared interpretation of the term “critical” (see comments on this in the corresponding *Indicator Factsheet*).
- The location of all critical habitats and sites for migratory species.
- Identification of relevant area-based conservation measures that either are currently or are capable of:
  - maintaining the quality of the habitats and sites;
  - maintaining the integrity of the habitats and sites;
  - maintaining the resilience of the habitats and sites;
  - maintaining the functioning of the habitats and sites;
  - doing all of the above in accordance with Aichi Target 11, which additionally seeks
    - effective management;
    - equitable management;
    - ecological representativity;
    - good connectivity;
    - integration into wider landscapes and seascapes.
- The extent to which the critical habitats and sites referred to above are included in area-based conservation measures that meet the requirements listed above.
- Identification of situations among those identified above which require to be supported by environmentally sensitive land-use planning and landscape management on a wider scale.
- The extent to which the situations identified in accordance with the preceding point are actually being supported in the way described.

In practice, assessments of progress with this target are likely to need to concentrate on certain particularly tractable subdivisions of the issue. Several other strands (e.g. resilience, equitability, connectivity) are important subjects for further work, but are not readily amenable to measurement with indicators in the near future. Accordingly, for reasons of practicality, just three indicators have so far been defined for aspects of Target 10, as follows:

- 10.1 Proportion of threatened and/or congregatory migratory species for which Key Biodiversity Areas have been identified throughout their range.
- 10.2 Proportion of Key Biodiversity Areas for selected groups of migratory species that are included in protected areas.
- 10.3 Management effectiveness of areas protected specifically for migratory species.

CMS Resolution 11.25 urges adequate monitoring of ecological networks to allow early detection of any deterioration in quality of sites, rapid identification of threats and timely action to maintain network integrity; and it points to existing monitoring methods that can help with this, such as the IBA Monitoring Framework developed by BirdLife International and the International Waterbird Census coordinated by Wetlands International.

#### **T10-G. Reporting on and review of progress at national level and by governing bodies such as the CMS COP**

The current CMS National Report Format includes questions addressing the development and designation of protected areas and the taking into account of migratory species in protected area regimes. As part of proposals at COP12 for rationalizing and streamlining the Report Format, revised questions on this subject have been proposed which relate more closely to the purpose of Target 10.

## TARGET 11

Migratory species and their habitats which provide important ecosystem services are maintained at or restored to favourable conservation status, taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable.

*Note:* The services concerned may include water supply, quality and regulation; disaster risk reduction; climate regulation; cultural services; food and other socio-economic benefits, all contributing to people's health, livelihoods and well-being. Actions towards this SPMS target may also contribute to SPMS target 8.

*Note added subsequent to SPMS adoption:* The phrase "indigenous and local communities" follows the terminology in the text of the Convention on Biological Diversity. At around the same time as the SPMS was being adopted by CMS, CBD COP Decision XII/12 (2014) confirmed that although the CBD was deciding to use the phrase "indigenous peoples and local communities" in future decisions and secondary documents, this would not act to interpret or change the legal meaning of the original phrase in the Convention text.

### Benefits that will result from achieving this target

Target 11 may be regarded as a sub-target of Target 8, since it seeks the same outcome (favourable conservation status for migratory species), but for a sub-set of migratory species, namely those which provide important ecosystem services. In this case therefore, achieving the target will not only benefit the migratory species and their habitats, but there will necessarily always also be consequent identifiable benefits for people's health, livelihoods or well-being.

#### T11-A. Outreach, promotion and uptake of the Plan

The fact that conservation of migratory species is not only desirable for its own sake, but also produces benefits for human society (ecosystem services), is a vital communication message. Promoting this message can be one of the most effective ways of building wider support for CMS objectives and for the implementation of CMS Family instruments.

Communication work guided by the *CMS Communication Strategy* (under development) will support the implementation of Target 11. (For more on this, see under Target 1).

#### T11-B. The delivery framework

Since Target 11 functions effectively as a sub-target of Target 8, the delivery framework described under T8-B applies.

Most CMS guidelines and action programmes are relevant directly or indirectly to the relationship between migratory species and ecosystem services, typically for example by addressing the impacts of unsustainable management or exploitation. The African-Eurasian Migratory Landbirds Action Plan is one of the most explicit in addressing an issue (agriculture) in these particular terms. CMS Resolution 11.29 on Marine Wildlife Watching is directly concerned with a specific category of (recreational) services, and its advice will be helpful for implementing Target 11 in that particular field.

#### T11-C. Key partnerships and other supporting delivery frameworks

For reasons explained under T11-B, the partnerships and supporting frameworks described in T8-C are also relevant here.

Implementers of the CMS and CMS instruments will also be able to generate more political and technical support from others who can help to achieve Target 11 by demonstrating that there is mutual reinforcement between this target and Aichi Biodiversity Target 14 (which expresses an analogous aim for biodiversity as a whole).

Opportunities for collaboration may lie with bodies such as the Ecosystem Services Partnership, the TEEB initiative (The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity), the World Forum on Natural Capital and the Natural Capital Coalition.

