



**CONVENTION ON  
MIGRATORY  
SPECIES**

Distribution: General

UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.19.1  
3 August 2017

Original: English

12<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES  
Manila, Philippines, 23 - 28 October 2017  
Agenda Item 19

**ANALYSIS AND SYNTHESIS OF NATIONAL REPORTS**

*(Prepared by the Secretariat)*

Summary

This document provides a summary of an international overview analysis of the information provided by Parties in their national reports, as submitted to the 12<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Conference of Parties in 2017. The full analysis is contained in Information Document 30, and the reports themselves are published on the CMS website, including those which arrived too late to be included in the analysis.

The analysis focuses on certain priority areas of Convention implementation which offer an insight into progress towards agreed objectives and lessons learnt from experience, including on the reporting process itself. A series of recommendations has been derived from this, concerning (i) Convention implementation, (ii) reporting and (iii) the format for future reports.

## ANALYSIS AND SYNTHESIS OF NATIONAL REPORTS

### Background

1. Monitoring and reporting on activities to implement the Convention (and on the outcomes of those activities) are essential for tracking progress, learning lessons from experience to guide future action, and forming the necessary international view about both the status of the Convention and the status of migratory species. When related to the obligations, goals and targets agreed by the Contracting Parties, this allows a cycle of feedback and adaptive management, at both national and international levels.
2. Article VI, paragraph 3 of the Convention requires Parties that are Range States of migratory species listed in Appendices I and II to inform the Conference of the Parties, through the Secretariat, of the measures they are taking to implement the provisions of the Convention for those species. National reports are provided as public documents on the CMS website (for the reports to the Twelfth Conference of the Parties (COP12) see <http://www.cms.int/en/meeting/twelfth-meeting-conference-parties-cms>).
3. The Standing Committee at its 45<sup>th</sup> meeting agreed that the same format as used for the Eleventh Conference of the Parties (COP11) would be used for reporting to COP12, with a few necessary adjustments to take into account relevant COP11 decisions. Parties that submitted reports on time for COP11 were provided with the template for COP12 containing relevant parts of their data already pre-filled from that previous occasion, thus avoiding the need for repetition (but leading to some new interpretation problems, as discussed in the full analysis referred to below).
4. For COP12, the Online Reporting System was opened in December 2016, and the deadline for submissions was 24 April 2017. Consequently, the period covered by information in this round of reports is from May 2014 (the submission deadline for COP11 reports) to April 2017, except in the case of information relating to new decisions adopted at COP11 itself (November 2014).
5. Being a publicly available dataset, the national reports can be directly consulted as an official source reference for CMS implementation and for information on migratory species for the individual countries. This is an invaluable resource for all stakeholders who play a part in implementation of the Convention at national and local levels, and it supports an integrated approach by State Authorities across all sectors, together with non-governmental organizations, community groups, academia and the private sector. As well as illuminating the results of efforts to date, the reports help to guide future action, research and investment priorities. The common approach taken to reporting also assists with cooperation between countries in transboundary and regional contexts.
6. In addition, the compilation by the Secretariat of an international overview of the data provided allows general patterns and trends to be seen, *inter alia* on progress with implementation of COP decisions, on notable successes and on challenges needing to be addressed. This includes a reflection on progress towards the achievement of goals and targets in the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023 (SPMS), which in turn relates to progress in delivering aspects of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (Sustainable Development Goals). The overview therefore helps to inform new decisions being taken by the COP, while also feeding into wider processes of international environmental governance.
7. The full analysis report is contained in document UNEP/CMS/COP12/Inf.30). It is based on the reports provided by those Parties that had submitted them by the formal deadline, and it has also been possible to include some that arrived shortly thereafter. The present document is a

short summary of that analysis, and the main structure follows that used for the equivalent analysis undertaken for COP11 (documents UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.19.3 and UNEP/CMS/COP11/Inf.42).

8. The conclusions include some lessons learned concerning the report format itself. Further to a specific request in Resolution 11.2, questions concerning the format were also considered by the Standing Committee and the Strategic Plan Working Group during the triennium, and suggestions for possible future adjustments are discussed separately in document UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.19.2.

