

**CONVENTION ON  
MIGRATORY  
SPECIES**

UNEP/CMS/COP14/Report

Original: English

14 February 2024

---

14<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES  
Samarkand, Uzbekistan, 12 - 17 February 2024

**DAILY MEETING REPORT – DAY 3 (14 February 2024)****VI. INTERPRETATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION (continued)**

227. The Chair opened the COW and asked for Secretariat to provide an update on documentation.
228. The Secretariat listed CRPs that were available, as well as the daily report of Day 2.
229. The Secretariat proposed to use the phrase ‘subject to availability of external resources’ after the meeting, and revise relevant text accordingly.

**Item 33.1. Report of the Credentials Committee**

230. The United Kingdom spoke on behalf of the Credentials Committee, which had reviewed three sets of credentials, bringing the total to 68 sets of credentials received so far.

**Item 33.2. Report of the Working Groups**

231. The Institutional and Crosscutting WG had met to discuss the Strategic Plan, for which a few minor outstanding issues remained to be discussed, with a view to finalise a CRP on Day 3.
232. The Aquatic WG reported that it had discussed and produced CRPs for a number of documents, except for document 27.1.1/Rev.1 *Bycatch*, which would be concluded on Day 3 of the COP. Document 27.2.4 *Deep Sea Mining* would be the next focus.
233. The Crosscutting WG had considered a series of documents, including document 27.1, for which agreement had been reached. The final two documents remaining for discussion on Day 3 of the COP were documents 15.1 *Restructuring of the ScC* and 30.4.3 *Wildlife Disease*.
234. The Avian WG reported that it had made good progress and was close to finalising discussions on documents 28.1 on illegal take, 28.2 on the AEMLAP Action Plan and 28.3 on preventing poisoning. The WG would next start discussion on flyways and the Initiative CAF.
235. The Terrestrial WG agreed on seven documents without changes and recommended their adoption, and made amendments to two documents that would come to the COW. The WG discussed amendments to one other document that required further consultation among delegations on Day 3 of the COP.

## **Item 30.4. Threats**

### **Item 30.4.1 Climate Change**

236. The UK Scientific Councillor introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.30.4.1/Rev3 *Climate Change and Migratory Species*, prepared by the ScC following discussion in WG. Annex 2 contained Draft Decisions, including draft Terms of Reference (TOR) for a CMS ScC WG on Climate Change and Migratory Species. A related information document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Inf.30.4.1 summarised *Climate Change and Migratory Species: a review of impacts, conservation actions, ecosystem services and indicators*.
237. Brazil reminded the meeting that it would be hosting UNFCCC COP30 in 2025, when it expected Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities would play a key role. It expressed support for the document, and suggested a few minor amendments submitted in writing.
238. South Africa recommended to add ecosystem-based adaptation where reference was made to Nature-based Solutions, consistent with CBD and UNFCCC language, and provided text in writing.
239. Belgium, on behalf of the EU and its Member States, had considered mainstreaming climate in internal legislation. The EU proposed to strengthen language in the documents and proposed amendments to be submitted in writing.
240. New Zealand informed that climate change impacts were already being felt by migratory species in Oceania and supported the document and its Draft Decisions.
241. IFAW, also on behalf of BEES, BirdLife International, Born Free Foundation, High Seas Alliance, HSI, Law of the Wild, OceanCare, Pan African Sanctuaries Alliance, Panthera, Save Our Seas, WCS, WDC and WWF, considered that the work of CMS was crucial to address the impacts of climate change on migratory species. They welcomed the document and its draft Decisions and highlighted that CMS was well-placed to play a leading role in advocating this role and promoting it in other MEAs.
242. Senegal supported adoption of the document and the amendments tabled by the EU and South Africa, especially concerning Nature-based Solutions. Senegal noted impacts of climate change on marine turtles, which were losing their breeding sites in coastal areas, while rising temperatures were having wide impacts on reptiles.
243. Maldives welcomed the document and in Revised Annex 1 to Resolution 12.21, they proposed an additional point in writing to reflect this under 'Measures to facilitate species adaptation in response to climate change'.
244. FFI underlined the local communities in combating climate change and suggested adding an operative paragraph to urge Parties and non-Parties to involve Indigenous People and Local Communities, especially where climate change mitigation measures were required.

