



CONVENTION ON MIGRATORY SPECIES

UNEP/CMS/COP15/Report/Rev.2

22 April 2026

Original: English

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

DAILY MEETING REPORT: DAY 5 (27 MARCH 2026)

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE – MORNING

503. On Friday morning, the COW heard reports from the WG Chairs. They then considered several CRPs.

Item 32.1 Report of the Credentials Committee

504. The Chair of the Credentials Committee reported that the Committee did not hold a meeting on Wednesday. Thus far, the Committee has validated a total of 60 credentials.

Item 32.2 Report of the Working Groups

505. The Budget WG Chair reported that WG discussed draft Resolution text on addressing arrears and would continue discussions. The Chair welcomed broader participation in the WG to identify options to support all Parties to make contributions in a timely manner and called for additional ideas on how to address arrears. The WG expected to finalize the budget for this triennium during its afternoon session.

506. The Aquatic WG Chair reported progress on a number of topics, including deep sea mining. He said the discussion on bycatch was nearly concluded and hoped that the WG would complete discussion by the afternoon. The WG also planned to discuss conserving seamount ecosystems, conservation priorities for cetaceans, freshwater fish, and the European eel.

507. The Avian Species WG Chair said the WG finalized documents on the prevention of illegal killing, taking, and trade of migratory birds, the Action Plan for Migratory Landbirds in the African-Eurasian Region, and Conservation of African-Eurasian Vultures, which had already been forwarded to the Plenary for adoption. The WG further discussed the documents on preventing poisoning of migratory birds, Action Plans for Birds, and Internationally Important Raptor Areas, which were sent to the COW for consideration. The Chair said the CRPs on seabirds and marine flyways and the Saker Falcon Global Action Plan were available for review. The Avian WG planned to revisit the document on flyways, following consultations.

508. The Institutional and Cross-cutting WG discussed the guidelines for preparing and assessing proposals for the amendment of CMS Appendices and agreed to finalize discussion on the document following agreement on resource mobilization. The WG also discussed wildlife health and agreed on compromise text, with the exception of one paragraph on resourcing, which was relevant to other agenda items. The WG agreed to park the discussion on wildlife health until after discussion on resource mobilization. The

WG also discussed the SPMS, which was also contingent on the outcomes of the resource mobilization discussion.

Item 28.14 Multiple Systems of Knowledge

509. The COW considered [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP28.14](#), with the EU clarifying retaining the text on “according to national circumstances” was acceptable. They had initially proposed its deletion.
510. A revision was prepared and the COW submitted the document to the Plenary for adoption.

Item 26.2 Preventing Poisoning of Migratory Birds

511. The COW considered document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP26.2](#) and agreed to forward it to the Plenary for adoption.

Item 26.4.1 Action Plans for Birds

512. The COW considered [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP26.4.1](#) and recommended it to the Plenary for adoption.

Item 26.8 Internationally Important Raptor Areas

513. The COW considered and agreed to submit document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP26.8](#) to the Plenary for adoption.

Item 27.1 Joint CITES-CMS African Carnivores Initiative

514. The COW discussed document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP27.1](#).
515. IUCN described its support for the African Carnivores Initiative (ACI) since its inception, with IUCN and CMS signing an MOU to recognize the role the IUCN Save Our Species (SOS) regranting mechanism could play. She noted funding from the EU had helped action on the ground but that the funding had ended. IUCN expressed readiness to channel funding directly to ACI POW priorities, noting a private donor had made a pledge, but that funding had to be matched before the contribution could be unlocked and secured. She explained that the funding opportunity would be lost without matching funds, and called on donors for support.
516. Uganda noted it actively supported the ACI, including through hosting a Joint ACI meeting where several threats were identified.
517. CITES noted the adoption of relevant decisions by its CoP and said the CITES Secretariat would work to help implement the revised ACI POW.
518. The COW submitted the document to the Plenary for adoption.

Item 27.4 Jaguar

519. On document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP27.4](#), UNEP welcomed the Regional Action Plan for Jaguar Conservation and supported the establishment of an Intergovernmental Platform for Jaguar Conservation and said UNEP could facilitate its implementation through the UNEP Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, if appropriate.

In response to a question posed on Thursday, UNEP said, although they lacked the necessary resources for establishing and operating the platform, they could facilitate resource mobilization, including by supporting the efforts of the CITES Standing Committee intersessional group. He highlighted the need for coherent implementation among MEAs, ensuring alignment of mandates, reporting flows, and technical guidance.

