

**CONVENTION ON
MIGRATORY
SPECIES**

UNEP/CMS/COP14/Report

Original: English

13 February 2024

14th MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES
Samarkand, Uzbekistan, 12 - 17 February 2024

DAILY MEETING REPORT – DAY 2 (13 February 2024)**III. ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY MATTERS (continued)****ITEM 33.1. REPORT OF THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE**

80. The Chair opened the COW and asked for the Working Group (WG) on Credentials Committee to report on progress made.
81. The United Kingdom, spoke on behalf of the Credentials Committee, which was composed of Kenya, the United Kingdom, Saudi Arabia, and Costa Rica. The Committee met twice to assess credentials. Of 91 Parties, 72 had submitted credentials, the Committee assessed 66, and four were awaiting clarification. Other Parties were requested to submit their credentials as soon as possible.

ITEM 33.2. REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUPS

82. The Aquatic WG reported that it discussed Document 27.1.1/Rev.1 on *Bycatch*, and noted deliberations were ongoing.
83. The Avian WG completed work on proposed Actions Plans for Christmas Island Frigatebird and Great Bustard and would begin discussing illegal killing at its next meeting.
84. The handling of documents was then outlined, including that:
- A note listing documents each WG would be addressing was posted in the CMS COP14 information hub;
 - some CRPs would result from discussions in the COW and their availability would be announced;
 - for CRPs from the WGs, decisions cannot be taken until the COW discusses them; and
 - comments made in writing would still have to be raised in the COW

V. SCIENTIFIC ASSESSMENTS AND REPORTS**ITEM 21. CONSERVATION STATUS OF MIGRATORY SPECIES****Item 21.1. State of the World's Migratory Species****Item 21.2. Assessment of the risk posed to CMS Appendix I-listed species by direct use and trade****Item 21.3. In-depth review of the conservation status of individual CMS-listed species**

85. The Secretariat introduced this agenda item as contained in Document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.21/Rev.1, which contained the report and proposed draft resolutions in Annexes 1 and 2. The COW discussed the following associated documents with this agenda item, which considered ScC recommendations:
- UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.21.1 *State of the World's Migratory Species*;
 - UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.21.2 *Assessment of the risk posed to CMS Appendix 1-listed species by direct use and trade*; and
 - UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.21.3 *In-depth review of the conservation status of individual CMS-listed species*.
86. The Secretariat noted that, going forward, a report would be prepared every six years at alternate COPs beginning at COP16.
87. In terms of actions, it was recommended that the COP adopt the draft resolutions in Annexes 1 and 2 of UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.21/Rev.1 and take note of the associated reports: UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.21.1, Doc.21.2, and Doc.21.3.
88. The United Nations Environment Programme-World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) introduced documents 21.1-21.3, highlighting that the report on the *State of the World's Migratory Species* found that half the sites of migratory species were not protected and there were large gaps in identifying large sites for many species. The report identified hundreds of species that would benefit from increased protection.
89. UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.21.2 found that 88% of species were at risk from use both at the domestic and international level, 55 species were at high risk. The report aligned with the findings from 21.1.
90. UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.21.3 contained in-depth reviews for ten species: five from Appendix 1 and five from Appendix 2. An Appendix 1 listing could benefit from increased protection for two of the Appendix 2-listed species.
91. The COW Chair opened the floor for comments.
92. Peru, speaking on behalf of Peru and Argentina, referring to UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.21.2, supported taking into account differentiated use by species, as well as by lethal and non-lethal use. They emphasized that species whose survival was threatened by trade required more attention. Costa Rica, Panama, Uruguay and Dominican Republic agreed with the statement made by Peru.
93. On the proposed draft resolution on the *State of the World's Migratory Species Report*, Israel requested adding text on "including the assessment of the risk posed to CMS Appendix 1-listed species by direct use and trade" to the provision on regularly reviewing the conservation status of migratory species at alternate COP meetings, starting at COP16.
94. Israel also cited potential issues with the methodology, noting it should be looked at more closely. They said a decision is needed to follow-up with these cases using the 12.9 Review Mechanism.

95. Belgium, speaking on behalf of the European Union and its Member States:
- supported the proposal for a regular review starting at COP16;
 - underscored the need for synergies with IPBES assessments, including on connectivity; and
 - supported the idea of developing an online CMS data dashboard, subject to available funding.
96. A revised meeting document would be provided based on comments made and brought back to the COW.