### Reporting performance

9. At the time of the submission deadline for the COP12 round of reporting there were 124 full Parties to the CMS. A total of 89 reports was received in time to be included in the present analysis. This is the highest number received for any CMS COP to date, and at 72 per cent it is also an improvement in the proportion of full Parties submitting timely reports. The rate of submission also improved (by comparison with COP11 in 2014) for each of the Convention's five regions individually. For COP11 the European region showed the highest rate of submission (69 per cent) and Africa the lowest (32 per cent); while for COP12 Oceania had the highest rate (86 per cent) and Asia the lowest (59 per cent). The extent to which the format was followed was quite variable, and in some cases only a few sections were completed; so the number of Parties answering varies between the different subjects in the format.

### Appendix I species overview

10. The report format includes several questions about the status of Appendix I species in each country, including the threats facing these species. In response to this, within the 89 reports, there were 1,231 identifications of threats affecting Appendix I species. The distribution of these across nine different categories (condensed from 31 sub-categories), and for each taxonomic group, is shown in percentage terms in Table 1 below. A more detailed breakdown of these figures is given in the full analysis document.

	Birds	Aquatic mammals	Terrestrial mammals	Reptiles	Fish
Direct killing & taking	24	9	20	20	20
Bycatch	9	30	2	24	29
Collisions & electrocution	16	14	4	4	6
Other mortality	0	2	0	9	0
Alien and/or invasive species	1	0	0	1	1
Disturbance & disruption	1	8	2	3	0
Habitat destruction/degradation	48	32	36	36	25
Climate change	1	2	6	2	2
Knowledge, regulation etc.	0	2	30	1	18

Table 1. Relative frequency of main types of threat cited as affecting Appendix I species.

Note: The figures are percentages of the total threat identifications made in relation to each taxonomic group. In some cases they add up to 99 or 101 because of rounding in the underlying data. The base unit is the number of "identifications" rather than the number of Parties, because each Party had two questions to answer on this subject.

11. Habitat loss/deterioration was the most frequently cited issue for most taxonomic groups in most regions; but bycatch was more important for reptiles in Africa, for aquatic mammals in two regions (Europe, Central & South America & the Caribbean) and for fish in three regions (Asia, Oceania, Central & South America & the Caribbean); while direct killing/taking was more important for birds in Asia; and knowledge/regulation was more important for terrestrial

mammals in Africa. These data should be treated with caution however, as the trends appear to have been led to some extent by the way that priorities were suggested in the questions, and the questions were not asked in the same way for each taxonomic group.

12. Other questions in this section asked about actions being taken to address the threats, and about the progress and success of those actions. Responses to this were reported in a variety of different ways, and there is no valid basis for quantifying or otherwise evaluating priorities and significances among the actions described. Progress or success was sometimes mentioned, but more often the mention of an activity could not be distinguished from any comment about the progress achieved (“protection of habitat” or “raising awareness” for example could refer either to an activity or a result, or both). Apart from a few references to e.g. “breeding success improved” and one or two specific project results in particular areas, the “progress/success” answers have generally not provided any evaluation of conservation status outcomes.
13. These answers do however provide a useful inventory of the types of action that are typically being pursued by Parties in response to the identified threats facing the migratory species for which they are Range States; and some examples of the progress they note as being achieved. In aggregate this includes the following:

**Activities**

- New/strengthened legislation or policy, increased penalties
- Strategies, action plans, recovery plans, management plans, local agreements/community plans, emergency response plans
- Regulation (inc. EIA), enforcement
- Spatial planning measures
- Establishment/expansion of protected areas, land use agreements
- Livestock management regimes
- Habitat management/restoration, beach & sea cleaning, removal/adaptation of structures/obstacles, construction of fish-passes
- Waste management/pollution control
- Protection and guarding of nest sites (against humans and predators)
- Provisioning of food
- Predator control
- Rescue and rehabilitation of individual animals
- Captive breeding, reintroduction and relocation schemes
- Artificial breeding sites (e.g. bat boxes, turtle nest sites)
- Mitigation measures for electrocution, collisions, by-catch
- Incentives, compensation (for damage by wildlife), benefit sharing schemes, establishment of alternative markets (product substitution)
- Good practice guidelines/codes of conduct
- Research, survey, assessment, monitoring (inc. of threats)
- Training, capacity-building, education, awareness, outreach, engagement
- Transboundary cooperation

