

**DRAFT REPORT OF THE 13TH MEETING
OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION
OF MIGRATORY SPECIES OF WILD ANIMALS**

Day 3 – Wednesday 19 February 2020

Note: This draft report follows the sequence in which items were discussed. The final report to be published in the Proceedings of COP13 will be restructured to follow Agenda items in numerical order. Paragraph numbering continues from the Draft Report of Day 2.

Committee of the Whole 09.45–12.35

SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL (ITEM 15 – CONTINUED)

(a) COP-Appointed Councillor Subject Areas – Analysis, Review and Recommendations (Item 15.1)

201. The Chair invited Australia to report on the work of the Friends of the Chair group that had been established on 18 February to progress this agenda item
202. Australia advised that there had been very productive discussions. The review process had been agreed, noting that the process was flexible. The composition of the recommended subject areas had also been agreed, subject to amending the 'Marine Fish' subject area to 'Fish, including expertise on harvesting'. Some Parties had requested extra time to submit nominations of potential COP-appointed Councillors and the deadline for this had been set at 18.00 on 19 February. Nominations needed to provide all the information required, as set out in CMS Notification 2019/22. The Secretariat would provide a comparative assessment if more than one nomination was received for a given subject area. Suggestions for potential new subject areas that had been made during the COW's deliberations on 18 February would be taken into account during the ongoing review process.
203. There being no further comments or objections from the floor, and at the invitation of the Chair, the COW agreed to the way forward as set out by Australia. The Chair thanked Australia and all those who had participated in the Friends of the Chair group.

REPORTS FROM SESSIONAL COMMITTEES (ITEM 30)

204. The Chairs or delegated representatives of the four COW Working Groups (Budget, Avian Species, Terrestrial Species, and Aquatic Species) provided brief progress reports on the status of the deliberations of each group.

CONSERVATION ISSUES (ITEM 26 – CONTINUED)

(b) Terrestrial Species (Item 26.3)

(i) Joint CITES-CMS-African Carnivores Initiative (Item 26.3.1)

205. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.3.1/Rev.1, including the draft resolution contained in Annex 1 and the draft decisions contained in Annex 2. Comments and proposals from the Scientific Council were provided in document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.3.1/Add.1. The Secretariat further noted that, in the interests of consistency, the COP was recommended to delete decisions 12.55 to 12.70. This recommendation had inadvertently been omitted from the document.

206. The European Union and its Member States, the Secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), Born Free Foundation and Cheetah Conservation Fund made statements supportive of the document, including the draft resolution and draft decisions it contained.
207. Nigeria and Senegal referred to the Seville workshop mentioned in paragraph 31 of COP13/Doc.26.3.1/Rev.1, and raised concerns about representativeness of participation and lack of consensus on the outcomes of the meeting.
208. The Chair noted that the relevant paragraph comprised part of the background document and was not included in the draft resolution or draft decisions. The concerns of Nigeria and Senegal would be reflected in the meeting report.
209. Born Free Foundation welcomed the document but concurred with the concerns expressed by Nigeria and Senegal.
210. Conservation Force welcomed the document and its annexes, but suggested that the African Carnivores Initiative (ACI) should be opened up to all interested stakeholders and experts. With regard to the concerns of Nigeria and Senegal, CITES had endorsed the conclusions of the Seville workshop and as the ACI was a common initiative of CMS and CITES, Conservation Force believed there should be a reciprocal endorsement by CMS.
211. The Chair invited the meeting to indicate any objection to the adoption of Annexes 1 to 4. There being no such objections and in the absence of proposals for amendments to the Annexes, the COW endorsed forwarding them to plenary for final adoption.

(ii) Conservation of the African Wild Ass (Item 26.3.2)

212. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.3.2, including the proposed amendments to Resolution 12.18 contained in Annex 1 and the proposed amendments to Decision 12.71 contained in Annex 2. The Scientific Council had recommended adoption of these proposals, as confirmed in document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.3.2/Add.1.
213. Ethiopia and Senegal strongly supported the document.
214. There being no further requests for floor and no opposition, the COW endorsed the proposed amendments to Resolution 12.18 and Decision 12.71 and recommended their adoption by plenary.

