



## CONVENTION ON MIGRATORY SPECIES

UNEP/CMS/COP15/Report/Rev.1

13 April 2026

Original: English

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

### DAILY MEETING REPORT: DAY 6 (28 MARCH 2026)

#### COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE – MORNING

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

#### Item 32.2 Report of the Working Groups

664. The Budget WG Chair reported that WG had successfully concluded their work.

665. The Aquatic WG Chair reported the Group finished all remaining items, including CRPs on seamount ecosystems, conservation priorities for cetaceans, freshwater fish, and the European Eel. He confirmed the CRPs were ready for consideration in the COW.

666. The Avian Species WG Chair said the WG had concluded its work and CRPs had been prepared for all avian species conservation issues. The Chair said all CRPs had been recommended to the COW, except [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP26.3.1](#) on flyways, which was on the agenda today.

667. The Institutional and Cross-cutting WG Chair said the Group had agreed on resource mobilization and finalized [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP14.3/Rev.1](#), noting the document had implications for the Decisions on wildlife health and the SPMS.

#### Item 25.1.1 Bycatch and Other Fisheries-induced Mortality

668. The COW considered document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP25.1.1](#), noting two bracketed text options in paragraph 15.

669. Brazil preferred maintaining the second set of brackets to “further encourage Parties to utilize the Global Biodiversity Framework Fund (GBFF) under the GEF in providing financial and technical support to the implementation of this Resolution”, noting this action was in line with the WG discussions. The EU and the UK said they agree.

670. The COW Chair explained that the CRP would be updated to reflect this agreement and submitted to the Plenary for adoption.

#### Item 25.2.2 Underwater Noise

671. The COW discussed [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP25.2.2](#) on underwater noise.

672. Norway, supported by Brazil and Chile, requested deletion of paragraph 15AA b) on research development, and commercialization of equipment for the detection of underwater targets, targets on the sea surface, or detonation of UXOs. Brazil and Chile supported its deletion.

673. The COW Chair explained that the CRP would be revised to include this amendment and submitted to the Plenary for adoption.

#### **Item 25.3.1 Priorities for Area-based Conservation of Marine Migratory Species**

674. The COW considered [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP25.3.1](#).

675. The COP-appointed Councillor for Marine Fish requested updated language in paragraph 2 to reflect the change in species status since the document was drafted, explaining that five of the marine turtles were globally listed as vulnerable, endangered, or critically endangered and two are categorized as least concerned and data deficient. Australia supported the proposal.

676. IUCN proposed adding reference to marine in paragraph 15 on ecologically or biologically significant “marine” areas. Ecuador supported the proposal.

677. The COW Chair explained that the CRP would be revised to include these amendments and submitted to the Plenary for adoption.

#### **Item 25.3.2 Vessel Strikes**

678. The COW considered document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP25.3.2](#) and submitted the CRP to the Plenary for final adoption.

#### **Item 28.1 Illegal and Unsustainable Taking of Migratory Species**

679. The COW considered document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP28.1/Rev.1](#).

680. In paragraph 16, on urging Parties and relevant funding to provide adequate, predictable, and timely financial support for implementing the provisions of this Resolution, the EU preferred “encourages” rather than “urges”.

681. Brazil opposed the EU’s proposal.

682. The COW Chair encouraged Parties to find a solution and said the COW would return to the issue. Following informal consultations, the EU accepted the use of “urges” in the document

683. The COW Chair submitted the document to the Plenary for adoption.

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

684. The COW considered document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP28.5](#).

685. Brazil requested deletion of bracketed text in paragraph 16 that requested the Secretariat to facilitate resource mobilization, noting the issue had been covered in the Decision on resource mobilization. The EU supported this deletion.

686. In the eighth preambular paragraph, the EU opposed reference to “recognizing that the sustainable management and prevention of such forms of animal farming is highly desirable to achieve One Health objectives”. The EU requested reference to “phasing out” rather than “sustainable management and prevention”.
687. The EU also expressed concern on paragraph 14 on funding needs, arguing that the Decision on resource mobilization would take a step forward on fundraising.
688. Brazil encouraged adoption of the document, noting discussion in the WG.
689. The EU requested more time to consider the document and, following informal consultations, said it could agree to support adoption of the document.
690. The COW Chair submitted the document to the Plenary for adoption.

