



CONVENTION ON MIGRATORY SPECIES

Distr: General

UNEP/CMS/Conf.10.11
29 August 2011

ORIGINAL: English

TENTH MEETING OF THE
CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES
Bergen, 20-25 November 2011
Agenda Item 17

ANALYSIS AND SYNTHESIS OF NATIONAL REPORTS

(Prepared by the UNEP/CMS Secretariat in collaboration with UNEP-WCMC)

BACKGROUND

1. Article VI(3) of the Convention requires Parties to inform the Conference of the Parties (COP), through the Secretariat, at least six months prior to each ordinary meeting of the Conference, about the measures that they are taking to implement the provisions of the Convention relating to Appendix I and II species. Consequently, the COP adopted, at its Seventh Meeting, a standard report format. The standard report format has since been updated and improved by the Standing Committee, following lessons learnt from the reporting rounds for the Seventh and Eighth Meetings of the COP.
2. National reports continue to provide the best means available to assess the status of implementation of the Convention and help to guide decisions on current and future strategic priorities. The present document provides an overview of the status of implementation of the Convention as reflected in the information provided by the 68 out of 113 eligible Parties¹ which submitted national reports by 10 June 2011. All national reports were submitted using the standard reporting format².
3. This analysis summarizes data provided in Section II (omitting questions on specific Appendix I species) and Sections III, V, VI, IX and X of the national reports. A more in-depth summary of this information is provided in Annex I to this report.
4. At COP9 in 2008, Parties adopted Resolution 9.4 calling upon the Secretariats and Parties to CMS Agreements to collaborate in the implementation and harmonization of online reporting implementation. With a view to moving towards online reporting in the future, this analysis was produced using the Online Reporting Tool developed by UNEP-WCMC.

¹ The European Union is not required to submit a national report. Armenia and Burundi acceded after the deadline.

² National reports are available at www.cms.int/bodies/COP/cop10/national_report/NRs_not_coded.html.

APPENDIX I SPECIES: OVERVIEW OF ISSUES & ACTIVITIES

5. The **taking of Appendix I species** is prohibited by the majority of Range States for the following major groups: birds (88 percent of responding Range States), marine mammals (94 percent), marine turtles (85 percent), terrestrial mammals other than bats (86 percent), bats (63 percent) and other taxa (including four species of fish and one reptile species) (77 percent).

6. For all groups, exceptions to the prohibition on take are granted by some Parties, principally for scientific reasons including conservation projects, or to protect people and their property.

7. **Obstacles to migration and threats** to migratory species as reported by Parties, along with the corresponding mitigation measures, are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Major obstacles/threats to Appendix I species and mitigation measures taken to overcome these obstacles/threats

Major obstacle/threat	Reported for	Mitigation measures
Habitat loss/alteration/fragmentation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Birds <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marine Mammals <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marine Turtles <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Terrestrial Mammals <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bats <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other taxa	Creation of protected areas, identification of corridors between habitats, restoration of habitat, habitat and species management, action/conservation plans, international cooperation, legislation, monitoring and research and awareness raising.
Man-made obstacles and threats	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Birds <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marine Mammals <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marine Turtles <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Terrestrial Mammals <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bats <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other taxa	Legislation and law enforcement, action/management plans, habitat management, research and monitoring, removal of obstacles, rescue operations, protected areas and awareness raising.
Bycatch	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Birds <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marine Mammals <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marine Turtles <input type="checkbox"/> Terrestrial Mammals <input type="checkbox"/> Bats <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other taxa	Training/awareness raising, legislation and law enforcement, technological fixes including deterrent devices ('pingers') and devices to allow bycatch to escape (TEDs), bans of specific gear, on-board observer programmes, monitoring and research, management/conservation plans, protected areas and no-fishing zones, education in treatment/handling of injured specimens and rescue operations.
Illegal Hunting/Poaching	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Birds <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marine Mammals <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marine Turtles <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Terrestrial Mammals <input type="checkbox"/> Bats <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other taxa	Legislation and law enforcement, surveillance, sustainable management, captive breeding and/or reintroduction, action plans/species management, trans-boundary collaboration, benefit sharing to encourage conservation and awareness raising.
Collision with shipping traffic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Birds <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marine Mammals <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marine Turtles <input type="checkbox"/> Terrestrial Mammals <input type="checkbox"/> Bats <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other taxa	Legislation (including no-fishing zones and regulation of whale watching), monitoring, real-time location tracking tool, maps defining high risk areas, international cooperation and awareness raising.
Pollution	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Birds <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marine Mammals <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marine Turtles <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Terrestrial Mammals <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bats <input type="checkbox"/> Other taxa	Ban on dumping at sea and contingency plans for pollution incidents, rescue operations, research, monitoring and awareness raising.