(iii) African Elephant Action Plan (Item 26.3.3)

215. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.3.3, including the draft decisions contained in the Annex. Comments from the Scientific Council were provided in document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.3.3/Add.1.
216. UNEP provided additional information on the African Elephant Action Plan and African Elephant Fund.
217. Senegal and Togo referred to the Memorandum of Understanding concerning Conservation Measures for the West African Populations of the African Elephant and expressed disappointment at the lack of progress made and the absence of financial resources for implementation.
218. UNEP clarified that the African Elephant Fund provided a funding mechanism for the West African Elephant MOU.

219. Togo undertook to provide a proposed addition to the draft decisions in order to make a clearer link between the West African Elephant MOU and the African Elephant Fund.
220. The Chair requested Togo to submit its proposal in writing to the Secretariat as soon as possible and referred the document to the Terrestrial Species Working Group for further discussion and finalization.

(iv) Sahelo-Saharan Megafauna (Item 26.3.4)

221. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.3.4, including the proposed amendments to Resolution 9.21(Rev.COP12) contained in Annex 1 and the draft decisions contained in Annex 2. Comments and proposals from the Scientific Council were provided in document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.3.4/Add.1.
222. The Secretariat also introduced the related document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.28.2.4 *Proposal for the Continuation of the Concerted Action for Sahelo-Saharan Megafauna: Scimitar-Horned Oryx (Oryx dammah), Addax (Addax nasomaculatus), Dama Gazelle (Nanger dama), Slender-Horned Gazelle (Gazella leptoceros), Cuvier's Gazelle (Gazella cuvieri), Dorcas Gazelle (Gazella dorcas), Red-Fronted Gazelle (Eurdorcas rufifrons), and Barbary Sheep (Ammotragus lervia) listed on the Appendices of the Convention*. Comments and proposals from the Scientific Council were provided in document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.28.2.4/Add.1.
223. The European Union and its Member States supported the adoption of the proposed amendments to Resolution 9.21(Rev.COP12) subject to a further minor amendment to the preamble. Minor proposed amendments to the draft decisions in Annex 2 would also be submitted. The EU welcomed and supported continuation of the Concerted Action, but would submit in writing minor additions to document COP13/Doc.28.2.4.
224. The United Arab Emirates indicated that it would submit brief comments on document COP13/Doc.28.2.4.
225. Senegal strongly supported both documents, including continuation of the Concerted Action.
226. The COW referred both documents to the Terrestrial Species Working Group for further discussion and finalization.

(v) Central Asian Mammals Initiative (Item 26.3.5)

227. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.3.5, including the proposed amendments to Resolution 11.24 contained in Annex 1 and the Programme of Work for the Central Asian Mammals Initiative (2021-2026) contained in Annex 2. Comments and proposals from the Scientific Council were provided in document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.3.5/Add.1.
228. Mongolia recalled that it had hosted the 2nd meeting of the Central Asian Mammals Initiative (CAMI) Range States in September 2019. On behalf of the Government of Mongolia the delegation expressed appreciation to the Government of Germany, the Government of the United Kingdom, Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) and the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) for their support. Mongolia supported the two documents under consideration.
229. The European Union and its Member States supported adoption of the proposed amendments to Resolution 11.24 with certain minor changes and also supported the adoption of the CAMI Programme of Work (2021-2026). The Programme of Work would nevertheless benefit from inclusion of an estimated cost for each of the actions identified

230. The United Kingdom supported Annex 1 and welcomed the Programme of Work contained in Annex 2. CAMI was a clear demonstration of regional commitment to transboundary cooperation for conservation. The UK noted the generous financial support to CAMI from the Governments of Germany and Switzerland, and concurred that it would be useful to have estimated costings included in the Programme of Work, as well as indications of where in-kind resources might be provided to support implementation.
231. Switzerland supported the proposed amendments to Resolution 11.24 and hoped that the COP would support the proposed Programme of Work.
232. Uzbekistan considered that CAMI provided an excellent example of transboundary collaboration and thanked the Governments of Germany and Switzerland for providing support to enable progress with implementation. Uzbekistan supported the amended resolution and proposed Programme of Work.
233. Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) observed that CAMI was highly successful and great model that could hopefully be extended to other regions. WCS encouraged Parties to adopt the amended Resolution and the proposed Programme of Work, which, in line with Scientific Council comments, would benefit from prioritization.
234. Young Naturalist Network supported the document.
235. The COW referred this item to the Terrestrial Species Working Group for further discussion and finalization, notably with regard to the amendments tabled by the EU.