#### **T11-D. Capacity development**

The main capacity needs relating to the implementation of Target 11 may be regarded as (a) those concerned with monitoring and assessing the conservation status of the species concerned (for which see under Target 8), and (b) those concerned with understanding the relationship between (changes in) the conservation status of the species concerned and (changes in) the delivery of ecosystem services.

On issue (b), studies of socioeconomic and cultural values of relevant migratory species are actions specified in CMS instruments including the West African Turtles MOU, the Conservation Plan for the IOSEA Marine Turtle MOU and the Medium Term Work Programme for the West African Elephant MOU. Further such studies on other taxonomic groups and their habitats may be a fruitful area for development in future.

#### **T11-E. Resourcing for biodiversity (including human, technical and financial resources)**

In relation to the “conservation status” part of the target, the comments on resourcing in T8-E are relevant. Existing decisions and instruments developed under the CMS Family otherwise do not specifically address issues concerning the relationship between migratory species and ecosystem services.

It is inherent in the ecosystem services paradigm however that safeguarding the conditions (including conserved species) that deliver ecosystem services is a way of ensuring sustainable provision of natural resources, and those natural resources may have economic value as well as having other forms of (tangible and intangible) value. Implementers of the CMS and CMS instruments may need to raise migratory species issues in national discussions regarding Payment for Ecosystem Services or other ecosystem-based remuneration schemes (see also Target 13).

#### **T11-F. Monitoring and evaluation, including indicators, milestones and feedback to the sub-targets, as well as headline measures of success by which overall success of the SPMS may be judged**

Target 11 could be read as containing two parallel expectations, one relating to the status of species that provide important services, and one relating to the status of habitats that provide important services. For assessment purposes however it will be more practical to regard this as primarily a species-focused question, where it is the *ecological system of a species in its habitat* that (in combination) gives rise to the services, and the *status of the species in this context* is the issue to be monitored and evaluated.

Assessment of progress towards this target will require information on:

- Identification of particular species (and species-habitat interactions) that provide important ecosystem services (including identification of the services concerned, and the role of the species in giving rise to them).
- Conservation status of the species concerned, assessed by reference to the definition of “favourable conservation status” adopted by the CMS.
- The relevant needs of women, indigenous and local communities and the poor and vulnerable.

- Whether (and ideally how) the needs of women and the other groups mentioned in the preceding point have been taken into account.

Measuring ecosystem service delivery by itself will not be enough to assess achievement of this target. Measuring species status by itself will also not be enough. The storyline at stake here is about the relationship between the two, and this may be best evaluated by means of narrative rather than by statistical data. Hence although not strictly an “indicator”, a series of case studies is proposed, and the indicator defined for this target is therefore listed as:

11.1 “Case study” approach.

It would be preferable to select cases which involve ecosystem services other than direct consumptive use, since the latter is covered under other targets (see Targets 5, 6 and 14).

#### **T11-G. Reporting on and review of progress at national level and by governing bodies such as the CMS COP**

The current CMS National Report Format does not address progress in relation to ecosystem services. As part of proposals at COP12 for rationalizing and streamlining the Format, a new question has been proposed which simply asks Parties to identify any assessments of ecosystem services associated with migratory species which may have been carried out. (See also under T8-G).

## TARGET 12

The genetic diversity of wild populations of migratory species is safeguarded, and strategies have been developed and implemented for minimizing genetic erosion.

*Note:* Safeguarding actions may include maintenance of the original gene pool for migratory species that are managed under human care for re-introduction into the wild and other purposes, or are otherwise of socio-economic as well as cultural value.

### Benefits that will result from achieving this target

Securing genetic diversity of migratory species is an important element of securing the CMS objective of favourable conservation status for these species. Target 12 foresees three distinct results:

- Strategies for minimizing genetic erosion are developed.
- The strategies mentioned above are implemented.
- The genetic diversity of the populations referred to is safeguarded.

The target is worded in an all-embracing way, suggesting that success requires an absence of *any* loss of genetic diversity among *any* wild population of *any* migratory species anywhere in the world. In fact for pragmatic reasons it is likely to operate more narrowly than this, taking advantage of the specific context of the corresponding Aichi Target 13. Aichi Target 13 is concerned with particular taxa which have productive uses for people, and SPMS Target 12 should therefore be interpreted as referring to wild populations (or relatives) of species that also exist in captive-bred or domesticated populations. (Conservation in general of all migratory species, including the genetic health of populations, is already covered by Target 8).

### T12-A. Outreach, promotion and uptake of the Plan

The importance of the genetic level of conservation may not be well appreciated by wider public audiences, and hence this target provides a useful basis for promoting awareness of the issue. Communication work guided by the *CMS Communication Strategy* (under development) will support the implementation of Target 12. (For more on this, see under Target 1).

