



**CONVENTION ON
MIGRATORY
SPECIES**

UNEP/CMS/COP15/Inf.22

9 March 2026

Original: English

15th MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES
Campo Grande, Brazil, 23 to 29 March 2026
Agenda Item 22

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REVISING THE CMS NATIONAL REPORT TEMPLATE:
PROPOSAL FOR CONSIDERATION**

(Prepared by UNEP-WCMC)

Summary:

This Information Document provides recommendations for revising the CMS National Report template, developed by UNEP-WCMC at the request of the CMS Secretariat.

This Information Document complements Document UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.22 *National Reports*.

Recommendations for revising the CMS National Report template: Proposal for consideration

Contents

Background	2
Approach taken	3
Proposal for a revised format for the CMS National Reporting template	5
Annex 1. Comparison between current and revised templates.....	18
Annex 2. Summary of feedback received from the Intersessional Working Group (IWG) on the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species and the CMS Secretariat.....	22

Background

With the adoption of the new [Samarkand Strategic Plan for Migratory Species \(SPMS\) 2024-2032](#) at COP14, Parties agreed (through Decisions 14.1-14.4) to revise the format of the CMS National Reports to align with the new SPMS. The revision of the CMS National Report template is therefore being undertaken primarily to align reporting with the new SPMS and enhance the relevance of National Reports as a means of tracking progress. The UN Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) was requested by the CMS Secretariat to support this process by preparing recommendations on the content and format of the revised National Reports.

The CMS National Reports – as the official mechanism through which Parties report on their implementation of the Convention – provide the key source of national-level information for assessing progress towards the SPMS goals and targets. [COP15 Document 15](#) outlines a proposed monitoring framework for tracking SPMS implementation. In this framework, 18 of the 44 proposed SPMS indicators (41%), covering 15 of the 23 SPMS targets, will draw directly on specific questions in the revised National Reports. The remaining SPMS indicators will be calculated using global data sets, as well as data compiled by the CMS Secretariat and the Scientific Council.

Updating the reporting template also presents an opportunity to streamline the report, improve reporting rates¹ and strengthen the ability of National Reports to collectively provide a representative picture of progress and to detect relevant trends over time. The intention is to agree a revised reporting template for use in the next CMS reporting cycle, ahead of COP16 in 2029.

Key aims of the revision include:

- Maximizing the relevance of National Reports to the new SPMS, ensuring they can be used to track progress towards SPMS goals and targets.
- Boosting reporting rates by streamlining the template.

¹ While over half (61%) of CMS Parties submitted National Reports by the deadline for inclusion in the analysis of reports to COP13, this proportion had fallen to less than half (44%) by COP15.

- Improving the robustness and comparability of analyses by introducing more clearly defined response options.

Approach taken

This document, prepared by UNEP-WCMC at the request of the CMS Secretariat, outlines an initial proposal for revising the CMS National Reporting template, taking into account the aims of the revision outlined above. Particular emphasis has been placed on the questions needed to inform the proposed SPMS indicators presented in [COP15 Doc.15](#). The draft template (see page 4 below) includes new questions aligned with the SPMS, alongside selected questions from the previous template that continue to provide valuable information. Questions from the previous template that are no longer considered relevant are proposed for deletion, in order to streamline reporting for Parties. **Annex 1** provides further detail on substantive changes made relative to the reporting template used for COP15.

Feedback from Parties and other CMS stakeholders on the proposed changes will be essential to ensuring that the revision achieves its intended aims. Initial comments have already been received from some members of the Intersessional Working Group (IWG) on the SPMS – tasked with developing the proposed SPMS indicators and advising on the new National Report template. A summary of the initial feedback, including comments from the CMS Secretariat, is provided in **Annex 2**. No substantive changes have yet been made in response to this feedback; it will be considered, together with any additional feedback received, after COP15 when a final version of the template will be developed.

Key points on the approach taken

- **SPMS structure:** The revised template is organized around the six goals of the SPMS. It is proposed that the “high-level” questions from previous reporting periods be retained, as these allow Parties to communicate overarching aspects of implementation that do not fit neatly under a single SPMS goal or indicator and offer more flexibility in how Parties describe such progress.
- **Reduced reporting burden:** The revised template currently contains **28 questions**, compared with **54** in the template used for the COP15 reporting period in 2025.
- **Relevance to indicators: Eighteen** of the proposed questions provide the sole mechanism for reporting on SPMS indicators; it will therefore be particularly important for Parties to complete these.
- **Question design:** The wording of questions has been developed to both inform the relevant indicators and generate information useful for understanding broader implementation. As a result, individual questions may not directly mirror the wording of the indicator text but should still capture the necessary information.
- **Structured response options:** The template primarily consists of questions with structured response options to support comparability across Parties and to succinctly inform relevant indicators. Where possible, multiple response options are offered to capture variation in

levels of implementation.² These structured questions are complemented by a limited number of targeted free-text questions to enable Parties to highlight key gaps, explain challenges and identify emerging pressures.

- **Capturing existing implementation:** Recognizing the need to establish a robust baseline as close as possible to the start of the SPMS period, many questions are framed to include actions undertaken previously, rather than focusing solely on activities conducted during the reporting period.
- **Future guidance:** Some questions would benefit from additional guidance to support consistent interpretation by Parties. How and when such guidance might be developed could be considered by the Secretariat at a later stage.

