



**CONVENTION ON  
MIGRATORY  
SPECIES**

Distribution: General

UNEP/CMS/COP12/Inf.29  
6 October 2017

Original: English

12<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES  
Manila, Philippines, 23 - 28 October 2017  
Agenda Item 14.2

**DEVELOPMENT OF A REPORT ON THE  
CONSERVATION STATUS OF MIGRATORY SPECIES**

*(Prepared by the Secretariat)*

Summary:

The 11<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP11) in 2014 identified the preparation of a review report on the conservation status of species listed on CMS Appendices as an activity to pursue within the CMS Programme of Work for 2015-2017.

This information documents summarizes progress to date in the implementation of this activity, and includes a scoping paper for the establishment of a “State of World’s Migratory Species” report.

## **DEVELOPMENT OF A REPORT ON THE CONSERVATION STATUS OF MIGRATORY SPECIES**

1. The 11<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP11) in 2014 identified the preparation of a review report on the conservation status of species listed on CMS Appendices as an activity to pursue within the CMS Programme of Work for 2015-2017 ([Resolution 11.1](#), Annex V, Activity 30 in the “implementation support” table). The production of the report was expected to be realized entirely through voluntary contributions.
2. Despite Secretariat’s efforts, financial resources sufficient to produce the report in the course of this triennium could not be secured. Efforts were devoted to the definition of the scope of the report, and identification of potential partners to contribute to the implementation of this activity.
3. Thanks to a voluntary contribution from the Government of Switzerland, an expert workshop was convened by the CMS Secretariat in Cambridge, UK on 21 November 2016, working in collaboration with the UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), which acted as local organizer and facilitator. In addition to the Secretariat and UNEP-WCMC, participants included the chair of the CMS Scientific Council, the scientific councillor for the UK and experts from BirdLife International, the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB), Wetlands International, the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and the Zoological Society of London (ZSL).
4. The main outcome of the workshop consisted of a scoping paper for the establishment of a “State of the World’s Migratory Species” report, prepared by UNEP-WCMC on behalf of the Secretariat. The paper was submitted to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the Sessional Committee of the Scientific Council (Bonn, 10-13 July 2017) for consideration. The meeting reviewed the paper and endorsed the revised version included in Annex 1 to this document, which is expected to provide a basis for implementing this activity in preparation for COP13 and for future COPs thereafter.

## ANNEX 1

## Scoping paper for the establishment of a “State of the World’s Migratory Species” report: Options for a flagship report to inform CMS decision-making

### 1. Context

The Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS) provides a global platform for the conservation and sustainable use of migratory animals and their habitats. Despite the recognised global importance of conserving migratory species, there is currently no comprehensive overview of the status and trends of the world’s migratory species to help governments track progress and prioritise actions. To remedy this, the 11<sup>th</sup> meeting of the CMS Conference of the Parties (COP) in 2014 identified the preparation of a review report on the conservation status of species listed on CMS Appendices as a high priority activity to pursue within the CMS Programme of Work (Resolution 11.1, Annex V, Activity 30 in the “implementation support” table).

At the global level, extensive data and indicators on a wide range of species are available to support decision-making and policymaking. A global report on the State of the World’s Migratory Species will help to bring together these datasets and indicators in a way that resonates with policy-makers, and thus foster a better understanding of the status of migratory species for which joined up responses from countries are particularly needed.

### 2. Preparation of this scoping paper

In order to define the scope of a ‘State of Migratory Species’ report, an expert workshop was convened by the CMS Secretariat in Cambridge, UK in November 2016, working in collaboration with UNEP-WCMC. As part of the workshop, experts identified priority datasets and indicators that could be drawn upon to help assess the conservation status of migratory species on an on-going basis. This scoping paper builds upon the outcomes of that workshop and proposes an approach for implementing this activity in preparation for COP13 and for future COPs thereafter.

This scoping paper considers three options for how this report could be produced, which offer varying levels of specificity and complexity in relation to the content and scope of the output. The common thread within each of these options is the aim to summarise the current state of knowledge on the status of, pressures on, and actions to safeguard migratory species at a global scale. In all three options, the report will bring together a number of key indicators to communicate high level information on the status of migratory species and to highlight challenges and success stories in the conservation of migratory species, in order to inform decision-making by CMS Parties and to raise awareness of the importance of migratory species more broadly. The “Proposed approach” section below outlines the areas common to all three options in more detail, and details of the options are provided in Table 1.