### **Item 30.4.2. Insect decline and its threat to migratory insectivorous animal populations**

245. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.30.4.2/Rev.1 *Insect decline and its threat to migratory insectivorous animal populations*, prepared by the Secretariat with input from the ScC. The document provided recommendations supported by Germany and Australia, and available as Information Document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Inf.30.4.2. It proposed Draft Decisions with guidance for the continuation work in the next triennium.

246. Australia welcomed the report on insect decline and its key messages and declarations and highlighted it would provide further support for the ScC to review findings and implement follow-up.
247. The United Kingdom welcomed the report and provided minor drafting suggestions in writing.

**Item 30.4.4 Light Pollution**

248. This document was introduced by a COP-Appointed Councillor UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.30.4.4 *Light Pollution Guidelines for Wildlife* along with the CMS Light Pollution Guidelines contained in Annex 2.
249. Australia supported the new aspect which aligned international guidelines to the national level, calling to specify in the Draft Decision “migratory” when referring to bats.
250. New Zealand noted that the additional species groups added to the revised guidelines would help Parties address threats to migratory species. They asked to make the guidelines available on the website.
251. OceanCare suggested that a COP-appointed expert lead this work.
252. The European Union supported the guidelines.
253. A CRP would be produced and come back to the COW for approval.

**Item 30.4.5 Plastic Pollution**

254. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.30.4.5 *Impacts of plastic pollution on aquatic, terrestrial and avian species*, which was prepared by the Secretariat and the ScC.
255. Annex 1 contained an executive summary of the Report *Impacts of Plastic Pollution on Freshwater Aquatic, Terrestrial and Avian Migratory Species in the Asia and Pacific Region*, with the full report contained in UNEP/CMS/COP14/Inf.30.4.5. Annex 2 contained the draft decisions.
256. The document also addressed the issue of ghost gear under Resolution 12.20 on Marine Debris, reporting on the work of the Global Ghost Gear Initiative.
257. On mobilization of resources, Brazil urged considering specific challenges faced by developing countries and proposed language to reflect this.
258. The European Union, given funding required to develop such reports, suggested subsuming 14.BB a) under 27.2.1.
259. Maldives called for support for upstream activities on migratory species, and an additional decision directed to the Secretariat, stating that, subject to resources, Parties’ capacity to address plastic pollution to reduce negative impacts on migratory species should be increased.
260. FFI noted the importance of local voices and practices in the development and implementation of effective locally appropriate actions.
261. This issue was referred to the WG to produce a CRP.

### **Item 30.5 Conservation Implications of Animal Culture and Social Complexity**

262. The Secretariat introduced this issue on behalf of Chair of the Expert Working Group on Animal Culture, and the relevant document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.30.5/Rev.1 *Conservation implications of animal culture and social complexity*, which was prepared by the ScC and its Expert Working Group on Conservation Implications of Animal Culture and Social Complexity and the Secretariat. Annexes contain recommendations from the second CMS workshop on animal culture and social complexity, and draft decisions.
263. IUCN read a statement on Human and Animal Culture as Determinants of Dynamic Spatial Units for Species Conservation Action.
264. The European Union and its Member States suggested the organization of activities to help Parties carry out decisions.
265. Senegal underscored that Chimpanzees, and other migratory species relied on cultures that allowed them to survive in hostile environments.
266. Monaco recalled the issue of culture for conservation began at COP11 with cetaceans and has now expanded to include other species.
267. OceanCare encouraged Parties to adopt and accept the expert group's work on culture and complexity.
268. BFF highlighted the social complexity of some of the CMS-listed species and urged following international principle for ethical wildlife.
269. The Chair noted that a CRP would be developed on this issue.

### **Item 30.6 Tourism**

270. The document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.30.6/Rev.1 *Ecotourism and migratory species* was introduced by the United Kingdom, with an Annex, containing guidelines on ecotourism and migratory species. UNEP/CMS/COP14/Inf.30.6 contained a wider review of migratory species ecotourism. Recommendations were appended to Annex 2 of Resolution 12.23 as guidelines.
271. The European Union noted the work of the United Kingdom and the Secretariat would help with the development, implementation and revision of national tourism plans.
272. India called the attention to the benefits to local communities of low impact tourism and including them in the implementation of tourism plans. India also cited the negative impacts of unplanned tourism.
273. BFF warned against financial support to conservation activities that can damage species, and said guidelines were needed, which could also bring impetus to IUCN guidelines.
274. Brazil distinguished between recreation and ecotourism, and discussed connectivity between protected areas.
275. The Chair noted that a CRP would be produced and brought back for approval.