Requests contained within CMS Resolutions and Decisions for Parties to submit additional information via the National Reports

A number of existing CMS Resolutions and Decisions request CMS Parties to report on the implementation of specific provisions through their National Reports (as detailed in Annexes 3 and 4 of [COP15 Doc.22](#)).³ As outlined in Doc.22, the CMS Secretariat has recommended that these existing reporting requests in Resolutions be removed or amended, and has further suggested that the COP may wish to consider whether future Decisions should continue to include such requests. Accordingly, these reporting requests have not been incorporated into this initial draft template; they will need to be revisited in a revised draft after COP15, taking into account any changes to Resolutions and Decisions adopted at the meeting. Incorporating all existing reporting requests from Annexes 3 and 4 as standalone questions would significantly increase the length and complexity of the National Report template.

² Response categories generally follow the approach taken in the monitoring framework for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (KMGBF) to capture the level of progress made by Parties towards implementation (i.e. for single-choice questions, Parties are requested to select one of No / Under development / Partially / Fully – these reflect increasing levels of implementation) (see [CBD/COP/DEC/16/31](#) and [CBD/COP/16/INF/3/Rev.1](#)).

³ Several COP15 pre-session documents include additional requests for Parties to report on progress via the National Reports. This includes proposed new decisions on Conserving Seamount Ecosystems (COP15 [Doc.25.3.3](#)), Seabirds and Marine Flyways (COP15 [Doc.26.3.2/Rev.1](#)), Renewable Energy (COP15 [Doc.28.11](#)) and Maintaining Lists of Species Listed in the CMS Appendices (COP15 [Doc.29.2/Rev.1](#)), as well as recommendations for additional reporting contained within pre-session documents on Conservation Priorities for Cetaceans (COP15 [Doc.25.4.1/Rev.1](#)), Cumulative Effects Assessments (COP15 [Doc.28.9](#)) and Concerted Actions (COP15 [Doc.31.1/Rev.1](#)).

Proposal for a revised format for the CMS National Reporting template *(draft version March 2026)*

The following draft template sets out the recommended revisions to the CMS National Report questions. Any links to the **COP15 reporting template** (i.e. whether the new question is identical to, modified from, or replacing an existing National Report question) and to the **proposed SPMS indicators** (as outlined in [COP15 Doc.15](#)) are shown in square brackets directly beneath each question.

1. Administrative information

Q.1.1: Name of the Party [[drop down list of Parties to select from](#)]

Q.1.2: Any territories which are excluded from the application of the Convention: [[free text](#)]

Q.1.3: Report compiler

Q.1.2.1: Name and title: [[free text](#)]

Q.1.2.2: Full name of institution: [[free text](#)]

Q.1.2.3: Telephone: [[free text](#)]

Q.1.2.4: Email: [[free text](#)]

2. The conservation status of migratory species (SPMS Goal 1: *The conservation status of migratory species is improved.*)

Q.2.1: Does your country use national-level or regional-level assessments of the conservation status of any CMS-listed species in planning and prioritization of conservation actions? [[Link to COP15 reporting template](#): modified question, replaces previous Q.XI.1 on conservation status; **Informs SPMS Indicator 1.2.3**]

SPMS Indicator 1.2.3: Percentage of Parties that are regularly updating national-level species conservation assessments (e.g. National Red Lists or equivalent) that consider CMS-listed species.

- Yes
- Partially, national- or regional-level assessments are only available and/or used for some CMS-listed species
- No, global-level information is used
- No

If 'Yes' or 'Partially', are national-level assessments for CMS-listed species regularly updated?

- Yes – please provide information on the frequency of updates [[free text](#)]
- No

If 'Yes' or 'Partially', please download the attached spreadsheet and provide details of the current **national or regional-level** conservation status, methodology/approach (e.g. IUCN Red List assessment, modified IUCN, non-IUCN Red List), and year of assessment for individual CMS-listed species.

3. The habitats and ranges of migratory species (SPMS Goal 2: *The habitats and ranges of migratory species are maintained and restored, supporting their connectivity.*)

Range States for CMS-listed species

Q.3.1: Please confirm that the list provided correctly identifies the Appendix I and Appendix II species for which your country is a Range State.

- Yes, the list is correct.
- No, amendments are needed to the following species: [\[dropdown list of species, with the following list of options to select from: Present, Not Present, Extirpated, Introduced, Occurrence Uncertain. A space for the citation is also provided.\]](#)

Please ensure you provide the supporting scientific justification for any changes.

Important areas and sites for CMS-listed species (SPMS Target 2.1)

Q.3.2: Have important areas and sites for migratory species listed in the CMS Appendices been identified (e.g. by an inventory) in your country? [[Link to COP15 reporting template](#): based on Q.XIII.1; **Informs SPMS Indicator 2.1.1**]

Indicator 2.1.1: Percentage of Parties that have fully or to a large extent identified all important habitats and sites for CMS-listed species at the national level.

- Comprehensively identified
- Partially
- Under development
- No

If 'Comprehensively identified' or 'Partially', when was information held on important sites and habitats last updated? Please specify the year when the most recent update took place.