### T12-B. The delivery framework

Genetic erosion is a challenging issue to assess directly, and the particular taxa that are the intended focus of Target 12 have not yet been systematically or fully specified. The emphasis for implementation therefore lies with precautionary measures such as control of alien invasive species and prevention of unintended releases of captive stock, as mentioned for example in the CMS Raptors MOU. CMS Resolution 10.19 on climate change also emphasises that reduction of all types of threats contributes to the maintenance of populations and of genetic diversity.

### T12-C. Key partnerships and other supporting delivery frameworks

Collaborations on genetic diversity issues in the specific context of migratory species conservation are at an early stage of development, and this therefore represents a useful area of opportunity for the development of new partnerships, including with the scientific research community and with initiatives addressing control of non-native species.

Target 12 corresponds to Aichi Biodiversity Target 13, which addresses analogous issues for biodiversity as a whole, and so implementers of the CMS and CMS instruments will be able to gain support from synergies with the wider efforts being made towards this Aichi target.

### T12-D. Capacity development

The main source of support for developing capacity in relation to this target is likely to lie with the partnerships and collaborations referred to under T12-D.

#### **T12-E. Resourcing for biodiversity (including human, technical and financial resources)**

In addition to the biodiversity conservation sector, sectors involved with management of domesticated species (e.g. livestock farming) benefit from efforts to maintain the gene-pools of associated wild relatives, and they should therefore have an interest in helping to support the resourcing needed to implement this target.

#### **T12-F. Monitoring and evaluation, including indicators, milestones and feedback to the sub-targets, as well as headline measures of success by which overall success of the SPMS may be judged**

Target 12 foresees three distinct results:

- Strategies for minimizing genetic erosion are developed.
- The strategies mentioned above are implemented.
- The genetic diversity of the populations referred to is safeguarded.

The first two of these involve measurable process activities. The third is framed in terms of preventing loss rather than achieving gain. Success with this third (outcome) result will therefore be marked by evidence of an absence of change rather than by evidence of a change.

Existing indicators are not well suited to addressing genetic erosion in wild animals. The most feasible course therefore is seen as asking CMS Parties to report on *activities* that relate to this target. The single indicator defined for this target accordingly is:

12.1 CMS National Report Format question, in two parts (in the context of proposals at COP12 for streamlining and improving the Format).

The “two parts” relate to (a) strategies for minimizing genetic erosion and (b) implementation actions.

Some relevant indicator development is beginning in relation to Aichi Target 13 in the context of the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership, which may in due course allow information on migratory species to be disaggregated.

#### **T12-G. Reporting on and review of progress at national level and by governing bodies such as the CMS COP**

The current CMS National Report Format does not address progress in relation to genetic diversity. As part of proposals at COP12 for rationalizing and streamlining the Format, two new short questions have been proposed which would provide the information for the two-part indicator defined for this target (see under T12-F).

## TARGET 13

Priorities for effective conservation and management of migratory species, their habitats and migration systems have been included in the development and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans, with reference where relevant to CMS agreements and action plans and their implementation bodies.

*Note:* 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. Even if they are not designed overtly to have biodiversity-related purposes, plans for issues such as land use, resource use, public health, disaster risk reduction, infrastructure distribution and economic development can include provisions that make an important difference to migratory species conservation. Actions towards this SPMS target may also contribute to SPMS target 2.

### Benefits that will result from achieving this target

Target 2 addresses integration of migratory species values into international, national and local strategies and planning processes of various kinds, so it should be read alongside Target 13 which seeks a similar (though not identical) result specifically in relation to the well-recognised and very widespread National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs). The “note” adopted with the target also allows its interpretation to be extended to cover other types of national plans and strategies that are not already covered by Target 2.

To the extent that any NBSAP does not currently include priorities for effective conservation and management of migratory species/habitats/migration systems, Target 13 expects such priorities to be added, and it expects reference to be made where relevant to CMS Agreements and Action Plans and their implementation bodies. NBSAPs can be and are periodically revised by CBD Party Governments, so there is a ready route available for achieving this change.

The target also expects priorities for effective conservation and management of migratory species/habitats/migration systems to be included in the *implementation* of NBSAPs. The benefit should be in more successful results for migratory species in particular, wherever they may currently receive less attention than other aspects of biodiversity.

### T13-A. Outreach, promotion and uptake of the Plan

Communication work guided by the *CMS Communication Strategy* (under development) will support the implementation of Target 13. (For more on this, see under Target 1). This will also be assisted by work undertaken by the institutions developing NBSAPs to promote awareness and uptake of those NBSAPs (see under T13-C).

### T13-B. The delivery framework

A framework for addressing Target 13 is provided in CMS document UNEP/CMS/Conf.10.27 (*Guidelines on the integration of migratory species into National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans*), which was endorsed by CMS COP Resolution 10.18 and which provides very helpful guidance specifically on the migratory species dimension of NBSAPs. Delivery of this target will furthermore take place primarily through the machinery of the NBSAP process in each country, as part of national implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity (see T13-C).