IV. STRATEGIC AND INSTITUTIONAL MATTERS

ITEM 14. STRATEGIC PLANNING

Item 14.1. Implementation of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023

97. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.14.1 *Implementation of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023*, prepared by the Secretariat. The SPMS was adopted by COP11 and revised by COP12. COP13 provided instructions and guidance on the assessment of the plan through Decisions 13.1-13.3.
98. UNEP-WCMC provided a brief summary of the progress in implementation of SPMS 2015-2023, based on a synthesis of information from multiple sources, including assessment of the priority indicators. Overall, positive progress had been made by Parties, many of which had identified critical sites for migratory species. Despite ongoing efforts, the conservation status of many migratory species continued to decline. The findings aligned well with the goals specified in the new Strategic Plan.
99. The Chair opened the floor for comments. There being none, the COW took note of the assessment of progress towards the achievement of SPMS targets contained in Annex to document 14.1, and the Chair confirmed that decisions 13.1-13.3 would be deleted.

Item 14.2. New Strategic Plan for Migratory Species

100. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.14.2 *New Strategic Plan for Migratory Species*, prepared by the Secretariat, which contained in Annex 1 a Draft Resolution and in Annex 2 Draft Decisions. The document reported on progress in implementing CMS COP decisions 13.4 to 13.5, options for a follow-up plan and the decision of Outcome 2 of the 53rd StC meeting. The COP was recommended to adopt the draft Resolution and draft Decisions contained in the document Annexes and delete Decisions 13.4 to 13.5.
101. The Cook Islands welcomed the document on the new SPMS and supported its six main elements. It noted that traditional knowledge on migratory species was not reflected in the strategy, and considered this to be an important source of information to better understand the conservation of migratory species and their habitats. Linkages to local people and their expertise within the plan would encourage them to take pride in conserving migratory species.
102. Bahrain supported the document and commended it in relation to the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF).
103. Belgium, on behalf of the EU and its Member States, acknowledged the new SPMS and its alignment of resolutions to climate change and ecological connectivity. They appreciated linkages to wider global priorities including the GBF and BBNJ, with goals

to establish MPAs in areas beyond national jurisdiction. They proposed adoption of the plan and supported its measures for monitoring, with some submitted amendments. They expressed concern relating to the development of indicators and the national reporting template, and that the term “conservation status” had no agreed definition. They encouraged that assessments be standardized and that measurable change in conservation status should be adopted through use of the IUCN Red List Status as the primary tool. They supported implementation of the SPMS across its territories and were committed to cooperate with relevant regional bodies to reach SPMS goals.

104. New Zealand supported the document and recommended its adoption. It suggested that the development of indicators could be done after COP14, and the updating of the reporting template should be done prior to COP15. Additional textual suggestions were submitted.
105. The United Kingdom considered that CMS had an important implementing role in the GBF, for which the SPMS was relevant. It considered that some follow-up could be clarified further, including on implementation and reporting, and provided proposed written amendments.
106. South Africa supported the new SPMS, which contributed to the GBF, consistent with the mandate of CMS and its priorities. It emphasized that the new SPMS required provision of adequate financial resources and the building of necessary capacity to enable Parties, especially developing countries, to fully implement the new SPMS.
107. Maldives welcomed the new SPMS, but highlighted that transboundary pollution issues impacting migratory species should be reflected in the document.
108. Brazil considered that the lack of appropriate resources and capacity hindered SPMS implementation. The proposed plan did not take into account the specific needs of developing countries for capacity and technology transfer to enable implementation. Brazil offered to submit text in writing in relation to this.
109. Georgia considered adoption of the SPMS important for improving implementation of CMS goals, and its adoption was essential, especially in terms of integrating the goals and targets of the SPMS into National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs). This approach would strengthen the synergies among MEAs, which was one of the goals of the SPMS.

ITEM 15. SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL

Item 15.1. Evaluation of the results of the restructuring of the Scientific Council

110. The Secretariat introduced the document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.15.1 *Evaluation of the restructuring of the Scientific Council*, which summarized the outcome of the evaluation of the results of ScC restructuring and proposed next steps to implement the relevant recommendations of the ScC-SC6. The document also proposed a procedure for replacing COP-appointed Councillors in the inter-sessional period, if needed. The ScC requested the Secretariat to explore increasing the number of Party-appointed Councillors from each region from three to four and the financial implications of such an increase.
111. Australia supported increasing the number of members from each region on the ScC, noting this would likely enhance the progress of workstreams; and reviewing all Working Groups and Task Forces each triennium to review their utility.

112. Belgium, speaking for the European Union and its Member States, believed it was premature to increase the number of Party-appointed Councillors, based on the budgetary implications, and proposed postponing this discussion to COP15. They supported amending the Rules of Procedure to account for the possibility of a member resigning or being no longer able to serve, and support draft decision on COP-appointed Councillors in Annex 3. They cautioned that the ScC should not veer toward discussing policy or governance.
113. The United Kingdom, supported by New Zealand, highlighted the benefit of increasing the ScC's membership considering the workload, and that it would provide for a greater expertise base and the sharing of work. The United Kingdom said some Parties participation could be self-funded. While better use could be made of virtual meetings of the ScC, they believe technical and policy discussions would be better in person.
114. The COW Chair asked Australia, European Union, United Kingdom and New Zealand to work together in a small group to find a way forward.