### 3. Objectives and intended outcomes of the proposed report

The main objectives of producing a ‘State of Migratory Species’ report can be characterised as follows:

1. To gain a better understanding of the overall conservation status of CMS-listed species by bringing together and synthesizing information on:
  - a. **Status** and **trends** of migratory species
  - b. **Threats** to migratory species
  - c. **Actions** taken to safeguard migratory species

2. To provide an update to the CMS Parties at COP13 (and ideally thereafter to successive COPs) on the conservation status of migratory species.
3. To contribute information to support communications on migratory species that will further promote actions to enhance their status.

The intended outcome is improved conservation status of migratory species and their habitats as a result of:

1. Increased awareness of the state of migratory species, threats facing CMS-listed species, and the responses by the global community.
2. Evidence-based decisions taken to conserve migratory species at global and national scales, leading to more effective conservation measures.

#### 4. Framework and content of the proposed report

The synthesis report will be compiled with a focus on bringing together aggregated datasets and visualizations in order to succinctly convey key messages on migratory species. The report will focus on CMS-listed species, but may contain broader information on migratory species not yet listed in order to provide contextual information where relevant.

This section outlines the proposed framework for the 'State of Migratory Species' report, and provides some examples of type of content. This scoping paper lays out three options for this report, each of which has a different level of specificity. The three options are:

Option 1: Comprehensive

Option 2: High-level synthesis with species-level analysis

Option 3: High-level synthesis without species-level analysis

Details of the three options are explained in detail in Table 1, along with details on the estimated financial resources required for each option. It would also be feasible to have a lower-cost option, focused solely on the production of the indicators (or a subset thereof); however, this option would not benefit from the wider synthesis and dissemination of information that would make it more accessible to policy-makers.

In general terms, it is proposed that the report will be structured using a pressure-state-response framework applied in other similar reports (for example, the Living Planet Report 2016). The structure of the proposed report and potential content might therefore include:

1. **Introduction**, outlining the scope of the report and the importance of migratory species (*potential links to SPMS Goal 4*);
2. **Status and trends** in migratory species, for example, a synthesis of IUCN Red List status for CMS-listed species (*SPMS Goal 3*);
3. **Threats** to migratory species, for example, compilation of available threat data from the IUCN Red List, CMS National Reports and/or the Living Planet Index (*SPMS Goal 2*);
4. **Actions to Safeguard Migratory Species**, for example, the proportion of migratory species listed on CMS, the protection status of CMS species, and examples of key actions for safeguarding CMS-listed species (*SPMS Goal 1 and 5*).

Within each section, indicators, disaggregated for CMS-listed species, will be developed. For example, the report will aggregate data to assess migratory species by groups<sup>1</sup> and will include an assessment at the species level of CMS Appendix I species, including IUCN Red List status, population size and trend, distribution, threats and conservation actions. For details on the

---

<sup>1</sup> In-line with CMS Parties' national reports, species will be grouped as follows: birds, terrestrial mammals, aquatic mammals, reptiles, fish and invertebrates.

proposed priority indicators, see Table 2. Option 1 will include all priority indicators identified, whereas for Options 2 and 3, two to three priority indicators for each section (State, Pressure, and Response) are recommended for inclusion. The CMS Scientific Council would confirm which indicators would be included. Options 1 and 2 would also include stories (presented as boxes or standalone sections) highlighting key successes where the conservation status of a species has been improved and any areas where urgent cooperative action may be required,

An online accompaniment to the report in the form of a webpage showcasing key infographics would be developed under proposed Options 1 and 2, in order reach a wider audience and make the key findings of the report more accessible through a digital medium. For the most comprehensive option (Option 1), a concise synthesis communication product, such as a poster or flyer, will also be developed in order to raise awareness, particularly among national Focal Points and their agencies. Both of these proposed additional communication elements will support wider dissemination of the report and its conclusions.

## **5. Assessing progress over time in the proposed report**

Producing such a flagship report will help to highlight the importance of conserving migratory species and will also serve as a baseline report against which future, regular assessments could measure progress and assess the effectiveness of efforts in conserving these species over time. Future updates could build on the initial outcomes of this first report in order to provide a more comprehensive picture of the state of the world's migratory species on an on-going basis, and thus support better informed decision-making in the CMS context.

