



CONVENTION ON MIGRATORY SPECIES

UNEP/CMS/Resolution 12.28 (Rev.COP13)

Original: English

CONCERTED ACTIONS

Adopted by the Conference of the Parties at its 13th Meeting (Gandhinagar, February 2020)

Recalling the preamble of the Convention, which refers to the Parties' conviction that conservation and management of migratory species require the concerted action of all Range States,

Further recalling Resolution 3.2¹, which instructed the Secretariat and the Scientific Council to encourage and assist Parties to take Concerted Actions to implement the provisions of the Convention, and which initiated a process for each meeting of the Conference of Parties to recommend initiatives to benefit a selected number of species listed in Appendix I,

Further recalling Recommendation 5.2², which introduced the concept of "Cooperative Actions" as a rapid mechanism to assist the conservation of species listed in Appendix II and to act as a precursor or alternative to the conclusion for any of those species of an agreement under Article IV,

Recalling also Resolution 3.2, as updated by Resolutions 4.2, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1, 8.29, 9.1, 10.23, and 11.13³ and Recommendation 6.2, as updated by Recommendations 7.1, 8.28, and Resolutions 9.1, 10.23, and 11.13⁴, which advise the Secretariat and the Scientific Council to encourage and assist Parties to take Concerted and Cooperative Actions to implement the provisions of the Convention and to improve the conservation status of certain listed migratory species,

Recalling the decision of the Parties at COP11 to consolidate Concerted Actions and Cooperative Actions into a single process, as described in Resolution 11.13,

The Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals

1. *Determines* that Concerted Actions are priority conservation measures, projects, or institutional arrangements undertaken to improve the conservation status of selected Appendix I and Appendix II species or selected groups of Appendix I and Appendix II species that
 - a). involve measures that are the collective responsibility of Parties acting in concert; or
 - b). are designed to support the conclusion of an instrument under Article IV of the Convention and enable conservation measures to be progressed in the meantime or represent an alternative to such an instrument;

1 Now consolidated as Resolution 12.28

2 Now consolidated as Resolution 12.28

3 All now consolidated as Resolution 12.28

4 All now consolidated as Resolution 12.28

2. *Adopts*
 - a) the *Guidelines to the Implementation of the Concerted Actions Process* contained in Annex 1 to this Resolution; and
 - b) the *Format for Proposing Concerted Actions* contained in Annex 2 to this Resolution;and *requests* Parties, the Scientific Council, the Secretariat and other relevant stakeholders to take them fully into account in the different steps of the Concerted Actions process;
3. *Requests* the Scientific Council to propose for each meeting of the Conference of the Parties a list of species for Concerted Actions;
4. *Requests* the Scientific Council to:
 - a) nominate, for each species and/or taxonomic group listed for Concerted Action, a member of the Council or a designated alternative expert to be responsible for providing a concise written report to each meeting of the Council on progress in the implementation of actions for the species or taxonomic group concerned in accordance with the *Guidelines to the Implementation of the Concerted Actions Process* contained in Annex 1 to this Resolution;
 - b) confirm at each subsequent meeting of the Scientific Council that these nominations remain valid or agree alternative nominations as necessary;
5. *Decides* to review, at each meeting of the Conference of the Parties, progress in implementing Concerted Actions, in accordance with the *Guidelines to the Implementation of the Concerted Actions Process* contained in Annex 1 to this Resolution;
6. *Instructs* the Secretariat and the Scientific Council to encourage and assist Parties to take Concerted Actions to implement the provisions of the Convention, where possible through existing instruments of bilateral or multilateral cooperation;
7. *Urges* Parties to provide the in-kind and financial means required to support targeted conservation measures aimed at implementing Concerted Actions for the species listed in Annex 3 to this Resolution;
8. *Adopts* the lists of species designated for Concerted Actions contained in Annex 3 of this Resolution and *encourages* Parties and other stakeholders to implement the activities included in the proposals for the designation of the species submitted in accordance with the *Guidelines to the Implementation of the Concerted Actions Process* contained in Annex 1 to this Resolution; and
9. *Repeals* Resolutions 3.2, 4.2, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1, 8.29, 9.1, 10.23, and 11.13 and Recommendations 5.2, 6.2, 7.1, and 8.28.

