



## CONVENTION ON MIGRATORY SPECIES

UNEP/CMS/COP15/Report/Rev.1

27 March 2026

Original: English

15<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES  
Campo Grande, Brazil, 23 to 29 March 2026

### DAILY MEETING REPORT: DAY 2 (24 MARCH 2026)

#### COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

64. On Tuesday morning, the COW Chair noted the relevant documents were forwarded to the WG on Budget. The Secretariat explained that the Daily Report from Day 1 had been uploaded in English, Spanish, and French, and that participants should send any comments to the Secretariat. The Secretariat also said the schedule for WGs would be uploaded on the website.

#### Item 32.1 Report of the Credentials Committee

65. The Chair of the Credentials Committee reported that 59 Parties had submitted credentials, 51 were validated, and two were waiting clarification. She urged Parties who had not yet submitted credentials to do so as soon as possible. The COW Chair also urged Parties to submit credentials.

#### III. ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY MATTERS

#### ITEM 14. BUDGET AND ADMINISTRATION

#### Item 14.3 Resource Mobilization

66. The Secretariat introduced document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.14.3](#) *Resource Mobilization*, describing the two annexes and their draft amendments, both of which contain text addressed to the Secretariat to explore options for strengthening support of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) for CMS, including on the GEF becoming the financial mechanism for CMS.
67. Brazil said it had acceded to CMS in 2015, explaining that one reason for the timing was the fact that CMS did not have a financial mechanism to support developing countries. Brazil observed that the international legal framework had evolved since the adoption of CMS, noting that the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities (CBDR) guided implementation of multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs). He stressed that, when Brazil evoked CBDR, they sought to highlight how much more CMS could achieved if developing countries were supported more effectively. Brazil recommended establishment of a dedicated financial mechanism, accompanied by a methodology for addressing needs and gaps, alongside a time-bound resource mobilization strategy. He underscored the importance of providing predictability, strengthening coordination among Parties, and ensuring clear timelines and monitoring mechanisms. Brazil proposed the addition of text stating that: "The Secretariat shall: (a) Develop, in consultation with the StC, a financial needs assessment and a resource mobilization

strategy, with particular attention to the challenges faced by developing countries in implementing the Convention, and submit it for consideration and approval at COP16.”

68. The EU did not support the GEF becoming the financial mechanism for CMS, observing it would take away scarce resources. She encouraged strengthening support in the GEF for CMS programmes and activities, including through increasing national coordination and providing additional guidance to the GEF.
69. The UK supported the EU’s intervention and did not support the establishment of a dedicated funding mechanism, which she said would risk duplicating existing mechanisms and divert resources away from practical conservation action.
70. New Zealand supported exploring options to strengthen the relationship between CMS and the GEF Secretariat and further supported the position of the EU and the UK. She did not support the GEF becoming the financial mechanism for CMS at this time.
71. Norway and Monaco supported the EU, UK, and New Zealand. Monaco observed that the document showed both significant financial progress alongside unmet needs. She did not support a dedicated financial mechanism for CMS, saying this would duplicate efforts and reduce investments.
72. Panama, Chile, Costa Rica, and South Africa supported Brazil’s proposal.
73. The COW Chair observed two positions: one which supported the creation of a CMS dedicated financial mechanism; and a second position in support of strengthening synergies and making use of existing mechanisms. He suggested referring the issue to the WG on Institutional and Cross-Cutting Issues, which was agreed to by the COW.

#### **IV. STRATEGIC AND INSTITUTIONAL MATTERS**

##### **ITEM 15. SAMARKAND STRATEGIC PLAN FOR MIGRATORY SPECIES (SPMS) 2024-2032**

74. The Secretariat introduced documents [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.15 Samarkand SPMS 2024-2032](#) and [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.15/Add.1 ScC comments arising from ScC-SC8](#).
75. New Zealand thanked the intersessional WG for its work to produce the actions, baselines, and indicators document and Switzerland for their voluntary contributions that enabled this work. She noted significant efforts to reach this point. She observed one outstanding issue on the indicators and action under Target 4.3, noting she supported indicators 4.3.1, 4.3.2, and 4.2.3. However, she did not support indicators 4.3.4 or 4.3.5 as they included terminology that was not defined nor used in CMS. She explained they were more specific than other indicators, which were aimed at all Parties, rather than a subset of Parties, and that it would be difficult to monitor since there was no data from CMS or other sources to measure them. On actions for target 4.3, she expressed flexibility, noting actions were potential actions to guide Parties and other stakeholders on the activities that could be undertaken to increase progress towards SPMS targets. She said once the issues around indicator 4.3 were resolved, she could recommend adoption of the proposed amendments to resolution 14.1 and the draft decision, taking on board the SC comments.
76. The EU welcomed the SPMS monitoring framework, and alignment of the Plan with resolutions on climate change and ecological connectivity, and appreciated linkages to the GBF and the BBNJ, among others.

