

# Convention on Migratory Species: Future Shape Phase II

---

## Options Report

1 ~~September~~ October 2010

**Authors: Prof. Robert Lee, Begonia Filgueira and Lori Frater**

**eric.**

Environmental Regulation and Information Centre Ltd | [www.eric-group.co.uk](http://www.eric-group.co.uk)

## Table of Contents

Acronyms .....	<u>23</u>
Executive Summary <del>and conclusion</del> .....	5
Conclusion and next steps .....	11
Introduction.....	<u>11</u> <del>12</del>
Methodology .....	12
Options.....	13
Option 1- Concentration.....	13
Option 2- Decentralization .....	20
Option 3- Ideal.....	26
Option 4 - Low Cost .....	33
<i>Annex I: methodology and outcomes (continued)</i> .....	39
<i>Annex II: Executive summary Phase I Report - main advantages and disadvantages of the CMS and the CMS Family</i> .....	43
<i>Annex III: Summary of the key issues raised in Phase II questionnaires and responses from Parties, organizations and MEAs</i> .....	52
Table 1: Summary of Key Areas of Concern.....	<del>53</del> <a href="#">Error! Bookmark not defined.</a>
Table 2: Highlighted Responses to Questionnaires .....	55
Table 3: Recommendations from Questionnaires .....	63
<i>Annex IV: Definitions of common terms used throughout the Report.</i> .....	69
<i>Annex V: Financial analysis of activities within each option.</i> .....	71
<i>Annex VI: Options scoring</i> .....	89
<i>Annex VII: Activities Table (developed at ISWGoFS meeting 1-2 July 2010)</i> .....	118
<i>Annex VIII: Impact of Individual Activities</i> .....	148

## ACRONYMS

AC	Advisory Committee
ACAP	Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels
ACCOBAMS	Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans of the Black Sea, Mediterranean Sea and Contiguous Atlantic Area 1996
AEWA	Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds 1995
ASCOBANS	Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans of the Baltic, North-East Atlantic, Irish and North Seas 1992
BLI	Bird Life International
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity 1992
CITIES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora 1973
CMS	Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals 1979 (also known as the “Bonn Convention”)
CMS Family	Subsidiary instruments created under the aegis of CMS
COP	Conference of the Parties
CSN	Critical Site Network
EUROBATS	The Agreement for the Conservation of Populations of European Bats
IPBES	Inter-Governmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services
ISWGoFS	Inter-Sessional Working Group in the Future Shape of CMS
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
MEA	Multilateral Environment Agreement
MOP	Meeting of the Parties
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MOS	Meeting of the Signatories
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PSC	Project Support Costs
Ramsar	The Convention on Wetlands of International Importance 1971
StC	Scientific Council
SPREP	South Pacific Regional Environment Programme

STC	Standing Committee
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNEP-WCMC	UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre
WATCH	Western African Talks on Cetaceans and their Habitats
WHC	UNESCO World Heritage Convention 1972
WOW	Wings over Wetlands Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds 1995

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ~~AND CONCLUSION~~

### Introduction

This paper is part of the Second Step of the intersessional process (FS Process) to explore the possibilities of strengthening the contribution of the CMS and the CMS family to the worldwide conservation, management and sustainable use of migratory species over their entire range as mandated by Resolution UNEP/CMS/Res.9.13.

The Second Step, or Phase II, builds on:

- The First Phase of the FS process which resulted in Eric's Phase I Report (*see Annex II* for a summary of advantages and disadvantages);
- Responses from the Parties and external organizations to Phase II questionnaires (*see Annex III*);
- Eric's 2 previous proposals for thematic Options and specific activities to influence the FS of CMS and its Family; and
- The results of the of the ISWGoFS meeting on the 1 and 2 July 2010 (*see Annex VII*).

At that meeting a workshop was held where ISWGoFS' members proposed a large number of activities to improve the CMS and its Family by taking into account the issues raised in Resolution UNEP/CMS/Res.9.13 para 3 (*see Annex VII*). Much, if not all of these activities coincided with the activities proposed by Eric whilst carrying out the same analysis of Resolution 9.13 and thus we do not replicate Eric's other draft reports here.

Eric was then asked to rationalize and prioritize the list of activities, group them under Options and develop each of the Options by both taking into account the *practical steps* needed to implement the Option and its *overall impact* on CMS and its Family. Following further consultation with the ISWGoFS and CMS' Secretariat, this Report proposes 4 Options for reform of CMS and it's Family, namely: *Concentration; Decentralization; Ideal; and Low Cost*.

### Methodology for calculating impact of the Options

In order to calculate the overall impact of an Option a number of distinct but complementary steps were taken.

#### 1 Develop the activity

Each of the activities (as proposed by the ISWGoFS) grouped under an Option was developed by setting out the likely practical actions needed to be taken in order to implement the activity (*see Annex VI*).

#### 2 Cost the activity

As requested by the ISWGoFS Eric also put a cost to these activities based on information contained in CMS and CMS Family's budgets and in consultation with CMS's Secretariat (*see Annex V*).

#### 3 Advantages and disadvantages as impacts of the activity

In order to understand the impact of an activity Eric, with input from the ISWGoFS, set out a number of advantages and disadvantages for this activity. As required by Resolution UNEP/CMS/Res.9.13 para 3, the advantages and disadvantages are

analyzed by taking into account their impact on CMS’ conservation status, integration (cooperation within the CMS Family), synergies (cooperation with external institutions), legal instruments, the institutions and their cost (*see Annex VI*).

#### 4 Scoring impacts

The ISWGoFS was very keen on being able to quantify in some way the impact on CMS and its Family of each Option and of the individual activities which made up an Option. Thus Eric developed a method based on impact scores, from 1 to 5, 1 being low impact and 5 high impact (for full methodology *see Annex I*), for impacts on conservation status, integration, synergies, legal instruments, institutional and cost.

#### 5 Overall impact of an activity

In order to understand the overall impact of an activity Eric applied the following formula-

$$[(d) + (e) + (f)] - [(a) + (b) + (c)]$$

The *positive/beneficial impacts* are made up of (d) conservation effects, (e) promotion of integration within the CMS Family and (f) promotion of synergies with external organizations. The *negative/cost impacts* are made up of: (a) legal effects, (b) financial costs and (c) institutional effects (*see Annex I* for full methodology).

#### 6. Impact of an Option

The **Option** itself was also given an impact score, the result of the following calculation-

$$[\text{Option x total beneficial activity impact}] - [\text{Option x total negative activity impact}]$$

The impact of an Option could be classified as low, medium or high positive (or negative) impact, although all Options scored positively. A low positive score 1-9 indicated that whilst the positive/benefit criteria scored higher than the negative/cost impact, the overall impact was low. A medium positive impact score between 10-18, reflected that the positive benefits outweighed the negative costs and a high positive score of over 18 signifies that the positive benefits substantially outweighed the negative/cost impacts (see Annex VI)

#### The Options

This is a summary of the Options (and activities) which are fully developed in the main body of the report.

Option	Option Score	Overall Impact
1. Concentration	5	Low Positive
2. Decentralisation	24	High Positive
3. Ideal	7	Low Positive
4. Low Cost	14	Medium Positive

## OPTION 1 - CONCENTRATION

A number of similar services and responsibilities are performed by the CMS and the CMS Family instruments. The strategy behind this option is to centralize CMS services where this achieves resource efficiently, both in terms of facilitating the sharing of resources and reducing and avoiding duplication of activities across the CMS and the CMS Family. Some of the activities under Option 1 also provide for opportunities for concentration between and amongst agreements, for example by extending the scope of an existing Agreement rather than negotiate a new Agreement (Activity 8)

The overall impact of this option is 5, ***a low positive impact*** (*see Annex VI for full activity and options scoring*). Although this option provided high benefits to CMS and its Family, it is also high in costs adding up to ***Euros 3m over a 3 year budgetary period***, broken down into Euros 1.7 m initial or start up costs and over Euros 1.343 as ongoing cost (*see Annex V for full costings*).

Examples of these costs include acquiring mapping and other information management software, the creation of various new full time positions, delegate travel to meetings and costs of reorganizing departments within CMS. However, initial costs for this Option 1 should be assessed against efficiency staffing relating to staff time, operational efficiency and savings from reduced duplication of activities over the medium to long term.

### Activities grouped under Option 1

1. CMS Secretariat to carry out a global gap analysis at the Convention level (planning);
2. Coordinate access to research data as a centralized service across CMS agreements (operational);
3. CMS to coordinate scientific research programmes based on identification of common issues/threats shared across the CMS family to reduce duplication and overlaps and improve economies of scale;\_
4. CMS Secretariat to provide centralized services relating to building capacity with the CMS Family including training and educational activities (operational);
5. CMS Secretariat to provide centralized administrative services to Agreements/MoUs based in Bonn (operational);
6. CMS Secretariat to measure implementation of the CMS and its Family both from a Party and conservation perspective (measuring);
7. Merger of existing CMS Family agreements (MoUs) with similar species (growth);-
8. Merge CMS Family agreements with synergies based on geography and/or ecology (growth);-
9. Extending the scope of existing Agreements/MoUs rather than developing new Agreements/MoUs (growth);

10. CMS Secretariat to co-ordinate communication across and within Agreements/MoU, this to include all media and press correspondence (communication).