Annex 1 to Resolution 12.28 (Rev.COP13)

GUIDELINES TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONCERTED ACTIONS PROCESS

Step 1: Proposing a species for Concerted Actions

- 1) Proposals for Concerted Actions can be submitted to the Scientific Council by Parties, the Secretariat or other relevant stakeholders.
- 2) The Scientific Council itself can also propose species for Concerted Actions.
- 3) Proposals for Concerted Actions may address a single species, lower taxon or population, or a group of taxa with needs in common. The target animals in each case should be clearly defined, including by reference to their status in terms of the CMS Appendices and the geographical range(s) concerned.
- 4) Proposals for Concerted Actions should be submitted using the template provided in Annex 2 to this Resolution.
- 5) Proposals for Concerted Actions should be submitted to the Scientific Council according to the provisions for the submission of documents to meetings of the Scientific Council or its Sessional Committee as defined by its Rules of Procedure.

Step 2: Assessment of proposal by the Scientific Council / Sessional Committee

- 1) Upon receipt of a proposal for Concerted Actions, the Scientific Council will assess the merits of the proposal.
- 2) The Scientific Council will assess the merits of each proposal, taking into account the following criteria:

(i) Conservation priority

May relate to the degree of endangerment or unfavourable conservation status as defined under the Convention; the urgency with which a particular kind of action is required; and other priorities expressed in CMS decisions.

(ii) Relevance

May relate to the degree to which the particular conservation problem is linked to migration and requires collective multilateral action; and the degree to which the proposed action will fulfil specific CMS mandates.

(iii) Absence of better remedies

An options analysis to test whether (and why) CMS Concerted Action is the best method of meeting the defined conservation need. Alternatives both within and outside the mechanisms of the CMS should be considered¹.

(iv) Readiness and feasibility

The proposal will need to demonstrate meaningful prospects for funding and leadership, and to address all significant issues of practical feasibility for undertaking the action.

¹ For cases where it appears that proceeding directly to the development of an Agreement or other instrument under Article IV of the Convention would be a better remedy, equivalent guidance and criteria for judging such proposals is provided in Resolution 12.8, *Implementation of Articles IV and V of the Convention*.

(v) Likelihood of success

Feasibility (see previous criterion) only concerns whether an action is likely to be implementable. Criterion (v) seeks in addition to assess whether implementation is likely to lead to the intended outcome. Risk factors to consider include: uncertainty about the ecological effects; weakness in the underpinning science; lack of a “legacy mechanism” by which results can be sustained; and activities by others that may undermine or negate the results of the action.

(vi) Magnitude of likely impact

Proposals that are equal in other respects might be prioritized according to the number of species, number of countries or extent of area that will benefit in each case; the scope for catalytic or “multiplier” effects, contribution to synergies or potential for acting as “flagship” cases for broadening outreach.

(vii) Cost-effectiveness

Proposals should specify the resources they require, but should also relate these to the scale of impact expected, so that cost-effectiveness can be judged.

- 3) If the Scientific Council considers it beneficial, it may recommend extending or reducing the number of species covered by the proposal or amend the proposed conservation measures.

Step 3: Recommendation to the Conference of Parties to designate species for Concerted Actions

- 1) If the Scientific Council concludes that there are merits in adding a species to the list for Concerted Actions, the Scientific Council will recommend to the Conference of the Parties at its next meeting to designate the species for Concerted Actions.
- 2) The recommendation of the Scientific Council to the Conference of the Parties will also include the conservation measures proposed to be undertaken under the Concerted Actions, as well as a list of Range State Parties of the species, where it is recommended measures are to be implemented.