77. The UK and Australia supported comments from New Zealand and the EU regarding indicators 4.3.4 and 4.4.5. The UK noted finance was a critical enabler and the Convention's partnership model was clear that each Party contributed according to their national priorities. Australia said the indicators were broad and the data required to support them would be difficult to find. The EU said no differentiation should be made between developed and developing countries.
78. Brazil said his previous comments on Resource Mobilization only reinforced the need for a financial needs assessment and disagreed with the previous comments in the sense that indicators 4.3.4 and 4.3.5 would contain difficult terminology. He said the UN had parameters of what was considered a developing country and the Plan needed to incorporate differentiation between developed and developing countries.
79. The COW Chair referred this matter to the WG on Institutional and Cross-Cutting Issues to make progress towards consensus.

## **ITEM 16. SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL**

### **Item 16.1 Sessional Committee Members**

80. The Secretariat introduced documents [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.16.1/Rev.2](#) *Sessional Committee (SC) Members*, [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.16/Add.1](#) *SC Members Candidate Profiles for the COP-Appointed Councillor for Wildlife Health* and [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.16/Add.2](#) *SC Members Candidate Profiles for the COP-Appointed Councillor for Terrestrial Mammals*. She appreciated the work of Ms Ruth Cromie, the outgoing COP-Appointed Councillor for Wildlife Health, for achievements during her tenure, including increased recognition of wildlife health as part of the One Health approach and three key studies of wildlife health prepared for COP14 and COP15. She also noted the proposal to reintroduce the shared position for the COP-Appointed Councillor for Terrestrial Mammals. She said the appointment of these positions would be considered in the final COP Plenary. She explained that the review of these subject areas took place in the ScC-SC, which agreed to maintain current subject areas, and change the title the COP-Appointed Councillor to Wildlife Health.
81. Ms Ruth Cromie, outgoing COP-Appointed Councillor for Wildlife Health, highlighted Mr Craig Stephen and Mr Chris Walzer as two outstanding candidates that would be excellent replacements to consider.
82. The UK echoed Ms Cromie's comments on the breadth of good candidates. The UK noted that the UK had nominated Mr Craig Stephen and the World Conservation Society (WCS) had nominated Chris Walzer. He asked how the process would move forward to discuss candidates within and between regions.
83. WCS also thanked Ms Cromie for her contributions and said Mr Walzer was available to meet with anyone at COP15.
84. This issue was referred to the Institutional and Cross-Cutting Issues WG.

### **Item 16.2 Overview of the Working Groups and Task Forces established under the CMS Scientific Council and its Sessional Committee**

85. The Secretariat introduced documents [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.16.2/Rev.1](#) *Overview of the WGs and Task Forces established under the ScC-SC* and [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.16.2/Add.1](#) *ScC comments arising from ScC-SC8*, noting a change in the duration of the WGs to open-ended so they could resume their work

immediately after the COP. As there were no requests for the floor, the COW Chair closed the agenda item, noting the document was for information purposes.

## **ITEM 17. ELECTION OF PARTIES TO THE STANDING COMMITTEE**

86. The Secretariat introduced document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.17](#) *Election of Parties to the Standing Committee (StC)*, recognizing the work of members who had completed two terms. She said 11 regional representatives and 11 regional alternatives could be elected and the Chair and the Vice Chair would be elected by StC58 immediately following COP15. The Secretariat recommended regional consultations to elect relevant members. The COW Chair invited regional coordinators to provide an update on Party nominations. Regional representatives asked for additional time to discuss nominations. The COW Chair urged consultation within the regional groups and said the COW would return to this agenda item.

## **ITEM 18. COLLABORATION WITH OTHER ENTITIES**

### **Item 18.1 Synergies and Partnerships**

87. The Secretariat introduced documents [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.18.1](#) *Synergies and Partnerships* and [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Inf.18.1](#) *Overview of Accreditation Schemes for NGOs*, noting the draft Decisions, if adopted, would contribute to all targets of the SPMS 2024-2032, especially Target 6.4.
88. CITES stressed partnerships as essential to address complex challenges facing migratory and CITES-listed species and highlighted the Saiga antelope as a powerful example of such collaboration. CITES also highlighted partnerships as playing an important role in advancing collaborative action on wildlife conservation and sustainable use, including the Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management which worked to promote the sustainable use and conservation of wildlife.
89. UNEP supported strengthened synergies and partnerships to support effective implementation of the Convention and as essential for coherent, effective implementation of all MEAs. UNEP also supported the Party-led Bern Process as important for dialogue, collaboration, and synergies among biodiversity-related conventions and other MEAs. She called for strengthening partnerships, including with Indigenous peoples, youth-led organizations, and local communities to ensure their meaningful participation in environmental decision making and to promote inclusivity.
90. The COW Chair suggested finalizing the draft decision and submitting it to the COP for adoption. As there were no objections, the document was submitted to the COP for adoption.