Item 15.2. Scientific Council Membership

115. The Secretariat introduced UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.15.2 *Scientific Council Membership*, noting it contains Annexes with information on both a comparative analysis of and full details for candidates for positions of the COP-appointed Councillors for the subject areas Aquatic Mammals and Climate Change. The Secretariat informed the COW that the COP-appointed Councillors for Aquatic Mammals (Dr Giuseppe Notarbartolo di Sciara), Climate Change (Prof Colin Galbraith) and Terrestrial Mammals (Dr Rodrigo A. Medellín) are stepping down from their positions. Since two COP-appointed Councillors shared the responsibility for Terrestrial Mammals, the Secretariat did not seek nominations for this subject area.
116. The Secretariat also asked regional groups to consider nominations and advise the Secretariat for consideration by the COP Plenary. Regions were also requested to provide their recommendations for Party-appointed Councillors and their alternates for the intersessional period and communicate their conclusion to the Secretariat.

ITEM 16. ELECTION OF PARTIES TO THE STANDING COMMITTEE

117. The Secretariat introduced this agenda item and associated document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.16 *Election of Parties to the Standing Committee*. The Secretariat reminded the COW that the StC would be renewed at every ordinary meeting of the COP, and that each member cannot serve for more two consecutive terms with no limit on the number of terms for alternate members. The StC included: 3 Parties from Africa; 3 Parties from Europe; 2 Parties from Asia; 2 Parties from South and Central America and the Caribbean; 1 Party from Oceania. In addition, there were 11 regional representatives servicing alternate members.
118. Regarding the current StC composition, the Secretariat confirmed only Georgia was not eligible for a third term and Uzbekistan would automatically serve on the StC in the next triennium as the COP14 host of COP14, together with Germany as Depositary. Regional groups were requested to submit nominations for the next StC, which would take over at the end of COP14.
119. In response to a query from Israel, the European Union confirmed that with respect to the Europe group, two seats would go, one to non-EU countries and one to an EU country.

ITEM 17. CMS CONTRIBUTION TO THE KUNMING-MONTREAL GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK

120. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.17 *CMS Contribution to the Kunming Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework*, prepared by the Secretariat. The document reported on the CMS contribution to the GBF, including progress on implementation of Resolution 13.1 *Gandhinagar Declaration on CMS and the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework* and Decision 13.8 *Migratory Species in the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework*. It highlighted CMS engagement leading to the GBF and its Monitoring Framework and implementation, including the Bern III Conference. The draft Resolution and Decisions urged alignment of CMS priorities in NBSAPs. COP14 was recommended to adopt the Resolution in Annex 2 and the Draft Decisions in Annex 3 and delete Decisions 13.7 and 13.8.
121. Convinced that GBF presented opportunities to enhance cooperation between MEAs and other bodies and processes, Switzerland recommended strengthening the linkage between CMS and the GBF in Annex 2 of the document through new text submitted in writing. Switzerland also submitted further textural changes in Annex 2 relating to Bern II Conference outcomes, and a proposed new paragraph relating to facilitating the Bern Process for cooperation among Parties to relevant MEAs. It also proposed new text in writing to complement Draft Decisions 14.AA and 14.BB focused on engagement in the Bern Process.
122. Cook Islands considered that collaboration between CMS and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) was beneficial for small countries with limited technical and financial resources to effectively implement MEAs. They urged MEAs to work towards reporting alignments to enable small countries to meet their reporting requirements, and urged partners to provide resources and technical and technological capacity to support NBSAP implementation. Cook Islands further urged Parties to integrate migratory species into National Invasive Species Strategies and Action Plans.
123. Drawing attention to the fact that the GBF reflected a political balance achieved after a long process, Brazil advised that it should be approached through a systematic and integrated perspective to avoid any possible revision of the commitments made or disruption of the balance achieved in the CBD. Brazil further urged COP14 to take finance mobilization provisions into account, and proposed modifications to the draft resolution on Annex 2, which it provided in writing.
124. Belgium, on behalf of the EU and its Member States, welcomed the document and valued the steps already undertaken to contribute to the implementation of the GBF, including the preparation of new SPMS, engagement in the Bern process and producing guidelines relating to ecological connectivity and landscape scale planning. It considered that GBF and related CMS Decisions would contribute to conserving migratory species, while implementation of CMS commitments would contribute to the implementation of many aspects of the GBF. It supported the Resolution and Draft Decisions on CMS engagement in CBD processes, which aimed to support GBF implementation in areas of relevance to CMS, contribute to the work of the CBD Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group (AHTEG) on GBF Indicators, and develop a new Joint Work Programme with the CBD Secretariat. Minor amendments were submitted in writing.
125. The Philippines supported the document and its Draft Decisions. They collaborated with other Southeast Asian nations in developing the ASEAN Biodiversity Plan, which aligned with the GBF and the SPMS. The Philippines proposed additional text under Draft Decision Annex 3 to address the need for Parties to advocate CMS related targets under the GBF, which it submitted in writing.

