



**CONVENTION ON
MIGRATORY
SPECIES**

Distribution: General

UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.24.4.4
26 May 2017

Original: English

12th MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES
Manila, Philippines, 23 - 28 October 2017
Agenda Item 24.4.4

BYCATCH

(Prepared by the Appointed Councillor for Bycatch and the Secretariat)

Summary:

At the Sixth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties in 1999, CMS Parties adopted the first resolution on bycatch. Since then, the topic has repeatedly been the focus of attention of CMS Parties with four subsequent resolutions adopted. These have been consolidated into one, contained in Annex 2 of Document 21.2.4, which is now rather complex. In order to incorporate recent developments and simplify the Resolution, revisions are being proposed to the consolidated version.

This document should be read in conjunction with UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.2.4 concerning resolutions to be consolidated.

Implementation of the draft Resolution and Decisions will contribute towards meeting targets 5, 6 and 7 of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023.

BYCATCH

Background

1. Bycatch, the incidental capture of a non-target species in fisheries, is both a common and universal phenomenon. Between a quarter and a fifth of all fish caught across the world is simply thrown overboard – the equivalent of millions of tonnes of fish and other marine life discarded every year. Trawls, seines, hooks and lines, gillnets and driftnets and even lines of pots and creels take their toll on many species of animals, such as marine mammals, seabirds, turtles and non-target fish species. Worst affected are long-lived, slow breeding species such as whales, seals, turtles and albatrosses.
2. Bycatch does not only affect individual animals, populations, or species; entire marine ecosystems are damaged as they lose an important element of their structure. In the face of this serious threat, CMS Parties have adopted a number of resolutions and recommendations over the years, calling for immediate action by the international community to address the problem and improve fishing practices to reduce the incidental capture of non-target species. In addition, there are several CMS Family Agreements and Memoranda of Understanding dedicated to species for which bycatch is a major issue. For example, the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP), the Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans of the Black Sea, Mediterranean Sea and contiguous Atlantic area (ACCOBAMS), and the Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans of the Baltic, North East Atlantic, Irish and North Seas (ASCOBANS) have long-standing and ongoing work streams to address bycatch.

Gillnet Fisheries

3. Resolution 9.18 on By-Catch asked for an assessment of the impact of fisheries bycatch and discarding on the conservation status of migratory species listed on the Convention. The 16th Meeting of the Scientific Council decided that the initial focus, in view of resource limitations and work in the meantime undertaken by other organizations, should be on gillnets.
4. Thanks to voluntary contributions from Australia and the United Kingdom, a desk-top study dealing with both the impact of global gillnet fisheries on migratory species and bycatch mitigation measures for gillnet gear was conducted. Initial results were presented to the 17th Scientific Council Meeting, and after further review by the Council and others, the final report was published as UNEP/CMS/ScC18/Inf.10.15.1.
5. Using information about species and gillnet fishing distribution, the analysis examined the relative exposure of species to gillnet activity. The information was then weighted by a factor to take into account the vulnerability of populations to extinction (IUCN weighted exposure). Species most exposed to gillnet fishing came from all species groups listed under the CMS.
6. Resolution 10.14 on Bycatch of CMS-listed Species in Gillnet Fisheries was based in part on the findings of this study. The consolidation of this resolution with previous CMS resolutions and recommendations on bycatch of migratory species (see UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21, 21.2 and 21.2.4) means that the specific focus on gillnets has been lost. This is however not an indication that the concerns around this gear type relating to bycatch of non-target species are no longer valid.

Monitoring

7. Knowledge of bycatch of CMS-listed species remains poor in most parts of the world, even where binding legislation is in place that mandates monitoring and mitigation. Monitoring of bycatch is often undertaken using different methodologies and variable standards,

resulting in insufficient fishery coverage and/or sampling designs that have prevented the extrapolation and integration of data across regions. Extrapolation from independent observer programmes to entire fleets using those gear types is also hindered by inadequate and variable information on fishing effort. This has prevented the calculation of total bycatch estimates for individual populations by fishery and geographical area and large sections of fleets remain unmonitored, making assessment of the impact of bycatch at a population or management unit level difficult (ASCOBANS/AC22/Inf.4.1.e).