*A more detailed understanding of the main gaps could be obtained by asking Parties to rate progress separately across **terrestrial, inland water and marine** environments (with a 'Not applicable' option for landlocked Parties). Parties could also be invited to briefly indicate which assessment or designation processes were used to identify important areas (e.g. national inventories or relevant global/regional processes).*

Biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning for CMS-listed species (SPMS Targets 2.2 & 2.3)

Q.3.3: Are all areas of your country covered by integrated and biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning, that specifically: [[Link to COP15 reporting template](#): new question; **Relevant to SPMS targets 2.2, 2.3 and 3.2**]

a. Addresses the negative impacts arising from the loss, degradation and fragmentation of important habitats for terrestrial CMS-listed species?

- Fully
- Partially
- Under development
- Not covered

b. Addresses the negative impacts arising from the loss, degradation and fragmentation of important habitats for freshwater CMS-listed species?

- Fully
- Partially
- Under development
- No

c. Addresses the negative impacts arising from the loss, degradation and fragmentation of important habitats for marine CMS-listed species?

- Fully
- Partially
- Under development
- No

4. Threats affecting migratory species and their habitats (SPMS Goal 3: *Threats affecting migratory species are eliminated or significantly reduced.*)

Knowledge of pressures affecting migratory species and their habitats (SPMS Target 4.1)

Q.4.1.1: Do you have good scientific knowledge and understanding of the most important pressures affecting CMS-listed species that occur in your country? [[Link to COP15 reporting template](#): new question, replaces previous question on pressures (Q.X.1); **Informs SPMS Indicator 4.1.2**]

SPMS Indicator 4.1.2: Percentage of Parties confirming that they have identified the most important pressures adversely affecting CMS-listed species in their country, across the full range of relevant taxonomic groups.

For each of the following taxonomic groups, please indicate the level of knowledge:

- Terrestrial mammals (excluding bats)
- Bats
- Aquatic mammals
- Landbirds
- Seabirds
- Waterbirds
- Sharks and rays
- Marine bony fish
- Freshwater fish
- Reptiles
- Insects

Dropdown options for each taxonomic group:

- Comprehensive understanding of threats
- Good, but not comprehensive understanding
- Partial understanding
- Poor understanding
- Work is planned or under way to address knowledge gaps
- Not applicable (species from a given taxonomic group are not present in country)

Please indicate any particular gaps in knowledge for these taxonomic groups: [\[Free text\]](#)

Q.4.1.2: During the reporting period, have you identified any novel, emerging or rapidly intensifying threats that are adversely affecting (or have the potential to adversely affect) CMS-listed species? [\[Link to COP15 reporting template: new question, replaces previous question X.1 on significant negative trends in pressures; Relevant to SPMS Target 4.1\]](#)

- Yes
- No

If 'Yes', please provide further details on the nature of the threat and identify the species or taxonomic groups affected: [\[free text\]](#)

Actions taken to combat specific pressures (SPMS Targets 3.1-3.5)

Q.4.2: a. Does your country have legislation or other domestic measures to address the overexploitation of Appendix II-listed species, including impacts on non-target species and ecosystems? [\[Link to COP15 reporting template: new question; Informs SPMS Indicator 3.1.2\]](#)
SPMS Indicator 3.1.2: Percentage of Parties that have effective measures (legal instruments, other policy frameworks or administrative measures) supported by compliance mechanisms to prevent the overexploitation of CMS Appendix II-listed species, including impacts on non-target species and ecosystems.

Select an option for each group:

- For terrestrial species – Fully / Partially / Under development / No
- For freshwater species – Fully / Partially / Under development / No
- For marine species – Fully / Partially / Under development / No

Please provide further details of the legislation/domestic measures involved. (Parties may, if they wish, indicate any major differences in the coverage of these measures across species groups within each environment): [\[free text\]](#)

If 'Fully' or 'Partially' for any groups of species:

- Are these measures actively supported by mechanisms to increase compliance?
 - Yes
 - No
- Does your country actively monitor the effectiveness of these measures?
 - Yes
 - No

Q.4.3: Are legislation and regulations in your country concerning Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) and Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA) considering possible impacts on migratory species and their habitats? [\[Link to COP15 reporting template: based on Q.VI.5; Informs SPMS Indicator 3.2.2\]](#)

Indicator 3.2.2: Percentage of Parties that have legislation and regulations on Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) and Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA) that considers possible impediments to migration caused by humanmade infrastructure.

- Yes

- Under development
- No

If 'Yes', are potential impediments to migration considered, including transboundary connectivity considerations?

- Yes
- Under development
- No

If 'Yes', do EIAs or SEAs incorporate cumulative effects assessments?

- Yes
- Under development
- No

Please describe any hindrances and challenges to the application of EIAs and SEAs with respect to migratory species, lessons learned, and needs for further capacity development [[free text](#)].

Q.4.4: Does your country have legislation, regulations or policies in place to combat pollution in a way that specifically reduces negative impacts on CMS-listed species? [[Link to COP15 reporting template](#): new question; **Informs SPMS Indicator 3.3.2**]

SPMS Indicator 3.2.3: Percentage of Parties that have measures in place to reduce the negative impacts of pollution on migratory species (across the full range of relevant pollution types).

a. Please provide an answer for each form of pollution a)-e).