126. WCS supported the document and its Draft Decisions and urged Parties to add reference to ecological integrity. WCS considered that all aspects of CMS implementation should be included in NBSAPs, as well as in their outreach and fundraising strategies.
127. The United Kingdom proposed revisions to Annex 3 of the document relating to effective implementation of Bern III Conference outcomes and how to support and apply the monitoring framework agreed under CBD, which it provided in writing. The UK mentioned that an operational paragraph was needed to Annex 2 to repeal resolutions 8.18, 10.18 and 13.1.
128. Kenya, in the process of revising its National Framework to align with CBD Decision 15.5 relating to national targets and indicators, was committed to ensure a coordinated approach to implementation of MEAs and supported the document, including its Resolution and Draft Decisions in Annexes 2 and 3.
129. South Africa supported the new draft decisions and the consolidation of the three Resolutions on CMS collaboration with CBD and its processes into a single Resolution.
130. Zimbabwe welcomed the steps outlined in paragraph 30 and the Draft Decisions presented, but considered that a specific instruction directed to the Secretariat to explore the feasibility of a financing mechanism under GEF would be useful under Draft Decision 14.BB. Zimbabwe recommended Parties to have a specific window for CMS and the issues prioritized in the Strategic Plan.
131. The Born Free Foundation (BFF) considered that work done by CMS on animal culture and social complexity was key to GBF implementation and should be promoted more broadly within the CBD and other relevant policy forums.
132. CBD considered that all goals and targets of the GBF were relevant to CMS, with targets focused on the conservation and sustainable use of species and on protecting and restoring ecosystems including their integrity and connectivity. Targets addressing underlying drivers of change, related to production and consumption patterns, to biodiversity values, to strengthening the means of implementation, and to engaging Indigenous Peoples, women and youth were equally important. Intended to be a broad framework, the GBF had the potential to enhance coherence among activities undertaken under MEAs, including CMS; an early opportunity to realize this coherence was the updating of NBSAPs currently underway.
133. IUCN called on CMS to continue strengthening synergies through GBF implementation and encouraged CMS Parties and stakeholders to implement the Strategic Plan and integrate their CMS obligations and SPMS actions into their NBSAPs. IUCN suggested changes in Annex 3 of the document, which it submitted in writing. IUCN also stressed the importance of ensuring coherence with other MEAs, including UNCLOS on the conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity of BBNJ areas. IUCN invited Parties to consider the Global Species Action Plan as a guide to integrate CMS work into NBSAPs, and recommended the IUCN Connectivity Guidelines and Technical Report on Connectivity and Linear Transport Infrastructure as useful resources in achieving proposed SPMS Goals 2 and 3.
134. Uganda represented the Africa region at the Bern III Conference, which aimed for efficient and effective implementation of the GBF. Uganda supported the proposed harmonization of strategies and synergies and considered that there was a need to strengthen policy and frameworks and support capacity at national and regional levels.

135. Having made provisions to protect biodiversity, Côte d'Ivoire supported the comments made on the GBF and invited the Secretariat to take into account the specific nature of developing countries.
136. The Secretariat would prepare a CRP in relation to the interventions and had been working on guidance relating to the commitment of Parties to the GBF. This guidance would be shared with UNEP and UNDP, which were involved in the NBSAP updating process.

