

**DRAFT REPORT OF THE 12TH MEETING
OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON THE
CONSERVATION OF MIGRATORY SPECIES OF WILD ANIMALS**

Note: This draft report follows the sequence in which items were discussed. The final report will be restructured to follow Agenda items in numerical order.

Day 1 – Monday 23 October 2017

Opening ceremony 10.00–12.00

OPENING OF THE MEETING (ITEM 1)

1. The Opening Ceremony, held on Monday 23 October 2017, was divided into ceremonial and official segments.
2. The ceremonial segment commenced with a short video and a performance of 'El Gamma's Tribute to Mother Nature' by Shadow Theatre Group.
3. The Master of Ceremonies, UN Environment Goodwill Ambassador Nadya Hutalong, introduced:
 - Welcoming remarks by Senator Cynthia A. Villar, Chair of Senate Committee on Environment and Natural Resources, Philippines;
 - A presentation by Dr Bradnee Chambers, CMS Executive Secretary to UN Foundation essay competition winner Zach Beaudoin, followed by a statement from Mr Beaudoin;
 - A keynote address by UN Environment Ambassador Yann Arthus-Bertrand.

**WELCOMING ADDRESSES (ITEM 2)
KEYNOTE ADDRESS (ITEM 3)**

4. The official part of the Opening Ceremony was chaired by the Chair of the Standing Committee, Mr Øystein Størkersen (Norway).
5. Addresses were delivered by:
 - H.E. Tarsicio Granzio, Minister of the Environment, Ecuador (Host of COP11);
 - Mr Roy Cimatu, Secretary of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), Philippines (Host of COP12);
 - Mr Ibrahim Thiaw, Deputy Executive Director of UN Environment;
 - Mr John E. Scanlon, Secretary-General of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES);
 - Ms Cristiana Paşca Palmer, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD); and
 - Dr Bradnee Chambers, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS).

ORGANISATIONAL MATTERS

ADOPTION OF RULES OF PROCEDURE (ITEM 4)

6. The Chair of the Standing Committee, Mr Øystein Størkersen (Norway) referred participants to the Rules of Procedure for the 12th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties (UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.4/Rev.1 *Rules of Procedure*). Minor corrections proposed by the Secretariat were contained in Annex 1 to the document, and a draft Decision to further review the Rules of Procedure during the forthcoming intersessional period was contained in Annex 2.
7. The COP adopted the Rules of Procedure, including the corrections contained in Annex 1 to document UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.4/Rev.1, as well as the decision contained in Annex 2.
8. The Chair noted that document UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.4/Add.1, concerning the subject of Parties with contributions in arrears, would be taken up by the meeting at a later point.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS (ITEM 5)

9. The Chair of the Standing Committee recalled that Rule 5 of the Rules of Procedure provided for the election of the Chair of the COP, the Chair of the Committee of the Whole (COW) who would also serve as Vice-Chair of the COP, and the Vice-Chair of the COW.
10. The Conference elected the following officers by acclamation:

Conference of the Parties

Chair: Mr Roy Cimatu, (Philippines)

Vice-Chair: Dr Rod Hay (New Zealand)

Committee of the Whole

Chair: Dr Rod Hay (New Zealand)

Vice-Chair: Ms Ariuntuya Dorjsuren (Mongolia)

11. The Chair of the Standing Committee confirmed that, in accordance with Rule 6 of the Rules of Procedure, the Bureau of the Conference was now complete and comprised all members of the Standing Committee, the Chair and Vice-Chair of the COP and the Vice-Chair of the COW. The Bureau would meet for the first time during the evening of 23 October.
12. Taking his place on the podium the Chair of the COP expressed the honour he felt and looked forward to guiding the meeting through its busy agenda.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA AND MEEETING SCHEDULE (ITEM 6)

13. The Chair referred the meeting to documents UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.6.1/Rev.4 *Provisional Agenda and Documents* and UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.6.2/Rev.1 *Provisional Annotated Agenda and Meeting Schedule*.
14. There being no proposals for amendments, both documents were adopted by consensus.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE AND OTHER SESSIONAL COMMITTEES (ITEM 7)