## **OPTION 2 - DECENTRALISATION**

The objective of Option 2 is to encourage a greater regional presence of the CMS Family in order to improve localization of activities through enhancement of services, personnel and partnership working with regional organizations. It gives CMS and its Family a greater presence at a local/conservation level by focusing on creating synergies and partnerships, rather than by duplicating the CMS institutional structure at a more regional level.

The overall impact of this option is 24, **a high positive impact**, in fact the highest of all four Options (see Annex VI for full options scoring). Estimated implementation costs totaled **Euros 852,000 over a 3 year budgetary period**, broken down into Euros 533,2256 as initial or start up cost and Euros 319,000 as ongoing costs for that period (see Annex V for full costs).

This Option has a high beneficial impact because there are also few high financial costs associated with the activities included under this option. The activities are largely based on synergies and integration and thus translate into economies of scale. However, whilst decentralization may result in integration amongst agreements sharing local resources, this Option would not resolve duplication of effort across the CMS and the CMS Family as this option is focused at a lower institutional level. Whilst the regionalization of activities may assist agreements capable of participating at this level it may not assist in resolving the diseconomies of scale to signatory Parties, who are Parties to numerous agreements, this would require a more concentrated approach at the Convention level.

### Activities grouped under Option 2

1. To work closer with partner organizations (including NGOs) in neighbouring Range States (planning);
2. Closer collaboration with UNEP regional offices, where appropriate, to assist with capacity building and technological support by CMS and its Family (planning);
3. Establishment of new Agreements outside of the UNEP family (i.e. ACAP) (operational);
4. MoUs/Agreements collaborating and sharing office/personnel/resources (e.g. as per Abu Dhabi – Dugongs and Birds of Prey) (operational); 5. Develop regional hubs for MEA implementation to identify synergies and linkages between MEAs and avoid duplication in projects and activities (e.g. SPREP) (measuring);
6. Establishment of external assessment and monitoring of effectiveness (for example by UNEP-WCMC) (measuring);
7. Regionalize conservation efforts by having local outposts with assistance from UNEP, NGOs and MEAs (growth);
8. Have a presence in each of the CMS administrative regions with assistance from UNEP, NGOs and MEAs (growth);

## 9. Work with local and indigenous communities (communication).

### **OPTION 3 - IDEAL**

The ISWGoFS was asked what their ideal CMS would look like. Their vision of the future was for CMS and its Family to have global reach and a greater influence amongst environmental international conventions. There was also a view that CMS should enhance partnerships with non-environmental international organizations to influence the sustainability and climate change agendas.

The activities under this Option tie that vision in with addressing the problems highlighted in the Phase 1 Report, including aiming to reduce any diseconomies inherent within the present system and by reducing the duplication of activities and improving resource efficiency.

The overall impact of this option is **7, a low positive impact** (see Annex VI for full options scoring). The total estimated cost of implementing Option 3 is **Euros 8.8m over a 3 year budgetary period**, broken down into almost Euros 2.418m as initial or start up costs and Euros 6.406m as long term costs for that period. Costs include amongst other things twenty five new full time staff, information, data and IT tools, publicity campaigns and workshops. This is an expensive Option, which is why although it has a very high positive impact on CMS and its Family it has an overall low positive impact.

However, it is important to note that the new staff and tools would achieve improved economies of scale in the medium to long term (in relation to financial savings from shared resources), human resources (not having to spend too much time duplicating effort) and operational efficiencies.

#### **Activities grouped under Option 3**

1. Prioritize and coordinate meetings of COPs, MOPs, MOSs, Scientific Committees and working groups (planning);
2. Coordinate with international organizations common meetings relating to shared issues (e.g. IUCN) and common research conservation programmes, species action plans and capacity building activities for on the ground conservation (planning);
3. Increase agreement Staff (operational);
4. Development of a MoU Unit to coordinate MoU activities (operational);
5. Create a migratory species scientific data hub, which would facilitate the use of migratory species data as an indicator of climate change (operational) ;
6. Information Management and reporting systems which are fully integrated across the CMS Family (operational);
7. Suspension of redundant MoUs with monitoring to be carried out by MoU Unit and coordinated by CMS (measuring);
8. Encourage all range states to become Parties/Signatories to CMS and CMS Family (growth);

9. The development of new multimedia platforms for example video conferencing to enhance communications across CMS Family and with external organizations (communication);

10. Run awareness campaigns to ensure that CMS is recognized by the public, academic institutions, international organizations and others as the global leader in the protection of migratory species (communication).

#### **OPTION 4 - LOW COST**

Option 4 gathers specific activities which build on existing practices by seeking to find low cost solutions to some of the issues highlighted in Phase I, such as implementation and growth of the Convention's subsidiary agreements. It is also important to note that implementing this Option would not affect the structure of CMS and its Family.

The overall impact of this option is *14, a medium positive overall impact*. The cost of implementation is low coming in at **Euros 419,200**, broken down into Euros 247,000 initial or start up costs and Euros 172,000 ongoing costs over that period. However, this medium positive impact may not deliver consistent economies of scale across the whole of the CMS and its Family or resolve resource inefficiencies as many of the individual activities did not score highly in relation to integration. This Option may also not assist in resolving the diseconomies of scale to signatory Parties, who are Parties to numerous agreements. Some of the activities do not provide permanent solutions to resource problems such as reliance on secondees and interns.

##### Activities grouped under Option 4

1. Create criteria against which to assess proposed new potential agreements (planning);
2. Parties/Signatories to translate guidance documents into local languages to assist implementation (operational);
3. Assess sources for improving current staffing compliment (e.g. UNEP, CMS Family's own staff, Parties, secondments, interns and consultants) including international staff exchange and traineeship (operational);
4. Develop a policy where implementation monitoring must be a part of any future MoUs (measuring);
5. Encourage more NGOs to become Signatories to MoUs and encourage more Range States to become Parties/Signatories to CMS and CMS Family (growth);
6. Agreements and MoUs focused only on migratory species (growth);
7. Support current scientific data hub currently under development (IPBES) and continue to support the development of existing implementation hubs (Tematea, UNEP-WCMC, IOSEA and AEWa) (communication);
8. Produce CMS website in 3 languages (communication).

## CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS

Options which have a high cost may also provide high benefits to the “shape” of the CMS and its Family. In some cases the costs are high initially but save resources in the long term. An example is Concentration which focuses on economies of scale and has a positive impact but high initial investment costs. Decentralization has the highest positive impact as it focuses on making partnerships, synergies and sharing resources (rather than opening new standalone offices and/or relocating staff) and because of its perceived effect on conservation efforts on the ground.

Option 3 (Ideal) is based on an ideal vision of CMS and thus has very high costs. However, even though the costs are high it has very high positive effect on CMS and its Family as it delivers the ISWGoFS vision of a high profile CMS at MEA level and with greater worldwide coverage. Option 4 is a low cost option and therefore has a medium positive impact without any major changes to the functioning of CMS.

Each Option has its advantages and disadvantages, e.g. Concentration and Ideal are high in cost but provide much needed resources to the overstretched CMS Secretariat. Low cost looks at policies which deal to an extent with problem areas identified in the Phase I Report and Phase II questionnaires such as more coordinated implementation monitoring and careful consideration of the impacts of creating a new agreement.

Resolution 9.13 states that during Phase II: *“For each of the issues mentioned in point 3 of Resolution UNEP/CMS/Res.9.13 and in the light of the outcome of the assessment of CMS’ current situation, the WG shall propose different options on the organization and strategic activities that could improve current operations”* This Phase II report fulfills this mandate.

It is now for the Standing Committee to ~~approve 3 possible~~ provide inputs to these options for reform of the CMS and its Family for further consideration. During Phase III: “...the WG shall propose three different options for the future organisation and the strategic development of CMS and the CMS family, outlining the pros and the cons of each.

A Phase III report will be communicated to the CMS Standing Committee members six months before COP10 where provisional recommendations will be made concerning the ISWGoFS’ preferred option for reform of CMS and its Family.. The Standing Committee members are expected to respond providing their coordinated comments and suggestions four months before COP10.