520. CITES supported the intersessional WG on this issue, establishing the TOR and modalities for a platform, and identifying potential sources of financing and identifying activities that could be implementing jointly by the POW.
521. Panthera thanked Brazil and Mexico for their efforts on this issue and commended all Range States to reach agreement on the Regional Action Plan. She noted a recent Ibero-America ministerial declaration on the jaguar, noting the jaguar's resilience was threatened by habitat fragmentation and illegal killing.
522. The COW submitted the document to the Plenary for adoption.

Item 28.7 Light Pollution

523. On [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP28.7](#), Brazil proposed "encouraging", rather than "imploing" Parties to manage artificial light so migratory species were not disrupted. The EU said it could accept this amendment.
524. In a paragraph on monitoring new evidence, the Dominican Republic requested reference to the impact of light pollution on marine turtles and their nesting sites on beaches. Senegal supported the proposed amendment.
525. Australia did not support singling out one species as light pollution impacted a range of migratory species. She proposed language on monitoring new evidence on the impacts of light pollution "on migratory species" and approaches to mitigation, "including relevant regulatory approaches". The Dominican Republic accepted this proposed text.
526. The COW Chair explained that the CRP would be revised to include these amendments and submitted to the Plenary for adoption.
527. After considering the CRPs the COW Chair proposed to move on with the items on the agenda.

Item 30.2.14. Proposal for the inclusion of the Scalloped hammerhead shark (*Sphyrna lewini*) on Appendix I of the Convention

- 527bis. Ecuador presented the proposal for the inclusion of the Scalloped hammerhead shark (*Sphyrna lewini*) in Appendix I of the Convention ([UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.30.2.14](#)), highlighting the species' decline and the main threats affecting it. Panama, Brazil, Kenya, the Dominican Republic, the United Kingdom and Saudi Arabia supported the proposal. The Charles Darwin Foundation, speaking on behalf of other organizations, also supported the proposal and highlighted the scientific evidence demonstrating that the requirements for listing the species in Appendix I of the Convention are met. While Peru expressed disagreement with the proposal, it requested, to avoid breaking consensus, that its objection be recorded, thereby enabling the COW to agree on recommending its adoption to the COP.

Item 30.2.6 Proposal for a Concerted Action for the flesh-footed shearwater (*Ardenna carneipes*) on Appendix II of the Convention

528. New Zealand introduced the listing proposal contained in document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.30.2.6](#), noting it had been prepared with Australia and France. Māori tribal authorities were also consulted and provided valuable knowledge about the ecological and cultural importance of this species, including its role as seasonal marker in the annual calendar. New Zealand highlighted several benefits of the listing, which could lead to: increased international cooperation to improve the uptake and effectiveness of seabird bycatch mitigation use in fisheries across the range; improving compliance monitoring and bycatch data collection; and promoting action to reduce threats like marine plastics and light pollution.
529. Australia, a co-proponent, described escalating threats, including climate change, marine pollution, and bycatch that jeopardized the species survival. Australia stressed that the listing would strengthen international cooperation to tackle these threats.
530. Brazil, Panama, the EU, Monaco, Samoa, Senegal, and ACAP supported the proposal. Samoa noted the species migrated across the Pacific and shared ongoing work in Samoa to protect the species, including tackling marine pollution and bycatch.
531. The proposal was submitted to the Plenary for final adoption.

Item 30.2.7. Proposal for the inclusion of the Hudsonian whimbrel (*Numenius phaeopus hudsonicus*) on Appendix I of the Convention

532. Brazil presented the proposal contained in [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.30.2.7](#), which it had prepared with Chile. Brazil explained that the sub-species depended on habitats in more than 30 countries, including 11 CMS Parties. He said threats included disturbance from unregulated recreational activities and vehicle traffic on some beaches, ecological change caused by climate change, exposure to heavy metal contamination, and hunting. Brazil noted the family to which this sub-species belonged was already listed in Appendix II and inclusion in Appendix I would strengthen collective conservation efforts.
533. Chile, a co-proponent, highlighted the Hudsonian whimbrel's vulnerability across its migratory route and noted all threats were transboundary issues that affected resting and breeding areas. She highlighted that the sub-species had experienced a 70% population decline over the past three generations, which justified inclusion in Appendix 1, and called for coordinated action to protect this sub-species.
534. The EU, Mauritania, Panama, Benin, and the Dominican Republic supported the proposal.

Item 30.2.8. Proposal for the inclusion of the Hudsonian godwit (*Limosa Haemastica*) on Appendix 1 of the Convention

535. Chile presented the listing proposal as contained in [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.30.2.8](#), which was submitted by Chile, Brazil, and Peru. Chile hosted wintering sites for the species, which was threatened by loss and degradation of habitat, hunting, climate change affects, and human disturbance.
536. New Zealand welcomed the proposal, explaining it was a range State. He said a tiny handful of the Hudsonian godwit make the world's longest migration from Alaska to New Zealand.