Some other CMS decisions and instruments emphasise particular steps that can be taken to reflect the same aim in respect of the taxa or issues they each address, including Resolution 10.11 on powerlines, Resolution 10.19 on climate change, Resolution 11.14 on flyways, Resolution 11.15 on poisoning of birds, the Whale & Dolphin Action Plan under the Pacific Island Cetaceans MOU, the Small Cetaceans Action Plan of the West African Aquatic Mammals MOU, the Argali Action Plan and the Saker Falcon Action Plan.



### **T13-C. Key partnerships and other supporting delivery frameworks**

Delivery of this target will take place primarily through the machinery of the NBSAP process in each country, and so national implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity forms the primary supporting framework. Furthermore, many NBSAP processes in themselves are led by partnerships of relevant stakeholders including governments, NGOs and others.

National Focal Points for CMS and CMS Family instruments will in particular be able to make most efficient progress towards the achievement of Target 13 by working in close partnership with the National Focal Points who are responsible for implementation of the CBD. Given the amplification in the “note” adopted with this target (applying it also to other relevant types of national plans and strategies), the same principle applies to coordination with the focal points of other MEAs. Strong encouragement for this has been given in CMS Resolution 10.10 on synergies and partnerships and in Resolution 10.18 on the integration of migratory species into NBSAPs.

### **T13-D. Capacity development**

The *Guidelines on the integration of migratory species into National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans* referred to in T13-B provide one of the most important forms of capacity support for implementers of the CMS and CMS instruments using Target 13.

NBSAP processes themselves are often associated with capacity building opportunities such as workshops, sometimes run with the support of UNDP or UNEP. The value of these is highlighted by the CMS Capacity-building Strategy 2015-2023.

Since NBSAPs are designed as a replicable model, experience from one place can often be translatable to another place; hence mechanisms for sharing experience and good practice between countries is a fruitful way of mutually building greater capacity on this subject.

### **T13-E. Resourcing for biodiversity (including human, technical and financial resources)**

The *Guidelines on the integration of migratory species into National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans* (referred to in T13-B) advise developing countries and countries with economies in transition to explore funding opportunities within the Global Environmental Facility (GEF) for the development and updating of their NBSAPs. Hence integration of migratory species issues in NBSAPs could be a feature in any funding applications to the GEF.

Only a minority of existing NBSAPs include strategies to finance their *implementation*, however, so particular efforts may be needed to address this aspect. Since relevant implementation measures for migratory species will often need to take place in a coordinated way with other Range States of the species concerned, notwithstanding the generally “national” scope of NBSAPs, the *Guidelines* advise that in cases where migratory ranges cover both developed and developing countries, arrangements for financial support from developed to developing Range States could be made.

Where resources can be leveraged for implementation of NBSAPs, and where the aims of Target 13 are reflected in the NBSAPs concerned, it is likely that this will contribute to the delivery of other SPMS targets at the same time.

### **T13-F. Monitoring and evaluation, including indicators, milestones and feedback to the sub-targets, as well as headline measures of success by which overall success of the SPMS may be judged**

NBSAPs themselves will often have their own monitoring and evaluation processes, to varying

degrees; but the focus for monitoring and evaluation for Target 13 needs to be specifically on the reflection in NBSAPs of migratory species issues, and assessing these in the context of the SPMS.

There are two principal aspects reflected in the target, namely development and implementation. Two indicators have been defined accordingly, as follows:

13.1 Extent of reflection of migratory species concerns in National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans.

13.2 Extent of reflection of migratory species concerns in the implementation of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans.

The Whale & Dolphin Action Plan under the Pacific Island Cetaceans MOU includes among its own indicators one on the number of NBSAPs or equivalent strategies integrating actions from the Action Plan; and instruments such as the Small Cetaceans Action Plan of the West African Aquatic Mammals MOU define indicators relating to other types of framework which may also be relevant to this target.

### **T13-G. Reporting on and review of progress at national level and by governing bodies such as the CMS COP**

Progress with NBSAPs themselves will often be reported and reviewed in the context of national implementation of the CBD; but the focus for Target 13 needs to be specifically on reporting progress with the migratory species issues that are covered, and reviewing this in the context of the SPMS, so that a sense can be given to the CMS COP (for example) specifically on this dimension.

The CMS National Report Format currently asks whether migratory species (and a list of issues related to them, e.g. research, cooperation, removal of obstacles to migration) are addressed by each country's NBSAP. This is likely only to go as far as tracking the presence or absence of references to these matters in the text of the NBSAPs, and not to address their implementation or the conservation outcomes sought.

As part of proposals at COP12 for rationalizing and streamlining the Format, a revised question has been proposed which, although shorter than the current one, would provide the information needed on the two aspects (development and implementation) addressed by the indicators defined for this target (see under T13-F).

## TARGET 14

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 their habitats.

*Note:* This target reflects international thinking on the subject in other fora.