**Progress**

- New/expanded protected areas
- Stronger enforcement, improved reporting of infringements
- Reduced poaching and other forms of offending; improved compliance
- Reduction in by-catch/other mortality
- Improved monitoring and reporting
- Greater knowledge, including of true extent of threats
- Greater awareness, engagement and support, inc. by NGOs, communities, other sectors

- More enlightened attitudes e.g. on land-use practices
- Habitat quality improvements, reduced pollution
- Improved species populations or distributions, declines stabilised, improved breeding success
- Improved stakeholder attitudes/behaviour
- Improved coordination between agencies.

#### Potential new species listings

14. Listing of species on Convention Appendices is a central component of the international cooperation and governance mechanisms provided by the CMS as a means towards necessary actions. Progress reported in this part of the Parties' national reports reflects contributions being made towards the achievement of aspects of Target 3 in the SPMS, which concerns *inter alia* improvement of international governance arrangements; and Target 15 which concerns *inter alia* the application of scientific information. Ultimately, it is supposed that the actions to follow will contribute to an improvement in the conservation status of the species concerned, which is the aim expressed in Target 8 (which in turn contributes to Aichi Target 12 in the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity).
15. Sixteen Parties indicated that they were Range States for qualifying species that are not yet on Appendix I of the Convention. Where the species concerned were named, they comprised in total 11 fish, 21 birds and 4 mammals. Only one quarter of these, however, meet the required threat status criterion defined by COP11 (Resolution 11.33). A further 22 species were mentioned which are already on Appendix I and so those have been excluded from the figures. Eight Parties indicated that they were taking steps to propose listing, but of the 20 species which have been the subject of duly submitted Appendix I addition proposals for COP12, only three were mentioned in this context in the national reports; so these two sets of information are not well matched.
16. Seventeen Parties indicated that they were Range States for qualifying species that are not yet on Appendix II. Where the species concerned were named, they comprised 8 fish, 18 birds and 6 mammals. Again, some other species were mentioned that are already on the Appendix. Nine Parties indicated that they were taking steps to propose listing, although only four of the species mentioned in this context feature among the 16 that have been formally submitted.

#### Development of new Agreements

17. Parties were asked to indicate whether they had been involved in initiating or participating in the development of any new CMS Agreements (including Memoranda of Understanding) during the relevant reporting period. Actions of this kind contribute to the achievement of aspects of Targets 3 and 9 in the SPMS, and ultimately, they would be expected to lead to conservation status improvements for the species concerned, which is the subject of Target 8 and the analogous Aichi Target 12 as mentioned above. Parties were also asked about any future plans in this regard, and about any particular needs for assistance. This is a somewhat problematic area of report information. The majority of Parties answering "yes" was in fact commenting only on existing Agreements, and the question itself contains ambiguities. The main apparently more substantive indications included the following:

Agreements (or other arrangements) in development:

- a Single Species Action Plan for the Far Eastern Curlew *Numenius madagascariensis*;
- the Action Plan for African-Eurasian Migratory Landbirds;
- (possibly) arrangements concerning the European Eel *Anguilla anguilla*;

Possible future plans:

- an MOU for the Andean Condor *Vultur gryphus*;
- an MOU for marine turtles in the Pacific Island Region;
- (subject to listing on Appendix II) an MOU for the Persian Leopard *Panthera pardus saxicolor*;
- transboundary cooperation arrangements for five species of Asian terrestrial mammals;
- (unspecified) arrangements for six taxa of African terrestrial mammals.