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

91. The Secretariat introduced document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.18.2](#) *Cooperation with IPBES*.
92. Norway encouraged further strengthening of cooperation between the CMS and IPBES, recognizing that IPBES provides high quality assessments on critical issues for the CMS and other environmental agreements, providing the scientific basis for decisions. Norway further encouraged the continued and increased uptake and use of findings from key assessments such as the ones on sustainable use of wild species, on valuation of nature, and on spatial planning and connectivity.

93. The EU supported engagement of the Scientific Council and the Secretariat in relevant IPBES processes and suggested several amendments in this regard.
94. South Africa encouraged engagement between with IPBES on the ongoing work programme of IPBES, particularly with respect to its assessment on spatial assessment and connectivity. The UK echoed the statements of Norway and South Africa.
95. Born Free Foundation (BFF) said it was essential that CMS remain actively engaged in IPBES scoping and review processes to ensure alignment, maximize mutual benefits, and promote coherent and complementary implementation. He said special attention should be given to the IPBES spatial planning and connectivity assessment and the second global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services, underscoring they could provide valuable guidance for strengthening conservation actions for migratory species.
96. The COW Chair said the Secretariat would prepare a CRP for consideration by the COW.

### **Item 18.3 CMS Contribution to the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework**

97. The Secretariat (she) introduced documents [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.18.3](#) *CMS Contribution to the GBF* and [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Inf.18.3](#) *Report of the Bogis-Bossey Expert Workshop 2025* on the Bern Process.
98. Brazil supported efforts to contribute to the GBF and on 15AA b), proposed consideration of all outcomes, not just “relevant” outcomes, as countries should be able to determine relevance according to their national priorities.
99. The EU suggested additional text on national reports to the CBD reflecting CMS objectives; and that the Secretariat, subject to the availability of resources, continue contributing to the global review of the collective progress in the implementation of the GBF, including its involvement in the PMRR (Planning, Monitoring, Reporting and Review) of the GBF, report to the StC and to COP16 on progress in implementing the Decision.
100. Switzerland cautioned that the development of additional and compounding guidelines could hinder progress. On 15.BBc, she said referring to the “new” Joint Work Programme was misleading as the Programme was underway and requested greater precision in the text. The Secretariat responded that the joint work programme was not yet formally established.
101. Senegal and Kenya supported strengthening synergies with the CBD and GBF.
102. UNEP commended the CMS Secretariat for strengthening cooperation and synergies with the biodiversity-related conventions, and welcomed work to integrate migratory species in NBSAPS. He said ensuring migratory species and ecological connectivity were reflected in national planning processes was critical.
103. The COW Chair said that the Secretariat would prepare a CRP.

### **ITEM 19. COMMUNICATION, OUTREACH AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT**

104. The Secretariat introduced [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.19](#) *Communications, Outreach and Information Management*, reviewing activities carried out since COP14, including moderation of the CMS website. Noted the increased interest in CMS by major media

outlets, he said on the first day of COP15, there were over 2200 articles published in 80 languages across 53 countries.

105. Brazil, on 15.AA, requested language encouraging Parties to provide broad support, including but not limited to financial support.
106. The EU, on 15.BB a), requested adding language on reflecting that communications were tailored to the general public and, on 15.BB b), reference to “other MEAs” with regard to partnerships with other entities.
107. On 15.AA a), Kenya proposed adding reference to voluntary contributions specifically earmarked for producing multilingual content. She also proposed two new subparagraphs on designating or confirming national Communication focal points to facilitate local dissemination of global CMS campaigns and on utilizing and promoting the “State of the World’s Migratory Species” report findings within national educational and policy frameworks.
108. The COW Chair said that the Secretariat would circulate a CRP with suggested amendments.

## **ITEM 20 CONSERVATION STATUS OF MIGRATORY SPECIES**

### **Item 20.1 Development of the next Report on State of the World’s Migratory Species**

109. The Secretariat presented document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.20.1/Rev.1](#) *Development of the Next Report on State of the World’s Migratory Species*.
110. Kenya supported the document and draft decisions, underscoring support for the development of mechanisms that held Parties improve reporting.
111. The EU supported the adoption of the draft decisions and proposed amendments on technical and scientific support, including text on reviewing the scope of the second State of the World’s Migratory Species Report, validating case studies and ensuring they reflect integrated approaches, and advising on the development of the CMS Data Dashboard.
112. South Africa appreciated the report and proposed a text amendment,
113. Uganda welcomed the proposal to prepare a second State of Migratory Species Report and proposed a standardized protocol for data submission.
114. Uganda also emphasized the importance of dissemination of this and other reports.
115. The COW Chair said the proposed amendments were complementary and proposed Parties work together to reach consensus in the Cross-Cutting WG, which was agreed.