### **Item 28.8 Insect Decline**

691. The COW considered document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP28.8](#).
692. The UK noted the document still contained bracketed text. The Secretariat clarified that Parties should provide guidance on what text to retain.
693. Brazil preferred a general reference to all principles of the Rio Declaration and opposed singling out individual Rio Principles. He said, if the EU wished to retain Principle 15 on the precautionary approach, then Brazil would ask that that Rio Principle 7 on CBDR be referenced elsewhere including in the document on resource mobilization. Brazil stressed insect decline as a key issue that demonstrated the interlinkages among all dimensions of sustainable development.
694. As a compromise, the EU said it could agree to delete the specific reference to Principle 15 in the preambular paragraph but maintain it in the operative text.
695. The UK suggested deleting both references to the Rio Principle, which Australia and Norway supported.
696. Following consultations, the EU said it could agree to include a general reference to the Rio Declaration in the preambular paragraph in the document on resource mobilization. Brazil pointed out this action would require re-opening the document on resource mobilization, which Ecuador and Chile supported.
697. Australia, Norway, and Monaco opposed reopening the text on resource mobilization.
698. Brazil sought clarification on the rules of procedure to reopen a document. The Secretariat read Rule 17 on motions to open and reopen.
699. Brazil asked if Parties, in principle, would support adding a reference to the Rio Declaration in the Decision on resource mobilization, in order to understand whether prior objection was procedural or substantive.
700. The UK proposed and Australia supported deleting the two references to the Rio Principle and the Rio Declaration.

701. Brazil observed that not all Parties agreed on reaffirming the Rio Declaration in the document, and expressed disappointment, and said his country would work during the intersessional period to prepare a document on migratory species and sustainable development for discussion at CMS COP 16. He agreed to the deletion of references to the Rio Principle and the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development.
702. The COW agreed to the deletions proposed by the UK and the Chair confirmed the Secretariat would update the document for approval by the Plenary.

#### **Item 26.3.1 Flyways**

703. The COW discussed [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP26.3.1](#).
704. Ecuador thanked Parties for the work undertaken in the Avian WG and highlighted on 15.BB in the draft Decision on Americas Flyways to develop a new CMS initiative for the America Flyways to be presented at COP16, which he said would help coordinate and facilitate implementation of the Americas Flyways Framework and Action Plan. He hoped this initiative would be adopted at COP16, and invited all Parties of Americas Range States to protect vultures and other migratory birds.
705. The COW agreed to send the CRP to the COP for final adoption.

#### **Item 28.3 Transfrontier Conservation Areas**

706. The COW considered [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP28.3](#) and submitted it to the COP for final adoption.

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

707. The COW considered [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP28.11/Rev.1](#).
708. The EU supported urging, instead of encouraging, Parties and non-Parties to implement the voluntary guidelines. However, Brazil supported retaining “encourage”. Following informal consultations on this and on 28.1 (illegal and unsustainable taking of Migratory Species take), Brazil said it could accept urge in this context if the EU accepted “urge” in 28.1 in the paragraph on Parties and relevant funding agencies providing adequate, predictable and timely financial support.
709. Brazil and the EU agreed to this compromise, and the COW submitted the document to the COP for final adoption.
- 709bis. The UK supported the EUs earlier intervention, to amend the language in operative paragraph 3 (c)

#### **Item 30.1 Guidelines for preparing and assessing Proposals for the Amendment of CMS Appendices**

710. The COW considered [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP30.1](#) and agreed to send it to the COP for adoption.

### **Item 25.3.3 Conserving Seamount Ecosystems**

711. The COW considered [UNEP/CMS/COP/CRP25.3.3](#) and agreed to send it to the COP for final adoption.

### **Item 25.4.1 Conservation Priorities for Cetaceans**

712. The COW reviewed [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP25.4.1](#) and sent it to the Plenary for adoption

### **Item 25.6.1 Freshwater Fish**

713. As there were no comments on [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP25.6.1](#), the COW forwarded it to the COP for adoption.

### **Item 25.6.2 European Eel**

714. The COW turned to [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP25.6.2](#) and submitted it to the Plenary for adoption.

### **Item 29.4 Species that meet the Criteria for Listing on CMS Appendices**

715. The COW considered [UNEP/CMS/COP/15/CRP29.4](#) and forwarded it to the COP for final adoption.

### **Item 14.3 Resource Mobilization**

716. On [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP14.3](#), the UK noted it could accept and advance the CRP on the understanding that brackets in 15 on the SPMS and 28.5 on insect decline would be removed and the text deleted.

717. The COW agreed to send the document to the Plenary for adoption.

### **Item 15. Samarkand SPMS 2024-2032**

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

719. Brazil requested the bracketed text in the document be deleted.

720. South Africa commended the spirit of cooperation.

721. The COW agreed with Brazil's intervention and the Chair said the Secretariat would send a revised CRP to the Plenary for adoption.