537. Peru, Brazil, Uruguay, Ecuador, the Dominican Republic, the EU, and Saudi Arabia supported the proposal.
538. The proposal was submitted to the Plenary for final adoption.

Item 30.2.9. Proposal for the inclusion of the Lesser yellowlegs (*Tringa flavipes*) on Appendix I of the Convention

539. Uruguay introduced this proposal contained in document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.30.2.9](#) and [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.30.2.9/Add.1](#) ScC *Comments*, noting the species visits 50 territories, including 32 CMS Parties, and had experienced a 60% decline over last three generations, including from farming and agriculture patterns in the species areas. Uruguay supported calling on agriculture ministries and farming representatives to better manage their work. He said existing initiatives, such as the Atlantic Flyway Shorebird Initiative, Pacific Shorebird Conservation Initiative, Americas Shorebird Conservation Strategy 2016, and the Midcontinent Shorebird Conservation Initiative and Road to Recovery, would benefit from this listing, and the ScC-SC had proposed including reference to the initiatives.
540. Peru, Argentina, Bolivia, Panama, the EU, Ecuador, the Dominican Republic, Costa Rica, and Brazil supported the proposal.
541. The COW Chair noted consensus and recommended the proposal to the Plenary for adoption.

Item 30.2.10. Proposal for the inclusion of the Snowy owl (*Bubo scandiacus*) on Appendix II of the Convention

542. Norway introduced [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.30.2.10](#) and [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.30.2.10/Add.1](#), explaining that the snowy owl was the Arctic's most iconic species and faced increasing pressure from climate change, habitat alteration, and declining prey availability. He said monitoring programmes across the Arctic had documented significant fluctuations and, in some regions, declines in snowy owl breeding success, distribution, and population stability. He noted the listing proposal aligned with broader CMS priorities for Arctic species, supported ongoing scientific collaborations already underway among Arctic states, and said the Arctic Council recognized the snowy owl as a vital indicator of ecosystem health.
543. Saudi Arabia, Liberia, Monaco, EU, Panama, and Brazil supported the proposal.
544. The COW submitted the document to Plenary for adoption.

Item 30.2.11. Proposal for the inclusion of the Ibera seedeater (*Sporophila iberensis*) on Appendix II of the Convention

545. Brazil introduced the proposal contained in document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.30.2.11](#), on behalf of Brazil and Argentina. He said the species was only recently described and occurred in Argentina, Paraguay, Bolivia, and Brazil, where there were only occasional records restricted to the state of Mato Grosso do Sul. He said the species was threatened by the unsustainable agricultural practices, further exacerbated by wildfires. He said some of its congeneric species, with which it shares habitat, are included in the MOU on the Conservation of Southern South American Migratory Grassland Birds and their Habitats. He said the inclusion of a species named after Iberá and the Pantanal, during a COP held in the Brazilian Pantanal, could help draw attention to and promote the conservation not only of this species but of all habitats associated with this region.

546. EU, Panama, Uruguay, Bolivia, and Peru supported this listing proposal.

547. The COW submitted the document to the Plenary for adoption.

Item 30.2.12. Proposal for the inclusion of the Pelagic thresher (*Alopias pelagicus*), the Bigeye thresher (*Alopias superciliosus*), and the Common thresher (*Alopias vulpinus*) on Appendix I of the Convention

548. Panama presented the proposal contained in document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.30.2.12](#), noting the three species cross EEZs and areas outside national jurisdictions, have unique biological characteristics, such as slow growth, late maturity, and a low reproductivity rate, and experience unsustainable mortality due to fisheries and bycatch. He observed, despite existing measures in some regional and current listing on Appendix II, fisheries and misidentification continued to present a major threat. He stressed a precautionary approach was necessary and national measures were insufficient, explaining the proposal would prohibit targeted fishing and address threats throughout their range.

549. New Zealand, noting decisions must be based on the best available science, said the criteria for Appendix I listing for the big eye and common threshers had not been met, and decline was happening in some but not all areas. However, he supported the proposal to list the pelagic thresher as it was critically endangered and met the listing criteria. He cautioned against undermining CMS listings, diverting attention away from species that face extinction, and ensuring available resources went to those that need it the most.

550. Peru recognized the importance of addressing the conservation of these species. Following a comprehensive evaluation of the biological, fisheries, and socioeconomic criteria, Peru said he could not support the proposed listing to Appendix I in its current form. He said Peru had made progress in a progressive, evidence-based fisheries management model that integrated conservation and responsible use. He believed such a listing would impose obligations that exceeded what the current framework could absorb without generating severe impacts on the communities dependent on these fisheries.