### Benefits that will result from achieving this target

Achievement of this target will contribute to agendas defined in other fora for improved attention to the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous peoples and local communities, and their customary sustainable use of biological resources, as an important objective in its own right. The further elements of the target however embody an assumption that achieving this in relation to aspects of such knowledge and practices etc that are relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of migratory species, their habitats and migration systems, will automatically also contribute to the favourable conservation status of such species and to the ecological connectivity and resilience of their habitats.

This target describes a state which may already exist in some places and may not in others, hence in the latter case a change would be expected in order to achieve it.

### T14-A. Outreach, promotion and uptake of the Plan

Communication work guided by the *CMS Communication Strategy* (under development) will support the implementation of Target 14. (For more on this, see under Target 1).

Outreach work on traditional knowledge, indigenous peoples and local communities in the CMS context offers possibilities for reaching new audiences who are additional to those who would be typical audiences for outreach work on the objectives of the Convention and the SPMS.

Indigenous traditions and knowledge may be a particularly important basis for communication in respect of certain groups of migratory animals and/or certain locations. As an example, the integration of traditional knowledge, stories and customs into education and awareness tools and materials is specifically emphasized as an objective for the information, awareness/education and communication activities in the Whale & Dolphin Action Plan under the Pacific Island Cetaceans MOU.

### T14-B. The delivery framework

CMS Family instruments which identify a particular role for attention to traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous peoples and local communities, and their customary sustainable use of biological resources, include the Whale & Dolphin Action Plan under the Pacific Island Cetaceans MOU, the Conservation Plan for the Sharks MOU, the Conservation Plan for the IOSEA Marine Turtle MOU, the Dugong MOU, the Great Bustard MOU and the African-Eurasian Migratory Landbirds Action Plan.

Traditional knowledge and customary practices may sometimes show the way to the most environmentally, economically and socially sustainable management approaches for conserving migratory species - hence the importance of understanding such knowledge and practices, respecting them and integrating them into relevant plans and strategies.

### **T14-C. Key partnerships and other supporting delivery frameworks**

Implementers of the CMS and CMS instruments will be able to generate more political and technical support from others who can help to achieve Target 14 by demonstrating that there is mutual reinforcement between this target and Aichi Biodiversity Target 18 (which expresses an analogous aim for biodiversity as a whole). In that context, a variety of initiatives for involvement of traditional knowledge and engagement of indigenous peoples are promoted by the CBD in the framework of activities to implement its associated Programme of Work, Plan of Action and Guidance on CBD Articles 8(j), 10(c) and related provisions; and these may also provide support for implementation of CMS objectives through Target 14.

Other international structures on the same issue which could potentially also offer collaborative help include the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues under the UN Economic and Social Council, the Indigenous People's Forum under the UN International Fund for Agricultural Development, the Local and Indigenous Knowledge Systems (LINKS) initiative of UNESCO, the Culture Network of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands and the IUCN Specialist Group on Cultural and Spiritual Values of Protected Areas.

### **T14-D. Capacity development**

The main route to development of greater capacity on the issues covered by Target 14 in many cases will lie with the potential collaborations and partnerships identified under T14-C.

### **T14-E. Resourcing for biodiversity (including human, technical and financial resources)**

A number of decisions and instruments developed under the CMS Family provide for resourcing mechanisms and opportunities aimed at exploring opportunities for funding and for submitting grant applications together with and in support of local communities, as well as ensuring the equitable sharing of revenues from trophy hunting and ecotourism/wildlife watching with local communities. These include the Argali Action Plan and the Small Cetaceans Action Plan of the West African Aquatic Mammals MOU.

### **T14-F. Monitoring and evaluation, including indicators, milestones and feedback to the sub-targets, as well as headline measures of success by which overall success of the SPMS may be judged**

Assessing the achievement of this target will require information on:

- 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.
- The customary sustainable use of biological resources of indigenous and local communities (presumably as far as this is also relevant to the same purposes as mentioned above, although that is not stated).
- The extent to which the knowledge, innovations, practices and customary uses described above are being respected, subject to relevant legislation and obligations.
- The extent to which indigenous and local communities are fully and effectively participating in the way that the matters listed above are being respected.

It appears to be assumed that contributions to “the favourable conservation status of migratory species and the ecological connectivity and resilience of their habitats” will follow as an automatic consequence of achieving the “respect” described in the target. It should therefore not be necessary in the context of this target to assess these ecological outcomes in their own right (they are in any case covered by other targets in the SPMS), nor to attempt to assess the way in which this causative

relationship functions. Achievement of the target therefore can be judged by evidence of the defined forms of (i) respect and (ii) participation.

The single indicator defined for this target is based on inviting CMS Parties to provide a narrative comment on the extent to which they have achieved these aspects of the target, in their own context. The indicator therefore is:

14.1 CMS National Report Format question (in the context of proposals at COP12 for streamlining and improving the Format).

#### **T14-G. Reporting on and review of progress at national level and by governing bodies such as the CMS COP**

The extent to which Target 14 is relevant will vary from country to country (some will have more indigenous and local communities, and/or more traditional knowledge, innovations and practices, and/or more customary sustainable uses, than others) - but it is likely that in nearly every case a country should be able to report at least something in relation to these issues. This can of course include information on how they have contributed to the achievement of the target elsewhere, in a context of international cooperation.