Linkages with the CMS Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023 (SPMS) goals and indicators will be considered, and references to the plan will be incorporated where appropriate. In subsequent years, following any future revisions to the CMS National Report template to incorporate questions for each of the SPMS targets, it is envisioned that closer linkages to the SPMS can be made, based on information provided by Parties in their CMS National Reports.

The prioritised indicators provide good coverage of the Targets of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species, with particular relevance to Targets 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10. Indicators for many of the Targets not covered by those proposed here (in particular, Targets 1, 2, 4, 9, 13, 14 and 16) are likely to be available once appropriate questions have been included in National Reports and thus would be better covered in future editions of the report. Of the indicators selected here, three are directly included within the current proposed indicators for the Strategic Plan, while a fourth will provide a baseline of key threats to migratory species, for which further threat-specific analysis can be produced. In the proposed indicator framework for the Strategic Plan, it is currently suggested that Target 11 be measured through individual case studies, due to the complexity of the Target and the lack of available data; as such, the species-level analysis included in Options 1 and 2 may serve to identify and inform the choice of case studies to measure progress towards this Target in the future.

The CMS Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023 and its goals and indicators were framed on the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and this provides opportunity now and in the future to identify within the proposed report the ways in which actions to safeguard migratory species are contributing to achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

As such, two of the indicators included in the CBD's indicator framework, welcomed at CBD COP 13 in 2016, are included in this list (the Living Planet Index and the Red List Index). These new disaggregations of two globally used indicators could not only help promote harmonisation of the indicators used across different conventions, but could also in turn be incorporated into the CBD's indicator framework in the future, to help ensure the consideration of migratory species in assessments of progress towards the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.

## **6. Approach for carrying out the work of preparing the proposed report**

It is proposed that the compilation of the 'State of Migratory Species' report be led by a suitable institution, with an adequate experience in the production of this type of reports, working closely with the CMS Secretariat and the CMS Scientific Council, and with input from indicator providers. The CMS Scientific Council will advise on which option should be pursued, taking into account the resource available. This scoping paper would be adapted into terms of reference for the desired course of action, before the work of developing the report is begun.

To develop the report, the lead institution would work closely with key experts to prepare the datasets and indicators that will form the foundation of the synthesis report. This will involve requesting key data providers to collate and disaggregate datasets (e.g. IUCN Red List Index) for migratory species (with a focus on CMS-listed species).

Collaboration with experts and data providers will be essential for whichever option is chosen, although the option chosen would determine the degree of collaboration undertaken. For Options 2 and 3, where only a subset of indicators will be selected and incorporated, suggestions are provided in Table 2 for which would be the priority indicators to incorporate, but the final decision which two to incorporate would be up to the CMS Scientific Council. Other potential indicators that become available for use could also be considered for inclusion, as appropriate. For instance, a scorecard for governments to assess progress in tackling illegal killing, taking and trade of birds in Europe is under discussion as part of a joint CMS/Bern initiative and, if available in time, could be considered for use as a response indicator.

Potential collaborators include IUCN, BirdLife International, ZSL, and Wetlands International; collaborations will be driven by data and information needs of key graphics/indicators to inform the State, Pressure, and Response sections. Other collaborators may also be approached depending on the indicator priorities, for example UN Environment (particularly the Science and Ecosystems Divisions) and other relevant UN initiatives pertaining particularly to biodiversity data and indicators; experts within the wider IUCN Species Survival Commission network; and members of the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership whose Secretariat is hosted at UNEP-WCMC.

Prior to finalisation, the report would be made available to the CMS Secretariat and the CMS Scientific Council for review. It is envisaged that the report would be launched at CMS COP13, and that a similar approach could be followed in the lead up to future COPs, building on the methodology developed within this first iteration.