Step 4: Decision of the COP to include species into the list for Concerted Actions

- 1) The Conference of the Parties will consider the recommendations of the Scientific Council and decide whether or not to accept the proposal for Concerted Actions, including the conservation measures proposed and the list of range States concerned.
- 2) If the Conference of the Parties accepts the proposal, it will include the species in the list for Concerted Actions.

Step 5: Reporting and monitoring of implementation of Concerted Actions

- 1) Members of the Council or alternative experts nominated by the Scientific Council will provide a concise written report to each meeting of the Scientific Council on progress in the implementation of actions for the species or taxonomic group concerned.
- 2) Parties that are Range States of species listed for Concerted Actions are urged to fully cooperate in providing information to the nominated members of the Council or alternative experts.
- 3) The Scientific Council will evaluate the progress made in implementation by Range State Parties of species listed for Concerted Actions and make appropriate recommendations for further actions, as necessary.

- 4) Parties that are Range States of species listed for Concerted Actions should report 180 days prior to each meeting of the Conference of the Parties on their progress in implementation of Concerted Actions, as part of their National Reports.
- 5) The Conference of the Parties will review the progress made in implementing Concerted Actions in order to measure the effectiveness of the instrument.

Step 6: Removing a species from the list for Concerted Actions

- 1) The Scientific Council, having assessed progress in implementation of Concerted Actions will recommend to the Conference of Parties at each of its meetings whether a species listed for Concerted Actions should be removed from the list.
- 2) The Conference of Parties, upon the recommendation of the Scientific Council will, at each of its meetings, decide whether a species should be taken off the list.

Annex 2 to Resolution 12.28 (Rev.COP13)

TEMPLATE FOR PROPOSING CONCERTED ACTIONS

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Proponents of proposals for Concerted Actions are requested to fill in the template below. The information required in the template is derived from Resolution 11.13 and document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.22.4/ANNEX I on <i>Improving the process for Concerted and Cooperative Actions</i> submitted to the Conference of Parties at its 11th meeting. The information compiled should as far as possible provide a balanced assessment of the advantages and risks associated with each issue, rather than being seen solely as a tool for persuasion (paragraph 5, Annex 3 to Resolution 11.13).</p> <p>Proposals should be submitted to the Scientific Council through the Secretariat at cms.secretariat@cms.int prior to the deadline for submission of documents to the Scientific Council at its meetings.</p> <p>All text in blue should be removed when submitting the proposal.</p> | |
| Proponent | Provide the name of the proponent and in the case of a stakeholder demonstrate your relevance to the species and CMS. |
| Target species, lower taxon or population, or group of taxa with needs in common | List the species, lower taxon or population, or group of taxa with needs in common concerned in accordance with the names used within the CMS Appendices. |
| Geographical range | Define the geographical range of the target species. |
| Summary of Activities | Summarize the activities proposed (100-200 words) |
| Activities and expected outcomes | Specify each activity to be undertaken, and define their expected outcomes. This should address both institutional aspects (e.g. development of an Action Plan) and ecological aspects (e.g. targets for improved conservation status). Following the SMART standard (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound) will help; and the intended process for monitoring and evaluation should also be described. When a complex set of activities are proposed, it would be useful to add a table that outlines for each activity: outputs/ outcomes, timeframe, responsibility and funding. Such a table enables Parties and stakeholders to quickly and clearly understand what is being proposed, when it will occur, who will be responsible, and if (and how much) additional resources may be needed for implementation. |
| Associated benefits | Identify opportunities to maximize added value, for example where actions targeting certain migratory animals may incidentally benefit other migratory species/taxa/populations, or where there is good scope for awareness-raising, capacity-building or encouraging new Party accessions. |
| Timeframe | Specify completion timeframes (and progress milestones where possible) and identify any elements of the action that are intended to be open-ended (e.g. measures to maintain conservation status). |
| Relationship to other CMS actions | Explain how the action's implementation will relate to other areas of CMS activity. This may form part of its purpose, for example if it is designed to lead to an Agreement; or it may involve showing how the action will support the Strategic Plan or COP decisions. It may also be necessary to show how different Concerted Actions complement or interact with each other. |
| Conservation priority | Explain why this action is a conservation priority. This may relate to the degree of endangerment or unfavourable conservation status as defined under the |