15. The Chair recalled that Rule 3 of the Rules of Procedure provided for the establishment of a Credentials Committee of five members. It had been the practice at CMS COPs for those five members to be drawn from the regional groupings. He invited nominations accordingly.
16. The following Parties were elected to serve on the Credentials Committee:

Africa: Republic of Congo, Ghana
Asia: Saudi Arabia
Europe: Norway
Latin America & the Caribbean: Uruguay

17. At the invitation of the Chair and in accordance with Rule 17 of the Rules of Procedure, the meeting decided to establish the Committee of the Whole (COW).
18. The Chair noted that the meeting might wish to establish further committees or working groups to discuss the draft budget and other issues. The COP decided that the establishment of these bodies would be taken up by the COW.

ADMISSION OF OBSERVERS (ITEM 8)

19. The Chair referred the meeting to document UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.8/Rev.1 *Admission of Observers*.
20. In accordance with Article VII of the Convention, the COP approved admission to the meeting of all those Observers listed in COP12/Doc.8/Rev.1.

REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODIES OF THE CONVENTION (ITEM 10)

(a) Standing Committee (Item 10.1)

21. The Chair of the Standing Committee (StC), Mr Øystein Størkersen reported that two full meetings of the StC had taken place since COP11, namely:
 - 44th meeting – October 2015, Bonn
 - 45th meeting – November 2016, Bonn
22. He referred participants to the full reports of both meetings, but summarized a number of highlights and identified some of the challenges dealt with by the StC during the triennium.

(b) Scientific Council (Item 10.2)

23. The Chair of the CMS Scientific Council, Dr Fernando Spina (Italy) made a presentation summarizing the activities of the Scientific Council since COP11, including changes to the modus operandi of the Council resulting from the establishment of a Sessional Committee. Two meetings of the Sessional Committee had been held:
 - 1st meeting – April 2016, Bonn
 - 2nd meeting – July 2017, Bonn
24. Dr Spina presented highlights of the Scientific Council's work in preparing and reviewing scientific aspects of COP12 documentation.

OPENING OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

25. The Chair of the Committee of the Whole (COW), Dr Rod Day, New Zealand, opened the Committee's deliberations with a greeting in Maori and noted that it was particularly significant that COP12 was being held in Oceania. The COW had a considerable agenda and it would be important to keep focused. He was honoured to be entrusted with the task of ensuring the smooth running of the Committee's deliberations.
26. At the invitation of the Chair, the COW decided to establish the following committees and working groups and elected by acclamation the Chairs indicated:
 - Budget Committee – Chair: Øystein Størkersen, Norway
 - Institutional Working Group – Chair: Narelle Montgomery, Australia
 - Review of Decisions Working Group – Chair: James Njogu, Kenya
 - Avian Working Group – Chair: Rob Clay, COP Appointed Councillor for Birds
 - Terrestrial Working Group – Chair: Alfred Oteng-Yeboah, COP Appointed Councillor for African fauna
 - Aquatic Working Group – Chair: Barry Baker, COP Appointed Councillor for Bycatch

SIGNING CEREMONY

27. The signature of the Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation of Migratory Sharks by H.E. Tarsicio Granzio, Minister of Environment of Ecuador, was welcomed by acclamation.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT (ITEM 12)

(a) Overview of Secretariat activities (Item 12.1)

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF WORK (ITEM 18)