8. **Bycatch** continues to be the threat reported most frequently for marine species (seabirds, mammals, turtles and sharks). Actions taken by Parties to reduce bycatch include legal requirements for the use of technologies including: alternative hook types, turtle excluder devices, and acoustic deterrent devices. To increase the likelihood of compliance, many Parties are providing training to fishing communities on the use of the various technological fixes. Enforcement measures to ensure the necessary precautions are being taken to avoid bycatch and to report bycatch when it occurs, including increased observer coverage on fishing vessels, were frequently cited. Parties also highlighted the need to share experience on technologies and successful mitigation measures between countries.

9. **Habitat loss and fragmentation** are the main obstacles to migration affecting migratory birds and terrestrial mammals, including bats, according to Parties. Efforts to alleviate these pressures include habitat restoration, the creation of protected areas (including trans-boundary protected areas), the creation of migratory corridors and the development of conservation plans. The importance of cooperation between Range States in the management of trans-boundary parks and the setting up of migration corridors was noted.

10. **Poaching and illegal trade** are among the major threats to birds, terrestrial mammals and marine turtles, but also affect marine mammals and other taxa, such as sharks and sturgeon. Lack of relevant legislation or difficulties in enforcing existing legislation were commonly reported as factors contributing to poaching and illegal trade. Many Parties are developing new legislation and strengthening law enforcement in order to combat poaching and illegal trade. Other actions included increased surveillance and protection of nesting sites. Parties also recognized the importance of raising awareness of conservation issues, with some working to increase stakeholder involvement and benefit sharing programmes.

11. **Other major threats** included: pollution (including marine debris) affecting marine mammals and turtles in particular; acoustic noise pollution (seismic/electromagnetic surveys that disturb marine mammals); collisions with shipping traffic; wind turbine development; electric infrastructure; and other physical barriers such as weirs that hinder migration. Clean-up programmes, regulations and acoustic guidelines are being implemented to mitigate pollution, and Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) were frequently cited as actions taken to minimize the negative impacts of man-made obstacles and development projects. Several Parties also identified climate change and related events such as droughts or floods as threats for all groups.

12. Impediments to conservation action included financial constraints, enforcement issues, lack of cooperation at the national and international level, lack of qualified personnel and lack of awareness. Further limiting factors were civil unrest, increase in human population and climate change.

13. Assistance required by Parties to overcome obstacles to migration was principally in the form of financial support (36 Parties), technical or material support (27 Parties), training (19 Parties), scientific support (13 Parties) and regional or international cooperation (12 Parties) (Table 2).

Table 2: Assistance required by Parties to overcome the obstacles to migration facing Appendix I species