ITEM 18. SYNERGIES AND PARTNERSHIPS

Item 18.1. Synergies and partnerships

137. Ms Amy Fraenkel, CMS Executive Secretary, introduced UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.18.1, which reported on progress on implementing Resolution 11.10 (Rev.COP13) *Synergies and Partnerships* and Decision 13.9 *NGO participation in CMS processes*. It includes examples of CMS engagement with UN agencies, MEAs, NGO's, civil society, and other groups and highlights the importance of engagement, and outlines activities to further strengthen collaboration and cooperation.
138. The Secretariat proposed exploring ways to increase its engagement with other stakeholders, including Indigenous Peoples, local communities and youth groups.
139. Australia, supported Belgium, speaking for the European Union, called for enhancing engagement with Indigenous Peoples groups and youth. They suggested the ScC Chair could facilitate discussions on the value of traditional and Indigenous knowledge systems in conserving migratory species and forwarding the results of these discussions to the next COP. They suggested language reflecting their comments.
140. Australia also proposed two new decisions on directing:
 - the CMS Secretariat to collaborate with Parties, the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and bodies, to undertake of existing opportunities related to the tangible and intangible cultural values associated with migratory species and their conservation; and
 - the ScC to assess the significance of multiple systems of knowledge and understanding, including traditional and Indigenous knowledge, for supporting effective migratory species conservation, and reporting to COP15 suggestions on ways CMS might facilitate inclusion of additional systems of knowledge and understanding for enhanced implementation of the Convention.
141. Belgium, speaking for the European Union and its Member States, pointed to youth participation under the CBD and CITES to enhance participation. They also suggested strengthening collaboration with regional fisheries and regional seas conventions.
142. South Africa, noting linkages between Agenda items 17, 18.1 and 18.2, suggested merging the three agenda items into one agenda item.
143. Brazil noted that partnerships must be institutionally and structurally appropriate for achieving CMS mandates and roles, noting they can complement each other but cannot overlap. They added that commitments taken under the Convention cannot be reinterpreted and preferred using the term "complementarity" instead of "synergies" and that excessive burdens should not be placed on the Secretariat, particularly in terms of budget.

144. Brazil noted that the phrase “multidisciplinary and transdisciplinary scope of approaches to collaboration” was not clear. It also supported deleting the phrase “as far as possible” in the draft resolution.
145. The UK requested reference to the BBNJ agreement.
146. Israel noted that some traditional practices could be harmful to migratory species and encouraged including, in the text proposed by Australia, that the ScC should also look at harmful traditional practices.
147. Switzerland considered that the Bern process should be “welcomed” rather than “noted”.
148. The Philippines suggested: an additional operative paragraph on engaging with the World Coastal Forum; language reflecting that protecting the migratory species habitats is key role of national and subnational governments; and that the capacity of local and subnational governments should be strengthened.
149. Regarding text in the proposed decision, Argentina supporting removing reference to promoting a new platform, saying there is no mandate for this.
150. New Zealand cited potential benefits with close cooperation with the BBNJ and encouraged Parties and other stakeholders to engage in that process. New Zealand did not support the proposal on subnational and regional governments. Para 3 don't support subnational and regional government.
151. Several speakers also supported interventions made on Indigenous knowledge.
152. CITES noted the recent adoption of a resolution on cooperation and synergies with CMS, and ongoing cooperation among Secretariats through the Liaison Group of Biodiversity-related Conventions.
153. BirdLife supported inserting reference to other stakeholders to help advance synergies.
154. The High Seas Alliance indicated that once the BBNJ treaty entered into force it would help CMS achieve its objectives by extending its area-based management tools.
155. CMS Executive Secretary Ms Amy Fraenkel and IUCN Director-General Grethel Aguilar signed an MOU on African carnivores and their habitats.

Item 18.2. Cooperation with the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES)

156. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.18/Rev.1 *Cooperation with the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES)*, which described agreement at the last IPBES plenary to undertake a fast-track methodological assessment of integrated biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning and ecological connectivity, which CMS had been calling for. CMS would nominate experts and review drafts as part of the process to develop.
157. The UK welcomed the document, highlighting the need for evidence-based action to practically engage on the assessment of spatial planning and interconnectivity.
158. New Zealand noted that IPBES inputs to CMS need to be implementable by Parties.

159. A CRP would be developed on this issue in the Working Group.

Item 19.1. Communication, outreach and information management

160. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.19 *Communication and information management*, prepared by the Secretariat. The document reported on a summary of communication, outreach and information management activities carried out by the Secretariat and highlighted activities aimed at raising awareness of migratory species. The Secretariat initiated a strategic review of its communication and outreach activities focused on identifying challenges and proposing a way forward.
161. Egypt considered that communication was crucial to CMS implementation, and encouraged MEAs to work together on joint communication messages. Egypt supported the document and draft decision but urged CMS to strengthen communication linkages with MEAs.
162. BFF reiterated the importance of communication and encouraged CMS and its Parties and partners to link with the new non-profit organization EcoFlix, which operated a new and effective communications tool.
163. There being no textual additions raised, the Chair concluded that the COW agreed with the document and recommended it for adoption in plenary.