### **Item 31.3.5 Proposal for a Concerted Action for the giraffe**

#### **CRP31.3.5/Rev.1**

722. The COW considered [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP31.3.5/Rev.1](#).

723. With minor amendments from Kenya and South Africa, the COW accepted the Concerted Action and said the Chair said a CRP would be sent the COP for final adoption.

## **Item 14.2 Budget 2027-2029 and Programme of Work for the intersessional period between COP15 and COP16**

724. With respect to UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP14.2, Ms Amy Fraenkel, CMS Executive Secretary, said that the Annex on the POW was still being updated and would be addressed in the afternoon.
725. Brazil suggested returning to the issues on Sunday morning instead. The COW agreed to this proposal.

## **VIII. APPENDICES AND CONCERTED ACTIONS**

### **Item 31. Concerted Actions**

#### **Item 31.3.6. Proposal for a Concerted Action for the Sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*) of the Eastern Tropical Pacific already listed on Appendix I and II of the Convention**

726. The Secretariat introduced document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.31.3.6](#), on behalf of Red Cachalotes del Pacifico, and proposed the continuation of the Concerted Action. She highlighted the need for financial support across Range States.
727. OceanCare support continuing the Concerted Action, noting threats from vessel strikes, underwater noise, and marine pollution.
728. The COW accepted the proposal and forwarded it to the Plenary for adoption

#### **Item 31.3.7. Proposal for a Concerted Action for the Franciscana dolphin (*Pontoporia blainvillei*)**

729. Uruguay introduced the proposal contained in [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.31.3.7](#), which it had prepared with Argentina and Brazil. They recommended renewing the Concerted Action.
730. The Animal Welfare Institute, Fundación Cethus, Humane World for Animals, Pro Wildlife, the Brazilian Humpback Whale Institute, the Brazilian Institute for Nature Conservation, and IFAW noted this species was the smallest dolphin in the world and faced significant anthropogenic pressures. She noted remaining work to be done, including attaining new abundance estimates within Argentina, conducting conservation status assessments for franciscana management areas as well as MPA-related assessments, and implementing actions to mitigate threats, particularly incidental mortality in fisheries and bycatch. She encouraged cooperation of the three governments and other stakeholders, and noted that the IWC-endorsed Franciscana conservation management plan was a model for regional collaboration.
731. Dominican Republic supported the proposal.
732. Brazil said it was proud to be co-cosponsor of the proposal.
733. IWC observed the Concerted Action complemented the IWC management plan for this species and said that the stressed its Scientific Committee would undertake a comprehensive assessment on the species and share its results.
734. The COW approved the proposal and forwarded it to the Plenary for adoption.

**Item 31.3.8. Proposal for a Concerted Action for the Lahille bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus gephyreus*) already listed on Appendix I and II of the Convention**

735. Uruguay, on behalf of Brazil, Argentina, and Uruguay, presented the proposal contained in [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.31.3.8](#).
736. Uruguay said the proposal was based on shared responsibility, noting only three countries harbored this population and calling for prevention before restoration, saying small populations could not tolerate high levels of additional mortality. She highlighted ongoing collaboration between the IWC, CMS, Range States, and other relevant stakeholders to ensure the IWC Conservation Management Plan for the Lahille dolphin and the CMS-proposed Concerted Action operate in a fully complementary and harmonized manner, avoiding duplication and maximizing the effectiveness of subspecies conservation.
737. Brazil reaffirmed its commitment to a collaborative approach with Range States. He explained that Brazil would submit proposals for new Concerted Actions at COP16 for the Amazon river dolphin and the Guiana dolphin. He also noted efforts of the Brazilian Presidency to increase CMS membership, particularly of non-Party Amazonian countries.
738. The Animal Welfare Institute, Fundación Cethus, Humane World for Animals, Pro Wildlife, and others, noted habitat degradation and pollution throughout the species' restricted range. They urged Range States to strengthen cooperation with CMS and IWC, develop a regional action plan, and provide the necessary technical and financial support for implementation.
739. IWC highlighted collaboration between CMS and IWC, noting the Concerted Action would also benefit the Franciscana dolphin.
740. WWF supported for Brazil's plan to table a Concerted Action at COP16 on the Amazon river dolphin.
741. The COW approved the proposal and forwarded it to the Plenary for adoption.