Assistance required	Birds	Marine Mammals	Marine turtles	Terrestrial Mammals	Bats	Other taxa
Financial	Angola, Argentina, Belgium, Benin, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Ghana, Honduras, Iran, Kenya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Senegal, Serbia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, United Kingdom (Bermuda), United Republic of Tanzania,	Angola, Benin, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Ecuador, Ghana, Guinea, Morocco, Pakistan, Panama, Samoa, Togo	Angola, Congo, Cote d'Ivoire, Guinea, Iran, Mauritania, Morocco, Pakistan, Senegal, Togo, Uruguay	Angola, Argentina, Burkina Faso, Chad, Congo, Iran, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Pakistan	Costa Rica, Ecuador	
Regional/international cooperation (including knowledge exchange)	Chile, India, New Zealand, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Ukraine, United Kingdom	India, New Zealand, Pakistan	France (French Guiana), India, Pakistan, South Africa	Algeria		Albania, India, New Zealand
Scientific research and monitoring	Costa Rica, Ecuador, Hungary, Mongolia, Saudi Arabia	Honduras, Uruguay	Algeria, Benin, Croatia, Ecuador, France, India		Honduras	Kenya
Technical/material support	Algeria, Angola, Chad, Congo, Croatia, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Iran, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Montenegro, Morocco, Pakistan, Paraguay, Senegal, Serbia, Switzerland, Tajikistan	Algeria, Angola, Benin, Croatia, Ghana, Mauritius, Morocco, Pakistan, Samoa, Togo	Albania, Congo, Guinea, Iran, Mauritania, Pakistan, Senegal, Togo	Algeria, Angola, Burkina Faso, Chad, Congo, Iran, Mali, Morocco, Senegal	Paraguay	Albania
Training/capacity-building	Burkina Faso, Chile, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Iran, Mali, Pakistan, Panama, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Togo	Albania, Algeria, Benin, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Mauritania, Mauritius, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia	Costa Rica, Ecuador, Panama	Congo, Iran, Morocco, Pakistan, Mali		
Species/habitat protection		Guinea, Honduras, Ukraine				
Staff/human resources			Costa Rica, France (French Guiana)			
Other	Albania, Belarus, Cyprus, New Zealand, Uruguay	India	Benin, France, Kenya, Morocco, Panama, and United Kingdom (Bermuda)	Argentina, Kenya		

POTENTIAL NEW SPECIES LISTINGS

Appendix I

14. Twenty migratory species not currently listed in Appendix I were identified as having an unfavourable conservation status by Range States (on the basis of 14 Parties responding) (Annex I, Table 8). The majority of species (16) reported were bird species, of which two (Saker Falcon *Falco cherrug* and Red-footed Falcon *Falco vespertinus*) were each put forward by two Parties and have been formally proposed for inclusion at COP10 by the European Union (COP10 Proposals I/1 and I/2). The remainder included three mammal species (African Elephant *Loxodonta africana*, African Manatee *Trichechus senegalensis*, Barbary Sheep *Ammotragus lervia*) and two fish species (Whale Shark *Rhincodon typus* and European Eel *Anguilla anguilla*). One bird species named, Red Knot *Calidris canutus*, has a subspecies already listed in Appendix I (*Calidris canutus rufa*). Eighteen of the 20 species mentioned as species requiring Appendix I listing are already listed in Appendix II.

15. Five Parties indicated that they are taking steps to propose the listing in Appendix I of seven species in total (Annex I, Table 8). Steps taken by Parties included submission of draft proposals and discussion of potential listings, in some cases in collaboration with other Parties. One Party already taking steps to propose listings (Benin) stated a need for assistance in the form of support for the proposal from other Parties; five other Parties require assistance to initiate the listing of new species in the form of financial, technical, and material support, primarily for proposal preparation and for conducting scientific studies to identify new species needing protection.

Appendix II

16. Twenty-five migratory species and one genus not currently listed in Appendix II were identified by Range States as having an unfavourable conservation status; this was on the basis of responses provided by eleven Parties (Annex I, Table 9). Twenty of the species and the genus *Lanius* are birds; sixteen of the bird species are within the genus *Lanius*, with the species and genus put forward by different Parties (species: France and Slovenia; genus: Italy). One additional bird species, Ortolan Bunting *Emberiza hortulana*, was also put forward by more than one Party (Italy and Slovenia). Other species named included nine mammal species, of which five are bats; and European Eel *Anguilla anguilla*, which was put forward by two Parties (Denmark and Sweden). Argali Sheep *Ovis ammon* was the only species named that has been formally proposed for inclusion in Appendix II at COP10 (COP10 Proposal II/1 proposed by Kazakhstan and Tajikistan). One species, Red Deer *Cervus elaphus*, put forward by Mongolia, has subspecies listed in both Appendices I and II but neither subspecies is known to occur in Mongolia.