28. The Executive Secretary made a presentation summarizing the Secretariat's activities during the triennium 2015-2017, including the information contained in document UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.18/Rev.1. The core budget for the triennium had been approximately €7.5 million. The Secretariat had been able to raise almost €4 million for a wide range of activities under the Programme of Work (POW). Thanks were due to all donors, including those that had supported delegate participation in COP12. Particular thanks were due to Abu Dhabi for its support of the work of the CMS Project Office in Abu Dhabi, as well as for the MOU on the Conservation and Management of Marine Turtles and their Habitats of the Indian Ocean and South-East Asia (IOSEA) and the MOU on the conservation of Migratory Sharks. Dr Chambers presented highlights of implementation of the POW with respect to the CMS Strategic Plan; aquatic species; terrestrial species; scientific advisory services; information communication and outreach; capacity building; and regional preparatory workshops for COP 12.
29. Noting the applause with which the Executive Secretary's presentation had been received, the Chair opened the floor for comment.
30. Switzerland had been pleased to read Doc18/Rev.1 and was impressed to see what had been achieved, but realised that the biggest challenge facing implementation of the Convention was lack of funding. It was crucial for the COP to take decisions in accordance with the priorities of the Strategic Plan and in line with the Future Shape process.

Switzerland called on all Parties present at the COP to assist the Secretariat with focusing and funding wherever possible.

31. Mongolia acknowledged the efforts made by the Secretariat and donors to resolve barriers to the migration of terrestrial species in Mongolia. The National Conference on this topic held under the auspices of CMS in 2015 had facilitated a recent agreement for the partial removal and re-design of railroad boundary fences impacting migratory ungulates.
32. The COW noted the presentation of the Executive Secretary.

BUDGET AND ADMINISTRATION (ITEM 14)

(a) Execution of CMS Budget 2012-2014 (Item 14.1)

33. At the invitation of the Chair, Enkhtuya Sereenen (Secretariat) made a presentation summarizing document UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.14.1 'Execution of the CMS budget during the 2015-2017 triennium', including updates (to 13 October 2017) as follows.
 - Paid contributions had risen to €6.7M (90%), while due contributions had fallen to €708,000 (10%).
 - The number of paid-up Parties had increased to 70 (58% of Parties), but there were still 50 Parties with unpaid dues (42%)
 - New Parties that had joined the Convention since COP11 had paid €38,780 (9% of contributions due), while €387,017 were outstanding (91%)
 - With regard to Implementation of the 2015-2017 budget, the estimated total expenditure to 31 Dec 2017 was €7,486,318, leaving a balance of €135,311.
 - The Trust Fund balance was estimated to be €282,495 as of 31 December 2017, though this figure included unpaid pledges of €109,136.
34. Ms Sereenen outlined successes and challenges encountered in executing the budget and confirmed that the COP was invited to take note of the document and to provide comments.
35. The Chair opened the floor for comments.
36. United Republic of Tanzania had hoped to see a more results-based analysis integrating the budget with the Programme of Work.
37. The Executive Secretary clarified that this was not possible since the COP-approved core budget, which was the subject of the report presented under Agenda item 4.1, contained no provision for activities. The activities contained in the Programme of Work and presented under agenda item 18 had all required additional fundraising outside of the core budget.
38. United Arab Emirates referred to paragraph 6 of document UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.14.1 and noted that the UAE had paid its assessed contribution as of 18 Sep 2017.
39. Norway suggested that it would be more appropriate to present the anticipated balance of the Trust Fund at 31 December 2017 without inclusion of the unpaid pledges.
40. Mongolia pointed out that at every COP the Parties submit proposals for expanding the number of species included in the CMS Appendices, but hadn't done such a good job with the budget and payment of dues. The budget was not only about money but also the capacity of the Convention.

(b) Budget and Programme of Work 2018–2020 (Item 14.2)