### **Item 20.2 State of the World’s Migratory Species - Interim Report (2026)**

116. The Secretariat presented the document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.20.2/Rev.1](#) *State of the World’s Migratory Species - Interim Report (2026)* noting they did not receive voluntary funding to cover the cost of the report, and the UN Environment Programme-World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) had developed the report in-kind. The Secretariat invited UNEP-WCMC to present the findings, which included: an update on recently reported changes to the conservation status, population trends and distributions of CMS-listed species; a summary of recent efforts to identify and protect

important habitats for migratory species and to map migratory pathways; the recognition that the data showed the situation for migratory species was worsening, driven by habitat loss and overexploitation; moving 26 CMS species, 18 of which were migratory shorebirds, to a higher risk category, and moving seven species, including the Mediterranean monk seals and the Saiga antelope, to a less threatened category. UNEP-WCMC explained that despite important successes, the overall picture was heading in the wrong direction.

117. Brazil noted, with concern, the trends in the report, and the COW took note of the report.

#### **ITEM 21. ATLAS OF ANIMAL MIGRATION**

118. The Secretariat introduced [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.21/Rev.1](#) *Atlas of Animal Migration* and Doc.21/Add.1 *ScC comments arising from ScC-SC8*. The COW accepted the document as originally presented and agreed to submit it to the COP for adoption.

#### **ITEM 23. REVIEW MECHANISM AND NATIONAL LEGISLATION PROGRAMME**

119. The Secretariat (she) presented documents [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.23](#) *Review Mechanism and National Legislations Programme*, [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Inf.23a](#) *Global Workshop on CMS Legislation: Summary of Discussions*, [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Inf.23b](#), *Legislative Guidance Document: Exceptions to the Prohibition on Taking of Appendix I-Listed Species under CMS Article III.5* and [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Inf.23c](#) *Legislative Guidance for Maintaining, Improving, and Restoring Ecological Connectivity*.

120. The EU stressed the importance of clarity in the review mechanism and the central role of National Legislation Programme of supporting Parties and proposed deleting reference to “subject to the availability of resources”. On commissioning a study, Australia clarified this would be subject to the availability of resources.

121. Brazil did not support the creation of a CMS Multistakeholder Task Force on Legislation, noting it raised questions regarding the CMS’s mandate to create such a group, and supported deleting the reference to the creation of a task force in the decision.

122. UNEP supported adoption of the draft decisions, particularly those aimed at strengthening national legal frameworks and enhancing implementation of the Convention. He supported strengthened coordination and knowledge exchange, and continued collaboration across relevant initiatives, and noted work with the CMS Secretariat to promote accession of non-Party countries, support the translation of CMS obligations into national legislation, convene regional workshops under the Montevideo Programme for the Development and Periodic Review of Environmental Law, and strengthen tools such as the Online Reporting System and InforMEA to enhance coherence and access to information across MEAs. He also noted ongoing consultation with the Secretariat to advance collaboration in support of the National Legislation Programme.

123. On 15.BB e), Kenya proposed reporting to COP16 on progress in implementing the decision. She said Kenya supported the creation of a CMS Multistakeholder Legal Task Force on Legislation, and requesting the StC59 to adopt its TOR. She noted Kenya was in the process of reviewing its national legislation.

124. Zimbabwe agreed with draft decisions. On the point raised by the EU, he reflected this process can only help us address gaps and challenges we are facing through the legal lens.

125. The COW Chair said that the Secretariat would prepare a CRP based on the amendments made, and encouraged informal discussions to reach a consensus-based proposal.

## ITEM 24. REVIEW OF DECISIONS

126. The Secretariat introduced document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.24](#), which listed decisions to be renewed or deleted that were not referred to in other COP15 documents.
127. The EU did not support deletion of: Decisions 14.38 and 14.39 on the maltreatment and mutilation of seabirds and fisheries, noting this would imply a deprioritization of the issue; 14.54 on marine wildlife watching; and 14.223 on impacts of plastic pollution on aquatic, terrestrial, and avian species, as there was no evidence this work was being undertaken elsewhere. The Secretariat noted the requests made by the EU.