17. Five Parties indicated that they are taking steps to propose the listing in Appendix II of a total of twenty-five species and the genus *Lanius* (Annex I, Table 9). Steps taken by Parties include discussions and preparations for the development of proposals, in some cases with other Parties, with Mongolia highlighting the aforementioned COP10 proposal to list *Ovis ammon*. Italy indicated that assistance could be sought from the EUROBATS Secretariat regarding the listing of various bat species; three other Parties not already taking steps to propose listings stated a need for assistance in the form of financial, scientific and administrative support in order to conduct scientific research.

AGREEMENT DEVELOPMENT

18. Forty of the reporting Parties (59 percent) indicated that they have initiated, participated in or are planning the development of a new Agreement or Memorandum of Understanding (MoU).

19. Agreements and MoUs mentioned by Parties that are already in force include those concerning Aquatic Warbler, South American grassland birds, African-Eurasian birds of prey, High Andean flamingos, Dugong, Mediterranean Monk Seal, manatees and small cetaceans of Western Africa and Macaronesia, marine turtles of the Indian Ocean and South-East Asia, African Elephant, Southern Huemul, gorillas, European bats and sharks. Agreements mentioned by Parties that are in development concern Houbara Bustard *Chlamydotis undulata*, Grey-cheeked Parakeet *Brotogeris pyrrhoptera*, African Wild Dog *Lycaon pictus*, Cheetah *Acinonyx jubatus*, Saiga Antelope *Saiga tatarica*, Sahara Oryx *Oryx dammah*, Addax *Addax nasomaculatus*, Asian Wild Sheep *Ovis ammon*, Snow Leopard *Uncia uncia*, gazelles, hyenas, flamingos, and Mediterranean pelicans. Ecuador noted the need for an MoU on Hawksbill Turtle *Eretmochelys imbricata*, while Samoa mentioned the need for an MoU for turtles and their nesting sites in the Pacific Island Region.

20. Assistance, in the form of financial, technical, logistical, scientific, administrative and legal support, is required by 11 Parties in order to initiate or participate in the development of new Agreements. Saudi Arabia suggested that the MoU on birds of prey could be further improved by convening a meeting of range States before or during COP10, with the assistance of the Secretariat.

PROTECTED AREAS

21. Migratory species are taken into account in the selection, establishment and management of protected areas within 62 of the reporting Parties (91 percent). Twenty-seven Parties apply international criteria that consider migratory species, in particular under the Ramsar Convention and the EU Birds and Habitats Directives. Twenty-seven Parties noted that migratory species are taken into account within their own national protected area criteria or legislation.

22. Important sites for migratory species were identified by 49 Parties (72 percent), with the number of sites listed ranging from one (Panama and Samoa) up to 100 (the Netherlands). The majority of sites listed had international designations, such as Ramsar Wetlands of International Importance and sites designated under the EU Birds Directive and the EU Habitats Directive, while many areas have also been identified as Important Bird Areas (IBAs).

23. Parties were asked to provide details on the number and area coverage of terrestrial, marine and aquatic protected areas within their countries. Sixty-one Parties reported a total 7,591 terrestrial sites; 58 Parties reported a total of 239 aquatic sites; 43 Parties reported a total of 256 marine sites and 32 Parties reported an additional 30,537 sites of unspecified type. The total area under protection declared by Parties amounted to over 1.2 million km².

24. The agency, department or organization responsible for action on protected areas was specified by 56 Parties (82 percent). These principally comprised ministries charged with governance of the environment, wildlife, forests, water, energy and sustainable development.

25. Positive outcomes of actions taken on protected areas were identified by 44 Parties (65 percent). These included the establishment, expansion and connection of protected areas; positive impacts on vulnerable species and habitats within protected areas; greater involvement of local communities; and increased tourism.