NATIONAL REPORTS (ITEM 20)

236. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.20, including the draft COP13 decisions contained in Annex 1 and the Analysis of CMS National Reports to COP13 contained in Annex 2. World Conservation Monitoring Centre gave a presentation focusing on the successful analyses permitted by the data, as well as threats to migratory species, and difficulties reported by Parties in implementing CMS.
237. Brazil supported the inclusion of analysis of National Reports in the budget, as presented by the Executive Secretary under budget Scenario 4 on 18 February. Brazil also supported the recommended actions and draft decisions in Annex 1, and outlined proposed amendments to decision 13.AA.
238. The European Union and its Member States supported deletion of Decisions 12.4 and 12.5 and supported the draft decisions in Annex 1 subject to amendments which it would be submitting in writing.
239. The Chair requested the Secretariat to revise the document, taking into account the amendments received in writing, and to present an updated in-session draft for further consideration by the COW.

APPLICATION OF ARTICLE III OF THE CONVENTION (ITEM 21)

240. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.21, including the draft resolution contained in Annex 1 and the draft COP13 decisions contained in Annex 2. Comments and proposals from the Scientific Council were provided as document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.21/Add.1. Document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Inf.37 *CMS Appendix I- Listed Species in International Trade – an Analysis of CITES Trade Data 2015-2018* provided an analysis of the nature and magnitude of the issue.

241. The European Union and its Member States considered the document a good starting point, and felt able to mandate further analysis for consideration at COP14, but were disinclined to support the draft resolution and decisions. There was a particular need for comparison of the species listed in the CMS and CITES Appendices.
242. Australia, New Zealand, Norway, South Africa and the United Kingdom also recommended further review, followed by consideration of this issue at COP14, as the best way forward.
243. Israel, Peru, Senegal and Zimbabwe considered this to be an important issue which would benefit from consideration and decision at COP13, rather than deferral to COP14.
244. CITES appreciated the strong cooperation between CMS and CITES, but noted a number of differences in approaches, definitions and goals which made it difficult to support a resolution focussing on the import and export of CMS Appendix I species.
245. Wildlife Conservation Society, speaking also on behalf of Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), International Environmental Law Project, and Defenders of Wildlife, supported the Draft Resolution and urged Parties to adopt it.
246. The Chair established an Open-ended Contact Group, to be chaired by New Zealand, and requested the group to conclude discussions on this item and to update the document as necessary for the further consideration of the COW.

REVIEW MECHANISM AND NATIONAL LEGISLATION PROGRAMME (ITEM 22)

247. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.22, including the template for the communication of a possible implementation matter (Annex 1), legislative guidance materials relating to implementation of Article III.5 (Annex 2), the model law for the implementation of Article III.5 of CMS (Annex 3) and the draft COP13 decisions contained in Annex 4.
248. Australia supported the document and tabled an amendment to Annex 2.
249. The European Union and its Member States agreed with the deletion of Decisions 12.6 to 12.9 and supported the adoption of the draft decisions with inclusion of some amendments that had been submitted in writing.
250. The Chair requested the Secretariat to revise the document, taking into account the amendments received in writing, and to present an updated in-session draft for further consideration by the COW.

AMENDMENT OF CMS APPENDICES (ITEM 27)

(d) Reservations with respect to Amendments to Appendices I and II of the Convention (Item 27.4)

251. Germany, speaking on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, and in its role as Depository of the Convention, introduced Document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.27.4, including the draft COP13 decisions contained in the Annex.
252. Israel considered that the increasing use of reservations undermined the goals of the Convention, and reduced its effectiveness. Israel would prefer to see specific included in the preamble to the draft decisions, urging Parties to avoid using reservations and emphasizing that this was not necessarily the best way to go.

253. Brazil observed that reservations were also a measure of flexibility within the Convention and enabled adaptation to each country's needs. They were not commonly used, but were nevertheless a valid resource.
254. Conservation Force echoed the comments of Brazil and stressed that reservations were a sovereign right of Parties, and that further advice from the UN Legal Office should be sought on this matter.
255. The Chair requested Brazil, the EU and Israel to constitute a small Friends of the Chair group, under the leadership of the EU, and to make a submission to the Secretariat for further consideration by the COW.