**Table 1. Overview of the details for each of the three proposed options**

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
<b>Summary description</b>	<b>Comprehensive:</b> Provides the most robust overview. Includes all indicators in Table 2, case studies within Introduction and detailed species-level analysis for Appendix I species. Communication materials	<b>High level synthesis, with species-level analysis:</b> Focusses on key indicators only, includes streamlined species-level analysis and online summary.	<b>High level synthesis, excluding species-level analysis:</b> Focusses on key indicators only, excludes species-level analysis and does not include communication elements.
<b>Report outline / sections included</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. Introduction               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Short introduction to put the report in context</li> <li>b. <i>Case studies to highlight benefits and successes</i></li> </ol> </li> <li>II. State – summarising “state” indicators</li> <li>III. Pressure – summarising “pressure” indicators</li> <li>IV. Response - – summarising “response” indicators</li> <li>V. <i>Species-level analysis</i> (see Annex for more details)               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <i>Detailed Appendix I overview table (based on available datasets and relevant literature)</i></li> <li>b. <i>Summarised information on Appendix II and migratory species not yet listed by CMS (e.g. # globally threatened, proportion in decline)</i></li> </ol> </li> <li>VI. Conclusions (or findings)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. Introduction               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Short introduction to put the report in context</li> </ol> </li> <li>II. State– summarising key “state” indicators</li> <li>III. Pressure–summarising key “pressure” indicators</li> <li>IV. Response – summarising key “response” indicators</li> <li>V. <i>Species-level analysis</i> (see Annex for more details)               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <i>Summarised information on Appendix I, Appendix II and migratory species not yet listed by CMS (e.g. # globally threatened, proportion in decline)</i></li> </ol> </li> <li>VI. Conclusions (or findings)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. Introduction               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Short introduction to put the report in context</li> </ol> </li> <li>II. State– summarising key “state” indicators</li> <li>III. Pressure- summarising key “pressure” indicators</li> <li>IV. Response- summarising key “response” indicators</li> <li>V. Conclusions (or findings)</li> </ol>
<b>Indicators included</b>	All 11 indicators in Table 2	Seven indicators from Table 2 (2-3 from each state/pressure/response), to be chosen by CMS Scientific Council	Seven indicators from Table 2 (2-3 from each state/pressure/response), to be chosen by CMS Scientific Council
<b>Outputs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Report:</b> The first ‘State of Migratory Species’ report, roughly 25-30 page report plus detailed Annex for species-level tables. Available in English, French and Spanish. Focus will be on presenting the key findings visually through infographics and other means of summarising indicators and high level state/pressure/response messages in an accessible way. Key success stories and spotlights on species where urgent cooperative efforts are needed will also be highlighted throughout the report, where relevant.</li> <li>• <b>Online webpage</b> in English to display the key findings and the main indicators on the web (all indicators). Presenting the report online will increase accessibility of the key findings in order to extend reach, longevity and impact of the report. Success stories and species requiring urgent efforts will also be highlighted.</li> <li>• <b>Summary ‘flyer’</b> (based on key indicators featured within the storyboard)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Report:</b> As in Option 1, but without the case studies within the introduction, a more streamlined ‘Species-level analysis’ and only focussing on two key indicators per section (those that are confirmed to be priorities by the CMS Scientific Council). The Species-level analysis will focus only on datasets readily available for Appendix I species and would not be supplemented with literature or additional supplementary information.</li> <li>• <b>Online webpage</b> in English to display the key findings and the priority indicators on the web. Presenting the report online will increase accessibility of the key findings in order to extend reach, longevity and impact of the report.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Report:</b> As in Option 2, but without the Species-level analysis chapter/Annex.</li> <li>• No additional communication materials</li> </ul>
<b>Estimated Budget</b>	US\$165,000*	US\$120,000*	US\$90,000*

\*Estimated budgets do not include costs for professionally printing the reports.