8. Further, with the considerable scientific uncertainty regarding the status and trends of many populations of aquatic species, the exact impacts and (un)sustainability of bycatch is hard to assess. For many species or populations, no baseline population data are available to inform management strategies and provide a measure of their ability to maintain a favourable conservation status in the face of high levels of bycatch. Often, there is also lack of clarity on population structure and appropriate management units, and a lack of robust data on abundance and trends and historic population size. In many cases, management objectives should therefore take into account the need to restore already depleted populations.

Mitigation

9. Mitigation should be informed by robust knowledge of the operational and environmental factors influencing bycatch rates, and the best mitigation approach may vary according to fishery, species and geographical area. At the same time, the perceived burden of data collection should not become a barrier to implementing mitigation, and data requirements need to be balanced with the urgent need to implement conservation action. Consultation with fisheries stakeholders, and trials and monitoring of mitigation, are key to ensuring industry support for mitigation measures. As mitigation is implemented, both efficacy and industry compliance should be monitored, with its development an evolving process that allows continued refinement of mitigation in partnership with stakeholders (ASCOBANS/AC22/Inf.4.1.e).
10. Various potential mitigation methods are now available, which are applicable in different fisheries and present solutions for different taxonomic groups. Accordingly, all of the CMS Family Agreements relevant for aquatic species are developing their own advice regarding bycatch. Some examples include:
 - The Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP) actively cooperates with RFMOs and provides numerous, up-to-date resources giving advice on the reduction of seabird bycatch on a [dedicated page](#) on its website. ACAP's Seabird Bycatch Working Group meets regularly and assesses current and emerging mitigation for many gear-types before developing 'best-practice advice' that is widely disseminated in relevant fishing fora.
 - The Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans of the Black Sea, Mediterranean Sea and contiguous Atlantic area (ACCOBAMS), in collaboration with the Regional Activity Center for Specially Protected Areas (UNEP/MAP-RAC/SPA), currently jointly coordinates a project on mitigating interactions between endangered marine species and fishing activities with the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM).
 - The Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans of the Baltic, North East Atlantic, Irish and North Seas (ASCOBANS) has a long history of working on the issue, and has repeatedly provided advice to the European Commission. More information can be found on a [dedicated page](#) on its website.
 - The Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation of Migratory Sharks (Sharks MOU) recognizes bycatch as a serious threat to many species. The Conservation

Working Group, which assists the Advisory Committee (AC) of the MOU is currently reviewing bycatch mitigation mechanisms being employed by fisheries management bodies and provides technical guidance to the AC and Signatories.

- The Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation and Management of Marine Turtles and their Habitats of the Indian Ocean and South-East Asia (IOSEA Marine Turtle MOU) actively cooperates with regional fisheries management organizations (RFMOs) and provides many bycatch-related resources on a [dedicated page](#) on its website.
11. The Scientific Committee of the International Whaling Commission (IWC) has a long history of considering the threat posed by bycatch to cetaceans, considering it the most serious, direct threat globally. Recognising the extensive expertise in cetaceans, fisheries and conservation science available to the IWC at a global level, in 2016 the Commission endorsed a proposal for a new Bycatch Initiative, which in collaboration with other organizations, such as CMS, ACCOBAMS and ASCOBANS, aims to develop, assess and promote cetacean bycatch prevention and mitigation measures world-wide. CMS has been invited to join the Standing Working Group established to develop a work programme, to oversee the work conducted, create an Expert Panel that will report to it, and work in consultation with a Coordinator within the secretariat of IWC who will seek to implement the programme of work.
12. Many partner organizations to CMS and the Agreements also actively engage in the efforts to reduce bycatch of CMS-listed species. A recent example is the Review of Methods Used to Reduce Risks of Cetacean Bycatch and Entanglement presented as UNEP/CMS/COP12/Inf.15, financed by the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) specifically with the intention to support initiatives to address cetacean bycatch, including those by CMS, its associated regional agreements, ASCOBANS and ACCOBAMS, and the IWC, by providing a summary of the current state of mitigation techniques. The CMS Secretariat and experts associated with the Scientific Council have had opportunity to peer review the report, ensuring its relevance to the work of the Convention.

Discussion and analysis

13. There is no doubt that while bycatch is by no means the only threat to aquatic species listed by CMS and covered by its agreements, for many species or populations it remains the most severe. Addressing it effectively requires collaboration between all relevant stakeholders, and significant improvements in monitoring and mitigation.
14. As a global treaty focused on the conservation of many of the species most affected by bycatch, CMS Parties, the Scientific Council and the Secretariat are in key positions to drive forward efforts to address this issue.