REVIEW OF DECISIONS AND RESOLUTIONS (ITEM 23)

(a) Review of Decisions (Item 23.1)

256. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.23.1, including the 'List of Decisions' to be renewed or deleted that were not addressed in other COP13 documents contained in the Annex.
257. Norway congratulated the Secretariat for following up on COP12 and reviewing all of the decisions taken. This was an important task to undertake after every COP.
258. The COW endorsed the Annex to Document 23.1 and confirmed that it could be forwarded to plenary for final adoption.

(b) Review of Resolutions: Decisions 12.11 and 12.12 (Item 23.2)

259. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.23.2. The COP was recommended to repeal Resolution 7.18 (Rev.COP12) and Resolution 6.3 (Rev.COP12); and to delete Decisions 12.11 and 12.12.
260. There being no interventions from the floor, the COW endorsed repeal of Resolution 7.18 (Rev.COP12) and Resolution 6.3 (Rev.COP12), as well as deletion of Decisions 12.11 and 12.12, and confirmed that the document could be forwarded to plenary for final adoption.

REVIEW OF THE CONSERVATION STATUS OF MIGRATORY SPECIES (ITEM 24)

261. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.24/Rev.1, including the draft decisions contained in Annex 1 and the supporting technical information contained in Annexes 2 to 5.
262. The European Union and its Member States welcomed the document and supported the adoption of the draft decisions, subject to minor editorial amendments that would be submitted in writing.
263. Australia stressed that the credibility of the CMS Appendices was crucial, and considered it especially important to assess species that had been listed prior to the development of the current listing guidelines.
264. South Africa noted and appreciated the work done so far. However, as this was a preliminary report, and for the purposes of consistency, South Africa recommended that geographical populations or regional assessments be considered in the Review of the Conservation Status of Migratory Species. This would provide a clearer picture of the conservation effort on the ground, especially with regard to mammals.

265. IUCN welcomed the draft decisions and supported their adoption. IUCN was working with the Zoological Society of London and others on a report on impacts of human exploitation of species, which was highly relevant and would be published in mid-2020.
266. UNEP-WCMC supported the draft decisions, highlighting the importance of this work to the overarching goals of CMS.
267. IFAW, also representing BirdLife International, Born Free Foundation, Humane Society International, NRDC, OceanCare, and WWF, supported the adoption of the draft decisions and recommended the extension of the approach to Appendix II species.
268. Brazil supported the textual change proposed by IFAW and requested its inclusion in the final draft.
269. The Chair requested the Secretariat to revise the document, taking into account the amendments received in writing, and to present an updated in-session draft for further consideration by the COW.

MOU Signing Ceremony

270. The representative of Ethiopia, Mr Kumara Wakjira, Director General of the Ethiopian Wildlife Conservation Authority, signed the Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation of Migratory Birds of Prey in Africa and Eurasia (Raptors MOU), bringing the number of signatories to 63.

Committee of the Whole 15.05–18.05

PROGRESS TOWARDS THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN ATLAS ON ANIMAL MIGRATION (ITEM 25)

271. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.25. Comments from the Scientific Council were provided in document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.25/Add.1. The COP was requested to take note of the report and to support the further development and use of the Atlas modules already realized.
272. India wholeheartedly supported the Atlas initiative and briefly outlined relevant work being conducted in relation to the Central Asian Flyway (CAF). India urged the Scientific Council to consider supporting preparation of a Bird Migration Atlas for the CAF, or incorporation of such information within the developing global Migration Atlas.
273. The European Union and its Member States took note of the report, welcomed the migration atlas for migratory mammals in the Central Asian region developed under the Central Asian Mammals Initiative, and also welcomed progress made in developing an atlas of bird migration in the African-Eurasian region and look forward to its finalization in 2021.
274. The EU supported further development and use of the modules being realized, including to ensure inter-operability with other digital databases, and wished to encourage further voluntary contributions to elaborate the Atlas of Animal Migration.
275. There being no further requests for the floor, the COW took note of document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.25, including Add.1.