#### IV. INTERPRETATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION

##### ITEM 24. REVIEW MECHANISM AND NATIONAL LEGISLATION PROGRAMME

276. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.24 Review Mechanism and National Legislation Programme, which contained Annex 1 with draft Operational Guidelines for the Review Mechanism and Annex 2 with a set of Draft Decisions.
277. Belgium, on behalf of the EU and its Member States, welcomed the provision of guidelines for the Review Mechanism under two changes on the text which were provided in writing.
278. OceanCare welcomed the proposal operational guidelines and the adjustments proposed by the EU.
279. Madagascar supported the document, and recommended an addition to Draft Decision 14.AA in Annex 2, for the Secretariat to enhance the NLP through alignment with National Legislation Project of CITES and the Sustainable Wildlife Management Programme of FAO and the consortium CIFOR/CIRAD/WCS.
280. WCS supported the interventions by the EU and Madagascar and advised the Secretariat to collaborate with other initiatives working with Parties to update their legislation.
281. FAO supported the proposal of Madagascar.
282. India wished to take this further to the WG especially relating to the review mechanisms and on Resolution 12.9. In response to the Chair, who sought to identify whether issues India wished to raise were of a substantive nature, India clarified that it wished to go deeper into the document, and would provide comments to the WG and in writing.
283. The Chair confirmed that a CRP would be produced and that further discussions would be held in the WG, and the document would come back to the COW.

##### ITEM 25. REVIEW OF DECISIONS

284. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.25 *Review of Decisions*.
285. Belgium, on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the proposal made in Annex I except for Decisions 13.16 and 13.71, where they sought further clarification relating to the recommendations to delete decisions.
286. The Secretariat clarified the worked carried out with CITES Secretariat under Decision 13.16 and mentioned it would keep decision 13.71.
287. Belgium, on behalf of the EU and its Member States, thanked the Secretariat for its response and for working to ensure retention of these two Decisions (13.16 and 13.71).
288. The Chair recommended that, with retention of Decisions 13.16 and 13.71, the COW recommend this paper for adoption. This was agreed.

##### ITEM 26. DEFINITION OF THE TERMS 'RANGE STATE' AND 'VAGRANT'

289. The COP-appointed Councillor for Birds introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.26/Rev.1 *Definition of the Terms 'Range State' and 'Vagrant'*,

- which included an Annex with guidance on use of the term 'vagrant'. COP13 had requested the ScC to develop terms for 'Range State' and 'vagrant', and the ScC had established an intersessional WG to address this. The ScC-SC6 did not recommend guidance for adoption by the COP. Discussion was taking place in the Crosscutting WG.
290. Belgium, on behalf of the EU and its Member States, appreciated the report and supported the recommendation to take note of the report. The EU recommended that the COP should decide that no further work on this matter was needed.
  291. Zimbabwe urged Parties to consider adopting the draft guidance provided by the WG.
  292. The United Kingdom advised on the application of the precautionary principle, and noted that a range of views were expressed on the guidance in ScC-SC6. It welcomed hearing views of Parties not present in the ScC and would find it disappointing if this COP could not adopt the guidance that it had requested.
  293. Argentina thanked the intersessional WG for carrying out this important work.
  294. South Africa supported the statement by Zimbabwe and suggested to refine the guidance for consideration by COP15.
  295. Israel echoed the comments made by the EU, and considered that the final conclusion of ScC-SC6 was to take note of the document and take no further action required.
  296. New Zealand requested the Secretariat to make guidance available for use by Parties as appropriate.
  297. Senegal took note of the document and supported the position of the EU.
  298. Australia welcomed the development of guidance material especially on determining species vagrancy and supported the adoption by the COP of the guidance material.
  299. Belgium, on behalf of the EU and its Member States, agreed to note the report, but considered that adoption would introduce a new term not part of the Convention text, which risked opening the door to an exception, adding ambiguity and uncertainty. It therefore did not recommend use of guidance by Parties.
  300. After summarising the issue and considering a further comment, the Chair concluded that different opinions remained, therefore the Crosscutting WG would further discuss and seek clarity on this issue, which would lead to a CRP. The appointed Councillor taking this forward considered this an acceptable way forward and agreed to take part in the discussion in the WG.

## **ITEM 31. AMENDMENTS OF CMS APPENDICES**

### **Item 31.1 Taxonomy and nomenclature**

301. Document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.31.1 *Taxonomy and nomenclature* was prepared by the ScC and the Secretariat and contained four annexes. UNEP/CMS/COP14/Inf.31.1 contained an excerpt from the standard reference for fish for each fish species listed in the CMS Appendices.
302. Without any comments, the COW approved the recommendations detailed in the document.