V. SCIENTIFIC ASSESSMENTS AND REPORTS

ITEM 20. ATLAS OF ANIMAL MIGRATION

164. The CMS COP-Appointed Councillor for Connectivity and Ecological Networks introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.20, 20/Add 1 *Atlas of Animal Migration*, prepared by the Secretariat. The document reported on the positive developments towards an Atlas on Animal Migration, which was foreseen as a long-term initiative. It highlighted progress in the development of four modules of the atlas: the Atlas for migratory mammals in the Central Asian region, the Atlas of bird migration in the Eurasian-African region, which was publicly accessible since May 2022, the Marine Turtle Breeding and Migration Atlas "TurtleNet" and the Global Initiative on Ungulate Migration (GIUM).
165. Egypt supported the document, which it considered crucial to CMS and other biodiversity-related conventions, but noted that it was necessary to take innovative decisions based on scientific and other issues to address the continued serious decline of migratory species.
166. Belgium, on behalf of the EU, encouraged Parties to support the continuation of this work, both with new groups of migratory animals and in new regions. They proposed a lighter process for gathering feedbacks, for example through a notification, and considered that the ScC be asked to provide further advice and guidance to the Secretariat on updating existing and developing additional modules of the Atlas. Proposed amendments were submitted in writing.
167. Bahrain recognized that mapping contributed to improved understanding of migratory patterns, and urged progress in draft Decision 14.BB element d) relating to additional modules, especially for a future Central Asian Flyway (CAF) atlas.
168. India acknowledged the relevance of mapping in contributing to the implementation of CMS and the GBF and welcomed the Draft Decisions, echoing the need for a CAF atlas.

169. The Chair concluded that a CRP on this issue would be conducted, including a reference to the written comments provided.

VI. INTERPRETATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION

ITEM 30. CROSSCUTTING CONSERVATION ISSUES

Item 30.1. Intentional take

Item 30.1.1. Priorities for addressing illegal and unsustainable taking of migratory species

170. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.30.1.1/Rev.1 *Priorities for Addressing Illegal and Unsustainable Taking of Migratory Species*, prepared by the Secretariat, which included a proposal to mobilize efforts to address these issues. The document defined what was understood as to constitute illegal taking and sustainability and examined the need for a more holistic approach to address gaps in legislation, policies and programmes.
171. Nigeria proposed amendments to clarify that sustainable use should not be promoted and that it was necessary to ensure sustainability, and that the use of wildlife should not be considered an integral part of wildlife management. It requested the ScC to develop general guidance on adaptive harvest management and that task forces should be referenced as processes to engage with.
172. Kazakhstan supported the document, noting the risk posed by wildlife trade, and acknowledged that trade posed controversial logistical and political issues. It suggested a close alignment with CITES in approaching illegal trade, and that confiscated wildlife specimens should be disposed of appropriately and not enter illegal trade. It provided written amendments to this effect.
173. The UK welcomed the document, and recommended a more coordinated approach with CITES and other relevant bodies. The UK reiterated its commitment to this issue, noting priorities of its wildlife crime unit to prevent illegal take, including of European Eel, and highlighted the need for training on illegal taking in national school curricula. It submitted proposed textual amendments in writing.
174. Belgium, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, acknowledged the complex challenges of illegal taking and noted the importance of the BBNJ. They suggested that the Resolution be amended accordingly and should address all CMS species and that fishing was a priority. They further suggested the use of migration ranges to include marine species, as appropriate.
175. Israel advised that all trade should be sustainable, highlighted the issue of confiscated wildlife and its relation to CITES, and proposed amendments in paragraph 12 concerning enacting the national sale of wildlife specimens.
176. Egypt commented that the wildlife trade had been taking place for a long time, but recent changes often rendered it unsustainable, including in Egypt, where local communities used to catch species sustainably. It added that wildlife law enforcement required significant resources and should be conducted in a collaborative way.

177. The Cheetah Conservation Fund (CCF) noted a lack of reference to the African Carnivores Initiative and to the taking of predators in general, although illegal taking was a key threat to many predators. The CCF submitted written amendments in writing.
178. WCS urged Parties to prevent illegal taking of migratory species and recommended that addressing domestic use of migratory species should be considered a priority by CMS. WCS submitted an operative resolution in writing to this effect.
179. Kyrgyzstan recommended adding text referring to local legislative issues, including local courts and the need for local measures to combat illegal taking. It further recommended strengthening national forces to ensure the sustainability of legal taking and to address trafficking and improve regular monitoring for improved species management.
180. Kenya highlighted that community-led approaches to design and implementation would lead to a reduction in illegal killing by increasing incentives for wildlife stewardship. Kenya proposed some changes to Resolution 11.3.1 by deleting new text and adding supporting community-led approaches and specific measures instead of community livelihoods.
181. Fauna and Flora International (FFI), also speaking on behalf of the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), supported the document and the oral interventions submitted, especially concerning confiscated wildlife.
182. The BFF recommended that Parties respected Article III Paragraph 5 of the Convention that prohibited the taking of species, and submitted wording in writing relating to the support to efforts to develop regional and international binding agreements to tackle wildlife trafficking.