AMENDMENT OF CMS APPENDICES (ITEM 27 – CONTINUED)

(c) Disaggregation of Bird Families and Genera listed under Appendix II (Item 27.3)

276. Prof Stephen Garnett, COP-appointed Councillor for Birds, introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.27.3. The COP was recommended to take note of this document, including Annex 1 *Methods used to characterise migratory movements of birds for the purpose of disaggregating families under Appendix II of the Convention on Migratory Species*, Annex 2 *List of bird species that belong to the Families and Genera currently aggregated under Appendix II, meet the CMS Criteria and have an Unfavourable Conservation Status*; and Annex 3, which contained a spreadsheet providing details of the assessments for individual species. The COP was further invited to consider the offer of the Scientific Council to work during the intersessional period and to provide advice to COP14 on the advantages and disadvantages of the various ways of treating the species currently aggregated under families or genera under CMS Appendix II.
277. New Zealand welcomed the work being done to simplify the lists of bird taxa and believed that this would help a focus on species that were actually migratory, of conservation concern, and that needed international cooperation to support their populations.
278. The European Union and its Member States thanked the COP-appointed Councillor for Birds and the Scientific Council for the preparation of the report. The EU recognized that disaggregation of bird families and genera had different implications at species level. The migratory status (following the CMS definition) was insufficiently known for some species and the threat status of some subspecies or populations might be higher than indicated by the IUCN threat status. It was important to note that, according to the Convention text, Appendix II shall list migratory species that have a conservation status which would significantly benefit from international cooperation. The benefit of international cooperation was recognized through CMS instruments such as AEWA, the Raptors MOU, Action Plan for Migratory Landbirds in the African-Eurasian Region (AEMLAP), Action Plans on American Flyways, the Central Asian Flyway, the East Asian-Australasian Flyway Partnership (EAAFP) and others, which listed all relevant migratory species or populations, regardless of their conservation status. The EU and its Member States therefore supported further analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of the various approaches suggested in the report and proposed focusing primarily on migratory status.
279. There being no further requests for the floor, the COW took note of document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.27.3, and welcomed the offer of the Scientific Council to continue working on this topic during the intersessional period.

CONSERVATION ISSUES (ITEM 26 – CONTINUED)

26.4 Crosscutting Conservation Issues

(a) Conservation Implications of Animal Culture and Social Complexity (Item 26.4.1)

280. Dr. Giuseppe Notarbartolo di Sciara, COP-appointed Councillor for Aquatic Mammals, introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.4.1/Rev.1. The COP was recommended to adopt the draft decisions contained in Annex 3 of this document and to delete Decisions 12.75, 12.76 and 12.77.
281. The United Kingdom considered that this was an important emerging area of conservation research. However, it was also important to understand how the work done so far could be applied in terms of practical management advice for the conservation of migratory species.

282. Argentina confirmed its support for the document, but concurred with the remarks made by the UK.
283. Born Free Foundation, speaking also on behalf of Humane Society International, International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW), OceanCare, and Whale and Dolphin Conservation (WDC), recalled the view of the late Bradnee Chambers that CMS was breaking new ground with this pioneering work, which could have fundamental repercussions for approaches to conservation. Parties were urged to support continued work by the Expert Working Group and to adopt the draft decisions. The wider CMS Family and partners were urged to highlight this area of work when engaging with wider forums, including the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework process.
284. Peru added its support for the document, but underlined the need for effective involvement of countries and national-level experts.
285. Senegal supported adoption of the draft decisions, which were very timely.
286. Conservation Force considered that there should be a comprehensive discussion on human livelihoods and culture to complement the work on animal culture.
287. There being no further interventions and no opposition, or proposals for amendments, the COW approved the draft decisions contained in Annex 3 of the document and recommended them for adoption by plenary. The COW also supported the deletion of Decisions 12.75, 12.76 and 12.77.