Protected areas

18. The first question in this section of the report format asks whether migratory species are taken into account in the selection, establishment and management of protected areas in the country. Nearly all of the Parties that answered this question replied “yes”, although the meaning of “taken into account” appears to have been interpreted in a variety of ways. Only a minority of reports made specific reference to migratory species or migration-related factors having played a part, citing for example the targeting of corridors or bottleneck sites, and areas being protected for a particular CMS priority species.
19. Some Parties responded to the further request to identify the most important sites. They did this in a variety of non-comparable ways, and it is apparent that isolating migratory species interests from the generality of a national protected area system is often a challenge. Similarly, attempts to distinguish contributions to terrestrial, aquatic and marine environments/species proved difficult (many sites have combinations of these), and “marine” in particular was interpreted in several contrasting ways. It is clear, however, that most countries’ protected area systems address all three habitat categories, and the slight differences between them may reflect no more than the normal relative preponderance of the three categories in the landscape.
20. Parties were then asked to describe positive outcomes of actions relating to protected areas. Most of the responses to this covered a longer period than the last triennium, and some gave no details, but the more specific types of reported outcome included the following (the figures represent the number of Parties who mentioned each type):
- Increased coverage of protected areas (12)
  - Species population improvement (not quantified) (11)
  - Management planning & related initiatives (8)
  - Awareness and capacity (6)
  - Improved habitat quality/habitat management (5)
  - Cross-sectoral and/or transboundary coordination (5)
  - Reduced threats & pressures (3)
  - Ecotourism (3)
  - Sustainable development projects (2).
21. Implementation of measures for protected areas may contribute towards the achievement of Target 10 in the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species, which in turn supports Target 11 in the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity. The information in the national reports does not allow any systematic measurement of this, but the reports have valuably flagged particular issues which, in each individual country context (for those countries providing responses), can be tracked from one reporting period to another and should help with planning/prioritizing future action. At global level the information at least demonstrates that there is evidence of significant moves being made in the desired direction, and it can be plausibly deduced that CMS implementation is making a contribution to the achievement of Goals 14 and 15 in the UN Sustainable Development Goals.

### Satellite telemetry

22. Nearly three-quarters of Parties that submitted reports indicated that they had undertaken conservation or research projects that use satellite telemetry. It seems that a few of these responses concerned animal tracking and telemetry projects that did not specifically have a satellite-related component: it may be useful to report on these too, but the approach taken to this has not been consistent. Most of the responses related to animal-based projects, but a few related to habitat surveys, which are not excluded from the question but Parties may have made different assumptions about that. The report format questions also contain some ambiguities which have led to further inconsistencies in the data.
23. Where information was given on the taxa addressed, projects reported by Parties in the European region (including projects undertaken by them in other regions) covered the greatest variety. Birds were the most preponderant target species in all regions except for Central & South America & the Caribbean, where fish and mammals featured more strongly. A number of projects were multi-national in nature.
24. Of the reports that gave information on positive outcomes, the most frequent type of result reported was in the category of improving knowledge about migration behaviours, routes and distributions. Support for monitoring and management, and contributing to other ecological knowledge, were also relatively frequently cited; while other types of result included awareness raising, methodological development and international cooperation.
25. Forty-six Parties indicated that they were planning future telemetry projects, although some of these were referring to the planned continuation of existing projects rather than commencing new ones. The main constraint cited as affecting future work was financial resources.
26. Implementation of conservation/research projects using satellite telemetry makes an important contribution to the achievement of Target 15 in the SPMS, which in turn supports Target 19 in the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity. These targets concern the improvement of science, technology and knowledge-sharing in support of conservation goals; and the CMS national reports show evidence (albeit qualitative) of positive progress specifically towards better understanding and management of migratory species.