Response option	Pollution type					
	a) Poisoning	b) Light	c) Chemical	d) Noise	e) Plastic	f) Other (please specify) [free text]
Fully						
Partially						
Under development						
No						

b. Are the impacts of pollution on CMS-listed species monitored, and are the results used to inform national decision-making?

Response option	Pollution type					
	a) Poisoning	b) Light	c) Chemical	d) Noise	e) Plastic	f) Other (please specify) [free text]
Fully						
Partially						
Under development						
No						

Q.4.5: For which individual CMS-listed species, or groups of CMS-listed species, has your country conducted or supported climate change vulnerability assessments, as called for in Resolution 12.21 (Rev.COP14)? [**Link to COP15 reporting template:** new question; **Informs SPMS Indicator 3.4.2**]

SPMS Indicator 3.4.2: Number of migratory species for which Parties have conducted climate change vulnerability assessments.

Please provide the name of the CMS species or group of species the assessment was relevant to and the scale of assessment: [[free text](#)].

Q.4.6: Does your country have measures in place for eradicating and/or controlling invasive alien species that are affecting, or relevant to, CMS-listed species? [**Link to COP15 reporting template:** new question; **Informs SPMS Indicator 3.5.2**]

SPMS Indicator 3.5.2: Percentage of Parties that have measures in place for eradicating and controlling invasive alien species that are affecting CMS-listed species.

Corresponding KMGBF Monitoring Framework indicator: related to the binary indicator for Target 6 (6.b 'Number of countries adopting relevant regulations, processes and measures to reduce the impact of invasive species') and binary indicator question 6.3 ('Does your country have measures in place for eradicating or controlling invasive alien species?').

- Fully
- Partially
- Under development
- No

If 'Fully' or 'Partially', does your country actively monitor the effectiveness of these measures?

- Yes
- No

5. Knowledge, capacity and resources (SPMS Goal 4: *Implementation of CMS is supported by adequate knowledge, capacity and resources.*)

Population monitoring (SPMS Target 4.1)

Q.5.1.1: Does your country run or participate in any active, systematic population monitoring schemes that collect nationally relevant data for CMS-listed species? [**Link to COP15 reporting template:** new question; **Informs indicator 4.1.1**]

SPMS Indicator 4.1.1: Mean percentage of CMS-listed species covered by active systematic population monitoring schemes providing relevant national-level information, across all Parties.

Corresponding KMGBF Monitoring Framework indicator: the number of species and taxonomic groups covered by systematic population monitoring schemes is suggested as an example of the type of information that could contribute to the assessment of headline indicator 21.1 Indicator on biodiversity information for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (see metadata factsheet for further details).

- Fully (i.e. data are collected for all species for which you are a Range State across the entire country, territory, etc.)
- Partially

- No, under development (there is an intention to establish active, systematic monitoring schemes relevant to CMS-listed species)
- No
- Unknown

If 'Partially', please specify the taxonomic groups to which these schemes apply (select all that apply):

- Terrestrial mammals (excluding bats)
- Bats
- Aquatic mammals
- Landbirds
- Seabirds
- Waterbirds
- Sharks and rays
- Marine bony fish
- Freshwater fish
- Reptiles
- Insects

Technical capacity (SPMS Target 4.2)

Q.5.2.1: In which of the following areas (if any) does your country require additional support in order to build sufficient **technical** capacity to effectively implement the Convention, its Resolutions and Decisions? [[Link to COP15 reporting template](#): modified from Q.XVII.3; **Informs SPMS Indicator 4.2.1**]

SPMS Indicator 4.2.1: Percentage of Parties reporting technical capacity support needs to be addressed.

Monitoring, data and analysis

Please select all that apply:

- Technical support for national and regional monitoring programmes for migratory species
- Access to, and use of, species and habitat data (for example, animal movement data)
- Use of emerging technologies (e.g., sound recording, eDNA, etc.)
- Identification and mapping of critical sites and corridors for migratory species
- Identification and assessment of key threats

Policy Integration and National Implementation

Please select all that apply:

- Strengthening legal and regulatory frameworks for migratory species
- Cross-sectoral coordination and policy integration across biodiversity, climate and development sectors
- Strengthening institutional capacity and governance mechanisms
- Integration of migratory species and connectivity into national planning processes and area-based conservation

Knowledge, innovation and peer learning

Please select all that apply:

- Use of decision-support tools and analytical platforms
- Peer-to-peer technical exchange across flyways, regions and taxonomic groups

- Technical support for CMS National Reporting, including data compilation, analysis and submission
- Integration of CMS priorities into national spatial planning

Access to practical guidance and best practice

- *List of thematic or implementation areas*

Other (please specify): [free text]

No technical assistance required

Resource mobilization (SPMS Target 4.3)

Q.5.3.1: During the reporting period (COP16 to COP17), have overall levels of resourcing (financial or other resources) for conservation activities specifically benefitting CMS-listed species changed? (**Link to COP15 reporting template:** modified from Q.XIX.2; **Informs SPMS Indicator 4.3.2]**

SPMS Indicator 4.3.2: Percentage of Parties reporting an increase or stability in the level of resources mobilized for conservation activities specifically benefitting CMS-listed species, relative to baseline levels.