(b) Energy and Migratory Species (Item 26.4.2)

(i) Renewable Energy and Migratory Species (Item 26.4.2.1)

288. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.4.2.1. Comments and proposals from the Scientific Council were provided in UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.4.2.1/Add.1. The COP was recommended to adopt the draft resolution contained in Annex 1 of this document, as amended; and to adopt the draft decisions contained in Annex 2, as amended.
289. The European Union and its Member States thanked the Secretariat and the Energy Task Force for the work done since COP12. In general, the EU supported the draft resolutions as amended subject to a few minor additions and modifications. The EU considered the work of the Task Force to be of major importance, given the rapid growth of renewable energy across a considerable part of the world. However, there was an urgent need to secure additional funding. The EU generally supported the amendments proposed by the Scientific Council but had minor changes to suggest. These would be submitted in writing.
290. Brazil and Senegal strongly supported the work undertaken.
291. The Chair noted that no opposition had been expressed. An in-session document would be prepared by the Secretariat, integrating proposed amendments received in writing, including those from the EU and the Scientific Council. This would be submitted to the COW for further consideration.

(ii) Power Lines and Migratory Birds (Item 26.4.2.2)

292. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.4.2.2. Comments and proposals of the Scientific Committee were provided as UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.4.2.2/Add.1. The COP was recommended to adopt the draft amendments to Resolution 10.11 contained in the Annex to the document.

293. India was generally in agreement, but noted that environmental impact assessments were not required for electricity transmission projects in India. India supported the Scientific Council proposal to replace “new” with “large scale” in the eleventh preambular paragraph of the amended Resolution 10.11.
294. The European Union and its Member States generally supported the proposed amendments to Resolution 10.11, but wished to propose some additional amendments. The EU also supported amendments proposed by the Sessional Committee of the Scientific Council.
295. Peru also supported the proposed amendments to Resolution 10.11 and briefly reported on the status of relevant actions at national level.
296. The Chair noted that no opposition had been expressed. An in-session document would be prepared by the Secretariat, integrating proposed amendments, including those recommended by the Scientific Council. This would be submitted to the COW for further consideration.

(c) Addressing Unsustainable Use of Terrestrial and Avian Wild Meat of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (Item 26.4.3)

297. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.4.3. Comments and proposals of the Scientific Committee were provided as UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.4.3/Add.1. The COP was recommended to review and adopt the renewed decisions as contained in the Annex to the document.
298. The European Union and its Member States confirmed its support for the renewed decisions contained in Annex but tabled a number of amendments, confirming that written proposals would be submitted to the Secretariat. The EU supported deletion of Decisions 12.86 and 12.87.
299. The Chair noted that no opposition had been expressed. An in-session document would be prepared by the Secretariat, integrating proposals submitted by the EU, as well by the Scientific Council. The revised text would be submitted to the COW for further consideration.

(d) Improving Ways of Addressing Connectivity in the Conservation of Migratory Species (Item 26.4.4)

300. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.4.4. Comments and proposals of the Scientific Council were provided as UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.4.4/Add.1. The COP was recommended to adopt the proposed amendments to Resolution 12.26 contained in Annex 1, and to adopt the draft decisions contained in Annex 2.
301. The European Union and its Member States thanked the Secretariat for promoting and sharing information on connectivity. The EU noted that implementation of Decisions 12.93 c) and d) had been hampered by a lack of Secretariat capacity, and recognized that sharing and review of information on connectivity required continuous efforts. The EU supported reflecting this in a resolution rather than in a decision. The EU was generally supportive of Annex 1 but had proposals for modest amendments that would be submitted to the Secretariat in writing.
302. Brazil supported the document in general and recognized the importance of enhancing and promoting connectivity. Brazil nevertheless suggested deletion of three paragraphs in Annex 1.

303. IUCN welcomed the document but tabled further improvements to Annex 1, including through reference to the definition of connectivity proposed by the Working Group on the CMS Family contributions to the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, as set out in COP13/Doc.17/Add.2/Annex 1. IUCN also briefly updated the meeting on work of the Connectivity Conservation Specialist Group of the World Commission on Protected Areas, WCPA.
304. The Chair invited the delegations of Brazil and the EU to engage with each other with a view to reaching consensus on amendments to Annex 1.
305. The Chair asked if there were any objections to the proposal tabled by IUCN to include the above-mentioned definition of connectivity. No objections were raised.
306. The Chair confirmed that a revised text would be submitted to the COW for further consideration.