41. The Executive Secretary made a presentation summarizing information contained in document UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.14.2 *Budget and Programme of Work 2018-2020*. Through Resolution 11.1, COP11 had requested the Executive Secretary to prepare budget proposals for consideration by COP12, including, as a minimum, a zero nominal growth budget scenario, a zero real growth scenario and, in consultation with the Finance and Budget Sub-Committee, if necessary, a third scenario. Three scenarios were duly presented in the document, all taking into account the embedded inflation rate for CMS salaries of 2%.
42. The Executive Secretary presented the amounts and implications under each scenario, noting that, in his view, scenario 1 was not a viable option because of adverse impacts on meetings of the Convention's governing bodies and provision of essential Secretariat services. Parties' assessed contributions under each scenario were contained in Annex 2 of document 14.2. These were based on the UN scale of assessments for 2016-2018, adjusted to take account of the fact that not all UN Member States were CMS Parties. Annex 2 would be revised to take account of two Parties that had joined the Convention since the document had been prepared. Annex 3 contained a draft COP12 Resolution on financial and budgetary matters, while Annex 4/Rev.1 contained a draft Programme of Work for 2018-2020, which should be considered together with the budget.
43. The Chair thanked the Executive Secretary for a very clear presentation. As these matters formed the core of the Budget Committee's work, he didn't anticipate a substantive discussion by the COW. Nevertheless, the floor was open if participant wished to make an important comment.
44. The representative of the EU and its Member States, made the following statement: "The European Union and its Member States acknowledge the draft Programme of Work, which enables Parties to have a comprehensive overview of planned activities. We thank the Secretariat for the detailed explanations on the budget scenarios proposed and on the different options available. We are concerned about the level of arrears and would like to know how this affects the functioning of the Convention. We look forward to further discussions in the Budget Committee in order to agree on a Programme of Work that reflects the policy priorities of the Parties within the resources available and a corresponding budget that is balanced, efficient and transparent and affordable by all Parties."
45. Israel observed that both the Convention's success and its workload had increased dramatically since COP11, alongside a tremendous improvement in visibility. This was due to the highly commendable work of the Secretariat. A modest budget increase would help to move the Convention forward even more.
46. Switzerland made the following statement: "Switzerland wants to congratulate the Secretariat for the presentation of the future budget. We also feel that document 14.2 is very well done; it allows a very fast identification of the relevant subjects, their costs, and the distribution of the overall budget to the different Parties. Switzerland hopes that all the Parties live up to their duties, now and in the future, and pay their obligatory contributions in due time. Switzerland believes that all the activities that are crucial for the functioning of the Convention should be covered by the core budget. We want to express our gratitude to the Standing Committee and the Secretariat for elaborating three different budget scenarios and for their very clear presentation. Switzerland clearly rejects scenario one because it does not even allow us to pay for the intersessional Standing Committee and Scientific Council meetings from the core budget. This cannot be the basis of running a convention successfully. Switzerland proposes to at least go for scenario 2 (zero real growth). But we must admit, looking at our strategy and the necessary actions that even our past decisions are asking for, we desperately need to increase the core budget. Switzerland can go up to a 3 per cent increase over scenario 2 – let's call this scenario 3: 3 per cent – and we would like to invite all Parties to give the discussion on such an increase scenario a chance."

47. Norway supported the remarks of other Parties and also preferred a narrowed scenario 3 solution. The Convention had seen flat budget development over the past three triennia; how long could this path continue? There was nothing more to draw down from the Trust Fund and things were now at a crossroads. During the various pre-COP events held on 22 October, politicians had made expressions of expectation and willingness. The Budget Committee would need to discuss these matters and find a solution.
48. Mongolia favoured scenario 3 to support efficient and effective implementation. Transboundary cooperation was very important and budgeting was one of the driving forces.
49. Mongolia further supported scenario 3 on behalf of India.
50. Republic of Tanzania congratulated the Secretariat for a concise and clear presentation and wished to support Parties that had spoken in favour scenario 3.
51. Costa Rica also supported scenario 3, which would enable more active participation of Latin American and Caribbean countries in meetings of the Standing Committee or Scientific Council through enhanced translation services.
52. The Chair invited those Parties that had spoken to articulate their views in the Budget Committee.

(c) Resource Mobilization (Item 14.3)

53. Laura Cerasi (Secretariat) briefly presented document UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.14.3. Thanks were due to all governments that had provided financial support for the work of the Secretariat, but although an amount equivalent to more than half of the triennial core budget had been mobilized, this was still only a small part of what would have been needed to implement the full Programme of Work 2015-2017. The Programme of Work 2018-2020, when finalized would provide the basis for resource mobilization during the forthcoming intersessional period.
54. The COW noted the report of the Secretariat.
55. The representative of the EU and its Member States made the following statement: “The European Union and its Member States welcome the document drafted by the Secretariat, and express gratitude to all those that have contributed to develop CMS activities. The EU and its Member States congratulate the Secretariat on its excellent work for fundraising and encourage all Parties as well as the Secretariat to explore further funding possibilities.”