| | |
|---|--|
| | Convention; the urgency with which a particular kind of action is required; and other priorities expressed in CMS resolutions and decisions. |
| Relevance | Explain, for example, the degree to which the particular conservation problem is linked to migration and requires collective multilateral action; and the degree to which the proposed action will fulfil specific CMS mandates. |
| Absence of better remedies | Provide a brief options analysis to test whether (and why) a CMS Concerted Action is the best method of meeting the defined conservation need. Alternatives both within and outside the mechanisms of the CMS should be considered. (For cases where it appears that proceeding directly to the development of an Agreement or other instrument under Article IV of the Convention would be a better remedy, equivalent guidance and criteria for judging such proposals is provided in Resolution 11.12 and document UNEP/CMS/COP11/ Doc.22.2/Annex 1.) |
| Readiness and feasibility | Demonstrate meaningful prospects for funding and leadership, and address all significant issues of practical feasibility for undertaking the action. |
| Likelihood of success | Explain how implementation is likely to lead to the intended outcome. Risk factors to consider include: uncertainty about the ecological effects; weakness in the underpinning science; lack of a “legacy mechanism” by which results can be sustained; and activities by others that may undermine or negate the results of the action. |
| Magnitude of likely impact | Explain the number of species, number of countries or extent of area that will benefit from the action; the scope for catalytic or “multiplier” effects, contribution to synergies or potential for acting as “flagship” cases for broadening outreach. |
| Cost-effectiveness | Specify the resources required and relate these to the scale of impact expected, so that cost-effectiveness can be judged. |
| Consultations Planned / Undertaken | If work is targeted in Range States, outline what consultations, if any, are planned or have been undertaken. Outline any consultations with other relevant stakeholders. |

Annex 3 to Resolution 12.28 (Rev.COP13)

**LIST OF SPECIES DESIGNATED FOR CONCERTED ACTIONS
DURING THE INTERSESSIONAL PERIOD BETWEEN COP13 AND COP14**

| Species (scientific name) | Species (common name) | Other CMS instruments or processes covering the species | Range of the species covered by the Concerted Action | Meeting of the COP that endorsed the proposal |
|--|---------------------------|---|--|---|
| AVES | | | | |
| PROCELLARIIFORMES | | | | |
| <i>Diomedeidae</i> | | | | |
| <i>Diomedea antipodensis</i> | Antipodean Albatross | ACAP | Full range | COP13 (2020) |
| GRUIFORMES | | | | |
| <i>Otididae</i> | | | | |
| <i>Ardeotis nigriceps</i> | Great Indian Bustard | - | Full range | COP13 (2020) |
| <i>Houbaropsis bengalensis bengalensis</i> | Bengal Florican | - | Full range | COP13 (2020) |
| <i>Otis tarda</i> | Great Bustard | Great Bustard MOU | Asian population | COP12 (2017) |
| MAMMALIA (AQUATIC) | | | | |
| CETACEA | | | | |
| Physeteridae | | | | |
| <i>Physeter macrocephalus</i> | Sperm Whale | Pacific Cetaceans MOU, ACCOBAMS | Eastern tropical Pacific | COP12 (2017) |
| <i>Platanistidae</i> | | | | |
| <i>Platanista gangetica gangetica</i> | Ganges River Dolphin | - | Full range | COP13 (2020) |
| <i>Delphinidae</i> | | | | |
| <i>Sousa teuszii</i> | Atlantic Humpback Dolphin | Western African Aquatic Mammals MOU | Full range | COP12 (2017) |
| <i>Orcaella brevirostris</i> | Irrawaddy Dolphin | - | Full range | COP13 (2020) |

