



# Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Distr. GENERAL

UNEP/CMS/Conf.7.6.1  
10 September 2002  
Agenda item 11a

---

SEVENTH MEETING OF THE  
CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES  
Bonn, 18-24 September 2002

## SYNTHESIS OF PARTY REPORTS

*(Prepared by UNEP-WCMC, in consultation with the Secretariat)*

### Background

1. In accordance with the terms of Resolution 6.5 (Cape Town, 1999), the CMS Secretariat commissioned the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) to conduct a synthesis of annual reports to CMS and related agreements<sup>1</sup>. The Synthesis included the reports to CMS and associated Agreements submitted by Parties between 1988 and 2001. The exercise brought together in a synoptic manner a wealth of information on the activities, knowledge, strengths and needs of CMS Parties. It continues to provide a basis for the harmonisation of reporting within CMS and in relation to other conventions and agreements.

2. The CMS Secretariat presented the 1988-2001 Synthesis of Party Reports to the CMS Standing Committee in December 2001. The Committee then instructed the Secretariat to continue the exercise for 2002, with Parties being offered the opportunity to use a new reporting format on a voluntary, trial basis (Document UNEP/CMS/Conf. 7.6.2 refers).

3. The present synthesis covers information provided in the 32 *current* reports that were received by the Secretariat through 31 July 2002. Information from the 2002 Party reports has been entered in a database and has also been incorporated into the new *CMS Information System* (Document UNEP/CMS/Conf. 7.6 refers). This brings together the data from various expert organisations, the knowledge generated within CMS and other biodiversity conventions, and the information provided by the Parties to CMS through their national reports. The prototype CMS Information System is available at for consultation at:

<http://www.unep-wcmc.org/cms/ims.htm>.

4. The present synthesis provides an overview of the status of data provided by Parties in 2002, and follows the format of the National Reporting Format. Part I summarizes the general information contained in the reports, while Part II summarizes the information reported on Appendix I-listed species.

---

1

This synthesis and the CMS Information System were produced by UNEP-WCMC under CMS contract MS/6020-01-01-22, Development of Information Management (Phase II). The synthesis was compiled and edited by Karen Simpson, Harriet Gillett and Gerardo Fragoso. Paul Birrell and James O'Carroll worked on the development of the Party Reports database and the Internet interface of the CMS Information System, in collaboration with Gerardo Fragoso and Harriet Gillett. The project was managed by Gerardo Fragoso. Douglas Hykle provided advice and guidance.

## Overview

5. National reports from thirty-two Parties were provided for inclusion in the CMS Information System and are covered in this synthesis. These Parties comprise:

Australia	Hungary	Poland
Benin	Israel	Portugal
Bulgaria	Jordan	Senegal
Burkina Faso	Kenya	Slovakia
Chad	Latvia	Switzerland
Chile	Mali	Tanzania
Congo	Moldova	Togo
Czech Republic	Monaco	Tunisia
Denmark	Morocco	United Kingdom
European Community	New Zealand	Uruguay
Guinea	Norway	

Twenty-three of these reports used the new National Reporting Format.

6. As can be seen from the sample of information compiled in relation to particular species and certain issues (as well as that contained in the 1988-2001 synthesis), this effort has the potential to offer valuable material not readily available from other sources. This, combined with the fact that it is available on-line, will provide an unprecedented opportunity to monitor implementation of the Convention across regions and over time.

7. On the other hand, the historically low response rate and, in particular, the minimal information provided by some Parties, still do not provide an adequate basis on which to make substantive recommendations with regard to the implementation of activities in support of migratory species. The strength of the CMS Information System and the conclusions of the synthesis of Party reports depend crucially on the comprehensiveness and timeliness of information submitted by all Parties.

### Action requested:

Parties that have not yet submitted their 2002 national reports are strongly encouraged to submit them, in electronic form and using the new National Report Format, not later than 30 November 2002 so that the synthesis can be made as complete and useful as possible.

### Detailed analysis

8. In general, the response from Parties to each section of the National Reporting Format was low. Information provided was frequently minimal, and in many instances responses to particular questions were not given, even when these were pertinent to the Party in question.