*Please note that at the request of a member of the ISWGoFS a table with the individual scores of activities has been added at Annex VIII. This table is different to table VI only in that it does not group the activities by Options but sets the activities out in order of the highest benefit to the lowest benefit.*

## INTRODUCTION

1. This paper is part of the Second Step of the intersessional process (FS Process) to explore the possibilities of strengthening the contribution of the CMS and the CMS family to the worldwide conservation, management and sustainable use of migratory species over their entire range as mandated by Resolution UNEP/CMS/Res.9.13. Eric's task is to facilitate the drafting by the ISWGoFS of proposals on strategies and structure of the CMS and the CMS family for presentation at the Tenth Conference of the Parties in Norway in 2011 (COP10).
2. The Second Step or Phase II of this process builds on Eric's Phase I Report of the FS Process (*see Annex II*), responses to Phase II questionnaires (*see Annex III*) and the results of the of the ISWGoFS meeting on the 1 and 2 July 2010. At that meeting an exciting workshop was held where ISWGoFS' members proposed a large number of activities to improve the CMS and its Family by taking into account the issues raised in Resolution UNEP/CMS/Res.9.13 para 3.
3. As instructed by the ISWGoFS's and in consultation with the CMS' Secretariat, this Report proposes 4 Options for reform of the CMS and its Family: Concentration, Decentralization, Ideal and Low Cost. This Report will be communicated to the CMS' Standing Committee members one month before the CMS' Standing Committee meeting and it is open to the Standing Committee to review it and provide further inputs. group the activities in another form.
4. As mandated by the ISWGoFS' terms of reference, the CMS Standing Committee will provide its comments and suggestions to the ISWGoFS within one month after the Standing Committee meeting. After these comments have been incorporated and on the basis of the hypothesis developed in the Phase II Report, the ISWGoFS will propose three different Options for the future organisation and the strategic development of the CMS and the CMS family, outlining the pros and the cons of each.
5. Eric will then produce a Phase III report under the instructions of the ISWGoFS which will make provisional recommendations about the ISWGoFS preferred Option for the FS of the CMS and its Family and which will be communicated to the CMS Standing Committee members six months before COP10. The Standing Committee members are then expected to respond providing their coordinated comments and suggestions four months before COP10.

## METHODOLOGY

6. Following the 2nd meeting of the ISWGoFS and after further consultation, Eric:
  - developed the activities proposed by the ISWGoFS into specific actions;
  - prioritised these activities on the basis that they sought to deal with the weaknesses and further exploit the advantages of the CMS and its Family as covered in the Phase I report and returned Phase II questionnaires (*see Annex II and III*); and
  - assessed the activities on the basis of their impact on 6 key foci: (a) legal effect, (b) financial cost, (c) institutional effect, (d) conservation effect, (e) integration within the CMS Family and (f) synergies with external organizations.

7. The activities were then grouped into 4 possible Options for reform of CMS and its Family, namely Concentration, Decentralization, Ideal and Low Cost, although the final grouping of activities ~~is to be decided by the Standing Committee and~~ may later take other forms including classification on the basis of their cost. Thus each activity has been scored, costed and considered individually as well as part of an Option.
8. Each activity within the 4 options was scored between 0 and 5 and given a total final score taking into account the 6 key foci. A high score for impacts (a) legal effect, (b) financial cost, (c) institutional effect would result in a negative impact on the CMS Family, whilst a high score for impact on (d) conservation, (e) integration within the CMS Family and (f) synergies with external organisations would result in a positive impact on the CMS Family. As such, the Total Score for each Option is based on a calculation of  $[(d) + (e) + (f)] - [(a) + (b) + (c)]$ .
9. A financial strategy initially identifies for each priority activity, the likely cost of the activity (low, medium, high). Eric costed these activities with the assistance of CMS's Secretariat input and its own evaluation taken from CMS's available financial information.

This methodology was ~~approved shared and discussed with by the Chair of the~~ ISWGoFS and ~~the~~ CMS<sup>2</sup> Secretariat and is reproduced more fully at *Annex I*.

## OPTIONS

### OPTION 1- CONCENTRATION

10. A number of similar services and responsibilities are performed by the CMS and the CMS Family instruments, these include: the arrangement of meetings; collection; management and storage of data; information technology; capacity building; and communication. Thus Option 1 looks at the concentration of CMS services where this can achieve efficiency through facilitating the sharing of resources and reducing or avoiding duplication of activities across the CMS and the CMS Family.
11. The list of activities identified against Option 1 provide individually and collectively means of resolving some of the diseconomies of scale of the management framework of the Convention and its subsidiary instruments that were highlighted in the Phase 1 Report and raised in the responses to questionnaires by Parties and partner institutions. The underlying objective of Option 1 is to streamline the different administrative systems implemented across the CMS and its daughter instruments and reduce multiplication of effort. Option 1, therefore provides a list of activities designed to drive efficiencies across staff time, finances and operational infrastructure.
12. Whilst this Option, in the main, focuses on concentration at the CMS level, some of the activities provide for opportunities for concentration between and amongst agreements which are geographically proximate, for example by extending the scope of an existing Agreement rather than negotiate a new Agreement (Activity 8). An example of this could be extending the coverage of AEWAs to include the Central Asian Flyway rather than the creation of a new Agreement.

## Activities

### ***1. CMS Secretariat to carry out a global gap analysis at the Convention level (planning).***

13. The gap analysis should consider what issues are already being addressed by the Convention, what issues it is not addressing, whether another organization is addressing these issues and if there are opportunities for the Convention to partner with this organization. The work of the Scientific Council could complement the gap analysis by providing information on any scientific gaps that exist and what research is required to fill these gaps.

#### Impact Level *Benefit*: Medium (8)

14. This activity can assist in the prioritizing of resources across the CMS Family providing for improved cooperation and sharing of resources. The analysis can assist in developing synergies with external organizations as it can identify the work areas of these organizations and where there may be commonality with the CMS Family agenda.

#### Impact Level *Cost*: Medium (5)

15. The negative impacts are individually quite minor requiring a consultant to undertake the analysis and with only a minor institutional impact as any additional support will be limited in duration.

#### Overall Activity Impact: Medium [8]-[5] = (+) 3

16. The benefit of the activity outweighs the costs of the activity with medium positive impact to the CMS and the CMS family.

### ***2. Coordinate access to research data as a centralized service across CMS agreements (operational).***

17. This activity involves amalgamating existing and future research data relating to the Convention's objective in central location, in order to allow easy access to all Parties and Signatories.

#### Impact Level *Benefit*: Medium (7)

18. Improved access to data held across the CMS Family in one central location (for example a Convention intranet site) reducing duplication of data collection and enhancing the sharing of information across the CMS Family.

#### Impact Level *Cost*: Medium (6)

19. The cost impact includes 20 per cent of the Information Management Officer plus the development of an intranet site to provide Parties and Signatories with direct access to the data source.

#### Overall Activity Impact: Low [7]-[6] = (+) 1

20. This activity records a low positive impact on the CMS. Over the medium to long term, it could improve the knowledge base of the CMS Family, which could ultimately assist in identifying gaps in knowledge and common challenges (changes in migratory patterns), which could allow the CMS to proactively seek solutions.

**3. CMS to coordinate scientific research programmes based on identification of common issues/threats shared across the CMS family to reduce duplication and overlaps and improve economies of scale.**

21. This activity involves developing research programmes across the Agreements and the MoUs in relation to common issues, where joint research can be shared between a number of different agreements. The activity could include shared research on the impacts of climate change, on developing indicators for measuring action plans and for developing guidance and information to be shared amongst the CMS family. In addition it may provide opportunities for data sharing. The activity can in the main be undertaken by the Scientific Council of the CMS and other Agreements.

Impact Level Benefit: High (9)

22. The benefits of the activity include increased opportunities for enhanced conservation benefits arising from more inclusive research projects and may allow for greater cooperation amongst the agreements and would enable the sharing and optimization of data generated from the research projects.

Impact Level Cost: Medium (5)

23. The costs of the activity would entail a percentage of a newly recruited Information Management Officer's time. 10 per cent has been estimated but this may require a higher percentage at the beginning of the activity to instigate this new policy.

Overall Activity Impact: Medium [9]-[5] = (+) 4

24. The positive impacts of this activity are assisted by the potential improvements in integration between agreements sharing research and data and the subsequent positive impacts this could have on enhanced conservation benefits.

**4. CMS Secretariat to provide centralized services relating to building capacity with the CMS Family including training and educational activities (operational).**

25. This activity would include the development of guidance to be shared across the CMS Family including capacity building and training programmes to enhance implementation. This would include centralized workshops by region or along common thematic interests, for example the development of national policy instruments, reporting practices and species monitoring.

Impact Level Benefit: Medium (8)

26. The benefits of the activity include increased sharing of experiences, expertise, and lessons learned amongst Parties and Signatories, which can result in improved conservation know-how.

Impact Level Cost: Medium (8)

27. The costs of the activity include those related to organizing additional workshops and training sessions as well as the cost of a part-time Capacity Building Officer (P2).

Overall Activity Impact: Neutral [8]-[8] = (0)

28. The positive impact of this activity could be higher if only a proportion of the cost for the Capacity Building Officer's time was attributed to the activity. In order for the activity to be considered on its own merits, the full cost for the Capacity Building Officer has been included within the impact assessment. Consequently, the activity impact is likely to be higher than neutral.

**5. CMS Secretariat to provide centralized administrative services to Agreements/MoUs based in Bonn (operational).**

29. The extent of these administrative services should include: the coordination of the meetings of COP/MOPs; the coordination of Scientific and Advisory Groups of CMS/Agreements and the meetings of scientific and technical group. CMS Secretariat to introduce harmonized financial management systems. The Secretariat would also develop coordinated fundraising activities and centralize the development and management of information technology. This would include the development of mapping systems, centralized systems and procedures in relation to data collection, management and storage ~~and centralization of data storage~~ and analysis, including the development of shared management systems as well as the centralization and harmonization of reporting formats and returns.