Attached Resolution

15. In order to incorporate recent developments and simplify the resolution, revisions have been made to the consolidated resolution contained in Annex 2 of Document 21.2.4. For background on this process please refer to Documents UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21 and UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.2.

Recommended actions

16. The Conference of the Parties is recommended to:
- a) adopt the draft Resolution contained in Annex 1.

ANNEX 1

DRAFT RESOLUTION

BYCATCH

NB: This draft Resolution should be read in conjunction with Document 21.2.4, Annex 2. Proposed new text is underlined. Text to be deleted is ~~crossed-out~~.

Recalling previous related decisions of the Conference of the Parties including Resolution 6.2, Recommendation 7.2, Resolution 8.14, and, Resolution 9.18, and Resolution 10.14 on bycatch,

Acknowledging the obligations of the global community to conserve natural resources through sustainable development, as underpinned by, *inter alia*, the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Convention on Biological Diversity, the United Nations Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks, the Commission on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, especially through its Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries,

Recognizing that bycatch has been highlighted as a priority threat to be mitigated in a number of CMS subsidiary agreements and memoranda of understanding,

Concerned that despite considerable progress on implementing bycatch mitigation measures to reduce the adverse impacts of fishing on listed migratory species, bycatch still remains one of the major causes of mortality of listed migratory species from human activities in the marine environment,

Further concerned that despite the progress made so far by the Parties, bycatch remains a key threat to aquatic species, especially those listed on Appendix I and Appendix II of the Convention (including seabirds, fish, turtles and aquatic mammals) and that significant additional efforts are required to ensure that bycatch is reduced or controlled to levels that do not threaten the conservation status of these species,

Concerned that migratory aquatic species face multiple, cumulative and often synergistic threats with possible effects over vast areas, such as bycatch of species, over-fishing, pollution, habitat destruction or degradation, marine noise impacts, hunting as well as climate change,

~~*Recognizing* that, under Article II of the Convention, Range States agree to take action for the conservation of migratory species, whenever possible and appropriate, paying special attention to migratory species, the conservation status of which is unfavourable, and taking individually or in cooperation appropriate and necessary steps to conserve such species and their habitat,~~

Recognizing that Article II of the Convention requires all Parties to take action to avoid any migratory species becoming endangered and, in particular, to endeavour to provide immediate protection for migratory species listed in Appendix I to the Convention, and to endeavour to conclude Agreements covering the conservation and management of migratory species listed in Appendix II,

Recognizing that Article III requires parties to prevent, reduce or control factors that are endangering or are likely to further endanger species in Appendix I,

~~Recognizing that Article III permits the Conference of the Parties to recommend to those Parties that are Range States of a migratory species listed in Appendix I that they take further measures considered appropriate to benefit the species,~~

~~Recognizing that Article VII requires the Conference of the Parties to review the implementation of the Convention and, in particular, to decide on any additional measure that should be taken to implement the objectives of the Convention,~~

~~Noting that two species of albatross are listed in Appendix I and twenty in Appendix II, and that seven species of petrel are listed in Appendix I and seven in Appendix I,~~

~~Noting that six species of marine turtle are listed in both Appendices I and II,~~

~~Noting that sixteen species of cetaceans are listed on Appendix I and forty-four in Appendix II,~~

~~Recognizing that the taking of Appendix I shark species is prohibited under Article III (5) of the Convention,~~

Noting that Section 3 paragraph 8 of the Shark MOU, to which a number of CMS Parties have acceded, provides that “sharks should be managed to allow for sustainable harvest where appropriate, through conservation and management measures based on the best available scientific information”, and that paragraph 13j of Section 4 of the Shark MOU encourages “relevant bodies to set targets based on the best available science for fish quotas, fishing effort and other restrictions to help achieve sustainable use”,

Recognizing the importance of integrating conservation activities with socio-economic development of some fisheries that accidentally take species listed in Appendices I and II,

Aware of the significant and continuing mortality of many albatross and other sea-bird species of fish, seabirds, marine turtles and marine mammals cetaceans through fisheries bycatch,

Noting that the co-operation of Range States in developing technical solutions and improving practice in relation to bycatch could greatly enhance the conservation of sea-bird, marine turtle and cetacean many populations of marine organisms,

Recognizing the efforts already made by some Parties to reduce bycatch by fisheries within their territorial waters and exclusive economic zones and by vessels fishing on the high seas under their flags,