### Mobilization of resources

27. The report format contains six questions about resource mobilization (none of them explicitly limited to the reporting period, so the information in responses may relate to earlier triennia). Seventy-three Parties indicated that they had made financial resources available for conservation activities having direct benefits for migratory species within their country. It appears that in most if not all cases “having direct benefits” has been interpreted as “having been the target of activities”, rather than reflecting any assessment of the actual conservation outcomes.
28. All Parties answering this question in the South & Central America & Caribbean region gave a positive answer, with Europe being the region with the next highest proportion and Oceania with the lowest. Some responses made reference to funding from NGOs as well as from government sources, and some mentioned activities undertaken on a multi-country basis. A few gave figures for the size of funding involved, but not enough to admit any analysis. Types of activity involved included the following:
  - species survey and population census;
  - species monitoring;
  - species reintroduction;
  - disease monitoring and control;

- other threat mitigation measures;
- individual animal rescue/rehabilitation (eg strandings, collisions);
- habitat survey;
- protected area establishment (including purchase), management and monitoring;
- habitat creation/restoration;
- development of conservation plans;
- law enforcement;
- public awareness, education and training;
- ecotourism;
- convening meetings and workshops;
- establishment of institutions or networks.

29. Six Parties reported that they had made voluntary contributions to the CMS Trust Fund to support requests from developing countries and countries with economies in transition. Fifteen Parties indicated that they had made financial contributions to support conservation activities for migratory species in other countries. Where activities were specified they included the following:

- species survey/biodiversity assessment;
- monitoring;
- animal translocation;
- captive breeding & release;
- habitat restoration;
- development of action plans;
- research, including on threats;
- capacity building.

30. Twenty-four Parties indicated that they had provided technical and/or scientific assistance to developing countries to facilitate migratory species initiatives. Several developing countries themselves gave positive answers to this. Types of assistance provided included the following:

- convening meetings/workshops;
- support for/coordination of international species initiatives under CMS and its Agreements;
- exchange of experience through joint participation in international projects;
- capacity-building/training and institutional development;
- support of moves towards MOU signing;
- development of action plans;
- development of Appendix listing proposals;
- field research & surveys;
- satellite telemetry;
- captive breeding and release;
- forensic science (DNA) to support anti-poaching enforcement;
- data access and sharing.

31. Nine Parties reported having received financial assistance from the CMS Trust Fund, for purposes including:

- marine turtles (unspecified);
- bird migration (unspecified);
- waterbird census;
- whales and dolphins (unspecified);
- awareness raising for sharks, dugongs and turtles;
- survey of dugong bycatch.

32. Forty-five Parties indicated that they had received financial assistance from sources other than the CMS Secretariat for migratory species activity. This represents 51 per cent of the Parties

submitting reports, and is a considerable increase on the total of 28 that gave this response in their reports for the previous triennium (although as noted above, the responses do not necessarily all relate to the most recent triennium). Given general global funding trends, this might be an encouraging signal about the availability and/or willingness of external sources to support migratory species conservation efforts, particularly given the (at best) static picture shown by the data in the reports on the ability of the CMS itself to be such a source.

33. Target 16 in the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species seeks a “substantial increase” in the mobilization of resources from all sources to implement the other objectives in the Plan, which will in turn contribute to the achievement of Target 20 in the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity. (Target 20 is expressed in similar terms to SPMS target 16, but for biodiversity as a whole). The CMS national reports to COP12 indicate an apparent increase in the number of countries where relevant mobilization has occurred: this may suggest some movement in the desired direction, but reflecting on whether or not the target is actually being achieved would require a method for quantifying the overall change in flows of funds involved, and currently neither the national reports nor any other existing process in CMS can offer this.

### Implementation of COP Resolutions and Recommendations

34. This section of the national reports can give particularly valuable insights into the implementation of the Convention in relation to priority issues elaborated by the COP. It offers a basis for information-sharing and dialogue about past progress and future planning at the level of each individual Contracting Party, as well as contributing to the global overview. The analysis in document UNEP/CMS/COP12/Inf.30) is therefore only one part of the potential use of this information; and given the large volume of what is reported under this heading, the analysis itself can only represent a highly summarized sample of it. Users are therefore encouraged to examine the reports themselves for further depth; while more extensive global analysis of some of the individual Resolutions/Recommendations could also be useful separately in future.
35. The 2014-17 report format asked about measures undertaken in relation to recent Resolutions and Recommendations, and a specific list of recent ones was provided under the 42 headings listed below. Against each of these is given the number of Parties making some response in the COP12 reports on the issue concerned.