**Item 31.2 Disaggregation of avian families and genera listed on Appendix II**

303. A COP-appointed Councillor (ScC) introduced UNEP/CMS/COP/Doc.31.2 *Guidance on the disaggregation of families and genera listed in Appendix II*, which was prepared by the ScC and was being discussed in the Avian WG. The Annexes included guidance on the treatment of species and a request to the ScC to establish an advisory list of species within the families and genera aggregated under Appendix II.
304. The United Kingdom expressed its support for Option 1.b.
305. The recommendations were approved by the COW.

**Item 31.3. Potential avian taxa for listing**

306. The ScC introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.31.3 *Potential avian taxa for listing*, expected to be considered in the Avian WG. A Draft Resolution was contained in an Annex.
307. The European Union proposed the Parties “take note of” rather than “endorse” the list of avian species that are likely to meet the criteria for listing in the Appendices.
308. New Zealand said it was planning to work with BirdLife to bring a listing to COP15.
309. Bangladesh reported on a migratory species dependant on coastal mangroves in its region, noting it would prepare a proposal for listing, to be brought forward for consideration at the next COP.
310. A CRP would be produced.

**Item 32.1 Concerted actions**

311. The Secretariat introduced the document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.32.1/Rev.1 *Concerted Actions*, which was submitted by the ScC and the StC, with support from the Secretariat. (add if time).
312. The United Kingdom stressed the need to ensure guidelines in the Annex follow through from the resolution, and suggested language to reflect this.
313. The Chair noted that a CRP would be developed.

**Item 32.2 Assessment of Progress in the Implementation of Concerted Actions and Possible Proposals for Their Extension**

314. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.32.2 *Assessment of Progress in the Implementation of Concerted Actions and Possible Proposals for their Extension*, which contained an overview of eight Concerted Actions and the Secretariat suggested the COP could consider closing these Concerted Actions.
315. As there were no interventions, the Chair suggested a statement indicating that the Concerted Actions would come to an end could be included in the report of the meeting.
316. The recommendations in the document were agreed on by the COW.

## ITEM 27. AQUATIC SPECIES CONSERVATION ISSUES

### Item 27.1. Fisheries-induced threats

#### Item 27.1.1 Bycatch

317. The COP-appointed Councillor for Bycatch introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.27.1.1/Rev.1 *Bycatch*, which contained a review of existing technical mitigation techniques to reduce bycatch of sharks, and draft Decisions directed to Parties, the ScC and the Secretariat.
318. OceanCare reiterating the draft Decision's provision on the need for time-bound action plans and measures for effective bycatch mitigation for the Harbour Porpoise, and noted work through ASCOBANS to address this issue.
319. Egypt underscored the need for a definition for bycatch to ensure effective implementation of measure; and synergies among biodiversity-related conventions to ensure a common understanding of terminology.
320. Senegal highlighted the importance of testing techniques to see what works.
321. Cook Islands did not support the development of decisions by CMS to include fishing licence conditions as this was the domain of the national fisheries administration. Cook Islands indicated that CMS use voluntary language such as "requested to". It noted bycatch management is based on the scientific and compliance information that is fishery and context specific; and that fisheries specific measures must be applied through relevant Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMOs).
322. Nigeria noted bycatch must be addressed without also addressing illegal fishing.
323. A CRP was being discussed.

#### Item 27.1.2. Fish aggregating devices (FADs)

324. The COP appointed Councillor for Marine Pollution introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.27.1.2/Rev.1 *Fish Aggregating Devices*. A document titled 'An Introduction to FADs as a Source of Marine Debris' was provided in Annex 1 and draft Decisions were provided in Annex 2.
325. OceanCare referred to FADs-related problems and the need to collaborate with ACCOBAMS and the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean.
326. Egypt referred to FADs-related problems and mentioned it should go Aquatic WG to strengthen the CRP and approve the doc.
327. The Chair noted there was an existing CRP, and proposed to retain that and come back to this on Day 4.

#### Item 27.1.3. Maltreatment and mutilation of seabirds in fisheries

328. The Chair of the Intersessional WG introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.27.1.3 *Maltreatment and mutilation of seabirds in fisheries*.
329. Brazil agreed with the WG conclusions and highlighted that the problem was not only confined to Brazil, and problems were attributed to a rogue group of fishers.