The current CMS National Report Format does not explicitly address the issues covered by Target 14. As part of proposals at COP12 for rationalizing and streamlining the Format therefore, a new three-part question has been proposed which would provide the information needed for the indicator defined for this target (see under T14-F). In answering this question Parties will be able to draw on information relating to implementation of Aichi Target 18 and the associated Programme of Work, Plan of Action and Guidance on relevant provisions in the CBD (Articles 8(j), 10(c) and related provisions), provided they give specific consideration to the migratory species aspects of these.

## TARGET 15

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.

*Note:* The “science base” here does not relate only to new research and monitoring, but also to making better use of existing datasets (including improving their public availability), and improving the standardization of data collection protocols. In addition to investigation and understanding of specific events, phenomena, patterns and consequences, greater efforts may also be required to improve data on baseline conditions, so that meaningful assessments of significance, and assessments of change, can be made.

### Benefits that will result from achieving this target

This target addresses a list of different aspects of knowledge and capacity, and in relation to all of these collectively it expects three kinds of result:

- The listed aspects should be “improved”.
- The listed aspects should be widely shared and transferred.
- The listed aspects should be effectively applied.

The first of these results is an explicit expression of an expected change relative to the starting position. The “note” adopted with the target makes reference to standardization of data collection protocols and to making baseline data more useful for assessing significance and change, but in all other respects the term “improved” is not defined and is left open to interpretation. Implementers of the CMS and CMS instruments will therefore wish to consider and develop an explicit understanding of what this aspect of the result should look like in their own circumstances.

### T15-A. Outreach, promotion and uptake of the Plan

Communication work guided by the *CMS Communication Strategy* (under development) will support the implementation of Target 15. Part of this target is itself focused on awareness: hence implementation mechanisms and opportunities relating to “outreach, promotion and uptake” in this context constitute part of the actual delivery of the target – therefore see under T15-B, and otherwise for more on this, see under Target 1.

### T15-B. The delivery framework

Sound science underpins all implementation of measures for migratory species conservation under the CMS and the CMS Family, supported by the Convention’s Scientific Council (the Sessional Committee of which adopts its own successive work programmes, on a thematic basis) and the technical advisory bodies of individual instruments, where such bodies exist.

Most CMS Family instruments and COP Resolutions on specific migratory species conservation topics refer to the role of science, and encourage data collection, monitoring, research and sharing of knowledge. Support for relevant measures can therefore be strengthened by citing the specific provisions to this effect that are detailed in the individual examples given in this section of the Companion Volume. In some cases, specific gaps in knowledge are highlighted as priorities for future work.

The CMS has its own Technical Series of publications, and these and other relevant scientific papers and technical reports are made available on the Convention’s website, along with overview data on listed species. The website therefore functions as a dedicated knowledge-sharing platform, directly supporting the implementation of Target 15.

### **T15-C. Key partnerships and other supporting delivery frameworks**

A range of relevant scientific collaborations is coordinated through the CMS Scientific Council and the technical advisory bodies of individual instruments, where such bodies exist. The CMS Family has also established strong working links with the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES).

Implementers of the CMS and CMS instruments will find significant support for the issues covered by Target 15 from a range of online datasets of relevance to migratory species. For example, “Species+”, developed by UNEP-WCMC and the CITES Secretariat, is a website designed to assist the implementation of CITES, CMS and other MEAs by providing a centralised portal for accessing key information on species of global concern. Other key international conservation datasets and specialist groups are hosted/administered by (among others), UNEP-WCMC, IUCN, BirdLife International and Wetlands International.

Further supporting entities/processes specifically identified in CMS instruments/decisions include Movebank (an online database of animal tracking data hosted by the Max Planck Institute for Ornithology), ICARUS (the initiative on International Cooperation for Animal Research Using Space), the Migrant Landbird Study Group and the Asian Scientific Initiative for Conservation of Migration.

Concerning the aspect of the target that relates to the values of migratory species, see also the partnerships and delivery frameworks described under Target 11 in relation to ecosystem services.

### **T15-D. Capacity development**

Parts of this target are themselves focused on training and understanding: hence implementation mechanisms and opportunities relating to “capacity development” in this context constitute part of the actual delivery of the Target – therefore see under T15-B.

Several CMS decisions and Family instruments identify particular priorities in relation to science and knowledge, towards which capacity building efforts should be particularly directed. Further support should come from the CMS Capacity-building Strategy 2015-2017.

Otherwise the main route to development of greater capacity on the issues covered by Target 15 in many cases will lie with the potential collaborations and partnerships identified under T15-C.

### **T15-E. Resourcing for biodiversity (including human, technical and financial resources)**

Research and information management is a common and fruitful area within which projects can be developed for external funding from a variety of sources. Cost-effective synergies in resourcing for activities to implement Target 15 will often be found in the context of technical collaborations and partnerships such as those identified under T15-C. Identification of shared priorities can also in some cases lead to research institutions and universities undertaking research for their own purposes, with their own resources, which at the same time meets aspects of the needs of migratory species conservation as defined in the SPMS. In addition, work undertaken through “citizen science” initiatives offers another avenue for making progress with this target at minimal cost.