#### **Strategic and institutional matters**

• Capacity-Building Strategy (Res. 9.12 / Res. 10.6)	25
• Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023 (Res. 11.2)	39
• Financial and administrative matters and Terms of Reference for the administration of the Trust Fund (Res. 11.1)	16
• Relationship between the CMS Family and civil society (Res. 11.11)	17
• World Migratory Bird Day (Res. 11.9)	42
• Outreach and communication issues (Res. 11.8)	27
• Development of CMS Agreements (Res. 11.12)	21
• Concerted and Cooperative Actions (Res. 11.13)	24
• Synergies and partnerships / cooperation with other Conventions (Res. 11.10)	34
• Future strategies of the CMS Family / “Future Shape” (Res. 10.9)	15

#### **Avian species and issues**

• Electrocution of Migratory Birds (Res. 7.04 / Res. 10.11)	32
• Southern Hemisphere Albatross Conservation (Res. 6.3)	11
• Migratory Landbirds in the African Eurasian Region (Res. 11.17)	22
• Global Flyway Conservation (Res. 10.10 / Res. 11.14)	24
• Saker Falcon (Res. 11.18)	26

- Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds (Res. 11.16) 35
- Migratory Species and Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza (Res. 8.27 / Res. 9.8 / Res. 10.22) 29
- Poisoning Migratory Birds (Res. 11.15) 34

#### **Aquatic species and issues**

- Migratory Marine Species (Res. 9.9 / Res. 10.15) 18
- Conservation of Migratory Sharks and Rays (Res. 11.20) 16
- Live capture of Cetacean from the Wild (Res. 11.22) 22
- Adverse Anthropogenic Impacts on Cetaceans and other Biota (Res. 9.19 / Res. 10.24) 17
- Loggerhead Turtle in the South Pacific Ocean (Res. 11.21) 3
- Conservation Implications of Cetacean Culture (Res. 11.23) 3
- Improving the Conservation Status of the Leatherback Turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*) (Rec. 7.6) 12
- Antarctic Minke, Bryde's and Pygmy Right Whales (Res. 7.15) 2
- Migratory Freshwater Fish (Res. 10.12) 15

#### **Terrestrial species and issues**

- Sahelo-Saharan Megafauna (Rec. 9.2) 4
- Tigers and other Asian Big Cats (Rec. 9.3) 5
- Conservation of the African Lion (Res. 11.32) 9

#### **Cross-cutting issues**

- Marine Debris (Res. 10.4 / Res. 11.30) 17
- Bycatch (Res. 6.2 / Rec. 7.2 / Res. 8.14 / Res. 9.18 / Res. 10.14) 21
- Wildlife Crime (Res. 11.31) 27
- Ecological Networks (Res. 10.3 / Res. 11.25) 30
- Climate Change Impacts on Migratory Species (Res. 7.5 / Res. 11.26) 25
- Modus Operandi for Conservation Emergencies (Res. 10.2) 13
- Marine Wildlife Watching (Res. 11.29) 17
- Oil Pollution and Migratory Species (Res. 7.3) 22
- Impact Assessment and Migratory Species (Res. 7.2) 30
- Invasive Alien Species and Migratory Species (Res. 11.28) 29
- Renewable Energy and Migratory Species (Res. 7.5 / Res. 11.27) 25

#### **Other remarks** 3

36. Nearly one-third of Parties did not provide a response to any part of this section of the format. Of those that did, the extent of completeness varied widely, from those that answered every relevant one of the topics, to those that answered only one or two of them. A few of the listed topics cover similar ground to that covered in other sections in the report format, so if a Party has not said much about these issues in one of the places in the format where it has been asked to do so, it may have said more in the other.
37. The question asked in this case specifically refers to measures undertaken since the last report – although some Parties did not do this, and reported instead measures from previous cycles, there was no pre-filling of this section by the Secretariat with earlier data, so no analytical confusion has arisen from that cause at least in this part of the reports. There is some suggestion, however, of different understandings among Parties about the extent to which certain strategically-expressed COP decisions have a national (and therefore reportable) implementation dimension to them.
38. The list above is necessarily different from that presented in the preceding triennium's report format, since it incorporates Resolutions adopted at COP11. Highlights of the responses given

on each of the topics are summarized in the full analysis document, and they represent a rich body of intelligence on targeted implementation activity.