## 28 Crosscutting Conservation Issues

### 28.1 Illegal and Unsustainable Taking of Migratory Species

128. The Secretariat introduced the documents [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.28.1](#) *Illegal and Unsustainable Taking of Migratory Species*, [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.28.1/Add.1](#) *ScC Comments*, [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Inf.28.1a](#) *Illegal and Unsustainable Taking of Migratory Species – A Scoping Analysis*, and [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Inf.28.1b](#) *Impacts of Take and Trade of Migratory Birds for Consumption in Africa-Eurasia*.
129. Brazil proposed using “urges” instead of “proposes” in reference to the timeline for financial support, to reflect the level of ambition.
130. The EU supported efforts on this agenda item, recognizing its importance to achieving Target 5 of the GBF. The EU did not support the proposal to reference multiple types of knowledge as equal to science and proposed adding “science-based” in front of management and adding “where appropriate using other systems of knowledge as well”.
131. Australia did not agree with the EU that multiple systems of knowledge was not science-based but said Australia could accept the proposal to include “where appropriate”.
132. Zimbabwe agreed with the proposed amendments and suggested only referencing the global level, observing it could also cover domestic use and trade.
133. Kenya supported the decision and the draft amendments, underscoring that addressing such threats required a dual approach of strengthening enforcement and emphasizing community stewardship. He stressed that Kenya’s experience confirmed that community-based conservation paired with incentives was an effective approach.
134. WCS strongly supported this initiative and appreciated the suggested edits by Brazil and the EU. WCS did not see the proposed amendments in Operative Paragraph 7 as necessary for inclusion.
135. BFF supported the work on this issue and proposed referencing “science-based” management to ensure the approach is grounded in science.
136. The COW Chair suggested that the Secretariat prepare a CRP to take into account and include the amendments and suggestions made, which was agreed.

## Item 28.2 Ecological Connectivity

137. The Secretariat introduced the document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.28.2/Rev.1](#) *Ecological Connectivity*.
138. Brazil proposed two changes to recognize long distance trails and green corridors, as follows: in operative paragraph 9, he suggested adding “including through long distance trails and their associated long-distance corridors”; in paragraph 10, he recommended adding “including through long distance trails”.
139. The EU supported adoption of draft decisions, observing they align with the EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030 and GBF. The EU proposed several text changes, related to adding text on identifying data gaps, providing scientific direction on assessing links between connectivity, ecosystem integrity, and climate resilience; and an assessment of research needs, among other suggestions. Furthermore, the EU endorsed the Global Partnership on Ecological Connectivity (GPEC) as a vital platform for collective action and urged continued resource mobilization to address implementation gaps, such as research on climate impacts and data capabilities.
140. Senegal welcomed progress, underscoring ecological connectivity as essential to survival of migratory species, including the African elephant and marine turtles.
141. The East Asian-Australian Flyaway Partnership (EAAFP) highlighted the role of institutional connectivity in ecological connectivity and species outcomes, explaining in their flyaway only a limited number of countries are Parties to CMS, while EAAFP brings together both CMS and non-CMS countries in a common framework. EAAFP called for strengthened cooperation between regional flyaway partnerships and the CMS.
142. The COW Chair said the Secretariat would prepare a CRP with the proposed amendments.

## Item 28.3 Transfrontier Conservation Areas

143. The Secretariat introduced the document, [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.28.3](#), noting it contains one annex with decisions and an addendum. The Secretariat recommended the COP adopt the draft decisions and delete decisions 14.197-14.199.
144. The EU supported adopting the draft decisions and deleting decisions 14.197-14.199 and called for maximizing practical use of the tool, including through broad engagement in testing.
145. Brazil encouraged a streamlined approach through national reporting, rather than through separate notifications or parallel reporting exercises to reduce administrative burden.
146. Zimbabwe supported the draft decisions and supported streamlined approaches to reduce reporting burdens.
147. The Cheetah Conservation Fund encouraged efforts to develop transfrontier conservation areas (TFCAs) as an instrument of conservation and provided an update on a regional initiative in the Horn of Africa.

148. South Africa highlighted her country's experience as a pioneer of the transfrontier conservation model and supported deletion of 14.199, observing that this tool was not subject to adequate consultation throughout the SADC region.
149. Ethiopia, Senegal, and Benin supported adoption of the draft decision. Ethiopia and Senegal also highlighted the role of bilateral agreements in TFCAs.
150. UNEP supported adoption of the draft decision and said any further investment in the tool should be based on clear demand, consultation, and a cost benefit assessment.
151. The COW Chair said the Secretariat would prepare a CRP with the proposed amendments.

#### **Item 28.4 Communities and Livelihoods**

152. The Secretariat introduced document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.28.4](#) *Communities and Livelihoods* and [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.28.4/Add.1](#) *ScC Comments*.
153. Brazil supports this draft decision, which is consistent with participatory approaches long valued in our national practice. He said, however, that its implementation should reflect aquatic and fisheries contexts as well, including transboundary basins and coastal zones, and recognize artisanal fishing communities as key actors in conservation and sustainable management. He also stressed the vital role of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs) in protecting breeding areas, stopover sites, and migratory corridors of migratory species, as well as the need to support them in the sustainable management and use of their biomes, taking into account their traditional knowledge and rights related to land, territories, and resources, as part of long-term policies for the conservation of migratory species.
154. The EU proposed that the ScC establish a dedicated WG to deal with scientific issues related to conflicts and coexistence between communities and CMS-listed species.
155. Ethiopia supported establishment of a dedicated WG that to address interactions between communities and CMS-listed species.
156. Kenya endorsed the 10 Guiding Principles and urged practical implementation through capacity building, exchange visits, and funding to empower local communities as the principal conservation and management partners on migratory species. She stressed ecological sustainability and the adoption of a precautionary approach where the conservation status of the migratory species across its range remained uncertain and proposed text to reflect this. She also underscored prioritizing the management of human-wildlife conflict or else such conflicts could potentially cause mortalities and population declines. In addition, she proposed adding text on facilitating broader consultations with CMS Parties, IPLCs, civil society organizations, and others to support inclusive and effective implementation of the Guiding Principles considering that migratory species were shared resources and heritage. Senegal supported Kenya's statement.
157. South Africa proposed text to reflect a whole of society and whole of government approach, and including the application of relevant recommendations, as appropriate beyond the Central Asia region. South Africa also proposed: reference to "innovative funding proposals; and language on mobilizing funding resources that integrate community-based wildlife management with sustainable livelihood opportunities; text on enabling the scaling up of community-based initiatives; and a new subparagraph on supporting capacity building at the community level, including for IPLCs.