Impact Level Benefit: High (12)

30. This activity can assist in reducing multiplication of efforts and enhance the development of specialization among staff through the concentration of skills. The activity can assist in achieving increased internal economies of scale through the reduction in duplication of activities and resources by developing mechanisms to improve coordination among existing initiatives in order to most efficiently and effectively utilize available resources.

31. The centralization of administrative services can also assist in cost reduction, for example through the coordination of meetings. This could result in financial savings relating to travel, venue and ancillary costs. These savings could be directed to the implementation of conservation projects.

Impact Level Cost: High (12)

32. This activity will result in major changes to the institutional structure of the CMS, requiring additional staff (Information Management Officer) (80% of staff time) plus 2 Assistants. The cost of recruitment is also significantly high and would require additional funding from Parties to enable this activity to be feasible.

Overall Activity Impact: Neutral [12]-[12] = (0)

33. The positive impact of this activity could be higher if only a proportion of the cost for the administrative Assistants were attributed to the activity.

34. In relation to the harmonization of reporting, it must be borne in mind that not all Parties have access to the same standard of technical capacity. In addition, some Parties may have difficulties in accessing the internet. Consequently, this activity is likely to only be effective with investment over the medium to long term.

**6. CMS Secretariat to measure implementation of the CMS and its Family both from a Party and conservation perspective (measuring).**

35. The measurement process should include an assessment of the quality of work being undertaken, an identification of gaps in the programmes and what possible measures may be required in order to close the gaps. The activity also includes developing indicators for measuring action plans.

Impact Level Benefit: Medium (6)

36. This activity can help to identify gaps in conservation programmes and identify possible solutions as to how these gaps could be rectified. The activity can also assist in improving the effectiveness of implementation across the CMS Family, which would be assessed at set periods of time as identified by the COP.

Impact Level Cost: Medium (7)

37. The main financial cost is that of the full-time Implementation and Monitoring Officer.

Overall Activity Impact: Low [6]-[7] = -(1)

38. The positive impact of this activity could be higher if only a proportion of the cost for the Implementation and Monitoring Officer's time was attributed to the activity. In order for the activity to be considered on its own merits and in order to capture all the benefits this option could offer, the full cost for the Implementation and Monitoring Officer has been included within the impact assessment.

39. The activity may also help make the Convention more effective and therefore it may be more attractive to new Parties or Signatories.

**7. Merger of existing CMS Family agreements (MoUs) with similar species (growth).**

40. This would involve two or more agreements losing their individual identity and merging into one new agreement based on commonality of species coverage.

Impact Level Benefit: High (9)

41. This activity could assist in the development of common conservation programmes between the merged agreements. The merger could lead to consolidating funds and resources, which may focus efforts towards improved implementation of projects.

Impact Level Cost: High (11)

42. The negative impacts of this activity are high as it would require a complete renegotiation of the merged agreements, and there would also be a high risk that some of the Parties/Signatories would not wish to belong to a merged agreement. The negative impact would be lower if there was only one agreement to renegotiate and the merger occurred at the negotiation stage of a new agreement.

Overall Activity Impact: Low [9]-[11] = (-)2

43. The negative impact of this activity is the large costs of renegotiation of the agreements, which could also put the agreement at risk and delay the work of the agreement during the renegotiation process.

44. The full impact of this activity would need to be considered in terms of any long term savings gained from operating only one agreement rather than multiple agreements.

**8. Merge CMS Family agreements with synergies based on geography and/or ecology (growth).**

45. This would involve two or more agreements losing their individual identity and merging into one new agreement based on geographical commonality.

Impact Level Benefit: High (10)

46. This activity could allow for benefit sharing between the agreements with one agreement benefiting from the best practices of another. It could provide for access to wider expertise and could result in more effective coordination of regional capacity with regards to management of resources.

Impact Level Cost: High (11)

47. The negative impact of this activity is the required renegotiation of the agreements, which could put the agreement at risk and delay the work of the agreement during the renegotiation process. The negative impact would be lower if there was only one agreement to renegotiate and the merger occurred at the negotiation stage of a new agreement.

Overall Activity Impact: Low [10]-[11] = (-)1

48. The negative impact of this activity is the required renegotiation of the any of the agreements, which could put the agreement at risk and delay the work of the agreement during the renegotiation process.

49. Another consideration could be that during the negotiation phase there could be competing and conflicting priorities between the Parties/Signatories and the priorities of some Parties may be favored at the expense of the others.

50. The full impact of this activity would need to be considered in terms of any long term savings gained from operating only one agreement rather than multiple agreements.

**9. Extending the scope of existing Agreements/MoUs rather than developing new Agreements/MoUs (growth).**

51. This would involve an assessment of whether a new agreement was necessary by considering whether its remit could be included into an existing agreement.

Impact Level Benefit: High (10)

52. This activity could provide a focus on the common threats shared across conservation programmes and could help to identify relevant responses by ensuring that best practice methods are applied. As many species face a number of the same impacts and threats on their populations, habitats and ecosystems more broadly, extending remits could develop synergies that could maximize the conservation outcomes for target species and their habitats.

Impact Level Cost: High (11)

53. The extension may dilute the focus and ability to target measures when compared with numerous agreements created to deal with specific geographical or species related issues. In addition, there may be an imbalance in the attention given to one species/conservation objective at the expense of another.

Overall Activity Impact: Low [10]-[11] = (-)1

54. The negative impact of this activity is the high cost due to the initial investment required to arrange any meeting to negotiate the extended remit of the agreement.
55. The full impact of this activity would need to be considered in terms of any long term savings gained from operating only one agreement rather than multiple agreements.

**10. CMS Secretariat to co-ordinate communication across and within Agreements/MoU, this to include all media and press correspondence (communication).**

56. CMS' Secretariat would be responsible for coordinating all campaigns and public events, as well as the coordination of CMS Family websites and where practicable provide centralized awareness raising on common/shared threats through publications and online resources.
57. This activity to include centralization of all press and media contacts, the development of a strategy for both internal and external communication. To produce publications on common threats, with all publications available to the CMS Family through dedicated website.

Impact Level Benefit: High (10)

58. This activity can lead to increased internal economies of scale through reduction in duplication of activities and resources by developing mechanisms to improve coordination among existing initiatives in order to most efficiently and effectively utilize available resources. It can assist in developing synergies with external partners through improved marketing of the CMS and its work activities.

Impact Level Cost: Medium (8)

59. This would involve the recruitment of a dedicated Communications Officer and the establishment of a communications unit.

Overall Activity Impact: Low [10]-[8] = (+)2

60. Whilst this is a fairly low positive impact, the medium to long term impact could be higher if the increased publicity and marketing of the CMS and the CMS Family led to increased Parties and Signatories and led to increased external partnerships. The cost should also be set off against the efficiency savings in time and finances over the long term achieved from increased economies of scale.

**Impact of Option 1 - Concentration**

61. The overall impact of this option is 5, a **low positive impact** (see Annex VI for full activity and options scoring). Although this option provided high benefits to CMS and its Family, it is also high in costs adding up to **Euros 3m over a 3 year budgetary period**,

broken down into Euros 1.7 m initial or start up costs and over Euros 1.343 as ongoing cost (see Annex V for full costs).

62. Examples of these costs include acquiring mapping and other information management software, the creation of various new full time positions, delegate travel to meetings and costs of reorganizing departments within CMS. However, initial costs for this Option 1 should be assessed against efficiency staffing relating to staff time, operational efficiency and savings from reduced duplication of activities over the medium to long term.
63. However, initial costs for this Option 1 should be assessed against efficiency staffing relating to staff time, operational efficiency and savings from reduced duplication of activities over the medium to long term.

## **OPTION 2- DECENTRALIZATION**

64. The objective of Option 2 is to encourage a greater regional presence of the CMS Family in order to improve localization of activities through enhancement of services, personnel and partnership working with regional organizations. Option 2 also addresses whether CMS activities could be devolved within its administrative Regions.
65. In the Phase II Questionnaires, it was noted that a lack of Regional and local offices greatly contributed to the lack of regional synergy, which in turn contributed to the relative inefficiency of the communication and Information Management systems between the Parties/Signatories. This Option therefore seeks, where applicable to resolve any unnecessary overlaps and unutilized economies of scale through improved collaborations and synergies with NGO's, MEAs, academic institutions, the private sector and governments. It therefore, requires the CMS family to engage greater support from conservation NGOs and the business sector in the delivery of activities in the field and thus requires agreements to form new relationships with local level conservation and governance institutions.
66. The activities listed under Option 2 seek to increase awareness of the CMS Family and its agreements at the local level, which may lead to increased ownership of agreements and action plans.

### **Activities**

#### ***1. To work closer with partner organizations (including NGOs) in neighbouring Range States (planning).***

67. The aim of this activity is to assist in the coordination of conservation activities, coordinated work programmes and information sharing with other stakeholder organizations.
68. The activity requires MoU Coordinators to look for opportunities to create potential partnerships with external organisations and possible future stakeholders, through the identification of common projects (e.g. the WOW project) and consolidating relationships by exchanging data and capacity building. Included under this activity is the aim to develop conservation programmes and action plans on how to deal with common threats that cross borders with neighboring states.