### **T15-F. Monitoring and evaluation, including indicators, milestones and feedback to the sub-targets, as well as headline measures of success by which overall success of the SPMS may be judged**

Individual pilot sample studies of relevant processes may need to suffice in providing some intelligence on this matter until such time as a functioning global indicator is developed. The partial indicator defined at this stage for Target 15 is as follows:

15.1 Trends in publication of papers on migratory species conservation in peer-reviewed or other similarly authoritative sources.

A method of globally measuring this indicator requires development. It addresses only one aspect of the target, as merely a sample of the issues it covers; by concentrating on the “science base” dimension, and not attempting to assess the “effective application” part of the target (which is more difficult). Informative trends may nevertheless be revealed.

#### **T15-G. Reporting on and review of progress at national level and by governing bodies such as the CMS COP**

The CMS Scientific Council and (where applicable) individual CMS Family instruments, in their regular programme implementation reports, will cover aspects of research and information-sharing activities etc which should illuminate progress towards this target.

The CMS National Report Format currently contains questions about numbers of research projects, in respect of each taxonomic group. It also contains questions about research projects that use satellite telemetry, about technical and/or scientific assistance provided to developing countries, and about implementation of Resolution 9.3 on CMS information priorities. Responses to these questions may play some role in supporting assessment of Target 15, but they are likely to be very incomplete.

As part of proposals at COP12 for rationalizing and streamlining the Format, therefore, a single revised and condensed question has been proposed which relates more directly to the issues covered by Target 15. See also the suggested indicator in T15-F.



## TARGET 16

The mobilization of adequate resources from all sources to implement the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species effectively has increased substantially.

*Note:* This target refers to resource mobilization in the broad sense including international and domestic funding from public, private and other sources. It however also implies policy choices that reduce the costs of improving the status of migratory species and thus also benefits from the correct implementation of Goals 1 and 2. Developing countries, least developed countries, small island developing states and countries with economies in transition have particularly acute needs in this regard. Resource flows to as well as within these countries need to increase, both through "north-south" and "south-south" cooperation.

### Benefits that will result from achieving this target

Achievement of this target will involve a measurable positive difference in mobilization of resources between a baseline point and (a) subsequent assessment point(s). The resources may be financial or they may be of other kinds (e.g. human capacity), but they must contribute to SPMS implementation in support of CMS objectives. Furthermore, to satisfy the target, the increase which occurs must be "substantial" (although exactly what this means is not quantified in the target).

### T16-A. Outreach, promotion and uptake of the Plan

Communication work guided by the *CMS Communication Strategy* (under development) can support the implementation of this target. (For more on this, see under Target 1).

The outreach message in one sense is a straightforward one, i.e. that improved commitments and flows of resources (of all kinds) are required for full achievement of many of the migratory species conservation objectives of the CMS and CMS instruments. On the other hand there are useful messages to promote that may be less familiar to many audiences and may be surprisingly positive for them, such as the cost-effectiveness of modern efficiencies in e.g. synergies between MEAs, and the scope for huge returns on investment in terms of the ecosystem services delivered when migratory species and their habitats are maintained at or restored to favourable conservation status (see also under Target 11).

### T16-B. The delivery framework

The CMS has a Trust Fund which supports the core activities of the Secretariat and is derived from annual contributions from the Parties, set according to the UN scale. Unlike some other Conventions however, CMS has no financial mechanism to which Parties can have access for supporting implementation of their commitments. Much implementation activity therefore relies on restricted voluntary funding for specific activities.

Migratory species conservation should be an intrinsically appealing and worthwhile subject for applications and appeals for funding from governmental, intergovernmental, non-governmental and private sector sources (including both industry and foundations). The species concerned are often charismatic, the necessary actions often easy to conceptualise (e.g. prevention of direct killing, or of habitat loss) and the returns on investment are potentially huge (as mentioned under T16-A). Collaboration between countries can also often be a strong "selling point" for funding applications. Formal encouragement for approaches on this basis to key potential funding sources can be found in many CMS Family instruments and decisions. Some of these also mention options for resourcing through measures such as levies on hunting permits or eco-tourism revenues.

The CMS has a Small Grants Fund for projects in developing countries, but this too is resourced from voluntary contributions and not from the Convention core budget. Several CMS Family instruments have developed their own project support mechanisms and programmes on a similar basis; such as the ACCOBAMS Supplementary Conservation Fund, the AEWA Small Grants Fund,

an ASCOBANS support programme and the EUROBATS Projects Initiative.