158. WCS, BFF, and UNEP appreciated the interventions of Brazil, Kenya, and South Africa to strengthen the decisions. WCS recommended that Parties not adopt the recommendation of the SC to establish a WG to address the “strategic issues related to interactions between communities and CMS-listed species”. While recognizing it was vital to work with communities to understand such interactions, she believed the issues were not exclusively scientific, and questioned the need for an official WG under the ScC.
159. BFF explained that efforts to implement the Guiding Principles should include, among others: emphasis on the need to ensure *ecological sustainability* and the adoption of a highly precautionary approach to the extractive utilisation of migratory species; with reference to Principle 9, an emphasis on the need to consider human-wildlife conflict resolution in the context of the International Consensus Principles for Ethical Wildlife Control, and the experiences of wider human-wildlife conflict mitigation efforts that focus on benefitting both wildlife and people; and wider consultation with CMS Partner Organisations and other key stakeholders in implementing the draft Decision.
160. UNEP said effective operationalization required a broader societal perspective in evaluating the role that community-based wildlife management could play as part of the wider economy, and how it interacts with other sectors, such as forestry, agriculture and tourism. He said transition to action required mechanisms tailored to the local context, combining clear rules, monitoring, enforcement, and locally adapted institutions. UNEP underscored that community-based conservation is not only a social consideration, but a critical condition for effective and sustainable conservation outcomes, and highlighted its Core Human Rights Principles for Private Conservation Organizations and Funders, developed in collaboration with Indigenous Peoples and community representatives across all regions.
161. The COW Chair suggested the Secretariat develop a CRP, taking into account opinions expressed, which the COW agreed to.

#### **Item 28.5 Wildlife Health**

162. The Secretariat introduced documents [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.28.5/Rev.1](#) *Wildlife Health*, which was revised by the ScC at ScC-SC8
163. Argentina rejected the One Health approach given it had withdrawn from the World Health Organization (WHO) and requested deletion of reference to it as well as to the Agreement on Pandemics.
164. The EU proposed that the WG on Migratory Species and Health and the WG on Climate Change as well as other relevant workstreams in CMS family agreements be tasked with jointly collating and discussing measures to monitor, prevent and mitigate mass mortality events of populations of migrating species and inform about actions that can be taken in that regard to COP16.
165. Senegal supported the One Health approach, noted Senegal had operationalized it at the national level. He supported including an amendment on the surveillance of epidemics to ensure wildlife and public health were addressed more holistically.
166. Brazil suggested many amendments, including reference to need for predictable and sustainable financial resources, consistency with the principle of CBDR, and insufficient resources and investment, particularly in developing countries, and facilitating resource mobilization including by exploring innovative financial resources.

167. Peru made several comments, including referring to domestic and production animals and pets as they there have been proven cases of zoonosis with these types of animals
168. UNEP added that the spread of High Pathogenicity Avian Influenza not only affected birds but migratory mammals like seals. UNEP emphasized that an effective One Health approach must prioritize the environmental dimension and prevention at source over reactive approaches; and urged all Parties to align their national actions with the CBD Global Action Plan on Biodiversity and Health, and consider response options outlined in the IPBES Nexus Assessment, noting this was essential to meeting GBF Target 5. He also welcomed the Secretariat's collaborative work with the Quadripartite on Avian Influenza.
169. WCS noted its formal designation by the World Organisation for Animal Health (WOAH) as a Collaborating Centre for Research, Diagnosis and Surveillance of Wildlife Pathogens with a focus on health and biodiversity, recognizing WCS's global leadership in science, One Health, transboundary disease surveillance, and biodiversity conservation. He said WCS was the only conservation organization to receive this designation. He supported the suggested additions from the EU, Peru, UNEP and many of the suggestions from Brazil.
170. Born Free supported the document, but proposed several revisions, including, among others; recognition of the CMS workstream on animal culture and social complexity; a new preambular paragraph recognizing the relevance of ongoing work at UNEP on the animal welfare–environment–sustainable development nexus to the improvement of wildlife health, and to efforts to mitigate the risk of emerging diseases with zoonotic potential.
171. Noting the text currently lacked recognition of the connection between population health and individual animal welfare, he proposed adding text in the operative paragraphs on: measures aimed at securing the cultural and social integrity of migratory species' populations; a precautionary approach to interventions involving migratory species in relation to prevention of health risks; and a goal alignment of planning with other relevant international mechanisms aimed at securing wildlife health.
172. The COW Chair suggested that discussions continue in the Cross-Cutting Issues WG, which the COW agreed to.