Impact Benefit Level: High (11)

69. This activity can assist in translating the international CMS obligations into national and local environmental agendas, which in turn could increase the understanding of the CMS aims and objectives and further conservation. It could also help to raise the profile of CMS environmental issues within the wider sustainability agenda. Further, it may also assist in reducing any overlaps and duplication of effort between agreements and other stakeholder organizations.

Impact Cost Level: Medium (7)

70. This activity may require some financial contribution from CMS to assist conservation programmes and programme officers. In addition, it would require some assistance from the CMS Secretariat but would not involve expanding the existing staff levels.

Overall Activity Impact: Medium [11]-[7] = (+)4

71. Whilst this activity has a medium positive impact, it is not without some negative impacts. The activity relies heavily on the involvement of external partners and NGOs are often not in a position to cover the costs related to activities in support of the implementation of CMS instruments. In the past CMS has assisted with subsidizing partnerships with NGOs in relation to, for example, the coordination of MoU implementation. There may not be equal coverage of available partners for all CMS subsidiary agreements. In addition, CMS should not dilute the focus of its agenda.

***2. Closer collaboration with UNEP regional offices, where appropriate, to assist with capacity building and technological support by CMS and its Family (planning).***

72. This activity includes identifying relevant training needs and technical support required by agreements. The CMS can utilise the current mapping exercise of regional offices conducted by UNEP. The CMS would need to select the offices that could act as a regional capacity building and technical hubs.

Impact Benefit Level: Medium (8)

73. This activity can help to raise the profile of subsidiary instruments within their Range States and could enhance the development of partnerships with other organizations and interested parties. In addition, it may assist in developing economies of scale and resource efficiency between agreements and UNEP regional offices.

Impact Cost Level: Low (4)

74. The negative impacts are relatively low; with low financial cost and minor input from the CMS Secretariat.

Overall Activity Impact: Medium [8]-[4] = (+)4

75. This activity has a medium positive impact with little negative impact. As the mapping exercise has already been undertaken by UNEP, this activity could be achieved in the short term.

**3. Establishment of new Agreements outside of the UNEP family (i.e. ACAP) (operational).**

76. This activity is a decision to be made during the negotiation of an Agreement and to be effective the Agreement would need to have the consensus of a Range State to act as the host. From the Convention level, this could be supported by a policy recommending this status.

Impact Benefit Level: Medium (5)

77. The mere establishment of an Agreement outside of the UNEP family does not automatically lead to improved integration and synergies, therefore this activity scored low in respect of these two criteria. As the Agreement will be based within a host nation, there are improved opportunities to have closer relationships with external stakeholders.

Impact Cost Level: Low (3)

78. This activity is dependent on the consensus of the Parties. It has little impact on the work load of the CMS Secretariat.

Overall Activity Impact: Low [5]-[3] = (+)2

79. The positive impact of this activity is that it could assist in liberating resources, at the CMS Secretariat level, which could be redistributed to other activities. As identified in the Phase I report, the CMS Secretariat has to oversee numerous subsidiary instruments, which put added pressure on to limited existing resources.

**4. MoUs/Agreements collaborating and sharing office/personnel/resources (e.g. as per Abu Dhabi – Dugongs and Birds of Prey) (operational).**

80. This activity is based on the expansion of current practices relating either to the establishment of a new Regional outpost (e.g. Abu Dhabi location in partnership with the Environment Agency of Abu Dhabi) or locating a new agreement within the office of an existing agreement (e.g. IOSEA located within the UNEP regional office in Thailand). These offices do not only provide a local presence for the agreements but also a Regional presence as for IOSEA in Asia and the Pacific Region where CMS' Regional representative sits.

81. The activity would require a positive institutional policy requiring that the coordination unit of a new agreement partners with the coordination unit of an existing agreement located in one of the Regions.

Impact Benefit Level: Medium (8)

82. This activity could assist in achieving resource efficiency between the co-located agreements and provide opportunities for improved integration and to minimize institutional overlap through the cooperation and sharing of resources allowing for mutual assistance and logistical support. In addition, through its regional presence synergies may be developed with regional stakeholders and partners.

Impact Cost Level: Medium (7)

83. The activity would require an initial investment cost if no such regional office base was currently available. It would also require the CMS to actively encourage these

partnerships with no additional staffing resources. If a hosting government altered its position, the agreement may be without a location.

Overall Activity Impact: Low [8]-[7]=(+)1

84. This activity has a low positive impact; it would require the consensus of Signatory Parties. In addition, agreements at a key stage in development may suffer from a loss of focus if involved in synergistic amalgamation with other instruments. There also might be political reluctance among some Range States if regional clusters are located elsewhere.

**5. *Develop regional hubs for MEA implementation to identify synergies and linkages between MEAs and avoid duplication in projects and activities (e.g. SPREP) (measuring).***

85. The purpose of regional hubs like SPREP is to serve as the conduit for concerted environmental action at the regional level. It promotes coordination of conservation activities.

86. This activity would require an initial identification of existing hubs (e.g. Pacific, Caribbean and African). It would also require active participation in the hubs through the provision of information on policy, implementation, conservation projects and funding of such projects at a regional and local level. Where no regional hub exists, CMS is to either support or encourage the establishment of such hubs within UNEP.

Impact Benefit Level: High (9)

87. This activity can help to provide access to joint working programmes and conservation activities. In addition, it can help assist agreements within the same region to share resources and avoid duplication of effort. SPREP for example helped to develop a project to streamline national reporting by Pacific Island Countries to biodiversity-related MEAs. It can also provide links to other NGOs, MEAs and other stakeholders involved with the regional hub.

Impact Cost Level: Medium (5)

88. It may be necessary to provide a level of financial assistance to the hub and this is seen as the main negative impact as it is perceived that there would be little institutional impact.

Overall Activity Impact: Medium [9]-[5]=(+)4

89. This activity could assist in achieving economies of scale at the local/regional level and provide opportunities for improved synergies with other stakeholders. It could, however, also dilute the focus of CMS.

**6. *Establishment of external assessment and monitoring of effectiveness (for example by UNEP-WCMC) (measuring).***

90. This activity would in fact amount to devolving monitoring of effectiveness to an external organization and this would entail the harmonization of data collection, storage, management and analysis.

91. This activity would build upon and complement the existing relationship with UNEP-WCMC in relation to the new format for submitting reports.

Impact Benefit Level: Medium (9)

92. The access to MEA data may assist in a more harmonized approach to conservation programmes by drawing on habitat and ecosystem data as well as species information from other Conventions. It could assist in reducing duplication of reporting and data collection and in addition could provide greater access to other data for example relating to habitat status.

Impact Cost Level: Medium (8)

93. There would be a cost for UNEP-WCMC to undertake the assessment of monitoring effectiveness and in addition this activity would lead to an increase in the CMS workload without any extension to the staffing levels.

Overall Activity Impact: Low [9]-[8]=(+)<sup>1</sup>

94. There could be a risk that the reporting burden could potentially be increased. There is an additional risk that the analysis of the data may be assessed by researchers who are not specialist within the specific species or geography being analyzed.

95. On the positive side, however, the monitoring may potentially be more independent and a more co-ordinated assessment ready for MEA wide co-ordination of reporting.

***7. Regionalize conservation efforts by having local outposts with assistance from UNEP, NGOs and MEAs (growth).***

96. This activity would build up on the recent location mapping exercise undertaken by UNEP. In addition, this activity would include the location mapping of stakeholder NGO offices. The exercise would assist CMS to identify potential synergies based on common or shared work programmes, geographies and interests.

Impact Benefit Level: Medium (8)

97. This could assist in providing access to a wider scope of expertise, including expertise on related issues from external organizations. Regionalization may allow more effective consideration of necessary capacity building activities by providing a better understanding of regional issues. It may also raise the profile of subsidiary instruments within their range states and could enhance the development of partnerships with other organizations and interested parties within the region.

Impact Cost Level: Medium (7)

98. It is estimated that a small financial contribution would be required to assist in fundraising activities and also a contribution to a local technical coordinator. Some assistance would be required by the CMS Secretariat with no additional staffing identified.

Overall Activity Impact: Low [8]-[7] = (+)<sup>1</sup>

99. This positive side of this activity is that it may help to introduce subsidiarity (decisions being taken at a level appropriate to the problems they address).

100. The negative side of this activity is that there may be remoteness from CMS Secretariat in Bonn. In addition, some Regions may not have the same level of available partners either in the form of other MEA outposts or NGO offices. A further

consideration is that there may be potential objections in some countries to the increased role of NGOs within the CMS agenda.

**8. Have a presence in each of the CMS administrative regions with assistance from UNEP, NGOs and MEAs (growth).**

101. This activity would utilise the presence of existing Agreement/MoU in the Regions. A mapping exercise of office and organisational locations in region is necessary, particularly where there is not already a CMS presence and build on existing partnerships (e.g. utilization of the current UNEP mapping exercise of offices).

Impact Benefit Level: Medium (7)

102. This activity could lead to possible joint programmes based on common issues with other interested stakeholder organizations. The activity also may result in small scale integration between regional CMS outposts.

Impact Cost Level: Medium (5)

103. A potential impact would be a possible financial contribution to the CMS focal point in the Region.

Overall Activity Impact: Low [7]-[5] = (+)2

104. The positive side of this activity is that there may be potential access to States not already a Party to CMS but to another MEAs (e.g. CITES) and therefore there may be an opportunity to undertake collaborative actions under CMS that would influence some Parties' actions where they are not a signatory to both conventions.