551. While Peru recognized the biological vulnerability of thresher sharks and did not question the need to strengthen their conservation, he believed that Appendix I was not the appropriate instrument for this. He said Appendix I included limited exceptions inconsistent with the nature of Peruvian fisheries, where the capture of *Alopias spp.* occurred incidentally in multispecies fisheries. He further explained that such fisheries represented the livelihoods for thousands of Peruvian artisanal fishers, and a direct source of protein. He underscored that prohibiting fishing under Appendix I would not eliminate interaction with these species, but rather incentivize discarding and illegal trade, jeopardizing the food security of vulnerable populations. Appendix II, he added, was linked to evidence-based management and the appropriate framework to guarantee both the conservation of the species and the viability of those who depended on them. He emphasized the importance of evaluating the listing proposal in a manner consistent with other applicable international instruments, such as CITES and the measures in force under the IATTC, to avoid conflicting obligations that hinder effective implementation.

552. Peru believed proposals of this scope would benefit from earlier dissemination among Range States to ensure fully informed participation from relevant national sectors. He reaffirmed Peru's commitment to thresher shark conservation and the sustainable use of fishery resources under sound scientific frameworks, and that they would continue to

promote evidence-based approaches that enable conservation without compromising the livelihoods of coastal communities. Therefore, he opposed the proposal and reiterated his call to maintain the species in Appendix II.

553. Chile also opposed the proposal for listing all three species said that adding that listing on Appendix I would require information from all Range States.
554. Following a suggestion from the COW Chair to consider each species separately, Panama said the three species must be considered together, noting difficulties in identification.
555. The EU, Benin, Senegal, Uruguay, Monaco, Paraguay, Ghana, Dominican Republic, and the UK supported the proposal. The Dominican Republic said it had banned the catch and trade of all the species for an undetermined amount of time.
556. WWF supported the proposal, noted difficulties with and limited capacity for species-level identification, and observed the listing would help ensure the three species were no longer overlooked, the addressing of data gaps, and allow populations a chance to recover.
557. The COW Chair asked those opposed to the proposal to reconsider their positions. New Zealand, noting support in the room for the proposal, said they would not stand in the way of consensus. However, she requested that their reservations be recorded, citing the worrying precedence this could set for future listings that did not meet the listing criteria based on limited evidence.
558. Peru and Chile reiterated their objection to this proposal.
559. The Secretariat shared the process for voting. She noted that according to the Rules of Procedure, on voting, a two-thirds majority of affirmatives were required for the proposal to be accepted. The vote had to be requested by a Party or by the Chair of the meeting.
560. Panama requested a roll call vote.
561. The COW Chair, noting the consensus-based nature of the CMS process, asked if Chile, Peru, and Panama could first consult to find a way forward before moving to a vote.
562. Peru reiterated its objection and Panama said it was not ready to negotiate on the proposal.
563. The COW moved forward with a vote. The Secretariat explained that all voting Parties had to have valid credentials, assessed and supported by the Credentials Committee. Those without valid credentials could not vote and those with three or more years in arrears would not be able to vote. She said 60 Parties had valid credentials and 57 could vote, given three Parties with valid credentials were three or more years in arrears.
564. The EU said it would provide vote as a bloc so 27 votes would be counted.
565. The following 49 Parties voted "yes": Australia, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cote D'Ivoire, Eswatini, Ethiopia, the EU as a bloc (27 votes), Ghana, Liberia, Mauritania, Monaco, Montenegro, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Republic of Moldova, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Uganda, the UK, and Uruguay.
566. The following Party voted "no": Peru.

567. The following six Parties abstained: Argentina, Chile, Costa Rica, India, New Zealand, and South Africa.

568. Since a two-thirds majority voted yes, the listing proposal was supported by the COW and advanced to the Plenary for adoption.

Item 30.2.13. Proposal for the inclusion of the Patagonian narrownose smoothound (*Mustelus Schmitti*) on Appendix II of the Convention

569. Brazil introduced its proposal contained in document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.30.2.13](#), explaining that the population declined by more than 80% over the last three generations, driven by overexploitation and incidental catch as well as degradation of coastal habitats. Brazil noted the species was listed on CITES Appendix II at COP20 in 2025, but stressed the need for listing on Appendix I, given current declines. Brazil thanked countries for providing additional information, saying it would be submitted as an information document.