### **Item 28.6 Pastoralism**

173. The Secretariat introduced the document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc 28.6/Rev.1 Pastoralism](#), noting cost constraints made them unable to support implementation of these decisions. The document suggests extending the mandate of the WG to conduct a dedicated physical meeting and an in-depth analysis.
174. Argentina reminded participants it had withdrawn from the World Health Organization (WHO). Argentina also requested elimination of references to the Agreement on Pandemics under the WHO.
175. Kenya and Peru expressed interest in joining a potential WG. Kenya and the EU supported deleting decisions 14.179-14.181. Kenya proposed the following changes: include "invertebrates" after birds in background paragraph 1; and including "communities" before global in paragraph 4.1.

176. The Global Alliance for Rangelands and Pastoralists supported the decision, underscoring the urgent need to promote pastoralist knowledge and evidence-based policy to support sustainable rangelands and species well-being.
177. COW Chair said that the Secretariat would prepare a CRP incorporating the suggestions.

**Item 28.7 Light Pollution**

178. The Secretariat introduced document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/28.9/Rev.1](#) *Light Pollution*, which was drafted by the Scientific Committee. She noted Annex 2 contains a summary of findings of the expert consultation on light pollution and recommended adoption of the resolutions.
179. New Zealand recognized light pollution as a growing threat to a wide range of migratory species, noting light pollution is recognised as a key threat in the listing proposals for both gadfly petrels and flesh-footed shearwater.
180. Switzerland proposed an amendment as paragraph 12, to “invite the ScC to draw up recommendations to mitigate the direct and indirect effects of light pollution for migratory fish and for particular those linked to migratory species”.
181. New Zealand and Switzerland supported adoption of the resolutions, with the deletion of COP 14 decisions.
182. Australia informed Parties of a process to identify and review gaps in evidence on light impacts on marine species, including fish. She said a new operative paragraph is not necessary because paragraph 11 includes the mandate to bring new evidence to COP about light pollution. In response, Australia preferred to reserve the text until after seeing the report.
183. The EU suggested many changes.
184. The COW Chair said the Secretariat would prepare a CRP.

**Item 28.8 Insect Decline**

185. The Secretariat introduced document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.28.8](#) *Insect Decline*, noting it focused on insect decline as a threat to migratory species, and that proposals for listing would be addressed elsewhere.
186. The EU requested, in the preamble, reference to Rio Principle 15 on the precautionary approach the importance of insects for ecosystem services, including pollination, soil health and food production. He also proposed deletion of the phrase “subject to the availability of resources” as a condition for undertaking the provisions in the decision, and made several other proposals in the Operative Paragraphs.
187. Brazil, recognizing that if one of the Rio recognizing the importance of the Rio Principles, said they entire Rio Declaration should be included rather than singling out one.
188. The COW Chair suggested that Secretariat prepare a CRP taking into account the statements made, which the COW agreed to.

## Item 28.9 Cumulative Effects Assessment

189. The Secretariat introduced documents [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.28.9/Rev.1](#) *Cumulative Effects Assessment* and [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Inf.28.9](#) *Cumulative Effects Assessment for Migratory Species*.
190. While appreciating the significance of cumulative effects assessment in mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into the impact management programme, South Africa said the evaluation done by the Secretariat could not be considered conclusive as only two Parties responded to the call to provide information and the fact that further information sourced might be biased to English speaking countries. Thus, she said it was premature to adopt a decision that assumed inadequate Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) initiatives and policies and national legislation do not exist. She proposed deletion of 15.AA to enable further development of the actions proposed in 15.BB and 15.CC on condition that a further call including workshops be extended to Parties and other relevant organizations to expand the pool of data and information gathered to inform more accurate and impactful guidance to Parties, including the practical application of the concept of animal culture in cumulative effects assessments without further burdening development especially in developing countries.
191. The EU requested Parties to consider ecological connectivity and ecological restoration when planning new linear infrastructure and encouraged Parties to ensure involvement of relevant businesses and public authorities, to embed biodiversity conservation into public and private decision-making. However, he suggested awaiting the outcome of the ScC's work on developing a CMS definition of cumulative effects assessment (CEA) before assessing its effectiveness to ensure a common understanding of CEA and enable effective implementation.
192. New Zealand expressed disappointment that only two Parties responded to the questionnaire and said many others were grappling with this issue in carrying out work. She supported requesting the ScC for guidance on cumulative effects on migratory species.
193. Uganda wondered suggested the low response rate was due to lack of capacity and/or for further guidance, and suggested further consultations were required prior to the adoption of the proposed Decision.
194. The Interamerican Association for Environmental Defense (AIDA) said that CMS could move further in the incorporation and implementation of the standards that being clarified across international law by the International Court of Justice and the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea. He believed that future CMS work could usefully focus on operationalizing these standards in practice: by reinforcing precaution where uncertainty persists, improving transparency and data-sharing, and ensuring that ecological connectivity and species movement are treated as central considerations in environmental decision-making. He stressed this was an important opportunity for CMS to help translate evolving international legal standards into more effective protection for migratory species and the ecosystems on which they depend.
195. The COW Chair suggested more in-depth discussion in the WG on Cross-Cutting Issues, to which the COW agreed.