REVIEW OF DECISIONS (ITEM 21)

56. The Chair noted that this item was the result of a six-year process to bring consistency and coherence to the resolutions adopted by Parties over the course of the Convention’s 34 years.
57. This process was intended to be a housekeeping exercise. COP11 had directed the Secretariat to identify provisions that were out of date, those that had been superseded by subsequent resolutions, or those that included tasks that had been completed. The process did not require either the Secretariat or delegates to add text or ‘improve’ resolutions.
58. The discussion would be conducted in three separate parts:
 - Discussion of Document 21/Rev.2. This document not only provided an overview

of the process undertaken by the Secretariat, but it also included a number of actions for the parties to take;

- Discussion of Document 21.1, which introduces roughly 30 resolutions that are proposed to be repealed in part;
- Discussion of Document 21.2, which proposes the consolidation of 13 resolutions where the parties have adopted two or more resolutions on the same issue.

59. The Chair expressed a preference for decisions to be made in the COW, but any documents requiring additional discussion would be referred to the Review of Decisions Working Group.

60. Due to changes in scientific information or developments in other CMS bodies, the Secretariat or the Scientific Council had considered it necessary to update some resolutions with substantive information. Document 6.2.1/Add1 listed these issues and documents, and also identified which working group would discuss them.

61. At the request of the Chair, Melanie Virtue (CMS Secretariat) introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.

62. She noted that the Secretariat's review had not included changes in the substance of any resolutions. Annex 1 included those resolutions that the Parties had already repealed, and no action was therefore required. Annex 2 included resolutions that the Secretariat believed had been fully implemented or superseded. Consistent with Resolution 11.6, the Secretariat has recommended that these resolutions be repealed in full. Annex 3 included those resolutions proposed for partial repeal, as well as those that should be consolidated. Annex 4 included those resolutions to be retained in full.

63. Resolution 11.6 also directed the Secretariat to establish a Register of resolutions and decisions. The current approach of the Secretariat was to list resolutions by the year in which they were adopted. The Secretariat noted that after the completion of this process, the number of resolutions would be much reduced, making them easier to find, and reducing the need for a Register. In addition, many themes would now only have one resolution. For example, instead of five resolutions on bycatch, there would now only be one. The Secretariat had proposed a number of themes in paragraph 10 of Document 21 in case the Parties wished to organize the resolutions by theme.

64. Taking into account the new distinction within CMS between 'resolutions' and 'decisions', the Secretariat had provided some advice on drafting. This advice could be found in paragraphs 25 to 30.

65. The Chair opened the floor for discussion of the document, including the Secretariat's advice on dealing with it.

66. The representative of the EU and its Member States endorsed the outcome of the process to date and supported the process whereby specific comments would be discussed in the Review of Decisions Working Group.

67. The COW took note of the advice of the Secretariat concerning the drafting of future resolutions and decisions (paragraphs 25-30 of the document), and agreed with the Secretariat's advice on the reduced need for a thematic register. The COW also took note of Annex 1, and confirmed its agreement of the proposals contained in Annex 2 and Annex 4.

(a) Review of Decisions to Repeal in Part (Item 21.1)

68. The Chair introduced documents UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.1 through to UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.1.35. He noted that five of these would be discussed

elsewhere on the COP agenda, and were not open for the current discussion:

- UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.1.27
- UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.1.29
- UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.1.30
- UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.1.32
- UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.1.35

69. The Chair explained that the Secretariat had prepared two annexes for each Resolution to repeal in part. The first included the analysis of the Secretariat and the second included a clean version of the resolution. Revised resolutions were identified in a manner consistent with the numbering of resolutions by CITES, so that CMS resolutions that had been revised would retain their original number followed by the COP at which that resolution had last been revised. For example, If Resolution 3.1 was revised at this meeting, it would be identified as 'Resolution 3.1 (Rev. COP12)'.

