



# Coming together for the conservation of birds of prey



## Status of Development of Raptor Conservation and Management Strategies and Equivalent Documents

UNEP/CMS/Raptors/MOS3/Doc.12.4

#### **Lauren Lopes**

Associate Programme Management Officer

CMS Office – Abu Dhabi

Lauren.LloydLopes@un.org



#### Background

#### MOU Text, Paragraph 12:

"[...] Signatories will aim to prepare and submit to the [...] Coordinating Unit [...] national or regional [e.g. EU] strategy or equivalent documents (e.g. Single Species Action Plans) for category 1 and, where appropriate, category 2 species in Table 1 in the Action Plan."



### Background

#### MOU Text, Paragraph 12:

"[...] Signatories will aim to prepare and submit to the [...] Coordinating Unit [...] national or regional [e.g. EU] strategy or equivalent documents (e.g. Single Species Action Plans) for category 1 and, where appropriate, category 2 species in Table 1 in the Action Plan."



#### MOU Text, Paragraph 20:

"Signatories will endeavour to finance from national and other sources the implementation in their territory of the measures necessary for the conservation of birds of prey. In addition, they will endeavour to [...] seek assistance from other sources for the financing and implementation of their strategies or equivalent measures".

## Status of document development

- MOU came into effect on 1 November 2008
- CU received 16 raptor conservation & management strategies or equivalent documents
- Submitted by 9 Signatories (of 61)
- Single- & multi-species docs
- All docs available on MOU website

- **EU**
- France
- India
- Luxembourg
- Madagascar
- Pakistan
- Sweden
- Switzerland
- UK



### Status of document development

- In addition, CU aware that strategies or equivalent documents are underway for:
  - Chad
  - Guinea
  - Lebanon
  - Finland
  - Hungary
  - Mali

- Mongolia
- Morocco
- Norway
- Pakistan
- South Africa
- United Arab Emirates



- "Guidelines for Preparing National or Regional Raptor Conservation and Management Strategies" (June 2012, Inf.3)
- Template that Signatories can build on (Inf.4)



- "Guidelines for Preparing National or Regional Raptor Conservation and
   Management Strategies" (June 2012, Inf.3)
- Template that Signatories can build on (Inf.4)

- Propose standardised format for strategies/eq. docs
- Set out the principal activities to be undertaken & issues to be addressed to implement the general provisions of the MOU
- Developed to ensure planners have the space to determine the appropriate level of detail for their contexts

- Other documents that can provide a useful framework to consider:
  - "Multi-species Action Plan to Conserve African-Eurasian Vultures" (Vulture MsAP), including its annexes
  - "Strategic Implementation Plan for the Vulture MsAP" (2020-2023)
  - "Saker Falcon Global Action Plan" (SakerGAP)







- Other documents that can guide how to address specific threats:
  - "CMS Guidelines to Prevent the Risk of Poisoning to Migratory Birds"
  - Docs produced/made available by the CMS Energy Task Force
  - Docs made available by the CMS Intergovernmental Task Force on Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds in the Mediterranean (MIKT)



#### Further assistance:

- Annex 2 Category 1 and Category 2 species that occur in each Signatory's territory, according to BirdLife International Data Zone, Dec 2022
- Information can inform about the species that conservation and management strategies or equivalent documents should cover



#### **Action requested**

- The Meeting is invited to take note of:
  - a) The current rate of development of national or regional raptor conservation and management strategies
  - b) The guidance currently available to support Signatories in developing those documents
  - c) The guiding information provided on species occurrence per Signatory's territory





- The Meeting is invited to:
  - Identify necessary steps to strengthen the implementation of the MOU regarding the development of national or regional raptor conservation and management strategies

Discussing the pertinence of the requirement

Discussing reasons/
challenges behind current
development rates



#### **Discussion**

**Para 12:** "[...] Signatories will aim to prepare and submit to the [...] Coordinating Unit where appropriate a national or regional [e.g. EU] strategy or equivalent documents (e.g. Single Species Action Plans) for category 1 and, where appropriate, category 2 species in Table 1 in the Action Plan."

Is paragraph 12's ambition of having Signatories develop strategies or equivalent documents a desirable & pertinent means for ensuring the conservation of birds of prey & their habitats?

Yes



- i. What <u>specific</u> challenges are preventing Sigs from developing their documents?
- **ii.** In what ways could Sigs, the CU &/or others help overcome those specific challenges so that documents are delivered?
- i. What alternative requirement would be more desirable and pertinent?
- **ii.** What potential challenges could prevent Sigs from implementing that alternative requirement?
- iii. What specific support would Sigs require to implement it?
- iv. How could the CU best support its implementation?



## Thank you for your attention

#### **Lauren Lopes**

Associate Programme Management Officer

CMS Office – Abu Dhabi

Lauren.LloydLopes@un.org

