

## **CHAIR'S REPORT ON THE OUTCOMES OF THE CONTACT GROUP ON CONSERVATION STATUS REPORT**

### **Members of the Working Group**

To be completed

**Chaired by:** Colin Galbraith, COP-appointed Councillor for Climate Change

The Contact Group had been established by the plenary of ScC-SC5 with the main purpose of reviewing and amending as appropriate the 3 annexes to pre-session document UNEP/CMS/ScC-SC5/doc.5. The CG completed its review during the meeting held on Friday 2 July from 11:30 – 13:00.

### **GENERAL POINTS, CROSS-CUTTING ACROSS THE THREE ANNEXES**

Overarching themes from the Contact Group discussion that are cross-cutting across the three Annexes are provided below, followed by specific points raised in relation to each Annex.

- Considerations around **population-level** information versus **species-level** information were raised. For instance, with species such as Orca there are some populations in decline, but the conservation status for the species overall is favourable. It was noted by the Secretariat that Annex 2 (Case studies) provided scope for more in-depth assessments (particularly for species with population-level listings), whereas the Conservation Status report (Annex 1) and the rapid assessment of Appendix I species (Annex 3) would be more high level. The Chair noted that as populations become more fragmented (e.g. due to climate change), this may become an issue that needs more consideration in future by the Scientific Council.
- **Range State list:** Wherever the range State list is referenced (e.g. Annex 2 case study map, meta-data for Annex 3 rapid assessment, etc.), it will be important to take into consideration wider work being carried out on this topic to ensure the most up-to-date range State list is used. The Secretariat can advise.
- **Datasets:** For final outputs, it will be important to explain datasets and any caveats clearly, including in relation to data comparability of global and national datasets (e.g. differences between IUCN Red List and National Red List assessments) and any data limitations (e.g. in relation to taxonomic coverage or other data gaps).

### **ANNEX 1: STATE OF MIGRATORY SPECIES REPORT: A PROPOSED FRAMEWORK**

The Contact Group welcomed the proposed framework for the Conservation Status report, noting that the State/Pressure/Response was a logical and useful approach to fulfill the mandate.

Detailed comments were made in relation to each of the sections, which have been documented for reference and future consideration. Suggestions were made in relation to additional datasets that could potentially supplement proposed datasets for specific taxonomic groups (e.g., for sharks and ungulates).

As part of the habitat analysis, it was noted that there may be scope to bring in other area-based datasets (beyond KBAs) into the analysis of Protected Area coverage. The document text has been updated to take this into account.

In the context of the “Response” section, the inclusion of an Annex of potential candidate species (e.g. migratory species that are not CMS-listed, but that could potentially qualify for listing) was suggested. If possible to produce and include, this could form part of the regular review of conservation status and support a more strategic outlook of where the Convention can best focus its efforts.

## **ANNEX 2: CMS APPENDIX I SPECIES IN-DEPTH ASSESSMENT: PROPOSED CASE STUDY TEMPLATE**

The Contact Group noted that overall they found the proposed case study template presented in Annex 2 to be fit for purpose for providing more in-depth assessments of Appendix I species. There was also agreement that it could be adapted for case studies pertaining to Appendix II species. In some cases, wider datasets (beyond IUCN Red List) will need to be considered when drafting the case studies, but the template accommodates this and includes areas where this could be incorporated (e.g. within the conservation and threats sections).

The Contact Group noted that it will be important that the case studies capture positives, as well as pointing out areas of species population decline and risk of extinction. While the template is neutral, it does provide this flexibility to include aspects of improvement (e.g. if Status is improving or if populations trend is promising). Section 3 on protection and management also provides opportunities to showcase CMS and other international actions that are working.

## **ANNEX 3: PROPOSED DRAFT METHODOLOGY FOR A RAPID ASSESSMENT OF CMS APPENDIX I TAXA**

Overall, the proposed methodology for the rapid assessment of Appendix I species was well-received by the Contact Group.

The Contact Group recommended that the following additional aspects be considered as the Appendix I rapid assessment moves forward:

- Consideration of **wider threats**: It was highlighted that in many cases, the primary threats to species are not overexploitation and trade, but relate to other threats such as habitat loss/degradation or climate change. This output provides a first step to assess use/trade impacts, but it is important for the Scientific Council to be clear to CMS Parties that this is only part of the picture. In the final output, it will be important to make this clear that the rapid assessment does not cover all threats and that there are more aspects to consider. The proposed rapid assessment provides a flexible framework that could be expanded in future to include a wider array of priority threats.
- As the rapid assessment methodologies progress and the **datasets** are compiled, it will be important to review and clarify not only the caveats of the datasets, but also the independence of the data between criteria so this is clear in the final output.
- The extension of the Excel output to include **hyperlinks for key CMS documents** (e.g. CMS listing proposals and Concerted Actions for species, where available) as metadata was highlighted as something that would add value to the output for both the CMS Scientific Council and for Parties.
- For criterion 4 on “**Management effort**”, it was noted that it would be useful to consider additional sources of management effort information (beyond CMS, CITES, IUCN data) if datasets are readily available and suitable across taxonomic groups.