### **T16-C. Key partnerships and other supporting delivery frameworks**

For the reasons explained under T16-B, partnerships and other frameworks will be central to delivery of this target. Significant funding provided by national governments and international agencies is available for migratory species conservation. Global funds are available through (for example) the Darwin Initiative; Save Our Species Fund; the Mohamed bin Zayed Species Conservation Fund; the Critical Ecosystem Partnership fund; and several funds under the US Fish and Wildlife Service's international programmes. Partnerships with major biodiversity-related NGOs and private foundations are also important.

CMS decisions make particular reference also to opportunities lying with the Asian Development Bank, World Bank, UNDP, European Union, UNEP, the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and others. Specific treatment of the opportunities provided by the GEF can be found in CMS Resolution 10.25 and COP document UNEP/CMS/Conf.10.41, while Resolution 11.10 points out that CMS Parties can submit their funding needs for the conservation of migratory species at national level that are in line with SPMS and Aichi targets to the GEF through the CBD Secretariat, to help in shaping the GEF's funding strategies.

Reinforcement for this approach can be drawn from the fact that Target 16 mirrors Aichi Biodiversity Target 20, and hence it offers links to the CBD Resource Mobilization Strategy and to the target adopted by CBD COPXI, to double total biodiversity-related international financial resource flows to developing countries by 2015 and at least to maintain this level until 2020.

### **T16-D. Capacity development**

Resource mobilization is itself inherently a form of capacity, and so capacity to deliver the target (along with the other targets in the SPMS) will be enhanced by achievement of the target itself.

Cooperation at all levels (i.e. including south-south and north-south) through exchange of resources, technology, and knowledge, as well as good practice in financing, is an essential form of mutual capacity development that will support the implementation of this target.

Fundraising in some contexts can be a specialist skill, requiring dedicated training. Many donor institutions offer advice and guidance tools (including e.g. on-line guides and familiarization workshops) to assist in navigating their application procedures. Appointment of fundraising experts to programme teams can sometimes prove to be a cost-effective investment when it unlocks resourcing that conservation specialists themselves are less able to access.

### **T16-E. Resourcing for biodiversity (including human, technical and financial resources)**

In the case of Target 16, the Target itself is focused on resourcing: hence implementation mechanisms and opportunities relating to resourcing in this context constitute part of the actual delivery of the Target. Section E of the Companion Volume for all of the other targets (1-15) contains support for this aspect, and so it is not duplicated here.

In this context it is important to keep in mind that mobilization of resources implies reduction of costs as well as optimizing the use of existing resources and the generation of new funds. Opportunities for this have been identified under various SPMS targets in relation for example to generating funds for migratory species conservation through better integration of relevant issues in national policies and plans, levies for hunting/fishing, protected area entry fees, Payments for Ecosystem Services, etc ( see e.g. T4-E, T5-E, T6, T7, T9-E, T11-E).

**T16-F. Monitoring and evaluation, including indicators, milestones and feedback to the sub-targets, as well as headline measures of success by which overall success of the SPMS may be judged**

Much discussion has occurred on potential measures of resource-flows in ways which would provide an indication of progress toward achievement of the equivalent Aichi Target (Target 20). The methodological challenges are considerable, and attempting to isolate a migratory species story from this, for SPMS purposes, adds a further challenge. More selective options could lie with targeted analyses of relevant spending by the GEF, or resource mobilization for implementation of NBSAPs, or quantifying the resources (of all kinds) involved in projects that address (or that indirectly benefit) migratory species. Accuracy of quantification is not important - what is important is to be able to compare measures made in a consistent way between one time-period and another.

For the time being, however, at the global “synthesis” level, the indicator defined for Target 16 is constructed on a somewhat simpler concept, as follows:

16.1 Success in implementing national actions for mobilizing resources to meet Target 16.

This is based on a supposition that governments will be encouraged to define some specific national resource mobilization actions for migratory species conservation. The global indicator would then assess the impact of these actions, drawing where appropriate on monitoring undertaken in the context of reporting to the CBD on Aichi Target 20. It would accordingly be for each country to define the national resource mobilization targets and monitoring methods that it deems applicable to its own circumstances, and it would then be asked to evaluate progress in achieving its own targets, provided it adhered to a few common stipulations (for the specifics of these, see the separate Indicator Factsheet developed for this target).

Individual CMS instruments may be able to contribute their own indicators; for example the Action Plan for the Southern South American Grassland Birds MOU contains an indicator based on the number of relevant projects that are funded.

**T16-G. Reporting on and review of progress at national level and by governing bodies such as the CMS COP**

The CMS National Report Format currently contains questions in several sections about the nature of assistance required by countries to implement various aspects of the Convention: this could provide the basis for a review of resourcing needs; but in practice most responses simply indicate in general terms that improved funding support is required.

The Format in addition however includes a six-part question specifically on resource mobilization, asking about financial resources made available for migratory species conservation activities, voluntary contributions to the CMS Trust Fund to support requests from developing countries, other voluntary contributions, and support received, either from CMS or other sources. As part of proposals at COP12 for rationalizing and streamlining the Format, a single revised and shortened question has been proposed, with four parts, covering the same issues and asking also about implementation of the CMS Capacity Building Strategy.