570. Uruguay, as a Range State, supported the proposal and thanked Brazil for including their comments in the information document. Panama and Senegal also supported the proposal, with Panama noting the species was endangered throughout the world due to fishing in its range areas.

571. WCS, on behalf of Divers for Sharks and other NGOs, supported the proposal, stressing the critically endangered status of the species.

572. The Committee recommended submission of the proposal directly to the COP for final adoption.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE – AFTERNOON

The afternoon began with consideration of CRPs, followed by continuing with consideration of agenda items.

Item 15. SPMS 2024-2032

573. The COW considered [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP15](#).

574. Brazil recommended discussing the CRP after the resolution on Item 14.3 on resource mobilization.

575. The COW agreed to postpone discussion on the CRP.

Item 20. Development of the next Report on the State of the World's Migratory Species

576. The COW reviewed document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP20.1](#).

577. As there were no requests for the floor, the COW agreed to submit the document to the Plenary for adoption.

Item 25.2.1 Marine Pollution

578. The Chair invited consideration of document [UNEP/CMS/COP15.CRP 25.2.1](#).

579. As there were no requests for the floor, the COW agreed to submit the document to the Plenary for adoption.

Item 25.2.2. Underwater Noise

580. The COW Chair invited discussion on [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP 25.2.2](#).
581. Chile could not support the draft Decision with its current language on military activities. She said 15.BB b) was not acceptable as formulated and could generate ambiguity on relevant regulatory frameworks.
582. Norway supported Chile's position and did not accept language in 15.AA b) on "research, development, and commercialization of equipment for the detection of underwater targets, targets on the sea surface, or detonation of UXOs that reduces the impacts to migratory species and their habitats". Brazil supported Norway and said Brazil could also propose compromise text or would support deletion of the relevant text.
583. The EU appreciated the proposal to review the guidelines developed by Australia before assessing whether peer review was necessary. The EU also proposed compromise text to "encourage research and develop capacity to reduce the impact of the detection of underwater targets, targets on the sea surface, and detonation of UXOs on migratory species and their habitats".
584. Norway did not support the EU's proposal.
585. The COW Chair encouraged Parties to find a solution and said the COW would return to the issue.

Item 25.2.3 Deep Sea Mining

586. The COW considered document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP25.2.3](#). Chile considered that UNCLOS addressed and was responsible for deep sea mining through the ISA. She stressed the need for sufficient scientific evidence before undertaking activities and inclusion of the precautionary approach.
587. Brazil, supported by New Zealand and the UK, did not support inclusion of the precautionary approach in this instance, noting it was already captured in Resolution 14.6. Chile accepted that it did not also need to be referenced here.
588. The Netherlands thanked Germany for its pragmatic approach to the document and supported the document without any changes.
589. The COW submitted the CRP to the Plenary for final adoption.

Item 25.6.3 Sharks and Rays

590. As there were no comments on document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP25.6.3](#), the COW agreed to submit the CRP to the Plenary for adoption.

Item 26.3.2 Seabird and Marine Flyways

591. As there were no comments on [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP26.3.2](#), the COW agreed to submit the CRP to the Plenary for adoption.

Item 26.7 Saker Falcon Global Action Plan

592. As there were no comments on document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP26.7](#), the COW agreed to submit the CRP to the Plenary for adoption.

Item 28.9 Cumulative Effects Assessment

593. As there were no comments on document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP28.9](#), the COW agreed to submit the CRP to the Plenary for adoption.

Item 28.10 Infrastructure

594. The COP considered [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP28.10/Rev.1](#) and agreed to send the CRP to the Plenary for final adoption.

Item 28.12 Climate Change

595. The COW considered [UNEP/CMS/COP/CRP28.12/Rev.1](#).

596. The EU proposed deleting the reference to sustainable use from Annex 2, noting that while appreciating the merit of sustainable use, they did not see an explicit relation to climate change. The EU said it was more relevant for consideration under Item 28.4 *Communities and Livelihoods*. The UK supported the EU, noting it was not appropriate in this context and sustainable use was not an appropriate strategy to support climate-induced range shifts.

597. Brazil underscored the importance of sustainable use for climate change and migratory species, noting that some climate change adaptation measures were considered sustainable use. However, in the spirit of compromise, they withdrew their proposal.

598. The COW submitted the revised CRP to the Plenary for adoption.

Item 28.13 Conservation Implications of Animal Culture and Social Complexity

599. The COW reviewed [UNEP/CMS/COP/CRP28.13/Rev.1](#) and submitted it to the Plenary for adoption.

Item 30.2.15 Proposal for the inclusion of the Great hammerhead shark (*Sphyrna mokarran*) on Appendix I of the Convention

600. Ecuador introduced the proposal contained in [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.30.2.15](#), noting that the species was headed toward global extinction and listing on Appendix I would send a unified and urgent message to support its conservation.