- Increased
- The same
- Decreased
- Unknown

Please provide further information on the reason for any change: [Free text]

Three additional possible indicators have been proposed to measure progress towards Target 4.3. The IWG could not reach consensus on these additional three indicators, and they have therefore been referred to CMS COP15 for discussion. Two of the three proposed indicators would be informed by new questions in the CMS National Reports, which would need to be developed and agreed.

6. Implementation of CMS, supported by effective governance, scientific knowledge and collaborative working (SPMS Goal 5: Implementation of CMS is supported by effective governance, including use of best available science and information, and collaborative working.)

Legal prohibition of the taking of Appendix I species (SPMS Target 5.1)

Q.6.1.1: Is the taking of Appendix I species prohibited by national or territorial legislation in accordance with CMS Article III(5)? [**Link to COP15 reporting template:** almost identical to current Q.IV.1 – proposed changes underlined below; **Informs SPMS Indicator 5.1.1].**

Indicator 5.1.1: Percentage of Parties that have fully prohibited the taking of all Appendix I-listed species by transposing appropriate legal measures into their domestic legislation, in line with CMS Article III.5.

Article III.5. Parties that are Range States of a migratory species listed in Appendix I shall prohibit the taking of animals belonging to such species. Exceptions may be made to this prohibition only if:

- a) *the taking is for scientific purposes;*
- b) *the taking is for the purpose of enhancing the propagation or survival of the affected species;*
- c) *the taking is to accommodate the needs of traditional subsistence users of such species; or*
- d) *extraordinary circumstances so require;*

provided that such exceptions are precise as to content and limited in space and time. Such taking should not operate to the disadvantage of the species.

- Yes, for all Appendix I species
- Yes, for some species
- Yes, for part of the country, or a particular territory or territories
- No

If 'Yes, for all Appendix I species' is selected, please identify any change in the legal statute(s) concerned that has been introduced since the last reporting: [\[free text\]](#).

If 'Yes, for some species' is selected, please indicate the species for which taking is prohibited. Please also identify the legal statute(s) concerned: [\[free text\]](#).

If 'Yes, for part of the country, or a particular territory or territories' is selected, please indicate the species and parts of the country or particular territory/territories for which taking is prohibited. Please also identify the legal statute(s) concerned: [\[free text\]](#).

Q.6.1.2: Exceptions - Where the taking of Appendix I species **is** prohibited by national legislation, have any exceptions been granted to the prohibition during the reporting period? **[Link to COP15 reporting template:** identical to current Q.IV.2]

This question only appears if the user selects 'Yes, for all Appendix I species' or 'Yes, for some species' in answer to Q.6.1.1.

- Yes
- No

If 'Yes', please indicate individual cases and provide details of the circumstances in the Excel file linked below, including which species this applies to, which reasons (among those in CMS Article III(5) (a)-(d)) justify the exception, any temporal or spatial limitations applying to the exception, and the nature of the "extraordinary circumstances" that made the exception necessary. Please download the list of species, select all that apply and upload the amended file.

Note: Article III(7) of the Convention requires Parties to inform the Secretariat as soon as possible of any exceptions made pursuant to Article III(5).

Q.6.1.3: Where the taking of all Appendix I species is **not** prohibited and the reasons for exceptions in Article III(5) do not apply, are steps being taken to update existing legislation or develop new legislation to prohibit the taking of all relevant species? **[Link to COP15 reporting template:** identical to current Q.IV.3]

This question only appears if 'Yes, for some species' or 'Yes, for part of the country' or 'No' was selected in 'Is the taking of Appendix I species prohibited by national legislation in accordance with CMS Article III(5)?'

- Yes
- No

If 'Yes', please indicate which of the following stages of development applies:

- Legislation being considered
- Legislation in draft
- Legislation fully drafted and being considered for adoption in [insert year]
- Other (please specify) [free text]

If no, please provide further information about the circumstances [free text]

Q.6.1.4: Are any vessels flagged to your country engaged in the intentional taking of Appendix I species outside of your country's national jurisdictional limits (consistent with the definition of "Range State" in Article I of the Convention)? [Link to COP15 reporting template: identical to current Q.IV.3]

- Yes
- No
- Unknown

If yes, please provide information on the circumstances of the taking(s), including, where possible, any future plans in respect of such taking(s) [free text]

Q.6.1.5: Has a review of enforcement of and compliance with national or territorial legislation relevant for the implementation of CMS Article III(5) been conducted? [Link to COP15 reporting template: new question; **Informs SPMS Indicator 5.1.2**]

Indicator 5.1.2: Percentage of Parties reporting a high degree of enforcement of and compliance with the domestic legislation used to implement CMS Article III.5.

- Yes
- No

If 'Yes', what is the assessed level of enforcement and compliance?

- High (full or almost full enforcement and compliance)
- Medium (partial enforcement and compliance)
- Low (low levels of enforcement and compliance)
- Unknown

Q.5.1.6: Has your country adopted legislation or other domestic measures specifically in response to CMS Article III(4) (a) or (b)? [Link to COP15 reporting template: modified from Q.X.2 and Q.XIII.3; **Informs SPMS Indicator 5.1.3**]

SPMS Indicator 5.1.3: Percentage of Parties that have enacted legislation or have implemented other domestic measures to address elements of CMS Article III.4 including, III.4.a) the conservation and restoration of habitats and III.4.b) activities or obstacles that seriously impede or prevent migration.