9. Summaries for each section of the report are given below. Figures on the number of Parties responding to each section and details of Party responses are given in the following sections:

- Part I: Information on general issues (items I, III, IV, V, VI and VII below).
- Part II: Details on each Appendix I-listed species (see item II below)

## **I. General Taxonomic Overview: Higher taxonomic groups of special interest to CMS**

10. The number of Parties responding to questions on each group (out of a possible maximum of 80 Parties) is: Birds (25); Marine mammals (20) and Marine turtles (19); Terrestrial mammals (other than bats) (11); Bats (8); “Other” (3).

11. The most detailed information was provided for the groups generating most responses, namely, birds, marine mammals and marine turtles. The greatest response was given to questions regarding legislation, with fewer comments made in relation to obstacles to migration. In general, data on obstacles to migration was accompanied by information on actions taken to overcome these obstacles and any assistance required.

12. The most frequently listed obstacles to migration for each group were:

- Birds: deterioration of habitat/habitat loss
- Marine mammals: interaction with fisheries/by-catch
- Marine turtles: interaction with fisheries/by-catch
- Terrestrial mammals (other than bats): destruction of habitat/hunting & poaching/obstruction of migratory routes
- Bats: deterioration of habitat/habitat loss
- “Other”: (only one Party responded)

13. Similarly, Parties responding to questions on actions to control factors endangering or likely to endanger the migratory species, tended also to provide information on factors that may limit such actions and any assistance needed. The response to the questions on exceptions to prohibition on taking of birds was generally good.

14. A wide range of types of actions taken are reported, including enactment of legislation, surveillance and creation of protected areas.

## **II. Information provided for Appendix I species**

15. The numbers of Parties reporting on each species are consistently very low. There are 25 Appendix I species that have not been reported on by any of the Parties so far. In general, little detail is provided in the reports, with perhaps the most detailed information provided in relation to marine turtles and marine mammals. This lack of information makes it difficult to identify trends for most species. Summaries of comments received from reporting Parties<sup>2</sup> are included in Part II.

16. Several factors have been identified by the Parties as restricting activities for the conservation of Appendix I species. Lack of financial resources is the most frequently cited reason for inactivity in the reporting period. Other factors include lack of personnel, lack of training, inadequate technical support and insufficient equipment.

## **III. Development of CMS Agreements and Memoranda of Understanding**

17. The number of Parties reporting participation in the development of new CMS instruments for each group are very low: Birds (8); Marine mammals (6); Marine turtles (6); Terrestrial mammals (other than bats) (2); Bats and “Other” (none).

---

<sup>2</sup> Discussions are being held with the United Kingdom to identify the best manner in which the new Reporting Format can be used to report on dependent and overseas territories. Information provided in the report submitted by the United Kingdom is therefore not yet included in the summaries for the specific Appendix I species.

18. Three Parties reported involvement with AEWA and four responded regarding ACCOBAMS. Perhaps the most information was provided in relation to development of two Marine Turtle MoUs for the Indian Ocean and South-east Asia and for the Atlantic Coast of Africa.

#### **IV. Further listing of Migratory Species in CMS Appendices**

##### **Appendix I**

19. Five Parties reported that they are Range States for endangered migratory species not currently listed under CMS, and which would be appropriate for inclusion in Appendix I. Species reported on include:

Birds (5 species):

*Podiceps cristatus, Oxyura maccoa, Glareola nuchallis, Rynchops flavirostris, Grus carunculatus*

Marine Mammals (8 species): *Balaenoptera physalus, Physeter catodon, Caperea marginata, Balaenoptera bonaerensis, Balaenoptera edeni, Balaenoptera borealis, Balaenoptera acutorostrata, Dugong dugon*

Terrestrial Mammals, other than Bats (2 species): *Gazella rufifrons, Taurotragus derbianus derbianus*

Other (1 species): *Carcharodon carcharias*

In all cases except one, Minke whale (*Balaenoptera acutorostratai*), information is given on activities in progress by the Party, or the assistance required for listing the species.