330. Egypt highlighted threats to birds and recommended further research on these issues by CMS.
331. The Chair noted the only change proposed was to add reporting to the StC under paragraph 14.AA of the CRP, and proposed that the COW recommend the document for adoption. The document was adopted by the COW.

**Item 27.2.1 Effects of marine pollution on migratory species**

332. The COP-appointed Councillor for Marine Pollution introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.27.2.1/Rev.2 Effects of Marine Pollution on Migratory Species.
333. Egypt approved the Draft Decisions but recommended to add enhancement of actions at national and regional levels.
334. OceanCare supported the comprehensive review of this multifaceted topic area, and encouraged partners to make funding available for this.
335. The Chair noted that there was a CRP on this document, so this would be taken on Day 4.

**Item 27.2.2. Marine noise**

336. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.27.2.2/Rev.2 *Marine Noise*, prepared by the Joint Noise Working Group of CMS, ACCOBAMS and ASCOBANS, the ScC and the Secretariat. The document recommended the COP to note the WG report, adopt the Draft Decisions and delete Decisions 13.38, 13.59 and 13.60.
337. Australia was developing underwater noise guidelines that would consider impacts on marine wildlife, as well as current international best practice standards and mitigation measures. It expected to publish the guidelines in June 2024, which it would share through the ScC.
338. Belgium, on behalf of the EU and its Member States, provided minor editorial comments in writing in relation to Draft Decision 14.CC element d).
339. Egypt approved the Draft Decisions taking into consideration the input of Australia on guidelines and mitigation measures.
340. The Chair informed that the COW would consider the CRP formally on Day 4.

**Item 27.2.3 Vessel strikes**

341. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.27.2.3/Rev.1 *Vessel Strikes*, prepared by the Secretariat, which contained Annex 1 with a draft Resolution, Annex 2 with guidance on reducing the risk of vessel strikes to Whale Sharks, and Annex 3 with Draft Decisions. Related Information document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Inf.27.2.3 contained a study on global ship strikes of Whale Sharks. The document highlighted the need for proactive measures, research, monitoring and international cooperation to reduce vessel strike risk.
342. Egypt supported the document and referred to impacts of vessel strikes on migratory whales.

343. OceanCare, speaking also on behalf of IFAW and WWF urged close collaboration between MEAs and with the private sector and highlighted threats of vessels strikes and potential ways to address it.
344. Kenya took note of the report and supported the adoption of the Draft Decisions to reduce risks of vessel strikes on marine megafauna.
345. ACCOBAMS noted its long history in dealing with ship strikes in the Mediterranean Sea and endorsed the document.
346. The Chair informed that there a CRP would come back for the COW to recommend for adoption on Day 4.

#### **Item 27.2.4. Deep Sea Mining**

347. The Secretariat introduced UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.27.2.4 *Deep-Sea Mining*, noting, among others, a letter submitted to CMS by the International Seabed Authority (ISA) contained in UNEP/CMS/COP14/Inf.27.2.4.
348. Many countries supported adopting a precautionary approach with respect to deep sea mining (DSM); underscoring the need that more information is needed on the impacts of DSM on migratory species. Many speakers also expressed their support for the draft decision and resolution.
349. Cook Islands stressed the need for Parties to enhance monitoring and research efforts, to better understand the potential impacts of deep-sea minerals extraction on migratory species. for a regional environmental management plan is to include a systematic environmental risk assessment of impacts as well as a cumulative impact assessment. They also pointed to emerging studies on the impacts of seabed mining, noting progress has been made since the CMS document was circulated. Cook Island stated that the document needs work to incorporate a systematic and holistic evaluation of potential impacts.
350. France supported a ban on DSM, focusing on the CMS mandate, strengthening knowledge of the impacts of DSM and working with the ISA.
351. Monaco stressed the importance of scientific data when deciding on steps to take on activities that could affect marine migratory species, and that CMS should continue work on this issue within its mandate.
352. Brazil expressed support for the draft resolution and decisions and adopting a precautionary approach on all seabed mining, and recalled the importance of discussions on the Mining Code under the ISA.
353. New Zealand noted that best available information on the impacts of DSM on migratory species should be shared with the ISA and supporting its work on areas beyond national jurisdiction. While support the draft resolution and decisions, they noted process issues with document and hoped for enhancing consultations in the future.
354. Germany stated it would not sponsor any work plans until deep sea impact and exploitation had been assessed.
355. Egypt asked that countries refrain from engaging in DSM until robust scientific information was available.