| Species (scientific name) | Species (common name) | Other CMS instruments or processes covering the species | Range of the species covered by the Concerted Action | Meeting of the COP that endorsed the proposal |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| <i>Balaenopteridae</i> | | | | |
| <i>Megaptera novaeangliae</i> | Humpback Whale | Pacific Cetaceans MOU, ACCOBAMS | Arabian Sea | COP12 (2017) |
| <i>Phocoenidae</i> | | | | |
| <i>Phocoena phocoena</i> | Harbour Porpoise | ASCOBANS, ACCOBAMS, Western African Aquatic Mammals MOU | Baltic Sea and Atlantic Iberian Peninsula | COP13 (2020) |
| MAMMALIA (TERRESTRIAL) | | | | |
| PRIMATES | | | | |
| Hominidae | | | | |
| <i>Pan troglodytes</i> | West African nut-cracking Chimpanzee | - | Guinea, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Cote d'Ivoire | COP13 (2020) |
| PROBOSCIDEA | | | | |
| <i>Elephantidae</i> (Central African populations only) | | | | |
| <i>Elephas maximus indicus</i> | Asian Elephant | - | Full range | COP13 (2020) |
| ARTIODACTYLA | | | | |
| <i>Giraffidae</i> | | | | |
| <i>Giraffa camelopardalis</i> | Giraffe | - | Full range | COP13 (2020) |
| <i>Bovidae</i> | | | | |
| <i>Eurdorcas rufifrons</i> | Red-fronted Gazelle | - | Sahelo-Saharan region | COP13 (2020) |
| <i>Gazella cuvieri</i> | Cuvier's Gazelle | Action Plan | Sahelo-Saharan region | COP13 (2020) |
| <i>Gazella dorcas</i> | Dorcas Gazelle | Action Plan | Sahelo-Saharan region | COP13 (2020) |
| <i>Gazella leptocerus</i> | Slender-horned Gazelle | Action Plan | Sahelo-Saharan region | COP13 (2020) |
| <i>Nanger dama</i> | Dama Gazelle | Action Plan | Sahelo-Saharan region | COP13 (2020) |
| <i>Ammotragus lervia</i> | Barbary Sheep | - | Sahelo-Saharan region | COP13 (2020) |

| Species (scientific name) | Species (common name) | Other CMS instruments or processes covering the species | Range of the species covered by the Concerted Action | Meeting of the COP that endorsed the proposal |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| <i>Addax nasomaculatus</i> | Addax | Action Plan | Sahelo-Saharan region | COP13 (2020) |
| <i>Oryx dammah</i> | Scimitar-horned Oryx | Action Plan | Sahelo-Saharan region | COP13 (2020) |
| PISCES | | | | |
| RHINOPRISTIFORMES | | | | |
| Rhinobatidae | | | | |
| <i>Rhinobatos rhinobatos</i> | Common Guitarfish | Sharks MOU | Full range | COP13 (2020) |
| Rinidae | | | | |
| <i>Rhynchobatus australiae</i> | Bottlenose (White-potted) Wedgefish | Sharks MOU | Full range | COP13 (2020) |
| Pristidae | | | | |
| <i>Pristis pectinata</i> | Smalltooth Sawfish | Sharks MOU | Gabon | COP13 (2020) |
| <i>Pristis pristis</i> | Large-tooth Sawfish | Sharks MOU | Gabon | COP13 (2020) |
| ORECTOLOBIFORMES | | | | |
| Rhincodontidae | | | | |
| <i>Rhincodon typus</i> | Whale Shark | Sharks MOU | Full range | COP12 (2017) |
| SQUATINIFORMES | | | | |
| Squatinae | | | | |
| <i>Squatina squatina</i> | Angelshark | Sharks MOU | Full range | COP12 (2017) |
| RAJIFORMES | | | | |
| Mobulidae | | | | |
| <i>Manta and Mobula spp.</i> | Mobulid rays | Sharks MOU | Full range | COP12 (2017) |