**9. Work with local and indigenous communities (communication).**

105. This is an already recognised action in the CMS strategic plan, as well as in the strategic plan of some of the other agreements, particularly the value of indigenous and local knowledge as a component for conservation programmes and activities. This activity would require the management of these local relationships and where possible in partnership with organisations already in the field. A key element of this activity would be to collect case studies and share best practice.

Impact Benefit Level: High (9)

106. This activity could lead to the development of local incentives for conservation and ownership at the local level and may improve on the ground conservation. In addition, there may be improved synergistic relationships relating to improved sharing of knowledge. The main positive impact of this activity is the potential for on the ground conservation programmes to be increased and focused to the needs of the locality.

Impact Cost Level: Low (4)

107. The financial and time costs for this activity are estimated to be fairly minor in terms of perhaps a small financial contribution to establish some of the partnerships and a small proportion of the staffing time to help identify these relationships.

Overall Activity Impact: High [9]-[4] = (+)5

108. Whilst this has a high positive impact, the activity is not without negative impacts and needs to be considered in light of these. Whilst there may be limited costs implications to the CMS, there are still likely costs in relation to adaptation and translation of relevant material for local and indigenous communities. There also may be costs for training and increased capacity building within the local organizations. There may be a need to secure support from local government and competitive interests. There also may be some concerns amongst Parties as to the involvement of specific community or NGO groups, which may have a specific agenda different to that of the government or even to CMS.

### **Impact of Option 2 - Decentralization**

109. The overall impact of this option is 24, *a high positive impact*, in fact the highest of all four Options (*see Annex VI* for full options scoring). Estimated implementation costs totaled **Euros 852,000 over a 3 year budgetary period**, broken down into Euros 533,2256 as initial or start up cost and Euros 319,000 as ongoing costs for that period (*see Annex V* for full costs).

110. This Option has a high beneficial impact because there are high beneficial impacts but also fewer financial costs, the activities under this Option being largely based on synergies and integration and thus translating into economies of scale. However, whilst decentralization may result in integration amongst agreements sharing local resources, this Option would not resolve duplication of effort across the CMS and the CMS Family as this option is focused at a lower institutional level. Whilst the regionalization of activities may assist agreements capable of participating at this level it may not assist in resolving the diseconomies of scale to signatory Parties, who are Parties to numerous agreements, this would require a more concentrated approach at the Convention level.

### **OPTION 3- IDEAL**

111. The activities listed under Option 3 seek to address many of the problems highlighted in the Phase 1 Report (2009) by aiming to reduce any diseconomies inherent within the present system and by reducing the duplication of activities and improving resource efficiency.

112. But central to the activities listed under Option 3 is an aim to achieve the ISWGoFS' ideal vision of the CMS in the future, which includes growth and global expansion of the CMS and its Family (activity 8), a more efficient institution (activities 1 and 6), improved conservation status (activities 2 and 5), improved monitoring (activity 4) and higher visibility (activity 10).

### **Activities**

#### ***1. Prioritize and coordinate meetings of COPs, MOPs, MOSs, Scientific Committees and working groups (planning)***

113. This activity seeks to streamline meetings to reduce financial, staff and operational overlap in the arrangement of multiple meetings, which often require extensive travel by some Parties. This activity builds upon current practices within the CMS (e.g. back to back working group meetings with Scientific Council meeting). This activity would require an alteration to the meeting schedule provided by the text of the agreements.

**Impact Benefit Level: Medium (8)**

114. Shared meetings can help to facilitate dialogue among agreements and facilitate harmonization of activities and action plans. Shared or back-to-back meetings can assist in achieving economies of scale and reducing duplication of staff effort and time. Financial savings could be redirected resources to implementation measures.

Impact Cost Level: High (11)

115. The high negative impact is attributed to necessary financial cost for altering the text of the agreements to reflect the change of meeting schedules. These costs would be attributed to delegate travel. There would also be an impact on the CMS Secretariat workload during this period.

Overall Activity Impact: Medium [8]-[11] = (-)3

116. This records a medium negative score, which indicates that this would have a negative impact on the CMS and the CMS Family. The reason for this negative impact however is due to the initial cost to coordinate the meetings to begin to realign their schedules. This must be considered in light of the potential positive medium to long term savings from coordinated meetings. The savings over the medium to long term could include for example the reduced cost of travel for staff, for interpreters, and also the travel costs for both sponsored delegates and self-funded Parties to more than one treaty. In addition, there may be additional savings in relation to staff time, which may assist in reducing the duplication of staff time to arrange a multitude of different meetings. There may also be additional savings relating to block bookings of hotels and conference facilities.

***2. Coordinate with international organizations common meetings relating to shared issues (e.g. IUCN) and common research conservation programmes, species action plans and capacity building activities for on the ground conservation (planning).***

117. This activity would require relevant international institutions to be identified, as well as any common and shared issues/conservation programmes. Strategic plans would have to be aligned where commonality of conservation efforts exists. It would be necessary to monitor and measure effectiveness of these common conservation activities.

Impact Benefit Level: High (10)

118. This activity can help to raise awareness of the status and role of migratory species in biodiversity conservation debates and may increase the potential for wider understanding of other issues for example habitat impacts. This activity can assist in the development of a synergistic relationship to aid knowledge sharing.

Impact Cost Level: High (9)

119. The cost of this activity is high and could be lower because it includes the full cost of a full-time International Liaison Coordination Officer.

Overall Activity Impact: Low [10]-[9] = (+)1

120. The positive impact of this activity could be higher if only a proportion of the cost for the International Liaison and Coordination Officer's time was attributed to the activity. However, having such a dedicated Officer would assist in developing the profile of the CMS and CMS Family, allow for improved knowledge exchange and networking.

121. This activity can assist to raise the profile of CMS/environmental issues in the sustainability arena. It may also assist in delivering improved conservation status.

**3. Increase agreement Staff (operational).**

122. To effectively increase the economies of scale of this option, a number of staff for a number of agreements has been identified for recruitment. These are: 2 x full-time assistants for the Gorilla Agreement; 1 x full-time assistant for ASCOBANS; 1 x full-time and 1 x part-time assistant for EUROBATS; and 13 x full-time for coordinators for MoUs without any present coordinator.

Impact Benefit Level: High (10)

123. One of the positive benefits of this activity is that new recruits can concentrate on integrating resources across the CMS and the CMS Family, helping to improve internal economies of scale through reduction in duplication of activities and resources by developing mechanisms to improve coordination among existing initiatives in order to more efficiently and effectively utilize available resources.

124. As this activity includes new staffing for the MoUs and Agreements currently understaffed, this would liberate those staff, who currently need to commit time to these subsidiary instruments.

Impact Cost Level: Medium (8)

125. The main impact is the cost of the recruitment and salary (for a 3 year period) of 17 full-time and 1 part-time new recruits for the identified Agreements and MoUs.

Overall Activity Impact: Low [10]-[8] = (+)2

126. The benefit of the activity outweighs the costs of the activity with low positive impacts in the short term to the CMS and the CMS family.

127. On the negative side, this will require additional contributions from Parties.

**4. Development of a MoU Unit to coordinate MoU activities (operational).**

128. This activity would involve the development of a specialist unit within the CMS to oversee the development and coordination of MoUs.

Impact Benefit Level: High (12)

129. This activity can provide better understanding of whether different MoUs address similar issues, it can help to improve utilization of available resources, avoid duplication of effort and promote consistency. The Unit can assist in identifying gaps in implementation and also may identify best practice. It will also provide resources to understaffed MoUs.

Impact Cost Level: High (11)

130. The high cost impact is attributed to the cost of employing two dedicated full-time members of staff and that this would result in changes to the institutional infrastructure of the CMS.

Overall Activity Impact: Low [12]-[11] = (+)1

131. This impact records a low positive impact, which could be higher if viewed over the medium to long term and the potential resource efficiencies that may be achieved over an extended time period, as well as the improvement in implementation and the reduction in the duplication of activities.

132. One of the positive impacts is that it can assist in delivering economies of scale through shared resources across MoUs. The role of Unit could assist in identifying inactive MoUs and providing support and solutions to assist MoU implementation.

***5. Create a migratory species scientific data hub, which would facilitate the use of migratory species data as an indicator of climate change (operational).***

133. This activity may not require the development of a new scientific data hub but could involve the development and utilization of existing data hubs for example the Critical Site Network Tool developed in the framework of the Wings over Wetlands (WOW) UNEP-GEF African-Eurasian Flyways Project.

134. The purpose of the hub would be to coordinate existing data, identify data gaps, provides population data and location maps. Central to the development of the hub would be the necessity to ensure the compatibility of data.

Impact Benefit Level: High (10)

135. This activity can help to reduce overlaps and duplication in different agreements developing separate scientific data systems. The hub can assist in identifying gaps in data across the CMS Family and provides for easy exchange of data and encourages integration. This can assist in improving the analysis and comparison of data.