## Item 28.10 Infrastructure

196. The Secretariat introduced the document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.28.10/Rev1](#) *Infrastructure*.

197. Brazil proposed changes to avoid overly broad definitions, including the following changes in Annex 1:
- In paragraph 1ter: deleting the current version and replacing with “acknowledge that infrastructure may include, inter alia, linear, water related, maritime, and urban infrastructure, the impacts of which on migratory species may vary according to typology, scale, location, and regulatory implications”
  - In paragraph 2ter deleting “precautionary triggers in the absence of adequate data”
  - In paragraph 14, deleting current text and replacing with “instructs the Secretariat to engage with relevant financial institutions to raise awareness of CMS guidance and available expertise on migratory species, as appropriate”.
198. The EU appreciated the work and proposed several text changes, including adding strategic environmental assessments (SEAs), deleting references to social impact assessment, and adding language on conducting multi-season and multi-year baseline surveys.
199. The COW Chair said the Secretariat would prepare a CRP on the basis of the proposals by Brazil and the EU.

#### **Item 28.11. Renewable Energy**

200. The Secretariat introduced the documents [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.28.11 Renewable Energy](#) and [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.28.11/Add.1 ScC comments](#).
201. The EU noted renewable energy can contain risks for migratory species and did not include the reference to “nature-shaped design”. The EU submitted amendments in writing.
202. The UK supported the expansion of renewable energy but opposed language in operative paragraph 3, sub paragraph c, on avoiding MPAs. He described the UK’s strict assessments with respect to renewable energy and MPAs and said the UK will submit more flexible language to the Secretariat.
203. The Interamerican Association for Environmental Defense (AIDA) welcomed progress and stressed the importance of an avoidance-first approach, especially in ecologically sensitive marine and coastal areas and along migratory routes. AIDA further stressed inclusive participation and transparency in marine spatial planning and siting processes and other analyses.
204. The COW Chair said the Secretariat would prepare a CRP on the basis of the proposals made by the Parties.

#### **Item 28.12. Climate Change**

205. The Secretariat introduced documents [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.28.12/Rev.1 Climate Change](#), and [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Inf.28.12a-d](#).
206. Brazil welcomed efforts to coordinate on the impacts of climate change on migratory species, underscoring climate change as an increasingly important driver of habitat loss. He welcomed further clarification in proposed strategy definitions, timeframes, and scales of action, noting their policy and implementation implications, and submitted proposals in writing.

207. The EU supported draft decisions 15.AA to 15.BB and submitted changes to 15.CC and 15.DD in writing.
208. South Africa, the UK, and IWC supported the proposed amendments and draft decisions.
209. South Africa welcomed the case studies on how to strengthen resilience of migratory species. IFAW supported strengthening the evidence base through case studies and shared an example of its research on the positive role of dugongs for carbon capture and storage in seagrass ecosystems. Born Free also supported case studies, especially on climate adaptation and land restoration.
210. Audubon proposed an addition to 15cc at the end on initiating a process to identify exiting assessments of likely range of migratory species and suggesting a pilot where such assessments do not exist.
211. The COW Chair said the Secretariat would prepare a CRP on the basis of proposals and suggestions.

#### **Item 28.13 Conservation Implication of Animal Culture and Social Complexity**

212. The Secretariat introduced the documents [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc28.13/Rev.1](#) *Conservation Implication of Animal Culture and Social Complexity* and [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Inf.28.13](#), and recommended adoption of the TOR for the expert WG.
213. Kenya, Senegal, and Somalia supported the recommendations and proposed decisions.
214. South Africa urged focusing on threats to species that have been identified as threatened, noting limited resources, and expressing concern over a lack of focus on the topic. South Africa proposed an amendment to the draft decision to focus the work on identified threats. Zimbabwe agreed with South Africa, also stressing resource shortages.
215. OceanCare expressed support for the WG related to ACCOBAMS and ASCOBANS and encouraged other daughter agreements to consider culturally transmitted behaviors when determining conservation measures.
216. The COW Chair said the Secretariat would prepare a CRP based on proposals and suggestions.