**Item 31.3.9 Proposal for a Concerted Action for the Antipodean albatross (*Diomedea antipodensis*) already listed on Appendix I of the Convention**

742. New Zealand presented the Concerted Action document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.31.3.9](#), which it prepared with Australia and Chile. New Zealand noted the proposal aimed to address fisheries bycatch in the high seas and to progress management of breeding sites.
743. SPREP supported the proposal and shared plans to work with members on port-based outreach activities to improve mitigation actions on fishing vessels. ACAP also supported the proposal.
744. The COW accepted the proposal.

**Item 31.3.10 Proposal for a Concerted Action for the flesh-footed shearwater (*Ardenna carneipes*) proposed for listing on Appendix II of the Convention**

745. New Zealand presented the document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP31.3.10](#), which it prepared with Australia.
746. ACAP supported the proposal.
747. The COW accepted the proposal.

**Item 31.3.11 Proposal for a Concerted Action for the Peruvian or Humboldt Pelican (*Pelecanus thagus*) already listed on Appendix I and II of the Convention**

748. Peru presented the Concerted Action in document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP31.3.11](#), which he said would help reduce the species decline. He stressed the species high mortality caused by outbreaks of avian influenza, alongside other threats including incidental capture in fishing nets.
749. The co-proponents, Chile and Ecuador, expressed their support for the proposal, with Chile noting the proposal was aligned with a One Health approach. Ecuador stressed the importance of protection for its country, noting Ecuador marked the northern limit of its breeding range.
750. The COW accepted the proposal.

**Item 31.3.12 Proposal for a Concerted Action for the Magellanic plover (*Pluvianellus socialis*) already listed on Appendix I of the Convention**

751. Chile presented the Concerted Action in document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP31.3.12](#), explaining Chile and Ecuador had carried out a species census and prepared national plans, including increased monitoring efforts and strengthened cooperation.
752. The COW accepted the proposal.

**Item 31.3.13 Proposal for a Concerted Action for the Sand tiger shark (*Carcharias taurus*) already listed on Appendix I and II of the Convention**

753. Brazil presented the Concerted Action in document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/CRP31.3.13](#), explaining the proposed Concerted Action aimed to strengthen regional conservation of this critically endangered species in the Southwest Atlantic, encompassing Brazil, Argentina, and Uruguay. He recognized that the species was already listed in Appendices I and II of CMS but continued to face severe declines due to bycatch, illegal recreational fishing, and degradation of coastal habitats. Brazil informed that the proposal would update the Regional Conservation Action Plan and enhance scientific and policy cooperation among Range States. Brazil had provided additional information in response to ScC comments, which were reflected in [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Inf31.3.13](#).
754. Panama supported the proposal. Uruguay, as a Range State, supported the proposal and committed to work in a coordinated manner in support of the Concerted Action.
755. WCS, on behalf of IBRACON, Instituto Baleia Jubarte, Projecto Tibarões de la Baía de la Ilha Grande, and Divers for Sharks, supported the proposal, noting the sand tiger shark population had declined by more than 80% in the last 75 years and viewed the

Concerted Action as a step to reverse and mitigate the threats this species from both commercial and sport fishing.

756. The COW accepted the proposal.

**Item 31.3.14 Proposal for a Concerted Action for the Basking Shark (*Cetorhinus maximus*) already listed on Appendix I and II of the Convention**

757. MARECO presented the Concerted Action in the document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.31.3.14/Rev.1](#), underscoring the need to further understand basking shark ecology. She requested deletion of a reference to the UK and the Cayman Islands in the Concerted Action, to correct a factual error.

758. The COW accepted the proposal.

**Item 31.3.15 Proposal for a Concerted Action for the Blue Shark (*Prionace glauca*) already listed on Appendix II of the Convention**

759. MARECO presented the Concerted Action in the document [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.31.15/Rev.1](#), stressing significant exploitation of the species and underscoring that conservation of the blue shark would provide benefits for similar species facing comparable threats.

760. The COW accepted the proposal.

**Item 31.3.16. Proposal for a Concerted Action for all species of Devil and Manta rays (*Mobulidae*) already listed on Appendix I and II of the Convention**

761. Manta Trust introduced the proposed Concerted Action contained in [UNEP/CMS/COP15/Doc.31.3.16](#), which was put forward by Manta Trust, WCS, and Ecuador. Manta Trust noted that 10 species were threatened by domestic consumption of their meat and trade in gill plates. Manta Trust cited declines of more than 80% across oceans and stressed the mobilization of technical and financial support.

762. Ecuador said his country hosted the biggest population of ocean rays worldwide, and that isolated actions would not be sufficient. He noted cooperation among CITES and CMS and said technical support would help with policymaking.

763. Brazil supported the Concerted Action and wished to be added as a co-sponsor of the proposal.

764. The COW accepted the proposal for a Concerted Action.