Item 30.1.2 Aquatic wild meat

183. The Secretariat presented document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.30.1.2/Rev.3 *Aquatic wild meat and action plan to address aquatic wild meat harvest in West Africa*, prepared by the ScC and its Aquatic Wild Meat WG and the Secretariat. CMS was the only MEA addressing this specific threat. The document included a request to support West African Parties in development of an action plan.
184. The Benin Environment and Education Society (BEES), speaking also on behalf of OceanCare, noted that documentation was lacking in West Africa, where marine fauna had long been caught for local consumption for meat, traditional uses and beliefs. Wider hunting and intentional capture of marine fauna had expanded for commercial purposes, resulting in fragmentation of populations, including African Manatee and dolphins. They recommended the draft Action Plan for West Africa and called on partners to support it. They encouraged CMS to identify the depth of this issue and measures to restrain the demand for aquatic wild meat.
185. Belgium, on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the continuation of the work of the Aquatic Wild Meat WG and the draft Resolution to address wild meat harvest in West Africa. Recognising the collective effort and key role of Parties and others, they recommended adding research recommendations, including in relation to food security and wild meat use. They submitted proposed amendments in writing.
186. Senegal noted that illegal practices had grown, and if they were not addressed urgently, migratory marine species would decline in West Africa.

Item 30.1.3. Terrestrial and avian wild meat

187. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP14/30.1.3 *Addressing Unsustainable Use of Terrestrial and Avian Wild Meat of Migratory Species of Wild Animals*, prepared by the Secretariat. An analysis of terrestrial species had been undertaken, while an analysis of avian species was underway.
188. Belgium, on behalf of the EU and its Member States, recommended the adoption of the Direct Decisions in Annex 2 and agreed to delete the decisions highlighted. They considered it important to include follow-up work based on recommendations under document 30.1.1 for avian wild meat and encouraged Parties, non-parties and others to monitor and implement management plans for species subject to unsustainable or illegal taking.
189. WCS urged Parties to include all decisions of the ScC-SC6 and recommended inclusion of ScC-SC text in a different font to enable text to be clearly identified.

Item 30.2 Conservation planning and management**Item 30.2.1 Ecological connectivity****Item 30.2.1.1 Ecological connectivity – Policy aspects****Item 30.2.1.2 Ecological connectivity – Technical aspects**

190. The COP-Appointed Councillor on Connectivity and Ecological Network introduced this issue and relevant documents:
- UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.30.2.1.1 *Ecological connectivity – Policy aspects*
 - UNEP/CMS/COP14/Inf.30.2.1.1 *Initiatives on connectivity*
 - UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.30.2.1.1 *Ecological Connectivity – Technical analysis*
191. The documents reported on the initiatives of the CMS Secretariat, the ScC-SC with its Working Group on Ecological Connectivity, and the Sessional Committee on Ecological Connectivity, including with the involvement of the CMS Executive Secretary and the Secretariat, which had contributed to connectivity being recognized as a major component of global conservation strategies. They highlighted the importance of connectivity for all aspects of conservation and sustainable use, offered an overview of existing initiatives on connectivity, offered a vision of the unique role CMS played for connectivity, and stimulated new initiatives to further support this role of CMS.
192. Belgium, speaking for the European Union and its Member States, called for finding ways to improve connectivity and implementing, and proposed several editorial and substantial amendments, including a new operative paragraph on reporting in the proposed draft resolution, and requesting the Secretariat to report to the COP on this issue.
193. WCS proposed several amendments, including language on ecological integrity, and stated that assessments of ecological connectivity were critical to inform conservation planning.
194. BirdLife called for referring to the needs of birds, to flyways, and to the CMS Atlas on Animal Migration.
195. Egypt underscored that some of the terminology required further clarification and could cause confusion, such as integrity and resilience.
196. The WG would develop a CRP based on the comments on this issue.

Item 30.2.2 Transfrontier conservation areas

197. The Secretariat introduced this agenda item and relevant documents: UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.30.2.2/Rev.2 on *Transfrontier Conservation Areas*, which highlights such areas in Africa, in particular.
198. Zimbabwe, supported by Uganda, indicated that countries within these areas were not consulted and their views were not reflected. They suggested deferring the draft Decision that was directed at Parties to COP15 pending a thorough consultation process.
199. Uganda cited the need for capacity building on the use of proposed tools, noting this could be done through technical support to Parties involved.

Item 20.2.3 Community participation and livelihoods

200. The Secretariat introduced the document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.20.2.3 *Community participation and livelihoods*, which contains an analysis of case studies on community involvement in species conservation. The Secretariat explained that a study on the “Potential for Community-Based Wildlife Management of CAMI species” was forthcoming.
201. The United Kingdom, supported by the European Union and its Member States, noted that communities should be understood as to also include Indigenous Peoples and local communities.
202. Egypt stated that Indigenous Peoples and local communities should be involved in decision making.
203. BFF stressed that collaboration among communities along migration routes should be fostered.
204. A CRP would be developed on this issue.