(e) Transfrontier Conservation Areas for Migratory Species (Item 26.4.5)

307. The Secretariat introduced Document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.4.5, including proposed amendments to Resolution 12.7 in Annex 1, and amendments to Decisions 12.94 – 12.96 in Annex 2. Comments from the Scientific Council were contained in Document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.4.5/Add.1.
308. India expressed its strong support for Transfrontier Conservation Areas and supported the amendments to the resolution and decisions. India added that it would welcome assistance and support from the Secretariat on this issue, and that it was submitting a written statement in this regard.
309. The European Union and its Member States supported the proposed amendments to Resolution 12.7 and to Decisions 12.94 to 12.96, subject to the inclusion of further amendments in the interest of clarity. These would be submitted in writing.
310. Brazil, Peru and the United Kingdom also supported the resolution and draft decisions but indicated that they would submit written improvements.
311. The Chair requested the Secretariat to revise the document, taking into account the amendments received in writing, and to present an updated in-session draft for further consideration by the COW.

(f) Community Participation and Livelihoods (Item 26.4.6)

312. The Secretariat introduced Document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.4.6, including amendments to Decisions 12.98 to 12.100 contained in Annex 1. Document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.4.6/Add.1 contained comments from the Scientific Council.
313. The European Union and its Member States supported the amendments to Decisions 12.98 to 12.100 with minor textual amendments which would be submitted in writing.
314. Mongolia, Bangladesh, India, Malawi, Senegal and Togo, welcomed the report and supported the amendments to the COP12 decisions.
315. IUCN supported the document and suggested a few minor amendments to the Annex. IUCN and its Sustainable Use and Livelihoods Specialist Group were ready to cooperate on activities. IUCN suggested that the concept of community connectivity, which considered linkages between communities, could powerfully complement site connectivity.

316. The Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) stressed the value of cooperation with indigenous people and local communities (IPLCs) and noted that areas of high ecological diversity in traditionally managed areas occupied by indigenous people covered large areas of the world. CBD had found participatory mechanisms for indigenous people to be a very successful approach to supporting conservation over the past 20 years.
317. By including the full and effective participation of IPLCs, and establishing a formal mechanism for them to contribute to the decision-making processes, the work of CMS on a number of issues would be enhanced.
318. The Chair requested the Secretariat to revise the document, taking into account the amendments received in writing, and to present an updated in-session document for further consideration by the COW.

(g) Impacts of Plastic Pollution on Aquatic, Terrestrial and Avian Species (Item 26.4.7)

319. The Secretariat introduced Document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.4.7, including draft COP13 decisions contained in the Annex. Document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.4.7/Add.1 contained comments from the Scientific Council.
320. The European Union and its Member States supported adoption of the draft decisions with minor additions that it would submit in writing. The EU considered it important to give increased attention to this issue, and to avoid duplication of effort through strong cooperation and synergies among all interested organizations.
321. Argentina, Ecuador, India, Mongolia, Peru, Rwanda, Senegal, and Seychelles fully supported the document, including the draft decisions. All these Parties reported on measures at national level adopted to reduce the use of single-use plastic, and some proposed international measures such as an international instrument to combat plastic pollution.
322. The Chair noted that other Parties were asking for the floor, but in the interests of time he encouraged them to submit their comments in writing.
323. UNEP reported that the 4th session of the United Nations Environment Assembly (UNEA) had adopted a Resolution strengthening cooperation among stakeholders in taking immediate action against plastic in the oceans. Three further meetings in 2020 would take stock, identify technical and financial resources and encourage partnerships, and UNEP looked forward to the active participation of CMS in deliberations at these meetings.
324. The Chair requested the Secretariat to make revisions taking into account the amendments received in writing, and to present an updated in-session document for further consideration by the COW.

(h) 26.4.8 Climate Change and Migratory Species (Item 26.4.8)

325. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.4.8. Comments from the Scientific Council were provided as UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.4.8/Add.1. The COP was recommended to take note of the document, to delete Decision 12.73, to adopt the draft decisions contained in the Annex to the document, amending Decisions 12.72 and 12.74, and to consider the comments from the ScC.
326. Mr Colin Galbraith, the COP-appointed Councillor for Climate Change, gave a presentation providing details of some of the activities in the Programme of Work.