70. The Chair explained the approach to be taken in discussing the proposed resolutions for repeal. Parties that wished to discuss specific resolutions proposed by the Secretariat for repeal should identify the resolutions in question so that they could be referred to the Review of Decisions Working Group. It would be assumed that the Committee of the Whole agreed with the recommendations of the Secretariat regarding any resolutions not proposed for discussion by the Parties, and they would be referred directly to plenary for adoption.

71. The Chair opened the floor for discussion, reminding the Parties that the number of documents to be considered prevented comprehensive review by COP12, and that it might therefore be appropriate to refer some documents to COP13.

72. The representative of the EU and its Member States acknowledged the hard work of the Secretariat, endorsed the outcome of what had been a difficult process and supported the documents in general. The EU and its Member States would present specific comments on certain subjects in the Working Group. The documents concerned were as follows:

- UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.1.1 Resolution 3.1, Listing of Species in the Appendices of the Convention
- UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.1.2 Recommendation 4.3, Conservation status of Crex Crex
- UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.1.5 Recommendation 5.3, Development of an Action Plan for the Great Cormorant in the African-Eurasian Region
- UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.1.8 Resolution 7.2, Impact Assessment and Migratory Species
- UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.1.10 Resolution 7.5, Wind Turbines and Migratory Species
- UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.1.15 Resolution 8.10, Implementation of the CMS Information Management System
- UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.1.26 Resolution 11.8, Communication, information and outreach plan
- UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.1.28 Resolution 10.15, Global Programme of Work for Cetaceans
- UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.1.29 Resolution 11.16, The Prevention of Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds
- UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.1.30 Resolution 11.17, Action Plan for Migratory Land Birds in the African-Eurasian Region (AEMLAP)
- UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.1.32 Resolution 11.23, Conservation Implications of Cetacean Culture
- UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.1.33 Resolution 11.27, Renewable Energy and Migratory Species

- UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.1.35 Resolution 11.33, Guidelines for Assessing Listing Proposals to Appendices I and II of the Convention.

73. The proposed changes were mostly minor adjustments requiring brief discussion by the Working Group.

74. The Chair noted that Documents UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.1.32 and UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.1.35 were covered elsewhere in the agenda and would not require discussion by the Working Group.

75. Australia also wished to amend a number of documents. Excluding some already listed by the representative of the EU and its Member States, these were:

- UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.1.7 Resolution 6.3, Southern Hemisphere Albatross Conservation
- UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.1.9 Resolution 7.3, Oil Pollution and Migratory Species
- UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.1.13 Recommendation 7.5, Dugong Range State Agreement
- UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.1.17 Recommendation 8.6, Migratory sharks.

76. Israel wished to amend one further document, UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.1.16 Recommendation 8.12, African/Eurasian Raptors and Owls.

77. The Chair concluded that the list of documents to be considered by the Review of Decisions Working Group was becoming clear. He suggested that those not proposed for further discussion could be recommended to plenary for partial repeal as proposed. The COW concurred with this suggestion.

(b) Consolidation of Resolutions (Item 21.2)

78. The Chair introduced Document UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.2 (comprising sub-documents UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.2.1 through to UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.2.13), and recalled that these were resolutions pertaining to the same issue, which could therefore be consolidated.

79. The EU and its Member States wished to propose amendments to the following:

- UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.2.1 National Reports
- UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.2.2 Taxonomy and Nomenclature.
- UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.2.3 Adverse Impacts of Anthropogenic Noise on Cetaceans and Other Migratory Species
- UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.2.4 Bycatch
- UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.2.5 Marine Turtles
- UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.2.6 Scientific Council
- UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.2.7 Climate Change and Migratory Species
- UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.2.8 Flyways
- UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.2.9 Wildlife Disease
- UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.21.2.13 Management of Marine Debris

80. The Chair referred these for discussion by the Review of Decisions Working Group, noting that the remaining three documents covered under this sub-item were already being discussed elsewhere in the agenda.