Item 30.3 Infrastructure

Item 30.3.1. Infrastructure and impact assessment

205. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.30.3.1/Rev.1 *Infrastructure Development and Migratory Species*, prepared by the Secretariat. The document reported on the implementation of Decisions 13.130 to 13.134 and addressed cumulative effects assessments for which the Secretariat had identified a need.
206. The United Kingdom highlighted the importance of taking account of cumulative impacts of infrastructure developments, and recommended flexibility in how Parties delivered in this respect. It proposed amendments in writing emphasising good quality impact assessments that included cumulative effects, and recommendations in terminology.
207. Belgium, on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amended text proposed by the ScC and the Secretariat. They encouraged Parties to observe and fulfil the recommended actions, and to take account of ecological connectivity and restoration when planning infrastructure. They provided written comments for consideration by the WG.
208. The UAE recognised the importance of impact assessments and encouraged the development of biodiversity management plans. Referring to proposed text in Annex 1 relating to sharing plans and assessments, it believed in a more flexible approach that

encouraged transparency and fostered a collaborative environment for best practices. The UAE confirmed its commitment to the principle of sustainable development in relation to infrastructure.

209. India noted the WG findings of significant gaps in funding for migratory species and the lack of capacity to implement actions. It urged dialogue and building capacity, and drew attention to the need to consider political sensitivity under Annex 2.
210. The Chair informed that the paper would be referred to the Institutional and Crosscutting WG, and would come back to the committee as a CRP.

Item 30.3.2. Renewable energy and powerlines

211. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP14/30.3.2 *Renewable Energy and Migratory Species*, which reported on progress in implementing Resolutions 10.11 (Rev.COP13) and 11.27(Rev.COP13) and Decisions 13.106-13.108. The document highlighted activities carried out by the ETF, which had focused on migratory birds, but would extend to all migratory taxa, and a new decision therefore proposed to extend the scope of the ETF to cetaceans.
212. Belgium, on behalf of the EU and its Member States, noted that the development of new infrastructure for renewable energy was important for sustainable development but posed increasing threats to migratory species, and most Parties faced challenges in performing impact assessments. They encouraged Parties to engage with the ETF and learn from its experiences, and expressed support for the Draft Decisions and ScC amendments. They submitted some minor amendments in writing, including to enable the energy sector to take actions to reduce negative impacts.
213. Whale and Dolphin Conservation (WDC) proposed minor change to document 30.3.2/Add.1 Draft Decision 14.AA, suggesting new wording relating to habitat loss and degradation, with a greater focus on impacts on ecosystems, which would be submitted in writing.
214. Egypt reported on best practice relating to energy, and recommended working together to prepare guidelines as well as in implementation and training.
215. The United Kingdom supported the Draft Decisions, except 14.AA element d), which it considered too broad and advised narrowing it down to reduce the burden on Parties. It submitted proposed amended text in writing.
216. The UAE considered migratory species in renewable energy developments, while the Mohamed bin Zayed Species Conservation Fund had supported successful mitigation actions in Mongolia that could be highlighted in case studies to encourage the inclusion of innovative technologies, with lessons learned integrated into guidance for policy makers.
217. The Chair informed that a CRP would come back to the COW after review by the WG.

ITEM 30.4. THREATS

Item 30.4.3 Wildlife disease

218. The COP-Appointed Councillor for Wildlife Health introduced the documents for this issue: UNEP/CMS/COP14/Doc.30.4.3 *Wildlife disease* and UNEP/CMS/COP14/Inf.30.4.3 *Migratory Species and Health*, which contained a Review of Migration and Wildlife Disease Dynamics, and the Health of Migratory Species, within

the Context of One Health. Document 30.4.3 reported on the renewed interest in health including zoonoses following COP13 which took place in the early months of the COVID-19 pandemic. The document also included, in Annex 3, a new proposed resolution on Avian Influenza.

219. The European Union, supported the One Health approach, and that WHO should be engaged on this issue before its next Assembly meeting in May 2024.
220. Israel stressed that pathogen spillover must be emphasized, not only in terms of the risk to wildlife but also in terms of the risk to humans and to other wildlife. He said that as WHO does not address wildlife well, CMS focal points should be the ones to engage with WHO.
221. Australia and the United Kingdom supported the stand-alone resolution on Avian Influenza.
222. BFF supported the CMS approach to wildlife diseases and adopting a precautionary approach.
223. The CITES Secretariat noted it was instructed to collaborate with CMS on the risk of pathogen spillover from wildlife trade.
224. WCS suggested the document downplayed pathogen spillover, which posed a significant risk to wildlife, livestock and people. They also supported CMS focal point engagement with WHO.
225. The United Kingdom preferred replacing the term “wildlife disease” with “wildlife health” to reflect the terminology used by One Health.
226. The WG would discuss this issue further.