SATELLITE TELEMETRY

26. Satellite telemetry projects were carried out by 35 Parties (52 percent) during the reporting period. Projects primarily focussed on birds, and the most frequently studied birds included raptors and geese. Several species of mammals and marine turtles were also subject to projects, with one Party tracking 11 bat species (Germany).

27. The main positive outcomes of satellite telemetry projects were identified as:

- Mapping of migratory routes;
- Identification of important sites used by birds including resting, wintering, breeding or feeding sites; and
- Understanding of behaviour.

28. Future projects using this technology are planned by 26 Parties (38 percent). For those Parties without any projects planned, the lack of financial resources, equipment, human resources and training in the technique were cited as impediments.

RESOURCE MOBILISATION

29. Financial resources were made available by 51 Parties (78 percent) for conservation activities that directly benefited migratory species in their own country. Parties specified activities involving species in all major taxonomic groups, with the majority focussing on birds (Annex I, Table 13). Reported activities included species surveys and other research projects, establishment and management of protected areas, species management plans, reintroduction programmes, training and raising awareness.

30. Voluntary contributions to the CMS Trust Fund to support developing countries were provided by six Parties (9 percent), according to national report responses. Contributions were reportedly directed towards funding attendance at CMS COPs, organization of other CMS meetings, implementation of Agreements and investment in projects benefiting migratory species. This appears to be an underestimate of the total number of Parties voluntarily contributing to the CMS Trust Fund, as voluntary contributions were also provided by additional Parties in the form of support for various meetings and workshops within the CMS Family according to the Standing Committee document relating to the CMS Trust Fund (see Annex 3 of CMS/StC37/11).

31. Voluntary financial contributions towards CMS conservation activities in other countries were reported by 10 Parties (15 percent). Activities involved a range of different species, in particular birds, marine mammals, and marine turtles (Annex I, Table 14). According to Parties, projects that have received contributions include the Sahelo-Saharan Antelopes Programme, the African-Eurasian Flyways project “Wings over Wetlands”, AEWAs projects in Africa, the International Climate Initiative, a workshop on Hawksbill Turtle *Eretmochelys imbricata* in the wider Caribbean, wildlife law enforcement in Gabon and Congo, and invasive species eradication in Kiribati.

32. Technical or scientific assistance to developing countries was provided by ten Parties (15 percent) in order to facilitate initiatives benefiting migratory species.

33. Several Parties specified that they contributed through provision of training and participation in workshops and seminars (Annex I, Table 15). Species reportedly benefiting from this support included birds, elephants, gorillas, Central Asian arid land mammals, whales and marine turtles.

34. Receipt of financial support from the CMS Trust Fund for conservation activities was reported by five Parties (7 percent). Species targeted included birds (Argentina, Madagascar and Uruguay), marine mammals (India and Samoa) and marine turtles (India).

35. Receipt of financial support from sources other than CMS for migratory species conservation was reported by twenty-five Parties (37 percent). Sources specified included international funding bodies, national governments, NGOs and one commercial foundation. The principal sources specified were the EU/EU-LIFE Nature Fund (eight Parties), GEF/UNDP (six Parties), WWF (four Parties) and Wetlands International (three Parties).

CMS COP RESOLUTIONS AND CMS COP RECOMMENDATIONS

36. Parties were asked to report on the implementation of 30 Resolutions and 13 Recommendations. The responses submitted by Parties within this section of the national report are summarized below by grouping together Resolutions and Recommendations covering similar topics. Details on responses to specific Resolutions and Recommendations can be found in Annex I.

37. Twenty-one Parties reported on Resolutions relating to **bycatch**, which affects birds, marine mammals, turtles and sharks. Efforts to reduce bycatch included work to improve fisheries management, awareness raising, on-board observer programs, use of deterrents, use and research on less harmful fishing gear, alert and care/rescue operations, establishment of protected areas, and monitoring of and research on bycatch levels. Parties reported on participation in bycatch related activities through ACAP, ACCOBAMS (including ByCBAMS), ASCOBANS, CCAMLR, and FAO COFI, and several EU Member States noted the EU's participation at Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs).