CMS Article III(4) (a):

- Fully
- Under development
- No

If 'Fully' or 'Under development', please give the title or other reference (and date) for the legislation or measure concerned [[free text](#)]

CMS Article III(4) (b):

- Fully
- Under development
- No

If 'Fully' or 'Under development', please give the title or other reference (and date) for the legislation or measure concerned [[free text](#)]

Article III.4. Parties that are Range States of a migratory species listed in Appendix I shall endeavour:

- a) to conserve and, where feasible and appropriate, restore those habitats of the species which are of importance in removing the species from danger of extinction;*
- b) to prevent, remove, compensate for or minimize, as appropriate, the adverse effects of activities or obstacles that seriously impede or prevent the migration of the species; and*
- c) to the extent feasible and appropriate, to prevent, reduce or control factors that are endangering or are likely to further endanger the species, including strictly controlling the introduction of, or controlling or eliminating, already introduced exotic species.*

Integration of CMS provisions into national planning processes and policies (SPMS Target 5.4)

Q.6.2.1: Does your country's National Biodiversity Strategy or Action Plan (NBSAP) or other relevant national planning processes and policies integrate CMS obligations and/or priorities for the conservation of migratory species and their habitats? [[Link to COP15 reporting template:](#) modified from Q.XVI.1; **Informs SPMS Indicator 5.1.4**]

Indicator 5.4.1: Percentage of Parties that have integrated CMS provisions and/or migratory species into their National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs), or other relevant national planning processes and policies.

- Yes – in NBSAPs
- Yes – in other relevant national planning processes and policies
- Yes – both in NBSAPs and in other national planning processes and policies
- Under development
- No

If 'Yes' (in other national planning processes and policies or both), please specify the processes and policies concerned: [[free text](#)].

Cooperation / collaboration (SPMS Target 5.5)

Q.6.3.1: During the reporting period, has your country participated in the development or implementation of any collaborative actions with other governments, including CMS listing proposals, joint Concerted Actions and/or the development of new CMS agreements? [[Link to COP15 reporting template:](#) modified version of Q.XII.1 and Q.XII.3; **Informs SPMS Indicator 5.5.1**]

Indicator 5.5.1: Percentage of Parties that have collaborated with other governments through joint Concerted Actions, CMS listing proposals and other collaborative actions to implement CMS.

- Yes
- No

If 'Yes', please select all that apply:

- CMS listing proposals
- Concerted Actions
- Development of new CMS Agreements (including MOUs)
- Single- or multi-species action plans
- Other species initiatives

If 'Yes', please indicate which other countries you collaborated with on the above actions [[free text](#)]. Parties could also be asked to specify the species or species group that each collaborative action related to, as well as the name of the action.

7. The profile of CMS and synergies with other relevant international frameworks (SPMS Goal 6: *The profile of CMS and synergies with other relevant international frameworks are enhanced.*)

Awareness raising (SPMS Target 6.1)

Q.7.1: During the reporting period, did your country design or participate in activities that raise awareness of the importance of migratory species and the actions needed to conserve them? [[Link to COP15 reporting template](#): modified version of Q.V.1; **Informs SPMS Indicator 6.1.1**] *Indicator 6.1.1. Number of activities designed to raise awareness of the importance of migratory species and the actions needed to conserve them, that have been conducted, produced or supported by Parties, directed towards: a) general audiences, b) lecturers, teachers or students, c) local communities (including hunters, fishers and farmers) and d) journalists and media professionals.*

If **yes**, please select all activities that apply. For each activity, please indicate the primary audience they were targeted at, and provide data on the number of such activities carried out in the past triennium by audience group.

1 st level: Multiple-choice	2 nd level: single choice (same set of options provided for every answer under level 1)	3 rd level: numeric field (same field offered for every answer selected under level 2)
Campaigns / events on specific topics	Audience types: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General audience • Lecturers, teachers or students • Local communities (including hunters, fishers and farmers) • Journalists and media professionals • Other, please specify 	Please specify the number of activities
Educational outreach		
Press and media coverage		
Social media (as the main activity, rather than supporting another activity, e.g., campaigns or events)		
Publications on specific issues		
Other (please specify) [free text]		
No actions taken	No follow up questions needed	No follow up questions needed

Synergies

Q.7.2.1: Does your country maintain any active (long-standing) formal structures or mechanisms that facilitate coordination among different sectors on biodiversity or environmental matters at

the national or subnational level relevant to CMS implementation? [[Link to COP15 reporting template: modified version of Q.VII.2](#)]

- Yes
- No, but planned
- No. If selected, please provide further information on the challenges / limitations that hinder the establishment of such structures or mechanisms [[free text](#)].

Q.7.2.2: Does your country have established collaboration and coordination between the CMS National Focal Point and the national focal points of other relevant MEAs to ensure coherent and synergistic implementation across conventions? [[Link to COP15 reporting template: modified version of Q.VII.3](#)]

- Yes, collaboration/coordination mechanisms are in place
- Yes, the same individual serves as focal point for multiple MEAs
- No, but under development/planned
- No. If no, please specify the challenges and constraints

Note for guidance: This could include activities such as:

- *Developing national biodiversity working groups to coordinate the work of focal points and ensure coherent national positions across MEAs.*
- *Harmonizing national reporting or knowledge management, for example, by making use of tools such as DaRT.*

8. General summary of national implementation progress and challenges [[Link to COP15 reporting template: modified version of HLS 1-3](#)]

Q.8.1: What have been the five most successful aspects of implementation of the Convention during the reporting period?