Noting that different stakeholders apply different definitions of bycatch and that this may cause confusion and inconsistency in reporting bycatch and in the development and delivery of bycatch mitigation strategies,

~~*Welcoming* the work underway through the implementation of Resolution 10.15 to identify gaps and overlaps between CMS and other relevant bodies with respect to their work on bycatch,~~

Conscious of the work already completed or underway under the auspices of CMS daughter agreements and other relevant bodies, especially the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP), the Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans of the Black Sea, Mediterranean Sea and contiguous Atlantic area (ACCOBAMS), and the Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans of the Baltic, North East Atlantic, Irish and North Seas (ASCOBANS), as well as of the Bycatch Mitigation Initiative agreed on by the International Whaling Commission (IWC) in 2016,

Recognizing the important role of the FAO and where appropriate Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs) in reducing bycatch of CMS-listed species ~~and the 2011 FAO International Guidelines on Bycatch Management and Reduction of Discards~~ and other non-target species,

~~Noting that gillnets are widely used in both commercial and artisanal fisheries in all oceans of the world; and therefore *w* Welcoming the assessment of the impact of gillnet fisheries on CMS-listed species and the review presented in UNEP/CMS/ScC18/Inf.10.15.1, and~~

~~Aware that there is a scarcity of information of the magnitude of gillnet fishing effort, bycatch incurred through this fishing method, the efficacy of mitigation measures, as well as abundance and distribution of many aquatic species listed on the CMS Appendices,~~

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

1. *Reaffirms* the obligation on all Parties to protect migratory species against bycatch, including seabirds, fishes, marine turtles and aquatic mammals ~~cetaceans~~;
2. ~~Notes the conclusions of the review presented to the Conference in document UNEP/CMS/Inf.10.30 and the Assessment of Bycatch in Gill Net Fisheries (UNEP/CMS/ScC18/Inf.10.15.1);~~
3. ~~Takes note that the species most exposed to risk from gillnet fisheries are likely to include representatives of all aquatic taxonomic groups listed on the Appendices of the Convention;~~
4. *Further notes and encourages* Parties to implement the best practice approach and procedures outlined in the 1999 FAO International Plan of Action for Reducing Incidental Catch of Seabirds in Longline Fisheries (IPOA-Seabirds) and its related Best Practices Technical Guidelines, the 1999 FAO International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks (IPOA-Sharks), the 2009 FAO Guidelines to Reduce Sea Turtle Mortality in Fishing Operations and the 2011 FAO International Guidelines on Bycatch Management and Reduction of Discards, and to develop and implement national plans of action as required by the IPOAs;
5. *Urges* Parties to assess the risk of bycatch arising from their ~~gillnet~~ fisheries, as it relates to migratory species, including by using observer programmes and/or other methods, where appropriate, to implement best practice mitigation measures and to review regularly the effectiveness of their implementation of mitigation measures with a view to refining them if required;
6. *Requests* all Parties, as a matter of gravity, to continue and strengthen measures within fisheries under their control, both within their territorial waters and exclusive economic zones, and by vessels fishing on the high seas under their flag, to minimize as far as possible the incidental mortality of migratory species listed in Appendices I and II, ~~including seabirds, marine turtles and cetaceans;~~
7. ~~Requests all Parties to strengthen the measures taken to protect migratory species against bycatch by fisheries within their territorial waters and exclusive economic zones, and by vessels fishing on the high seas under their flags;~~
8. *Encourages* all Parties that are Range States of ~~seabirds, marine turtles and cetaceans~~ aquatic species listed in Appendices I and II, and which have relevant fisheries, to co-operate mutually and with other countries to reduce as far as possible the incidental taking by such fisheries of such migratory species, for example by the sharing of, and further development of, practical and effective mitigation devices for seabirds, marine turtles and cetaceans;