601. Peru appreciated the presentation by Ecuador and shared its concern for the state of the species. However, he opposed the proposal, questioning whether listing would achieve the desired results. He could not support it based on the biological criteria, noting insufficient global data, and said listing on Appendix I would have a negative impact on fisheries communities. Peru said a proposal of this scope required prior discussion among Range States.

602. Panama supported the proposal and appealed to Parties to remain consistent in talking about conservation, stressing there was clear evidence of the great hammerhead shark's global decline.

603. The EU, Brazil, the Dominican Republic, Senegal, Monaco, Norway, Kenya, Liberia, Samoa, Fiji, Bangladesh, and the Humpback Whale Institute, also on behalf of Divers for Sharks, supported the proposal.

604. Peru noted its position was grounded in a holistic approach, based on scientific evidence with biological criteria and social aspects. He did not support the proposal but said he would not block consensus.
605. The COW accepted the listing proposal and agreed to submit it to the Plenary for adoption.

Item 30.2.16 Proposal for the inclusion of the Angular Angelshark (*Squatina Guggenheim*) on Appendix II of the Convention

606. Brazil introduced the proposal contained in [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.30.2.16](#), noting that Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay developed the proposal as the three Range States and reporting a severe decline in the species. At the same time, the Range States agreed on the need to strengthen scientific knowledge on its dynamic status and that this knowledge could be used to strengthen transboundary cooperation, enable knowledge generation, strengthen capacity, and consolidate joint management measures. Brazil said the Range States would cooperate to strengthen these gaps through a GEF project, with the aim of presenting concrete progress in advance of COP16, to strengthen the proposal. He therefore withdrew the proposal for inclusion of the angular angelshark on Appendix II of the Convention.
607. The COW Chair confirmed withdrawal of the proposal.

Item 30.2.17 Proposal for the inclusion of the Spotted sorubim (*Pseudoplatystoma corruscans*) on Appendix II of the Convention

608. Brazil introduced the proposal contained in [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.30.2.17](#), stressing the significant population decline. He observed that protective measures had not been sufficient to ensure the species survival and believed listing on Appendix II would support the species conservation, facilitate access to international funding, enhance the exchange of scientific data, and support alignment among Range States.
609. Ecuador, the EU, Peru, Paraguay, Uruguay, Panama, Senegal, and WCS supported the proposal.
610. The COW Chair confirmed the proposal would be submitted to Plenary.

Item 30.2.4 Proposal for the removal of the Bukhara deer (*Cervus elaphus yarkandensis*) from Appendix I of the Convention

611. On [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.30.2.4](#), Uzbekistan thanked Parties for the constructive discussion and valuable feedback over the last days and said it would consider their comments. She mentioned that a multi-stakeholder workshop would be convened in Uzbekistan and thanked the Government of Germany for its financial support. She informed Parties that the workshop would include field visits. She said considering all the feedback, Uzbekistan was withdrawing its proposal.
612. The EU expressed its gratitude to Uzbekistan and looked forward to working with Uzbekistan in the future.

VI. INTERPRETATION AND REPORTING ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION

Item 22. National Reports

613. The Secretariat introduced [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.22](#) and [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Inf.22 Recommendations for Revising the CMS National Report Template](#), noting the revised template was intended to align with the SPMS. She noted that StC58 would establish a WG to further contribute to the development of the template by the Secretariat for consideration and adoption by StC59. UNEP-WCMC provided an analysis of National Reports, based on reports from 59 Parties submitted by the reporting deadline, and highlighted broad themes from these reports, including key successes and challenges.
614. Brazil said it was committed to reporting and supported the simplification and streamlining of the reporting framework, saying that information currently required, including in Annexes 3 and 4, should be incorporated into the national reporting template. On 15.AA, he suggested adding text on ensuring that any information requested under existing Resolutions be appropriately integrated and consolidated within the national report templates to avoid duplication of reporting requirements, and that the report requests would be, as far as possible, addressed through the National Reports Mechanism.
615. Parties agreed to this suggestion and the COW Chair said the Secretariat would prepare a CRP and submit it to the Plenary for adoption.

VIII. APPENDICES AND CONCERTED ACTIONS

Item 31. Concerted Actions

Item 31.2. Progress in the Implementation of Concerted Actions

616. The Secretariat introduced [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.31.2. Progress in the Implementation of Concerted Actions](#). The COW noted the report.