- 1) [[free text](#)]
- 2) [[free text](#)]
- 3) [[free text](#)]
- 4) [[free text](#)]
- 5) [[free text](#)]

Q.8.2: What have been the five main challenges in implementing the Convention during the reporting period?

- 1) [[free text](#)]
- 2) [[free text](#)]
- 3) [[free text](#)]
- 4) [[free text](#)]
- 5) [[free text](#)]

Q.8.3: Please describe the five main priorities for implementing the Convention in your country, during the coming triennium.

- 1) [[free text](#)]
- 2) [[free text](#)]
- 3) [[free text](#)]
- 4) [[free text](#)]

- 5) [free text]

Annex 1. Comparison between current and revised templates.

The following table provides an overview of the preliminary recommendations with respect to the existing COP15 National Report template, and whether it is proposed that current questions be **retained** (table rows shaded green), **modified** (blue rows) or **deleted** (red rows). The main consideration informing these recommendations is the aim of improving alignment with the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species (SPMS). Some sections of the current template relate to topics that are no longer explicitly reflected in the SPMS goals and targets, while other questions do not directly inform the proposed SPMS indicators or the core intent of the SPMS. In these cases, changes are proposed to help streamline the template and focus reporting on information that is most relevant for monitoring progress under the SPMS. **N.B.** In addition to the sections that are retained or modified, the following new questions have been added: Q.3.3, Q.4.1.1, Q.4.1.2, Q.4.2, Q.4.4, Q.4.5, Q.4.6, Q.5.1.1, Q.6.1.2.

Table 1. Comparison between the current COP15 reporting template and the recommended changes.

Section of COP15 National Report template	Question number (COP15 template) and brief summary of the topic covered	Preliminary recommendation <i>(if being retained, the new question number is provided in parentheses)</i>
High-level summary of key messages	HLS.1 (Most successful aspects of implementation)	Retain (Q.8.1)
	HLS.2 (Greatest implementation difficulties)	Retain (Q.8.2)
	HLS.3 (Main priorities for future implementation)	Retain (Q.8.3)
I. Administrative information		Retain in modified form (Section 1)
II. Accession/Ratification of CMS Agreements/MOUs		Delete
III. Species on the Convention Appendices		Retain in modified form (Q.3.1)
IV. Legal prohibition of the taking of Appendix I species	IV.1 (Legal prohibition of taking)	Retain (Q.6.1.1)
	IV.2 (Exceptions)	Retain (Q.6.1.2)
	IV.3 (Updates to legislation)	Retain (Q.6.1.3)
	IV.4 (Engagement of flag vessels in intentional taking)	Retain (Q.6.1.4)
V. Awareness	V.1 (Actions taken to increase awareness)	Retain in modified form; informs proposed indicator for SPMS Target 6.1 (Q.6.1)
	V.2 (Free text follow-up to VI.1)	Delete
	V.3 (Impact of awareness actions)	Delete
	V.4 (Evidence used to measure impact)	Delete

Section of COP15 National Report template	Question number (COP15 template) and brief summary of the topic covered	Preliminary recommendation (if being retained, the new question number is provided in parentheses)
VI. Mainstreaming migratory species in other sectors and processes	VI.1 (Mainstreaming in national or local strategies and/or planning processes)	Delete
	VI.2 (Integration of 'values of migratory species' in other national reporting processes)	Delete
	VI.3 (NGO/civil society involvement in migratory species conservation)	Delete
	VI.4 (Private sector involvement in migratory species conservation)	Delete
	VI.5 (Legislation and regulation concerning EIAs and SEAs)	Retain in modified form; informs proposed indicator for SPMS Target 3.2 (Q.4.3)
	VI.6 (Integration of biodiversity and migratory species considerations into national energy and climate policy and legislation)	Delete
VII. Governance, policy and legislative coherence	VII.1 (Improvements from governance arrangements and agreements)	Delete
	VII.2 (Establishment of liaison committees to address CMS implementation issues)	Retain in modified form (Q7.2.1)
	VII.3 (Collaboration between CMS focal points and relevant Conventions)	Retain in modified form (Q.7.2.2)
	VII.4 (Legislation, policies, initiatives or action plans to promote community involvement)	Delete
VIII. Incentives	VIII.1 (Elimination of harmful incentives)	Delete
	VIII.2 (Development of positive incentives)	Delete
IX. Sustainable production and consumption	IX.1 (Implementation of plans/other steps concerning sustainable production)	Delete
X. Threats and pressures affecting migratory species	X.1 (Threats and pressures that are having an adverse impact)	Delete; replace with a less detailed question on pressures that specifically informs SPMS Indicator 4.1.2 (Q.4.1.1)
	X.2 (New legislation or other domestic measures in response to CMS Article III.4.b))	Retain in modified form and combine with XIII.3; informs proposed indicator for SPMS Target 5.1 (Q.6.1.6)
XI. Conservation status of migratory species	XI.1 (Major national-level changes in the conservation status of CMS-listed species)	Retain, but substantially revise; informs proposed indicator for SPMS Target 1.2 (Q.2.1)
XII. Cooperating to conserve migration systems	XII.1 (Participation in the development of proposals for new CMS Agreements, including MOUs)	Retain in modified form, combined with XII.2; informs proposed indicator for SPMS Target 5.5 (Q.6.2.1)
	XII.2 (Actions taken to encourage non-Parties to join CMS and its Agreements)	Delete