Participation in Regional Fisheries Management Organizations

9. *Requests* those Parties ~~which~~ that are also Parties to regional fisheries management organizations (RFMOs) to highlight there the serious problems of incidental mortality of migratory species listed in Appendices I and II, ~~including seabirds, marine turtles and cetaceans~~, with a view to the adoption of mitigating measures;
10. ~~Strongly encourages Parties, through their participation in relevant fora, for example through RFMOs, to raise the serious and ongoing problem of bycatch of migratory species, especially as it refers to seabirds, sharks, marine turtles and marine mammals, with a view to improving mitigation measures for the reduction of bycatch as well as improving data collection through, *inter alia*, independent observer programmes;~~
11. ~~Calls on Range State~~ Parties, working through regional fisheries management organizations and agreements, as appropriate, to:
- a) raise the serious and ongoing problem of bycatch of migratory species, especially as it refers to seabirds, fishes, marine turtles and marine mammals, with a view to improving mitigation measures for the reduction of bycatch;
 - b) compile information and take action regarding fishing activities in waters under their jurisdiction, or by flagged fishing vessels under their jurisdiction or control, as the very first step to address the problem, covering:
 - i) resources targeted;
 - ii) resources being caught accidentally;
 - iii) effects on the resource being caught accidentally (estimate total bycatch in the fishery(ies) and population impact); and
 - iv) implementation of mitigation measures known to be effective.
 - c) implement appropriate schemes (including, where appropriate, on-board observers or electronic monitoring systems) for fisheries within waters under their jurisdiction, or carried out by flagged fishing vessels under their jurisdiction or control, in order to determine the impact of fisheries bycatch on migratory species. Where relevant, this should be carried out in the context of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations' (FAO's) International Plans of Action on Seabirds and Sharks;
 - d) encourage research proposals in geographical areas in which there is a particular lack of information and that, at the same time, are not covered by currently existing CMS Agreements. In particular, information is needed on:
 - i) artisanal fisheries, generally;
 - ii) gillnet fisheries, generally;
 - iii) pelagic and bottom trawling, and purse seine fisheries;
 - iv) in the case of cetaceans, special attention is to be paid to South, South-east and East Asia and West Africa;
 - v) for turtles, these include long-line fisheries in the Pacific Ocean and impacts on Olive Ridley Turtles in South Asia;
 - vi) for birds, South America and northern gillnet fisheries; ~~and~~
 - vii) for sharks, all fisheries. ~~and~~
 - e) consider and implement ways and means to reduce the amount of discarded and lost nets and other detrimental fishing gear both within their maritime zones and on the high seas, as well as ways and means of minimizing such losses from vessels flying their flag;

~~12. Requests the CMS Secretariat, in conjunction with CMS daughter agreements (to avoid duplication of effort), to write to relevant RFMOs and other competent international bodies, inviting them to share with the CMS Secretariat available information on:~~

- ~~a) migratory species bycatch policy and management;~~
- ~~b) migratory species bycatch in the fisheries for which they have responsibility;~~
- ~~c) assessments of the impacts by their respective fisheries on seabirds, sharks, turtles and cetaceans;~~
- ~~d) adoption of monitoring, control and surveillance measures on bycatch in the fisheries relevant to migratory species; and~~
- ~~e) best practices on the basis of the performance reviews that are underway.~~

~~and requests the CMS Secretariat to transmit this information to the Scientific Council;~~

~~13. Calls on CMS Parties:~~

- ~~a) to require the implementation of proven bycatch solutions for work relating to implementation of the FAO's 'International Plan Of Actions (IPOA) for reducing the impacts of longline fishing on Seabirds' and 'Sharks' and development and implementation of national plans of action as required by those IPOAs; and~~
- ~~b) that are also members of relevant RFMOs (e.g. ICCAT, IOTC, CCSBT, WCPFC) to work within those RFMOs to reduce bycatch in these fisheries through *inter alia* the development of bycatch action plans, independent observer schemes, assessments of the scale of the problem, awareness raising, and promoting technical mitigation.~~

Bycatch Mitigation Measures and Data Collection

14. *Encourages* Parties to conduct research to identify and improve mitigation measures, including use of alternative fishing gear and methods, particularly in respect to non-selective gears such as gillnets, to avoid or reduce bycatch where feasible, and subsequently promote their use and implementation;

15. *Invites* Parties to improve reporting of bycatch information and data in their CMS National Reports, or via their reports to CMS daughter Agreements, particularly on bycatch mitigation methods that have proved to be effective;

16. *Further encourages* Parties and *invites* other governments, fisheries and fisheries-related organizations and the private sector to facilitate collection of species-specific bycatch data and to share such data wherever possible;

17. *Requests* Parties to provide available information, including the results of bycatch risk assessments or mitigation research, to the Scientific Council to allow the Scientific Council, upon request from one or several Parties, to identify and provide advice to them on best-practice mitigation techniques for each particular circumstance;

18. *Requests* the CMS Secretariat, subject to the availability of resources, to:

- a) Source funds for: undertake a studies to assist any interested developing countries to determine relative levels of bycatch in their commercial and artisanal fisheries when they so require, where feasible in collaboration with relevant intergovernmental organizations; and

- b) organize a series of specialist bycatch mitigation workshops in developing country Parties and non-Parties with substantial commercial fisheries in coordination with any interested Parties, where feasible in collaboration with relevant intergovernmental organizations;
- c) report progress on these actions to the CMS Standing Committee and Scientific Council;
- d) make the information gathered under paragraph 12 a) readily accessible to all relevant range states for migratory species threatened by bycatch, *inter alia* to assist in the application of bycatch mitigation techniques relevant to migratory species and report progress to meetings of the Standing Committee and Scientific Council.

Collaboration and Cooperation

- ~~19. Requests~~ the Secretariat to bring this resolution to the attention of, and to explore cooperation with, the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Committee of Fisheries of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations;
- ~~20. Instructs~~ the CMS Secretariat to make the information gathered under paragraph 17 readily accessible to all relevant range states for migratory species threatened by bycatch, *inter alia* to assist in the application of bycatch mitigation techniques relevant to migratory species and report progress to each Standing Committee meeting;
- 21. ~~Invites~~ Requests the Secretariats of CMS and relevant daughter agreements to improve cooperation and communication on bycatch-related issues, and to cooperate closely with other relevant programmes, such as the IWC Bycatch Mitigation Initiative;
- 22. *Invites* the Scientific Council and the Working Group on Bycatch to recommend to the Conference of the Parties, as appropriate, concerted measures actions to be taken by Parties in respect of seabirds, marine turtles and cetaceans species listed in Appendices I and II that are affected by bycatch;
- 23. *Instructs* the Scientific Council and the Bycatch Working Group to identify for each particular bycatch situation (gear type, species, fishing area and season) the most effective mitigation techniques, which should build upon and complement existing initiatives within the fisheries sector;
- 24. *Requests* the Scientific Council to consider any scientific and technical information submitted by Range States or other relevant bodies, relating to impacts on migratory species from bycatch, in particular CMS daughter agreements;
- ~~25. Invites~~ consultation with regional fisheries organizations having a function in relation to those species with a view to obtaining scientific data, and to coordination with conservation measures enforced by them;
- ~~26. Urges~~ the Secretariats of Agreements or Memoranda of Understanding which include actions to address bycatch (such as ACAP, ACCOBAMS, ASCOBANS, West African Marine Turtle MOU, and the IOSEA Marine Turtle MOU) to identify any range states not yet signatory to such arrangements and encourage such range states to become Parties and/or Signatories to these arrangements and report progress to the CMS Standing Committee at its meetings;
- 27. *Encourages* stakeholders to consult experts on all taxa concerned, including the particular expertise available within relevant CMS agreements, to consider the potential effects on aquatic mammals, seabirds, marine turtles and sharks when choosing mitigation measures;

- ~~28. Further encourages all stakeholders to make full use of CMS agreements related to aquatic species and the particular expertise available within them related to bycatch of the taxonomic groups they deal with;~~
29. Requests the Secretariat, the Scientific Council and Parties to continue and increase efforts to collaborate with other relevant international fora and where appropriate the RFMOs, with a view to avoiding duplication, increasing synergies and raising the profile of CMS and CMS agreements related to aquatic species in these fora;

Technological and Financial Assistance

30. Calls upon Parties to support the participation of representatives of the Secretariat and Scientific Council in relevant international fora through voluntary contributions;
31. Calls upon all donor countries to consider helping developing countries acquire and use relevant technology, and with appropriate education and training of fishermen;
32. Further encourages Parties to provide financial and technical support to developing countries for the mitigation of bycatch of species listed in the Appendices of CMS, focusing on work with indigenous and local communities that depend on fisheries for their livelihoods;
33. Calls upon Parties and invites other governments, partner organizations and the private sector to provide voluntary contributions for ~~the execution of these follow-up reviews and to finance~~ independent research on the effectiveness and further improvement of bycatch mitigation measures; and

Final Provisions

34. Repeals
- a) Resolution 6.2, *By-Catch*;
 - b) Recommendation 7.2, *Implementation of Resolution 6.2 on By-Catch*;
 - c) Resolution 8.14, *By-Catch*;
 - d) Resolution 9.18, *By-Catch*; and
 - e) Resolution 10.14, *Bycatch of CMS-Listed Species in Gillnet Fisheries*.