38. Efforts to reduce the impacts of **man-made obstacles and human induced impacts** (including oil pollution, electrocution, wind turbines, and noise pollution) on migratory species are being taken by thirty Parties. Measures against oil pollution are addressed in legislation and contingency plans, with further actions including monitoring and identification of particularly sensitive areas. The protection of birds against electrocution includes the replacing of dangerous technology and measures to avoid collision. Actions relating to wind turbines range from development of guidelines and research to the identification of areas of particular vulnerability. Work to minimize the impact of marine noise pollution included research and the use of listening devices to detect marine mammals prior to use of sonar. Twenty-one Parties conduct Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) for development projects, with EIAs mandatory in 16 countries either for all or for specific projects. Further measures included species and habitat protection, research into toxic contaminants and support for the moratorium on commercial whaling.

39. Twenty-two Parties reported on actions taken in relation to **migratory birds**, with several Parties noting their ratification of ACAP and their involvement in Western Hemisphere Migratory Species Initiative (WHMSI). On-going activities relating to monitoring and the development of management plans were also highlighted. Albatrosses and Petrels, Saker Falcon *Falco cherrug* and a number of other raptor species were reported to be protected within Range States.

40. Actions for **migratory marine species** were taken by 24 Parties and include work to improve conservation policies/management, participation in IWC, awareness raising, research and monitoring. A number of marine species are protected within parts of their distribution range. Further measures included the regulation of whale watching, rescue and release of specimens and closer cooperation with IWC on whale conservation.

41. Two Parties (Belgium and India) reported on Recommendations aimed at **migratory terrestrial mammals**. Belgium reported their support for the Scientific Council's work on the MoUs on Central Eurasian and Aridland Mammals and the Sahelo-Saharan Megafauna. India is undertaking work aimed at increased protection for tigers and other Asian cats through better cooperation in the management of trans-boundary protected areas.

42. Concerted actions for **Appendix I species** were taken by seven Parties, through the organization of workshops, development of action plans, financial support of the AEWA Secretariat, research, species protection and management.

43. Twenty-seven Parties reported on **cooperation with other bodies and processes** (IUCN, UNESCO, UNDP); Conventions (CBD, CITES, Bern, IWC, Ramsar, UNCCD, UNFCCC); CMS processes (ACAP, ACCOBAMS, AEWA, ASCOBANS, EUROBATS, Raptors MoU, Sharks MoU, etc.) and cooperation with a number of other organizations and NGOs. Further relevant actions included sharing of expertise and trans-boundary cooperation in the re-establishment and conservation of species. Parties implemented a number of agreements under the above frameworks. Looking ahead, Parties proposed the application of the AEWA approach to other migratory bird species.

44. **Climate change** was addressed by 13 Parties, with measures including research and monitoring, development of Action Plans and planning measures (for example to reduce forest fires, water management, reduction of emissions). Trans-Saharan migratory birds were identified as suitable early warning indicator species with regard to climate change impacts on the conservation status of migratory species globally.

45. **Avian influenza** was addressed by 17 Parties, with actions including active and passive monitoring, surveillance, training of relevant staff, awareness raising, inspections of poultry facilities, research, development of national action/contingency plans and international cooperation. Research was reported to provide evidence that resident birds may move into affected areas, with large-distance migrants reaching the regions in Africa with the most contagious forms of avian influenza.

46. Seven Parties took actions to address **capacity building** through the organization of conferences, training and research. Ten Parties worked on **outreach and communication issues**, with actions ranging from relevant exhibitions, campaigning and promotion of the conservation of biological diversity and migratory species to the publication and broadcasting of information through a range of media.

47. Twelve Parties reported on measures taken to ensure **sustainable use**, including the development of national strategies and species management plans, quota systems, monitoring, policies on benefit sharing and regulation of take.