356. Australia emphasized impacts on migratory species, prey and ecosystems on which they depend are not sufficiently understood, and the need to work through and communicate and engage with the ISA on this issue.
357. The Netherlands stated the document should focus on migratory species, prey the and ecosystems on which they depend.
358. Spain noted its moratorium on DSM until more information regarding impacts becomes available, and stated safeguards must be in place to ensure marine ecosystem are not affected.
359. Norway underscored the need to respect the mandates of existing international institutions, and that the document confuses competencies of relevant institutions and organizations. ISA mandates should be spelled out, BBNJ references should be more precise, UNCLOS language more streamlined, and the CMS role more precise according to its mandate.
360. Samoa noted progress made in the Pacific region on calling for a DSM moratorium, and asked that others join the moratorium.
361. Belgium stated the resolution should relate directly to migratory species and not seabed mining more broadly, and asked that the Secretariat inform ISA of the COP14 decision on this issue.
362. Fiji noted its 10-year moratorium on DSM, and that environmental and social impacts must be considered, and that ISA, BBNJ and the CBD must work together on this issue.
363. India, Belgium and Costa Rica also intervened on similar points already raised.
364. The Chair noted that the WG would continue its work on this issue.

### **Item 27.3. Marine Wildlife Watching**

#### **Item 27.3.1 Recreational in-water interactions**

365. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.27.3.1/Rev.1 *Recreational in-water interactions*, which had an annex containing *Guidelines for Recreational In-water Interactions with Marine Wildlife*.
366. No comments were made on this issue and the Chair noted that the Aquatic WG had finished working on this issue and a CRP had been made available.

### **Item 27.4. Area-based Conservation Management**

#### **Item 27.4.1 Important Marine Mammal Areas (IMMAs)**

367. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.27.4.1 *Important Marine Mammal Areas*, prepared by the Secretariat, which contained Annex 1 with a report of the Marine Mammal Protected Area Task Force if the IUCN SSC and Annex 2 with the Draft Decisions. The Aquatic WG had finished discussion on the document, so a CRP was already available.
368. Bahrain made suggestions on identification of IMMAs in the Arabian Gulf identification and other socio-economic aspects to consider.

369. Egypt supported the statement of Bahrain and noted work in the Mediterranean in cooperation with ACCOBAMS to create a system of protected IMMAs and the role of Egypt.
370. WDC supported the document and its Draft Decisions and encouraged Parties to use IMMAs.
371. Noting that it had organized the first IMMA workshop in 2017 with IUCN, ACCOBAMS supported the Draft Decisions in the document.
372. The Chair noted that a CRP was available and would come back to the committee in due course.

#### **Item 27.4.2. Important Shark and Ray Areas (ISRAs)**

373. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.27.4.2/Rev.1 *Important Shark and Ray Areas*, which was prepared by the Secretariat. The document was endorsed by the 4<sup>th</sup> Meeting of Signatories (MOS4) to the Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation of Migratory Sharks and by ScC-SC6 for adoption.
374. Egypt welcomed the Draft Decisions already endorsed by the Sharks MOU and encouraged all Range States to sign the MOU during COP14.
375. The Chair noted that a CRP would be received in due course.

#### **Item 27.4.3. Seagrass ecosystems**

376. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.27.4.3 *Seagrass Ecosystems*, prepared by the Secretariat.
377. The UAE commended efforts detailed in the document to promote sustainable management of seagrass ecosystems and their role in supporting migratory species. The UAE proposed inclusion of new preambular text in writing to emphasize collective commitments to seagrass restoration and to highlight financing mechanisms.
378. Bahrain supported amendments proposed by the ScC that captured the vital role and functionality of seagrass ecosystems, and welcomed the 2030 Seagrass Breakthrough.
379. Egypt supported inclusion of the amendments proposed by the UAE, and emphasized the economic value of seagrass ecosystems, which provided refuge for many migratory species.
380. Kenya supported the draft Resolution in Annex 1 on conservation and sustainable management of seagrass.
381. The Chair noted that the CRP would come back to the committee on Day 4.

#### **Item 27.5. Marine Mammals**

##### **Item 27.5.1. Conservation priorities for cetaceans**

382. The Secretariat presented document *Conservation priorities for cetaceans*, prepared by the Secretariat and the ScC, with a Resolution contained in Annex 2. The Aquatic WG was reviewing the document, but no CRP was yet available.