Item 31.2.1. Report on the implementation of the Concerted Action for Chimpanzee (*Pan troglodytes*) behavioural diversity and cultures

617. The IUCN SSC PSG SGA Working Group on Chimpanzee Cultures (WGCC) introduced the report contained in [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.31.2.1](#) and reviewed actions undertaken through the Concerted Action. She explained that the WGCC was appointed as the Steering Committee for the Concerted Action, and that WGs were established to focus on the specific activities outlined in the proposal. They were recommending that the Concerted action be renewed.

Item 31.2.2. Report on the implementation of the Concerted Action for the Straw-colored fruit bat (*Eidolon helvum*)

618. Uganda introduced the report contained in [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.31.2.2](#), which was submitted by Bat Conservation International and Max Planck Institute of Animal Behavior.
619. Ethiopia noted the benefits provided by straw-colored fruit bat and commended Uganda for taking the initiative for this proposal. He said the implementation report could have been presented in a more informative manner and the actions elaborated.
620. The COW took note of the report.

Item 31.2.3. Report on the implementation of the Concerted Action for the Pallas's cat (*Felis manul*)

621. The Association for the Conservation of Biodiversity in Kazakhstan presented the report contained in [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.31.2.3](#) (ACBK). The activities were considered complete, the species had been officially recognized under CAMI, and a proposal for continuing or renewing the Concerted Action would be considered ahead of COP16. He also mentioned a monitoring network for conservation across Kazakhstan and Mongolia.
622. The COW took note of the report.

Item 31.2.4. Report on the implementation of the Concerted Action for the Eurasian lynx (*Lynx lynx*)

623. North Macedonia introduced the implementation contained in [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.31.2.4](#), noting the Concerted Action would be implemented and finalized in the next implementation period.
624. The EU recognized that challenges in the process led to delays, preventing completion of the Concerted Action and said they would support continuation of the Concerted Action. However, they urged the Range States and relevant stakeholders to resolve any complications in order to achieve the required results.
625. The COW noted the report.

Item 31.2.5 Report on the implementation of the Concerted Action for the Giraffe (*Giraffa camelopardalis*)

626. The Giraffe Conservation Foundation (GCF) presented document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.31.2.5](#), which proposed that the Concerted Action be closed and/or amended in line with the new four species taxonomy for giraffe as recently published by the IUCN SSC Giraffe and Okapi Taxonomy Taskforce.
627. Ethiopia thanked the GCF for its support in developing the Ethiopian Giraffe Conservation Action Plan.

Item 31.2.6 Report on the implementation of the Concerted Action for Humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) of the Arabian Sea

628. The Secretariat introduced the report contained in [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.31.2.6](#), which was prepared by the Arabian Sea Whale Network. The Secretariat highlighted progress and noted the development of a regional conservation management plan (CMP) for the Arabian Sea humpback whale, which was developed with all Range States as a Joint CMP between the IWC and CMS. Following adoption of the CMP by COP 15, the IWC in 2026, and the CMS StC in 2027, the Concerted Action would be closed and Parties would focus on the adopted CMP.
629. IWC commended progress and offered to support work towards the Joint CMP.
630. AWI welcomed meaningful progress for the humpback whale, noting it was one of the most endangered populations in the world.
631. The COW noted the report.

Item 31.2.7. Report on the implementation of the Concerted Action for the Sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*) of the Eastern Tropical Pacific

632. The Secretariat introduced the report in [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc 31.2.7](#), noting advances in understanding sperm whale social structure and culture and expansion in acoustic monitoring.

633. The COW noted the report.

Item 31.2.8. Report on the implementation of the Concerted Action for the Franciscana dolphin (*Pontoporia blainvillei*)

634. Uruguay, on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay, introduced the report contained in [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc31.2.8](#), underscoring the alarming levels of bycatch and budget limitations. Uruguay urged Parties to continue supporting regional technical work and working with other fora such as the IWC and regional fisheries organizations.

635. The UK welcomed progress and appreciated synergies between the Concerted Actions and the work of the IWC. Panama echoed the UK and congratulated the proponents for progress made.

636. The COW noted the report.

Item 31.2.9. Report on the implementation of the Concerted Action for the Antipodean albatross (*Diomedea antipodensis*)

637. New Zealand, on behalf of Australia and Chile, introduced the report in [UNEP/CMS/COP15.Doc.31.2.9](#), noting good progress on fisheries management and research actions and increased use of satellite tracking tools to determine overlap with high seas fisheries.

638. SPREP thanked the proponents, noting SPREP had worked with Pacific Island countries on mitigation measures for Antipodean albatrosses in fisheries. ACAP commended the progress made.