**Table 2. Overview of proposed indicators and datasets for inclusion in the State of Migratory Species**

Chapter	Indicator	SPMS Goal/ Target	Data source	Aim	Indicative budget (USD)	Option		
						1	2	3
STATE	Overview of conservation status and population trends of migratory species	Goal 3, Target 8	IUCN Red List data, and potentially CMS national reports (for additional population trends data for Appendix I species)	To give an indication of the percentage of migratory species that are globally threatened and the proportion that have declining populations, in order to give an indication of where concerted efforts may be required. <i>[Further species level details would be incorporated into the Species-level section for Options 1 &amp; 2]</i>	US\$4,000	✓	✓	✓
	Red List Index - measure trends in conservation status of migratory species	Goal 3, Target 8	IUCN Red List data (BirdLife International))	To show trends in conservation status over time for different taxonomic groups of migratory species and by region	US\$4,500	✓	✓	✓
	Migratory species LPI (for CMS-listed species)	Goal 3, Target 8	Living Planet Index (ZSL)	To show trends in population abundance for CMS-listed species over time.	US\$4,500	✓	✓	✓
PRESSURE	Main threats, according to the IUCN Red List	Goal 2, Target 5, 6, 7	IUCN Red List data	To provide a threat analysis for taxonomic groups and CMS Appendix I listed species (% breakdown by threats) to highlight the main threats facing CMS species.	US\$4,500	✓	✓	✓
	Living Planet Index (LPI) – Threats to migratory species	Goal 2, Target 5, 6, 7	Living Planet Index (ZSL)	To summarise the threats faced by CMS species (all CMS listed and by taxonomic group) based on species for which data is available within the LPI.	US\$2,000	✓	✓	✓
	Pressures faced by Appendix I species	Goal 2, Target 5, 6, 7	CMS National Reports	To provide a threat analysis for Appendix I species only by taxonomic group (based on Party responses)	US\$3,500	✓		
RESPONSE	Trends in protected area coverage of KBAs (including IBAs and AZEs) identified for migratory species	Goal 3, Target 10	KBA & WDPA Protected Area data [BirdLife International, IUCN and UNEP-WCMC)	To show the extent to which those areas, identified as being of high importance for migratory species, are allocated protection by governments.	US\$3,750	✓	✓	✓
	Coverage of protected areas in countries party to CMS	Goal 3, Target 10	World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA) (UNEP-WCMC)	To give an indication of the % area covered by protected areas (overall & by CMS Party) as a proxy for response. Links to Aichi Target 11.	US\$4,000	✓	✓	✓
	Protected status of CMS species by Parties	Goal 1, Target 3	TBD (e.g. National Reports - prohibition of take by taxonomic group)	To summarise level of protection for CMS-listed species as reported by Parties	US\$4,750	✓		
	Proportion of all migratory species listed on CMS	Goal 1, Target 3	IUCN Red List data - migratory status (*The completeness of the 'migratory' tag will determine the feasibility of this for all groups)	To assess CMS coverage by taxonomic group and identify potential gaps. Where possible, threat status of migratory species will be considered to identify groups that may merit closer scrutiny. <i>[Further species level details would be incorporated into the Species-level section for Options 1 &amp; 2]</i>	US\$4,500	✓		



## Annex Estimated Budget by Option

### Option 1

The total cost of Option 1 is estimated to be **USD 165,000**.

#### **Indicative budget by activity**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Total (USD)</b>
Produce the indicator disaggregation and associated storylines, in collaboration with indicator providers (see Table 2 for full list of indicators included)	\$40,000
Writing/compiling report, including collating inputs from collaborators and incorporating CMS feedback (includes case studies for benefits section in the Introduction and a "Species-level analysis" chapter with associated Annex)	\$67,500
Translation of the report into 3 languages and design/layout of the report	\$12,500
Development of online webpage based on the key findings of the report, highlighting high level messages and main indicators (English only)	\$20,000
Compilation, design and layout of synthesis communication product based on the key findings of the report (poster/flyer in English only)	\$10,000
Project Management, including liaising with collaborators	\$15,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$165,000</b>

### Option 2

The total cost of Option 2 is estimated to be **USD 120,000**.

#### **Indicative budget by activity**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Total (USD)</b>
Produce the indicator disaggregations and associated storylines, in collaboration with indicator providers (see Table 2 for details of the recommended indicators to include per section)	\$27,500
Writing/compiling report, including collating inputs from collaborators and incorporating CMS feedback (including streamlined 'Species-level analysis' chapter)	\$52,500
Translation of the report into 3 languages and design/layout	\$10,000
Development of online webpage based on the key findings of the report, highlighting high level messages and main indicators (English only)	\$20,000
Project Management, including liaising with collaborators	\$10,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$120,000</b>

### Option 3

The total cost of Option 3 is estimated to be **USD 90,000**.

#### **Indicative budget by activity**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Total (USD)</b>
Produce the indicator disaggregations and associated storylines, in collaboration with indicator providers (see Table 2 for details of the recommended indicators to include per section)	\$27,500
Writing/compiling report, including collating inputs from collaborators and incorporating CMS feedback	\$45,000
Translation of the report into 3 languages and design/layout	\$9,500
Project Management, including liaising with collaborators	\$8,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$90,000</b>