Impact Cost Level: High (11)

136. The high cost impact is due to the financial cost of developing a new scientific data hub. This cost could be reduced if existing systems were utilized. The cost also includes the recruitment of a specialist data hub officer. From an institutional perspective, whilst the impact is high at the inception of the hub it would lessen over the medium term due to the recruitment of the dedicated staff member.

Overall Activity Impact: Low [10]-[11] = (-)1

137. Whilst this activity has a low negative impact, the high initial investment cost of developing the hub should be assessed in terms of the medium to long term financials savings gained from harmonized scientific data collection and the impact this improved data system may have for on the ground conservation. In addition, the data sets can provide valuable population data to other International Conventions providing for example indicators on the status of climate change and biodiversity.

***6. Information Management and reporting systems which are fully integrated across the CMS Family (operational).***

138. This activity involves the harmonisation of national reports and harmonisation of reporting processes allowing collection of data at source. It draws on the harmonisation of national report work currently being undertaken by the CMS.

Impact Benefit Level: High (10)

139. This positive benefit of this activity is the potential to reduce the duplication of reporting and the amount of time spent reporting under numerous different systems. This in turn can help to improve the analysis and comparison of data allowing for better analysis of gaps and inconsistencies.

140. Substantial financial efficiencies can be achieved when information systems are developed and managed in concert than independently, this can include shared servers, platforms, licences and development costs.

Impact Cost Level: High (11)

141. The high negative impact is due to the very high cost attributed to software costs and for the introduction of information management systems and training workshops. The cost of this option is high as it includes the full cost of 2 full-time staff. If employed, the cost can be spread across a number of activities, resulting in a reduced financial impact for this particular activity.

Overall Activity Impact: Low [10]-[11] = (-)1

142. The low negative impact is influenced by the initial cost of developing an appropriate information management system, which over time should be set against any financial savings across the CMS from reduced costs from shared, maintenance of multiple platforms, reduced costs of updating technology through time and volume-savings with service providers.

143. On the negative side, there are inequalities in the level of IT and technical capacity across different Parties. Due to asymmetrical IT infrastructure a level playing ground may be difficult to achieve and may require further investment thus making the final negative impact higher.

***7. Suspension of redundant MoUs with monitoring to be carried out by MoU Unit and coordinated by CMS (measuring).***

144. This activity is linked to the development of the MoU Unit (activity 4 under Option 3) and would fall under the remit of the MoU Unit team. The purpose of the activity would be to establish a set of criteria for monitoring the implementation of MoUs, which would be approved by the COP. The criteria would help to identify implementation gaps and the causes of behind these gaps and what strategies could resolve these problems. This could allow for sharing best practice amongst MoUs about successful implementation activities. Suspension would be a decision for the Signatories.

Impact Benefit Level: Low (5)

145. This activity did score quite low against the positive criteria; however it could lead to improved implementation of activities, where the MoU unit was able to identify good practice, which could be shared across MoUs.

Impact Cost Level: Medium (7)

146. This activity would require an alteration to the text of the Convention. The only financial cost associated with this activity would be to contract a consultant to develop the relevant criteria.

Overall Activity Impact: Low [5]-[7] = (-)2

147. This activity has a low negative impact. This activity can work in conjunction with the development of an MoU Unit and because of this the impact on the CMS Secretariat is low as the new MoU Unit recruits would assist with the operation of this activity.

148. On the positive side this activity could assist in the prioritization of resources and help in the identification of lessons learnt for future agreements.

149. On the negative side, it may take some considerable time to develop the relevant criteria for determining whether or not a MoU is redundant.

**8. Encourage all range states to become Parties/Signatories to CMS and CMS Family (growth).**

150. This activity would involve a proactive lobbying of Range States not already a Party to the Convention.

Impact Benefit Level: Medium (7)

151. This activity can assist the CMS to improve its' global reach, which would ensure that States across all of migratory routes are Parties to the Convention. This in turn can help to improve conservation programmes across the complete migratory route.

Impact Cost Level: Medium (6)

152. The cost of this activity includes 25% of the Communication Officer's time as well as the cost of promotional activities to raise the profile of the CMS and assist the Communication Officer to lobby potential new Parties or Signatories. It is anticipated that this activity would have minor impact on the CMS workload because of the new dedicated Communications Officer

Overall Activity Impact: Low [7]-[6] = (+)1

153. The positive aspect of this activity is that it aims to expand the current Party coverage of the CMS by aiming to achieve global coverage. Increased Party numbers can assist in providing additional funding, which can help to fund actions identified under the CMS Strategy.

154. On the negative side, this may involve a longer negotiation period for resolutions and agreements.

**9. The development of new multimedia platforms for example video conferencing to enhance communications across CMS Family and with external organizations (communication).**

155. This activity seeks to improve internal communication across the CMS and the CMS Family by the introduction of multimedia systems, for example video conferencing to allow members of working groups, Advisory Committees and Scientific Bodies to communicate with greater ease and frequency.

Impact Benefit Level: High (9)

156. This activity can lead to improved internal communications as well as contributing to the reduction of costs for travel to multiple meetings. Improved communication can also assist in increased knowledge sharing and know-how, which assists conservation efforts.

Impact Cost Level: Medium (4)

157. The activity records relatively low financial costs to the CMS as it is envisioned that a consultant could be contracted to develop the new multimedia system and provide training to the relevant personnel and Parties/Signatories.

Overall Activity Impact: High [9]-[4] = (+)5

158. This activity results in a high positive impact to the CMS assisting to develop improved internal communication and potentially reduce the amount of travel for some delegates to multiple meetings. On the negative side not all Parties will have access to multimedia systems or appropriate IT systems.

***10. Run awareness campaigns to ensure that CMS is recognized by the public, academic institutions, international organizations and others as the global leader in the protection of migratory species (communication).***

159. The aim of this activity is to increase the external communication strategy of the CMS. It includes a redesign of the existing website to engage with external stakeholders and to target information to specific target groups. Other activities would include the promotion of best practice, increased promotional activities relating to capacity building publications and increased focussed species campaigns.

Impact Benefit Level: High (9)

160. The advantage of this activity is that it can increase awareness of CMS beyond that of directly interested parties. The activity can also raise awareness of conservation programmes and activities undertaken by the CMS Family, which in turn could lead to new partners and resources to assist in conservation efforts.

Impact Cost Level: Medium (5)

161. The financial cost of this option is represented by 75% of the Communication Officer's time. It is envisioned that this activity would not impact negatively on the CMS workload as it would be undertaken by this new member of staff.

Overall Activity Impact: Medium [9]-[5] = (+)4

162. A positive aspect of this activity is the increased awareness of the CMS, which could in turn increase potential funding sources for the Convention and its agreements.

163. One of the negative impacts of this activity is the initial cost of developing publicity and marketing materials.

**Impact of Option 3 - Ideal**

164. The overall impact of this option is 7, ***a low positive impact*** (see Annex VI for full options scoring). The total estimated cost of implementing Option 3 is ***Euros 8.8m over a 3 year budgetary period***, broken down into almost Euros 2.418m as initial or start up costs and Euros 6.406m as long term costs for that period. Costs include amongst other things twenty five new full time staff, information, data and IT tools, publicity campaigns and workshops. This is an expensive Option, which is why although it has a very high positive impact on CMS and its Family it has an overall low-medium positive impact.

165. However, it is important to note that the new staff and tools would achieve improved economies of scale in the medium to long term (in relation to financial savings from shared resources), human resources (not having to spend too much time duplicating effort) and operational efficiencies.

#### **OPTION 4 - LOW COST**

166. The activities listed under Option 4 aim to achieve greater cooperation at local level between existing agreements through working together on common/shared issues with limited cost to the CMS and its Family. This Option aims to build upon the current practices of the CMS and to identify potential activities that can enhance the current activities at no or little additional cost.

167. Some of the activities identified include: working on multi species projects (species group) at the project and agreement level to improve on the ground conservation status; accessing manpower resources from external organizations; and continuing to support and develop current scientific data hubs (e.g. Tematea).

#### **Activities**

##### ***1. Create criteria against which to assess proposed new potential agreements (planning).***

168. The purpose of this activity is to enhance the development of new agreements to ensure that they have the relevant institutional infrastructure in place and thereby reducing any future impact on the CMS.

169. The proposed criteria should include: scientific need; existing and potential synergies (internally and externally) funding criteria; existence of a volunteer coordinator and the added value of CMS involvement. An example of added value includes the consideration of whether the new agreement will encourage participation and extend Parties, including considering whether the proposed agreement is better served by another MEA or other initiatives.

#### **Impact Benefit Level: Medium (8)**

170. The positive impact of this activity can assist in delivering a coordinated approach to agreement development ensuring that an agreement has the necessary resources and staffing required before it comes into force, which in turn can help to reduce the current drain on the CMS Secretariat's resources. The activity may also assist focusing resources where they are most needed.

#### **Impact Cost Level: Medium (7)**

171. The negative impacts are in general quite low, this activity would require a new mandate and in the short term there would be the cost of contracting a consultant to develop the criteria. It would however, in the short term put added manpower pressure onto the CMS Secretariat.

**Overall Activity Impact: Low [8]-[7] = (+)1**

172. One of the positive aspects of this activity is that the more efficient development process could make new agreements more attractive to States not already a signatory, which may lead to increased funding over the long term. This in turn could increase the influence of CMS amongst other MEAs.