639. The COW noted the report.

Item 31.2.11. Report on the implementation of the Concerted Action for the Common guitarfish (*Rhinobatos rhinobatos*) and the Bottlenose wedgefish (*Rhynchobatus australiae*)

640. The IUCN Shark Specialist Group introduced document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.31.2.11](#), highlighting significant progress in the scientific and technical foundation for the conservation of the species. International management of trade had been strengthened, with all species listed on Appendix II of CITES and a zero-export quota established. Work was also underway with the Sharks MOU and the Group anticipated all remaining work could be completed under the MOU. Therefore, they recommended closing the Concerted Action.

641. The COW approved closing the Concerted Action.

Item 31.2.10. Report on the implementation of the Concerted Action for the Blue shark

642. The Marine Research and Conservation Foundation (MARECO) presented document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.31.2.10](#), noting progress made in the identification of

important shark and ray areas to improve understanding of critical habitats and engagement with the tourism sector. Despite progress, MARECO said the blue shark was one of the most exploited species, with continued decline, and proposed an updated Concerted Action that aimed to build momentum and scale up efforts in key areas.

643. The COW noted the report.

Item 31.3. Proposals for Concerted Actions for the Triennium 2026-2029

644. The Secretariat introduced document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.31.3./Rev.1.](#)

645. The COW then proceeded with the discussion of specific proposals.

Item 31.3.1. Proposal for a Concerted Action for Chimpanzee (*Pan troglodytes*) behavioural diversity and cultures already listed on Appendix I and II of the Convention.

646. IUCN presented the proposal as contained in [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.31.3.1.](#), noting discussion took place in the Terrestrial WG.

647. Senegal, as a Range State for the chimpanzee, supported the Concerted Action and called for the financial and technical means to be made available to implement the work of the Concerted Action.

648. The COW approved the proposal and forwarded it to the Plenary for adoption

Item 31.3.2 Proposal for Concerted Action for the Straw-colored fruit bat (*Eidolon helvum*)

649. Uganda presented the proposal contained in [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.31.3.2.](#)

650. The EU welcomed efforts made in awareness raising surrounding bats in general and questioned why such efforts were not planned to continue. The EU requested more information on linking bat conservation with citizen science and ecotourism. The EU supported approval of the Concerted Action but encouraged Parties to reconsider the discontinuation of the awareness-raising measures and instead encouraged them to strengthen these efforts in the Concerted Action.

651. The COW approved the proposal and forwarded it to the Plenary for adoption.

Item 31.3.3 Proposal for a Concerted Action for the Eurasian lynx (*Lynx lynx*)

652. North Macedonia introduced the proposal contained in [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc31.3.3.](#), noting several activities were underway, including the development of guidelines on the lynx, which would be ready by spring 2027, and baseline surveys on the conservation status of the two Asian sub-species. North Macedonia said the Concerted Action would continue to be implemented and no change in approach was needed.

653. The EU supported the proposal, noting it was both a keystone and flagship species, and questioned whether the proponents intended to ensure the outcomes of activities were translated into action.

654. The COW approved the proposal and forwarded it to the Plenary for adoption.

31.3.4 Proposal for a Concerted Action for the Striped hyena proposed for listing on Appendix I and II.

655. Uzbekistan introduced the proposal contained in [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.31.3.4](#), noting discussion took place in the Terrestrial WG. She said the proposal proceeded under the assumption that the striped hyena would be included on Appendices I and II.

656. The COW approved the proposal and recommended that the COP adopt it.

Item 31.3.5. Proposal for a Concerted Action for the Masai giraffe (*Giraffa tippelskirchi*) Northern giraffe (*Giraffa camelopardalis*), Reticulated giraffe (*Giraffa reticulata*) and Southern giraffe (*Giraffa giraffa*)

657. Ethiopia introduced the proposal in document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.31.3.5](#), noting it was a renewal of the previous Concerted Action, which was originally developed by Cameroon, Chad, Ethiopia, Kenya, Niger, Tanzania, and Zimbabwe. Ethiopia observed that some Range States expressed concern during the discussion in the Terrestrial WG and emphasized Ethiopia viewed the Action as a matter of coordinated action across Range States to conserve the species globally regardless of their status at the national level.

658. Senegal and Kenya supported the proposal.

659. South Africa proposed several amendments to reflect its unique position in giraffe conservation, noting it did not share the same challenges as other Range States.

660. The Secretariat confirmed that these amendments would be reflected in an updated CRP.

661. Zimbabwe supported South Africa, noting there were inaccuracies, and proposed sending comments in writing to correct the CRP.

662. The COW Chair asked the Secretariat to prepare a revised CRP, taking into account amendments by South Africa.