327. Brazil recognized the great importance of this issue but opposed the creation of an additional reporting burden through the use of ad hoc questionnaires. Brazil supported the draft decisions, subject to an amendment to one paragraph, and also supported deletion of Decision 12.73.
328. The European Union and its Member States also supported deletion of Decision 12.73, and supported the draft decisions subject to amendments that would be submitted in writing.
329. The Secretariat of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands considered it important to increase and enhance cooperation on climate change, and emphasized the important role played by carbon-rich wetlands.
330. Humane Society International referred to the nexus of migratory species and climate change, underling that protection of biodiversity made a significant contribution to climate change mitigation and adaptation – for example, the role played by the recovering populations of great whales as carbon sinks and environmental engineers.
331. The Chair requested the Secretariat to make revisions taking into account the amendments received in writing, and to present an updated in-session draft for further consideration by the COW.

(i) Light pollution (Item 26.4.9)

(i) Light Pollution Guidelines for Wildlife including Marine Turtles, Seabirds and Migratory Shorebirds (Item 26.4.9.1)

332. Australia introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.4.9.1/Rev.1, which contained a draft resolution in Annex 1 and guidelines in Annex 2. Document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.4.9.1/Add.1 contained comments from the Scientific Council. Australia supported the EU document under the following item, and proposed that light pollution would be a good theme for the next World Migratory Bird Day.

(ii) Light Pollution and Migratory Species (Item 26.4.9.2)

333. The European Union and its Member States briefly introduced Document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.4.9.2, including a draft resolution in Annex 1 and draft decisions in Annex 2. Document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.4.9.2/Add.1 contained comments from the Scientific Council.
334. The Chair proposed merging Documents UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.4.9.1/Rev.1, and UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.4.9.2, and discussing them together. This proposal was acceptable to Australia and the EU.
335. New Zealand thanked Australia for the guidelines and noted that these had already proved useful with regard to light-pollution impacts on seabirds in New Zealand. In addition, New Zealand would provide information to CMS on the results of research currently underway on this topic.
336. The Chair requested the Secretariat, in conjunction with Australia and the EU, to merge the two documents, and to present a revised in-session draft for further consideration by the COW.

(j) Insect Decline and its Threat to Migratory Insectivorous Animal Populations (Item 26.4.10)

337. The European Union and its Member States introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.4.10 including the draft resolution contained in Annex 1 and the draft decision contained in Annex 2. The comments and proposals of the ScC were provided in UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.4.10/Add.1. The EU could support the incorporation of many of the Scientific Council's proposals, with some minor changes. The COP was recommended to adopt Annex 1 and Annex 2.
338. Senegal supported the document, including the Scientific Council's comments.
339. Australia and Brazil supported Annexes 1 and 2, subject to inclusion of amendments that would be submitted in writing.
340. WWF, also representing BirdLife International and IFAW, welcomed the document and the comments of the Scientific Council, and called on Parties to adopt the draft resolution and draft decision.
341. Young Naturalist Network also supported the draft resolution and draft decision.
342. The Chair requested the Secretariat to make revisions, taking into account the amendments received in writing, and to present an updated in-session draft for further consideration by the COW.

(k) Infrastructure Development and Migratory Species (Item 26.4.11)

343. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.26.4.11. The COP was recommended to adopt the draft decisions contained in the Annex of this document, and consider whether to add decisions on the development of guidance on infrastructure-related impacts on beaches and nearshore habitats of CMS-listed species to the draft decisions contained in documents COP13/Doc.26.2.6 *Marine Turtles* or COP13/Doc.26.2.10 *Global Programme of Work for Cetaceans*.
344. The European Union and its Member States, supported by Brazil, welcomed the initiative and supported adoption of the draft decisions, subject to amendment.
345. India reported that it had formulated guidelines on infrastructure development and migratory species.
346. Mongolia supported the report and the draft decisions, and recalled that UNEA4 had adopted a Resolution calling for actions to strengthen environmental impact assessments and promote existing best practices. Mongolia considered this Resolution to be important, and proposed including reference to it in the present document.
347. The Chair requested the Secretariat to make revisions, taking into account the amendments received in writing, and to present an updated in-session document for further consideration by the COW.

**CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE ROOM PAPERS (CRPs)
TO BE FORWARDED TO PLENARY FOR FINAL REVIEW AND ADOPTION**

348. The COW endorsed CRP14.1 *Strategic Plan* for forwarding to plenary for final adoption.
349. The meeting commenced discussion of CRP14.2/Rev.1 *Options for a Follow-up to the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023* but decided to hold over further consideration of this and other CRPs until the following day.