173. A negative aspect of this activity is that the criteria could lead to potential disagreements, particularly in relation to the criteria for setting priorities as well as who determines such criteria and priorities. Some unattractive activities might be unnecessarily prejudiced and not all urgent activities might be prioritized and this could have an impact on how the Convention is perceived.

**2. Parties/Signatories to translate guidance documents into local languages to assist implementation (operational).**

174. The aim of this activity would be to devolve translation of guidance documents to the Parties and Signatories to the CMS Family. The purpose of the activity would be to help improve capacity building at the local level, which in turn could assist local know how and increase conservation activities.

Impact Benefit Level: High (9)

175. The high benefit of this activity is that it can help in assisting in increasing implementation, increased ownership amongst Parties and Signatories, raise awareness and capacity building.

Impact Cost Level: Low (3)

176. There is no immediate direct impact on the budget of the CMS, however many Parties and/or Signatories may not have the relevant funds to undertake the translation, as such the low negative score reflects only the lack of financial impact on the CMS.

Overall Activity Impact: High [9]-[3] = (+)6

177. Whilst this activity has a high positive impact, there are still other potential negatives to be considered. On the negative side if all Parties are required to translate documents, many of the developing countries would require financial support. If there is insufficient financial support available for developing countries there may be a disparity between Parties and Signatories.

**3. Assess sources for improving current staffing compliment (e.g. UNEP, CMS Family's own staff, Parties, secondments, interns and consultants) including international staff exchange and traineeship (operational).**

178. This activity seeks to expand upon current practices and develop new sources of increasing staffing resources at a low cost. This could include identifying secondment opportunities for partner organizations (e.g. BLI), Parties/Range States and academic institutions. In addition, the CMS could lead on developing with other MEAs a 1 year traineeship programme open to all practitioners and students.

Impact Benefit Level: Medium (8)

179. The positive impact of this activity is that it can offer the opportunity to develop synergies with other organizations and can lead to knowledge exchange between these

organizations resulting in increased know-how and capacity building. The activity can liberate existing staff time to concentrate on other activities.

Impact Cost Level: Medium (6)

180. There is little direct cost to the CMS, however, if one of the sources of increases staffing was from consultants, this would increase the financial impact of this activity. There could also be an increase work load on existing staff responsible for the induction, training and supervision of interns and secondees.

Overall Activity Impact: Low [8]-[6] = (+)2

181. One of the positive aspects of this activity is that it could provide a potential source of new staffing at no additional cost and increase the profile of CMS and its Family. It could also provide a potential source of additional expertise not currently available.

182. A negative aspect of this activity is that the increased access to interns and secondees does not provide continuity of staffing.

**4. Develop a policy where implementation monitoring must be a part of any future MoUs (measuring).**

183. This is a low cost option to the development of a MoU Unit. The activity requires the development and/or utilization of indicators to monitor the effectiveness of agreements. The implementation and effectiveness of MoUs would be reviewed at COP level. Criteria would need to be developed to assist the monitoring the implementation of MoUs. The criteria would need to be able to identify any implementation gaps, the reasons for these gaps and how they could be resolved. A side effect of the process would be the identification of effective MoU strategies, which could be shared with other underperforming MoU agreements.

Impact Benefit Level: Medium (6)

184. A positive aspect of this activity is that implementation is assessed at the highest decision making level (COP). The act of monitoring implementation could elevate the profile of agreement implementation across Signatories, which in turn could result in improved implementation activity amongst signatories. Monitoring could lead to the identification of best practice, which could be shared across the CMS Family.

Impact Cost Level: Medium (5)

185. This activity has in reality a low cost impact, the impact is influenced by the initial cost of contracting a consultant to create the criteria, subsequently over the long term this would cease. The CMS Secretariat however, would be required to assist in the monitoring process with no additional staffing and the activity could also lead to an increased reporting burden on the Parties/Signatories.

Overall Activity Impact: Low [6]-[5] = (+)1

186. Whilst this activity has a low positive impact, on the positive side, this activity could assist in identifying inactive MoUs. It also allows for the assessment of agreements at the correct decision making level (COP).

187. On the negative side however, the causality of impact may be difficult to measure.

**5. Encourage more NGOs to become Signatories to MoUs and encourage more Range States to become Parties/Signatories to CMS and CMS Family (growth) .**

188. The purpose of this activity is to increase the potential resources for CMS and the CMS Family. Increased NGO involvement can provide a valuable source for providing coordinators for MoUs and also for providing technical advice. Increased number of Range States who become Parties/Signatories can provide additional funding and may also provide opportunities for future MoU hosts.
189. The activity requires the lobbying of potential Parties/Signatories and the development of guidelines for operating with external organisations.

Impact Benefit Level: High (9)

190. Increased NGO involvement in MoUs may provide a potential access to data held by NGOs, allowing for more informed decision making relating to conservation programmes and also possible access to new partners for implementing agreements on the ground.
191. The activity can also assist in raising the profile of subsidiary instruments within their Range States and could enhance the development of partnerships with other organizations and interested parties.

Impact Cost Level: Medium (6)

192. The main negative impacts are the cost of developing a publicity campaign to assist in lobbying new potential Parties and Signatories and also the manpower time of the CMS staff, without any additional staffing.

Overall Activity Impact: Medium [9]-[6] = (+)3

193. Although this activity does have a positive impact, there are some negative aspects to this activity. It may be necessary to make sure that NGOs are adhering to the fundamental principle of CMS. In addition, there may be potential objections in some countries to the increased role of NGOs. In addition, there may be an imbalance in Party States as there may be a lack of sufficient expertise across different States, resulting in disparity between States.

**6. Agreements and MoUs focused only on migratory species (growth).**

194. The purpose of this activity is to focus the development of Agreements and MoUs solely on migratory reducing the number of agreements which have a trans-boundary focus, thereby reducing the burden on the CMS Secretariat and on the resources of the CMS.

Impact Benefit Level: Medium (6)

195. This activity can lead to increased focus on the conservation requirements of migratory species as well as direct the resources of the CMS on a reduced remit.

Impact Cost Level: Medium (6)

196. Any decisions about the future scope of new agreements could be decided at a scheduled COP and therefore need not incur any financial costs.

Overall Activity Impact: Neutral [6]-[6] = (0)

197. This activity would apply only to new agreements and not existing agreements.

**7. Support current scientific data hub currently under development (IPBES) and continue to support the development of existing implementation hubs (Tematea, UNEP-WCMC, and IOSEA) (communication).**

198. This is a low cost alternative to the development of a new scientific data hub within the CMS Family. It involves the CMS continuing to support the development of IPBES and of existing implementation hubs operated by IOSEA, UNEP-WCMC and Tematea.

Impact Benefit Level: Medium (8)

199. The positive impact of this activity is that it can help increase the sharing of knowledge both within the CMS Family and with other MEAs. This could lead to improving the quality of data and information. At the International level, this could assist in improved awareness raising within governments about best practice across International Conventions and the challenges they face.

Impact Cost Level: Medium (7)

200. The negative impacts may arise from any costs that may be due from participating in existing systems and would require manpower time from the CMS Secretariat without any additional staffing.

Overall Activity Impact: Low [8]-[7] = (+)1

201. This activity recorded a low positive impact however one negative aspect of this activity is that it may result in distance and detachment from on the ground activities. In fact it may be more apt to concentrate on those data systems being developed by CMS subsidiary instruments.

**8. Produce CMS website in 3 languages (communication).**

202. The aim of this activity is to provide the website in the three major languages of the CMS, in order that the website is accessible for an increased number of Parties, thereby reducing any potential exclusion of Parties and increasing ownership. This activity deals only with the translation of web pages, for example news & Events, species activities, bodies and meetings, Secretariat, about CMS pages and search engine function. This does not the documents included in the website.

Impact Benefit Level: Medium (7)

203. Producing the website in English, French and Spanish could assist in capacity building and developing local knowledge and therefore potential conservation improvements on the ground.

204. The main benefit of this activity is to improve communication within the CMS Family but also to raise the profile of the CMS within other countries by making the website more accessible.

Impact Cost Level: Medium (7)

205. The main cost is for the translation of the website, however the website is not a very large site and the translation would be limited to web pages and not to all of the documents attached to the pages.

Overall Activity Impact: Neutral [7]-[7] = (0)

206. The impact of this activity has been scored as neutral, primarily because of the cost of the initial translation, although subsequent updates would also require to be translated. The financial cost would need to be supported by additional funding to the CMS.

#### **Impact of Option 4 - Low Cost**

207. The overall impact of this option is *14, a medium positive overall impact*. The cost of implementation is low coming in at **Euros 419,200**, broken down into Euros 247,000 initial or start up costs and Euros 172,000 ongoing costs over that period.

208. However, this medium positive impact may not deliver consistent economies of scale across the whole of the CMS and its Family or resolve resource inefficiencies as many of the individual activities did not score highly in relation to integration. This Option may also not assist in resolving the diseconomies of scale to signatory Parties, who are Parties to numerous agreements. Some of the activities do not provide permanent solutions to resource problems such as reliance on secondees and interns.