##### **Appendix II**

20. Four Parties reported that they are Range States for migratory species not currently listed by the CMS, and which would be appropriate for inclusion on Appendix II. Species reported on include:

Marine Mammals (7 species): *Balaenoptera physalus, Balaenoptera borealis, Physeter catodon, Balaenoptera bonaerensis, Balaenoptera edeni, Caperea marginata, Orcinus orca*

Birds (4 species): *Haematopus ostralegus, Burhinus oediconemus, Bostrychia olivecea, Streptopelia turtur*

Other (2 species): *Carcharodon carcharias, Rhincodon typus*

In each case information is given on activities in progress by the Party, or the assistance required, for listing the species. Two Parties report activities in progress (covering 11 of the species) and two further countries report the need for assistance in relation to two species (Whale shark *Rhincodon typus* and Turtle dove *Streptopelia turtur*).

#### **V. Satellite Telemetry and Other Remote Sensing Techniques**

21. Twelve Parties reported that relevant projects had been carried out, and each Party provided at least some information on these projects. In nine of those twelve instances, the information provided consisted of very brief statements identifying that research had been conducted. Only one report provided detailed summaries of the projects undertaken, including results, and two other Parties provided basic summaries of their research.

22. The greatest response was in relation to birds (8 Parties), with work on albatrosses being most reported (3 Parties). Four Parties reported activities in relation to marine turtles and terrestrial mammals (other than bats). No activities are reported on bats or “other” species.

## **VI. Mobilisation of Resources**

23. Eighteen Parties indicated that financial resources have been made available for conservation activities with a direct benefit for migratory species. Almost all provide details on these activities, which ranged from funding for individual species, to general contributions through statutory bodies. Five Parties report voluntary financial contributions to other countries and six report provision of technical/scientific assistance. Three Parties report receiving funds from the CMS Trust Fund, with details of how these funds were spent. The greatest response (15 Parties) was on financial assistance/support from sources outside the Convention, again with details on funding and activities undertaken.

## **VII. Implementation of Resolutions and Recommendations**

24. Eleven Parties reported information on implementation of substantive, operational Resolutions and Recommendations. Comments made by each Party in relation to Resolutions 6.1 to 6.4 and Recommendations 6.3 to 6.5 are summarised in Part I. Information that could have been reported here may have been included under other sections. This may account for the particularly low level of response in this section.

### General conclusions on process: proposals to improve future reporting

25. In general, use of the new National Reporting Format seems to have encouraged more comprehensive and more accurate responses from Parties. Parties *not* using the new format often omitted contributions on several issues mentioned throughout this synthesis. The following recommendations should be considered also in the discussion of document UNEP/CMS/Conf. 7.6.2 (Proposed Format for National Reports).

#### a) Quality of information provided in National Reports

Many of the contributions provided in the reports submitted to date are extremely succinct, to the point of preventing the elaboration of meaningful conclusions across regions, topics or taxa. The report form should include a statement encouraging Parties to respond to all questions (since it cannot be assumed that the absence of response indicates that no activities have taken place), and to provide more comprehensive answers. Summaries of activities rather than single-line statements would be useful, as well as more information on factors limiting action and assistance required to overcome these factors.

The electronic version of the new reporting format might usefully include *Help* buttons for each section, as an effective way to encourage clearer responses, and examples of the type and quality of contributions expected in each topic. These examples can be taken from some of the existing reports, which, in a number of instances provided commendable contributions.

b) Protected Areas

A number of Parties volunteered information on issues related to protected areas relevant to migratory species. It is suggested that a thematic section be included in the report, to enable and encourage contributions to be made on this topic.

c) Miscellaneous comments

Several Parties provided information on assorted topics which did not have a designated space in the current format. It may thus be useful to include a section to make miscellaneous comments for each major Appendix I group.

d) Cross References

The National Reporting Format requires Parties to report by species, by higher taxonomic group and by theme. It may be helpful if the new Report Format encouraged Parties to provide cross-references between sections where appropriate, to help avoid duplication of answers.

e) Development of Agreements

There appeared to be confusion between initiation of national processes required for *participation* in a negotiated Agreement, and the initiation of the *development and negotiation* of the Agreement itself. The headings/questions in the Agreement sections could be amended to improve clarity.

f) Resolutions and recommendations

It may be helpful to specify more explicitly in a revised Reporting Format which aspects of implementation of the various resolutions and recommendations Parties are requested to report on.