### Conclusions and recommendations

39. The increased reporting rate achieved for the COP12 cycle is a positive achievement (72 per cent of eligible countries, a higher figure than in any of the previous four triennia). The analysis undertaken here does not reveal reasons for this increase, but improvements in the process in recent years (on-line submission etc.) are likely to have played a part.
40. The resulting international overview is very helpful for Convention monitoring, and it should help to inform new decisions being taken by the COP. On this occasion, it also allows some (albeit unquantified) reflection on progress towards the achievement of goals and targets in the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023, which in turn contributes to other environmental objectives agreed by the international community.
41. Good use should also be made of the ability to consult the national reports directly as an invaluable resource for supporting coordinated efforts among all stakeholders who play a part in implementation of the Convention at national and local levels, and in transboundary and regional contexts.

#### *Convention implementation*

42. From responses given on the addition of new species to the Convention Appendices, it seems that a number of Parties may be relying on out of date versions of the Appendix lists. Even in respect of genuinely unlisted taxa, a considerable mismatch has been revealed between intentions stated in the national reports concerning listing proposals and the actual proposals submitted to COP, although the reasons for this are unclear.

***Recommendation 1:*** *It would be worth investigating any difficulties that Parties have experienced that may be the cause of the observed lack of alignment between positions on Appendix listing revealed in national reports, compared with those revealed by formal listing proposals.*

43. The reports demonstrate continuing interest among Parties in developing new Agreements/MOUs under CMS, which is an action that supports aspects of Targets 3 and 9 in the Strategic Plan. Part of what has been reported on this, however, concerns other frameworks such as Action Plans or other transboundary cooperation arrangements. Individual Parties' thinking on this may also sometimes be combined with (or replaced by) thinking on options for Concerted Actions under the Convention, yet that is not addressed in the same part of the national reports (it has featured instead, in the latest format, in the separate section on Resolutions and Recommendations). In recent years, there has been some philosophical convergence and streamlining of rationales among all these processes (for example in Resolutions 11.12 and 11.13), but there may be a case for still further rationalization of the overall "menu of cooperation options" available to Parties in this context.

***Recommendation 2:*** *Consider the possible scope for further streamlining/rationalization of the way in which options for constructing cooperative frameworks available under the Convention (Agreements, transboundary arrangements, Concerted Actions etc.) are presented to Parties, including in the structure of related reporting processes.*

44. The information on "outcomes" in the protected areas section of the national reports does not allow any systematic measurement of the contributions being made by national protected area activities towards the achievement of the relevant target (Target 10) in the SPMS, but it does at least demonstrate that there is evidence of significant moves being made in the desired

direction. In any event the reports have valuably flagged particular issues which, in each individual country context (for those countries providing responses), can be tracked from one reporting period to another, and should help with planning and prioritizing future action.

45. It appears that Parties often find it difficult to isolate and account specifically for the migratory species component of wider conservation programmes (for example protected areas and ecological networks); and that they similarly find it difficult to disaggregate aquatic/terrestrial/marine environments in the way suggested by several CMS systems, including the national report format. The aquatic/terrestrial/marine categorization is more workable where species-based measures are concerned, but is less workable where habitat- or ecosystem-based measures are concerned.
46. It is clear that telemetry projects continue to make a contribution to knowledge about patterns of animal migration and the conservation requirements of migratory species, although funding is often cited as a constraint in pursuing this.
47. A majority of countries report that they are devoting financial resources to some extent towards conservation activities for migratory species, with some also providing assistance to other countries. In the case of technical assistance to other countries, it is notably also not only developed countries that have provided this. National report information, however, does not quantify resource mobilization in a way which would shed light on progress towards achieving SPMS Target 16, nor does the information go beyond “activity reporting” into the question of assessing conservation outcomes. There is however an indication of an apparent increase in the number of countries where relevant resource mobilization has occurred, and this may suggest some movement in the desired direction.
48. The COP12 reports show a significant increase in the number of Parties indicating that they have received financial assistance for migratory species activities from sources other than the CMS Secretariat, compared with the previous triennium. Given general global funding trends, this might be an encouraging signal about the availability and/or willingness of external sources to support migratory species conservation efforts, particularly given the (at best) static picture shown by the reports concerning the ability of the CMS itself to be such a source.
49. Numerous other specific points on aspects of Convention implementation are identified in relation to the 42 topics covered in the section of the full analysis document which addresses past COP Resolutions & Recommendations.