Section of COP15 National Report template	Question number (COP15 template) and brief summary of the topic covered	Preliminary recommendation (if being retained, the new question number is provided in parentheses)
	XII.3 (Participation in the implementation of Concerted Actions under CMS)	Retain in modified form, combined with XII.1; informs proposed indicator for SPMS Target 5.5 (Q.6.2.1)
	XII.4 (Steps taken to enhance cooperation in ways that reflect a migration systems approach)	Delete
	XIII.5 (Mobilization of resources/steps taken to address ecological connectivity in relevant international processes)	Delete
XIII. Area-based conservation measures	XIII.1 (Identification of critical habitats for migratory species at the national level)	Retain; informs proposed indicator for SPMS Target 2.1 (Q.3.2)
	XIII.2 (Assessing the contribution of national protected area networks to migratory species conservation)	Delete
	XIII.3 (New legislation or other domestic measures in response to CMS Article III.4.a)).	Retain in modified form, and combine with X.2; informs proposed indicator for SPMS Target 5.1 (Q.6.1.6)
	XIII.4 (Assessments of management effectiveness for protected areas)	Delete
	XIII.5 (Implementation of other effective area-based conservation measures)	Delete
XIV. Ecosystem services	XIV.1 (Assessment of ecosystem services associated with migratory species)	Delete
XV. Safeguarding genetic diversity	XV.1 (Strategies to minimize genetic erosion of biodiversity)	Delete
	XV.2 (Follow-up to XV.1)	Delete
XVI. National biodiversity strategies and action plans	XVI.1 (Do NBSAPs explicitly address obligations under CMS or priorities for migratory species?)	Retain in modified form; informs proposed indicator for SPMS Target 5.4 (Q.6.2.1)
	XVI.2 (Implementation of other relevant action plans, initiatives, task forces and programmes of work not covered in previous questions)	Delete
XVII. Traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities	XVII.1 (Actions taken to foster consideration of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities)	Delete
	XVII.2 (Actions taken to foster effective participation and involvement of indigenous and local communities in migratory species conservation)	Delete
	XVII.3 (Progress in the area of traditional knowledge innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities)	Delete

Section of COP15 National Report template	Question number (COP15 template) and brief summary of the topic covered	Preliminary recommendation <i>(if being retained, the new question number is provided in parentheses)</i>
XVIII. Knowledge, data and capacity-building	XVIII.1 (Actions contributing to the achievement of results in the area of knowledge, data and capacity-building)	Delete
	XVIII.2 (Follow-up to XVIII.1)	Delete
	XVIII.3 (Assistance required to build sufficient capacity to implement obligations under CMS)	Retain in modified form; informs proposed indicator for SPMS Target 4.2 (Q.5.2.1)
XIX. Resource mobilization	XIX.1 (Making financial or other resources available for conservation activities benefitting migratory species)	Delete
	XIX.2 (Receipt of financial or other resources for conservation activities benefitting migratory species)	Retained, with minor modifications; informs proposed indicator for SPMS Target 4.3 (Q.5.3.1)
	XIX.3 (Most important CMS implementation priorities requiring resources and support)	Delete

Annex 2. Summary of feedback received from the Intersessional Working Group (IWG) on the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species and the CMS Secretariat.

The draft revision of the template was sent to members of the IWG on the SPMS on 22 January 2026, with written feedback requested by 13 February 2026. Comments on the draft template were received from Australia and the United Kingdom and circulated to all members of the IWG. Additional feedback was also provided by the CMS Secretariat.

The comments received included a mixture of general observations and specific suggestions. An overview of some of the general themes arising from this initial review is provided below:

- **Reviewers welcomed the overall simplification of the template**, noting that the draft revision addresses a substantial number of the proposed SPMS indicators.
- **Reviewers observed that the revised structure of questions would make it easier for the Secretariat to identify progress**, pointing in particular to the increased use of multiple-choice formats and the introduction of distinctions between taxonomic groups and habitat types (terrestrial, freshwater and marine) within several questions.
- **It was noted that there is currently no explicit question relating to indigenous or local knowledge**, and that a question (Q.XVII.2) from the existing reporting template could be considered for retention to address this.
- **Several reviewers suggested including a final open-ended question**, allowing Parties to provide any additional information on CMS implementation not covered elsewhere in the template (such as actions related to specific Resolutions or Decisions).
- **It was noted that the broad nature of the 'Partially' response option** could limit the ability to identify where key gaps remain, since it may reflect anything from minimal to near-complete progress.
- **Reviewers observed that the question on prohibiting the taking of Appendix I species may not fully capture differences in national legislation**, as some prohibitions do not encompass the full definition of "take" under CMS Article III(5) or may not apply consistently across all relevant jurisdictions.
- **Reporting burden for species-level assessments:** Reviewers noted that it could be challenging for Parties to provide information on the national or regional conservation status of each individual CMS-listed species for which they are a Range State (follow-up to Q.2.1).