383. Egypt welcomed the Draft Decisions and noted overlap between this and other documents. It urged partners to support a workshop for a Red Sea Action Plan for cetaceans.
384. Brazil expressed support for the document, which was in line with its objective of protecting its more than 50 species of cetaceans, especially migratory whales. It requested the Secretariat to prioritize support for a capacity-building workshop for implementation of an action plan for South Atlantic whales, which had not yet been held due to a lack of resources.
385. Argentina supported the document.
386. The Chair informed that a CRP would come back to the COW for approval.

**Item 27.5.2. Single Species Action Plan for the Atlantic Humpback Dolphin (*Souza teuszii*)**

387. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.27.5.2/Rev.2 *Single Species Action Plan for the Atlantic Humpback Dolphin (*Souza teuszii*)*, prepared by the Secretariat. The Aquatic WG proposed no changes to the document. The mandate for the work came from Concerted Action 12.3 (Rev.COP13), which foresaw development of a species action plan; Annex 2 contained the draft SSAP. A related information document contained factsheets.
388. Senegal hosted the Marine Megafauna meeting in 2023, which led to a declaration by the Range States in support of the document and the SSAP, and urged other Parties to support it.
389. Benin had contributed to the development of the SSAP and echoed the statement of Senegal in calling on Parties to adopt the document and the SSAP to encourage conservation action.
390. The Chair indicated that the document was unamended from previous discussions, and sought agreement to recommend it from adoption, including the SSAP Draft Decisions. The COW recommended the document for adoption.

**Item 27.5.3. Sirenians, pinnipeds and otters**

391. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.27.5.3/Rev.1 *Sirenians, pinnipeds and otters*, prepared by the Secretariat. Discussion was taking place within the Aquatic WG, and preparation of a CRP was underway.
392. Egypt welcomed the document and highlighted the need to conserve Dugongs in the Arabian Gulf and the Red Sea and called for an Action Plan for the Dugong population of the Red Sea.
393. The Chair informed that a CRP would be available in due course.

**Item 27.6. Marine turtles**

**Item 27.6.1. Marine turtles**

394. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.27.6.1/Rev.1 *Marine turtles*, prepared by the Secretariat. The document had been discussed in the Aquatic WG, which proposed to accept the recommendations with minor amendment. Related Information Document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Inf.27.6.1 contained a Draft Report of an on-

going Marine Turtle Legislative Review for the Asia-Pacific Region prepared by WWF. A CRP was not yet available.

395. The Inter-American Sea Turtle Convention looked forward to work together with CMS and Parties for the conservation of marine turtles globally.
396. Egypt, which had been monitoring marine turtles in the Red Sea for many years, supported the document.
397. Senegal informed that during the 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of Signatories of the Atlantic Turtles MOU, Signatories reviewed the situation of turtles along the Atlantic coast, and revised, updated and adopted the regional Conservation Management Plan. Senegal supported the document and its Draft Decisions.
398. India highlighted the importance of the 9<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Signatory States to the IOSEA Marine Turtle MOU scheduled in Tanzania in 2024 as a forum to discuss future actions in detail.
399. WWF drew attention to the legislative review for the Asia-Pacific Region, which aimed to assess and harmonize marine turtle legislation and close gaps in policies at a national level. WWF had received 22 country responses during a regional survey to conduct a preliminary analysis, and encouraged remaining Parties to respond.

**Item 27.6.2 Single Species Action Plan for the Hawksbill Turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*) in South-East Asia and the Western Pacific Ocean Region**

400. The Secretariat introduced UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.27.6.2/Rev.1 *Single Species Action Plan for the Hawksbill Turtle (Eretmochelys imbricata) in South-East Asia and the Western Pacific Ocean Region*.
401. Cook Islands, supported by the Philippines, underscored the need for financial and technical assistance to implement the SSAP and urged Parties in a position to do so to support this effort.
402. Senegal, supported by Egypt, stated that a global action plan for the Hawksbill Turtle was need, citing threats such as poaching.
403. A CRP was being prepared by the WG.

**Item 27.7. Fish**

**Item 27.7.1. Single Species Action Plan for the Angelshark (*Squatina squatina*) in the Mediterranean Sea**

404. The Secretariat introduced UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.27.7.1 *Single Species Action Plan for the Angelshark in the Mediterranean Sea*. The SSAP builds on the Mediterranean Angel Sharks: Regional Action Plan (MedRAP), and was developed to guide Mediterranean Range States in activities for Angelshark conservation The Secretariat thanked Monaco for its financial support.
405. The EU noted an amendment it would submit in writing.
406. IUCN commented that the Mediterranean region is one of last strongholds for the species.
407. The WG was still expected to discuss this SSAP.