48. Actions relating to the **CMS Strategic Plan 2006-2011** were reported by 15 Parties and included integration of migratory species into national biodiversity strategies and legislation, participation in relevant agreements and work on future work priorities. Nine

Parties contributed to **achieving the 2010 biodiversity target**, through national strategies, promotion of conservation issues, increase of protected area coverage and monitoring.

49. Eight Parties worked on action in relation to the **priorities for CMS agreements**, including through AEWA, ASCOBANS, EUROBATS, the Birds of Prey MoU, Mediterranean Monk Seal MoU, Sharks MoU, CAF Action Plan and Aquatic Warbler MoU. Two Parties took action with regard to **CMS information priorities**, including the promotion of harmonization of reporting procedures.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

50. On the basis of this analysis of national reports, the following priority recommendations have been identified for the consideration of the Parties to CMS.

Knowledge Exchange and Management

51. **Enhance cooperation between Parties, with a focus on capacity-building.** Financial and technical constraints, as well as a lack of qualified personnel, were frequently cited by Parties as limiting factors in taking action to mitigate the threats to migratory species. Parties often requested knowledge transfer from other Parties on particular issues, particularly with respect to scientific monitoring (including satellite telemetry projects). It is recommended that Parties provide assistance in the form of training and logistical support to other countries (particularly developing countries) to aid with implementing the practical aspects of both data collection and threat mitigation.

52. **Enhance the “Migration forum” to allow for Parties to share best practices and lessons learned on specific topics.** It is recommended that the Migration forum be expanded in order to allow CMS Parties to exchange ideas on particular topics more efficiently and to meet their reported needs for technical support and information. Instead of a mailing list, the forum could be put online (with a secure login) so that topics could be searched when needed. The forum could also be separated into different topics, allowing Parties with experience in effective implementation to highlight best practices for mitigating the various obstacles to migration. For instance, Parties could share experiences on the following:

- Bycatch reduction (through the use of technical fixes and legislation);
- Habitat protection/restoration;
- Pollution mitigation;
- Mitigating the negative impacts of wind farms and powerlines on birds;
- Improvements to enforcement (e.g. to reduce poaching, egg collection); and
- Drafting relevant legislation.

53. Such discussion fora may enable the development of CMS Guidelines on different topics to assist Parties in addressing the various threats faced by migratory species to meet the reported needs for sharing of experience.

54. **Create a directory of priority projects for knowledge sharing.** Parties are conducting a variety of projects on CMS-listed species around the world, but there is currently no centralized clearinghouse for this information. It is recommended that a directory of priority projects involving migratory species be developed. Involvement of conservation organizations, academics, and other relevant stakeholders should be encouraged. This directory could be combined with the searchable database and the forum discussed above in order to create a storehouse of knowledge for CMS Parties.

Foster linkages with other international agreements and bodies

55. **Ensure effective collaboration with other Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs).** Many of the issues that CMS is striving to address are also being discussed in other relevant fora. Fostering links and collaborating closely with MEAs that have already made progress in areas of interest to CMS would be advantageous. These include, but are not limited to, CBD, CCAMLR, CITES, MARPOL, OSPAR, Ramsar and UNCLOS. For instance, learning from the substantial progress that has been made in reducing bycatch at CCAMLR would be enormously beneficial to CMS Parties. Collaboration could build on the existing memoranda of understanding/cooperation of the Convention and the collaboration with the other biodiversity-related conventions through the Biodiversity Liaison Group. The InforMEA portal currently developed by the MEA Information and Knowledge Management Initiative, of which CMS is a part, may prove useful in this regard.

56. **Collaborate more closely within RFMOs.** As bycatch was cited as a major threat to many CMS-listed species and many Parties are members of RFMOs, it may be beneficial for CMS Parties to take CMS-specific concerns to these fora in order to strengthen bycatch reduction measures and monitoring.