#### *Reporting*

50. Although improved, the reporting rate is still far below 100 per cent, and many individual reports remain incomplete.

***Recommendation 3:*** *Every encouragement should be given to Parties to submit their national reports for the next triennium by the deadline agreed in advance of COP13, and to endeavour to provide information in every section of the report that is relevant to them. Where advice or other support is needed to assist in making this possible, such needs should be clearly identified and discussed with the Secretariat at the earliest opportunity.*

51. “Pre-filling” of certain report sections by the Secretariat prior to issuing the format to Parties probably helped national compilers to avoid a certain amount of re-originating of information they had provided on previous occasions. It appears however that many compilers did not replace outdated information with updates, or did so in some sections and not in others, resulting in internal contradictions within the individual reports. Analysis was made problematic by an inability to distinguish pre-filled data (which may or may not still be correct) from data newly entered in the most recent reporting period.

**Recommendation 4:** *If “pre-filling” of data is undertaken again in future reporting cycles, some method should be found to enable such pre-filled data to be readily distinguished from new data in the final submitted reports. In general, it would help also for Parties to provide more specificity in all report sections concerning the time-period to which a given response relates, making a particular effort to focus on information about status, events and activities during the most recent triennium (since the last COP).*

52. Information about the development of new Agreements is a somewhat problematic area of report information. It was apparent that many Parties were in fact commenting only on existing Agreements rather than the development of new ones; and “development” itself appears to have been interpreted in divergent ways.
53. The section of the national reports on Resolutions & Recommendations can give particularly valuable insights into the implementation of the Convention in relation to priority issues elaborated by the COP. It offers a basis for information-sharing and dialogue about past progress and future planning at the level of each individual Contracting Party, as well as contributing to the global overview. Nearly one-third of Parties however did not provide a response to any part of this section, and among those who did, the extent of completeness varied widely. There is also some suggestion of different understandings about the extent to which certain global decisions are relevant at national level. The present analysis has only allowed a very brief examination of information under this heading (although resulting in an extensive catalogue of summary points), and there would be good scope to do more.

**Recommendation 5:** *Parties should be encouraged to pay particular attention to providing good report information on the implementation of the priority COP Resolutions, Decisions and Recommendations identified in the report format, since this is a key area for sharing lessons learnt.*

**Recommendation 6:** *Options should be explored for undertaking some more in-depth analysis of aspects of the information provided in national reports on the implementation of individual COP Resolutions, Decisions and Recommendations.*

#### *The report format*

54. The analysis of national reports to COP11 (UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.19.3) concluded with a recommendation that future revisions of the report format should tailor questions to the objectives in the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species, and the COP in Resolution 11.2 requested the Secretariat to consider amendments along similar lines. Proposals arising from this are discussed separately in document UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.19.2 on *Revising the Template for National Reports*. As an additional contribution to the future work envisaged on this, a series of thirteen specific recommendations on the format has been developed focusing simply on the points which have emerged from the analysis of the current round of reports; and these are presented in the full analysis document.

**Recommendation 7:** *Options for acting on the thirteen specific recommendations made in the full analysis document concerning possible adjustments to the future format for national reports should be considered and addressed, either in conjunction with any wider strategic review of the format mandated by COP, or in their own right if no such review is mandated.*

#### Recommended actions

- The Conference of the Parties is recommended to take note of the present report and the recommendations made.