**Item 27.7.2 Freshwater fish including the European Eel**

408. The Secretariat introduced this document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.27.7.2/Rev.1 *Freshwater fish including the European Eel*.
409. This issue would be further discussed in the Aquatic WG.

**Item 27.7.3 Implementation of the CMS Appendix I-Listing for the Oceanic Whitetip Shark (*Carcharhinus longimanus*)**

410. Maldives introduced the document for this agenda item UNEP/COP/CMS14/Doc.27.7.3 *Implementation of the CMS Appendix I-Listing for the Oceanic Whitetip Shark (Carcharhinus longimanus)*. They emphasized that the fact that this CMS Appendix I species remains in trade indicated that global implementation of the Appendix I listing was inadequate. The document contained proposed decisions that would help improve implementation of the listing for this species.
411. The European Union welcomed the effort of the Maldives, noting the species had declined in Europe by 50 per cent over three generations.
412. Senegal urged efforts to improve the conservation status of the species.
413. Work on this issue would continue in the WG.

**Item 28.1 Prevention of illegal killing, taking and trade of migratory birds**

414. The Secretariat introduced UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.28.1/Rev.1 *Prevention of illegal killing, taking and trade of migratory birds*.
415. Kenya, supporting the proposed amendment, called attention to its punitive penalties for taking endangered species.
416. Georgia and Saudi Arabia also made interventions, the latter noting its work with BirdLife and Secretariat and a workshop to establish a working group this issue.

**Item 28.2. Action Plan for Migratory Landbirds in the African-Eurasian Region (AEMLAP)**

417. The Secretariat introduced UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.28.2 *Action Plan for Migratory Landbirds in the African-Eurasian Region (AEMLAP)*, which discusses, among others.
418. Kenya noted development of a SSAP for the Grey Crowned-crane, and that it was working with Madagascar to develop a plan for the Madagascar Pond-heron.

**Item 28.3. Preventing poisoning of migratory birds**

419. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.28.3 *Preventing poisoning of migratory birds*, which addresses, among other things, preventing lead poisoning of migratory birds from ammunition and the establishment of a task force to address this. However, it has yet to meet due to a lack of resources.
420. Kenya noted poisoning affecting migratory birds was not limited to lead poisoning and stated that the country prohibited poisoning of species.
421. South Africa emphasized the need for available and affordable alternatives to lead ammunition, expressed concern that the task force had not yet met, and urged sending this issue to the budget group.

422. BirdLife also expressed concern with lack of progress in getting the lead task force up and running, and said progress must be made in the upcoming triennium.

423. Further discussions took place in the WG.

#### **Item 28.4. Flyways**

##### **Item 28.4.1. Flyways**

424. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.28.4.1/Rev.1 *Flyways*, prepared by the Secretariat, which highlighted activities carried out to implement the Programme of Work on Migratory Birds and Flyways 2014-2023 and the strategic review of all CMS Flyways-relevant documents, working groups, task forces and other instruments. The document was being discussed in the Avian WG.

425. Australia supported the document and was pleased with the progress made in implementing this Resolution, and noted the importance of collaboration between CMS and the East Asian-Australasian Flyway Partnership (EAAFP) and partners of the West Pacific Flyway.

426. The Chair noted that the Avian WG would continue deliberations and the document would come back to the COW.

##### **Item 28.4.2. Initiative for Central Asian Flyway**

427. India presented document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.28.4.2 *Initiative for Central Asian Flyway*, prepared by the Secretariat, which contained proposals for adoption of a draft Resolution and Draft Decisions to establish the Initiative for Central Asian Flyway (CAF) under CMS, and the adoption of Terms of Reference.

428. Bangladesh supported the Initiative for CAF and mentioned it had conducted satellite tracking of migratory birds in collaboration with IUCN Bangladesh.

429. WWF welcomed the Initiative CAF.

430. BirdLife International acknowledged the leadership of India in developing the initiative, which filled a key global gap in flyway conservation.

431. Uzbekistan, which had hosted a CAF meeting in 2001 on migratory waterbirds, supported the comments by India and the establishment of the Initiative CAF, which would synergize CMS and non-CMS instruments.

432. The Chair noted that the Avian WG was reviewing the paper, which would come back to the meeting on Day 4.