Nomenclature and Taxonomy

57. **Harmonize species nomenclature with CMS daughter Agreements.** Parties again raised the discrepancy between the taxonomy followed by CMS and that followed by ACAP (particularly in reference to albatrosses). This appears to be causing confusion amongst Parties about which species are listed and which need further protection (see, for example, the discussion on Tristan Albatross *Diomedea dabbenena* within the Potential New Listings section of Annex 1). It is suggested that, unless there are substantive discrepancies that require further discussion, CMS adopts the taxonomy of ACAP. In this regard, consideration could be given to inclusion of all species of albatross and petrels in the CMS Appendices, to ensure CMS remains in-line with ACAP. Harmonizing nomenclature would help to facilitate concerted implementation and information management.

58. **Address confusion over family-level listings.** Despite the adoption of Resolution 3.1 on the Listing of Species in the Appendices of the Convention, family-level listings still appear to be causing confusion amongst Parties due to changing taxonomy. It is recommended that a clear list of CMS-listed species, including those covered by the higher taxon listings, be made available to Parties, through an updated version of the CMS Information Management System (IMS).

Species-related activities

59. **Encourage Parties to take action to mitigate the major threats to migratory species.** Parties identified a number of obstacles to migration and threats throughout their national reports (Table 1; with details provided in Annex I). Habitat loss and degradation, bycatch, pollution, poaching, ship strikes and man-made obstacles (including wind farms) were frequently highlighted by Parties as having negative impacts on migratory species. Actions should be taken on these identified issues as a priority.

60. **Encourage Parties to adopt legislation prohibiting take.** Many Parties do not currently have specific legislation prohibiting take of Appendix I species.

61. **Consider the species suggested by Parties for listing.** Request that the CMS Scientific Council consider the species suggested by Parties as species that may merit listing

in Appendix I and/or II (Annex I, Tables 8 & 9) and indicate priority species for further research so that resources can be allocated or raised by Parties and the Secretariat. **Enable Parties to generate species lists by country.**

62. Currently, a static distribution list organized by species is provided to Parties, along with search facilities within CMS IMS that are set up to allow searches by species. It is recommended that the CMS IMS be updated to allow Parties to search by country for species occurrence data, with corresponding details on the CMS Appendix listing.

National Reporting

63. **Adopt the use of on-line reporting for CMS and daughter agreements national reports.** Reporting via the on-line reporting tool will enable Parties to quickly and efficiently fulfil their reporting requirements to CMS. By incorporating distribution data, questionnaires can be tailored to Parties so that only relevant questions will appear (e.g. only Parties with Appendix I bats will see that section); this will help save time and avoid confusion in the future. It will also allow Parties to review their previous reports more readily and update the information to make it relevant to the current reporting period. The on-line reporting tool should streamline the process, making it more efficient for Parties and more standardized for analysis. Ultimately, if CMS and its daughter agreements all adopt the on-line reporting tool Parties would be able to fulfil their reporting requirements for the various agreements without duplicating effort.

64. **Revise national reporting form to solicit focussed answers from Parties.** It is recommended that Section X of the national reporting template, on the implementation of COP Resolutions and Recommendations, be modified to include closed questions with tick boxes, supplemented by boxes for the provision of additional information. This would aid standardization of responses and facilitate meaningful analysis. UNEP-WCMC will provide additional specific comments on ways to improve the national reporting form to the Secretariat directly.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Enhance cooperation between Parties, with a focus on capacity-building.**
- **Update the CMS Information Management Plan.**
- **Enhance the “Migration forum” to allow for Parties to share best practices and lessons learned on specific topics.**
- **Create a directory of priority projects for knowledge sharing.**
- **Ensure effective collaboration with other MEAs.**
- **Collaborate more closely within RFMOs.**
- **Harmonize species nomenclature with CMS daughter Agreements.**
- **Address taxonomic confusion over family-level listings.**
- **Encourage Parties to take action to mitigate the major threats to migratory species.**
- **Encourage Parties to adopt legislation prohibiting take.**
- **Consider the species suggested by Parties for listing.**
- **Enable Parties to generate species lists by country.**
- **Adopt the use of on-line reporting for CMS and daughter agreement national reports.**
- **Revise national reporting form to solicit focussed answers from Parties.**