

Outline of revised format for CMS National Reports

Contents

HIGH-LEVEL SUMMARY OF KEY MESSAGES	2
I. ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION	2
II. ACCESSION/RATIFICATION OF CMS AGREEMENTS/MOUS	4
III. SPECIES ON THE CONVENTION APPENDICES	4
IV. LEGAL PROHIBITION OF THE TAKING OF APPENDIX I SPECIES	6
V. AWARENESS	9
VI. MAINSTREAMING MIGRATORY SPECIES IN OTHER SECTORS AND PROCESSES	10
VII. GOVERNANCE, POLICY AND LEGISLATIVE COHERENCE	11
VIII. INCENTIVES	12
IX. SUSTAINABLE PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION	12
X. THREATS AND PRESSURES AFFECTING MIGRATORY SPECIES; INCLUDING OBSTACLES TO MIGRATION	14
XI. CONSERVATION STATUS OF MIGRATORY SPECIES	17
XII. COOPERATING TO CONSERVE MIGRATION SYSTEMS	19
XIII. AREA-BASED CONSERVATION MEASURES	20
XIV. ECOSYSTEM SERVICES	22
XV. SAFEGUARDING GENETIC DIVERSITY	23
XVI. NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS	24
XVII. TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE, INNOVATIONS AND PRACTICES OF INDIGENOUS AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES	25
XVIII. KNOWLEDGE, DATA AND CAPACITY-BUILDING	26
XIX. RESOURCE MOBILIZATION	27

HIGH-LEVEL SUMMARY OF KEY MESSAGES

In your country, in the reporting period, what does this report reveal about:

The most successful aspects of implementation of the Convention? (List up to five items):

1. **Implementing area-based conservation measures:** Fiji has successfully established Marine Protected Areas (MPAs), Local Resource Declarations (such as the 10-year Lau Island Seascape declaration), and sanctuaries like the Nadogo Turtle Sanctuary.
2. **Integrating traditional practices into conservation:** There has been foundational success in utilizing traditional spatial closures (*tabu*) within customary fishing grounds (*qoliqoli*) and economically empowering communities through the Locally Managed Marine Area (LMMA) network.
3. **Banning the harvest of endangered species:** The government has successfully implemented bans and applied fines and prosecutions to stop the harvesting of endangered migratory species, particularly sea turtles.
4. **Safeguarding genetic diversity:** Fiji has actively implemented targeted captive breeding and release programs, most notably the Hawksbill turtle head-starting program at the Kula Environment Centre.
5. **Collaborative NGO and community partnerships:** The government has successfully partnered with organizations like the WWF, BirdLife International, and NatureFiji-MareqetiViti to drive community engagement, protect critical habitats, and mitigate seabird bycatch through Port Based Outreach programs

The greatest difficulties in implementing the Convention? (List up to five items):

1. **Inadequate standalone legislation:** Fiji lacks a standalone Migratory Species Act, and its existing Endangered and Protected Species (EPS) Act of 2002 is primarily designed to domesticate CITES obligations rather than CMS obligations.
2. **Lack of strict statutory prohibitions:** Because of the legislative gap, the "taking" of all CMS Appendix I species is not categorically prohibited, and prohibitions are only recognized if the species is concurrently listed under CITES. Furthermore, specific exemptions still exist that legally authorize the harvesting of sea turtles for non-commercial, customary purposes.
3. **Information sharing and data consolidation challenges:** Achieving full compliance is hindered by a lack of an information-sharing platform for agencies to access data, requiring continued effort to consolidate data across key stakeholders like the Ministry of Fisheries and the Ministry of iTaukei Affairs.
4. **Diluted public awareness:** Awareness actions have had a "small impact" because they are often lumped into other campaigns; the report notes a need for more standalone awareness campaigns dedicated solely to the CMS to generate larger positive impacts.
5. **Lack of specific assessments:** Assessments regarding migratory species conservation are generally integrated within broader biodiversity strategies, rather than existing as standalone evaluations for the protected area network

The main priorities for future implementation of the Convention? (List up to five items):

1. **Targeted Research and Capacity Building:** Identifying specific scientific research gaps for CMS-listed species so that evidence-based public awareness and national advocacy campaigns can be developed.
2. **Strengthening National Reporting Mechanisms:** Establishing formal and standardized data collection and reporting pathways that seamlessly bridge local community observations with national institutional frameworks. Funding is needed to implement all CMS-related activities and for reporting consultations and compilation.

3. **Expansion of Customary Management Plans:** Developing comprehensive, species-specific Community-Based Management Plans across all customary fishing grounds (*qoliqoli*) to systematically manage CMS species beyond current fragmented, institution-led initiatives

I. ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION	
Name of Contracting Party	<i>Fiji</i>
Date of entry into force of the Convention in your country	<i>01 April 2013</i>
Any territories which are excluded from the application of the Convention	<i>Not applicable</i>
Report compiler	Name and title: <u><i>Mr. Jimmy Clint Gaunavou (Senior Environment Officer (Multilateral Environment Agreements))</i></u> Full name of institution: <u><i>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change</i></u> Telephone: <u><i>+679 3311699</i></u> Email: <u><i>jimmy.gaunavou@environment.gov.fj</i></u>
Designated CMS National Focal Point	Name and title of designated Focal Point: <u><i>Ms. Senimili Baleicakau (Director, Department of Environment)</i></u> Full name of institution: <u><i>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change</i></u> Mailing address: <u><i>P. O. Box 2109 Government Buildings, Suva, Fiji.</i></u> Telephone: <u><i>+679 3311699</i></u> Email: <u><i>senimili.baleicakau@environment.gov.fj</i></u>
Representative on Scientific Council	Name and title: <u><i>Mr. Krishneel Nand (Principal Environment Officer (Resource Management Unit))</i></u> Full name of institution: <u><i>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change</i></u> Mailing address: <u><i>P. O. Box 2109 Government Buildings, Suva, Fiji.</i></u> Telephone: <u><i>+679 3311699</i></u> Email: <u><i>krishneel.nand02@environment.gov.fj</i></u>

II. ACCESSION/RATIFICATION OF CMS AGREEMENTS/MOUs

Please confirm the status of your country's participation in the following Agreements/MOUs, and indicate any updates or corrections required:

- Yes, the lists are correct and up to date, or

Updates or corrections:

No comments were provided under this section.

CMS Instrument

CMS Instrument	Party/Signatory	Range State, but not a Party/Signatory	Not applicable (= not a Range State)
ACAP	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ACCOBAMS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
AEWA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Aquatic Warbler	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ASCOBANS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Atlantic Turtles	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Birds of Prey (Raptors)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Bukhara Deer	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Dugong	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
EUROBATS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Gorilla Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
High Andean Flamingos	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IOSEA Marine Turtles	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Middle-European Great Bustard	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Monk Seal in the Atlantic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Pacific Islands Cetaceans	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ruddy-headed Goose	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Saiga Antelope	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Sharks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Siberian Crane	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Slender-billed Curlew	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
South Andean Huemul	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Southern South American Grassland Birds	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Wadden Sea Seals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
West African Elephants	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Western African Aquatic Mammals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

III. SPECIES ON THE CONVENTION APPENDICES

Please confirm that the [\[automatically populated\]](#) lists provided below for each species/subspecies correctly identify the **Appendix I** species for which the country is a Range State (countries of interest to the species relating to being in the pathway of the CMS species eg feeding, nesting etc.)

- Yes, the lists are correct and up to date.
- No, the following amendments need making:

[free text box]

No information.

Terrestrial mammals (not including bats):

No information.

Aquatic mammals:

- Humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*)
- Green turtle (*Chelonia mydas*)

Bats:

- *Tadarida brasiliensis*

Birds:

- Bristle-Thighed Curlew (*Numenius tahitiensis*)
- Sanderling (*Calidris alba*)
- Ruddy Turnstone (*Arenaria interpres*)

Reptiles:

- Green Turtle (*Chelonia mydas*)

Fish:

- *Acipenser sturio*
- *Pangasianodon gigas*

Please confirm that the [automatically populated] lists provided below for each species/subspecies correctly identify the Appendix II species for which the country is a Range State

- Yes, the lists are correct and up to date.
- No, the following amendments need making:
[free text box]

Terrestrial mammals (not including bats):

- *Equus hemionus*
- *Loxodonta africana*
- etc.....

Aquatic mammals:

- *Balaenoptera bonaerensis*
- *Caperea marginata*
- etc.....

Bats:

- *Eidolon helvum*

- *Otomops madagascariensi*
- etc....

Birds:

- *Crex crex*
- *Sarothrura boehmi*
- etc....

Reptiles:

- *Crocodylus porosus*
- *Podocnemis expansa*
- etc....

Fish:

- *Carcharodon carcharias*
- *Rhincodon typus*
- etc.....

Insects:

- *Danaus plexippus*

No information.

IV. LEGAL PROHIBITION OF THE TAKING OF APPENDIX I SPECIES

Is the taking of Appendix I species prohibited by national or territorial legislation in accordance with CMS Article III (5)?

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

Additional comments:

While the Endangered and Protected Species (EPS) Act 2002 regulates the commercial and non-commercial trade of certain species, it does not categorically prohibit the 'taking' of all CMS Appendix I species as required by Article III(5). To fully domesticate these obligations, there is a recognized need to either develop a standalone Migratory Species Act or comprehensively amend the existing EPS Act to explicitly incorporate and protect all CMS-listed species.

[If selected yes for 'all' this question will appear]

Please identify the legal statute(s) concerned.

Not applicable

[add link(s) and / or upload document(s)]

[If selected yes for 'some' this appears]

Please indicate the species for which taking is prohibited:

(select all that apply)

Marine turtles are protected, but taking is not strictly prohibited, this basically means that the taking of marine turtles is generally prohibited under national legislation; however, specific exemptions exist. The Offshore Fisheries Management Act 2012, the Offshore Fisheries Management Regulations 2014, and the Fisheries Act 1941 allow the Ministry of Fisheries to legally authorize the harvesting of sea turtles through special exemptions. These exemptions are strictly limited to non-commercial, customary purposes.

[we will consider ways to pre-populate this section with relevant species]

Please identify the legal statute(s) concerned.

The following legal statute(s) are concerned:

1. Endangered and Protected Species (EPS) Act 2002
2. Endangered and Protected Species Regulations 2003
3. Environment Management Act 2005
4. Offshore Fisheries Management Act 2012
5. Offshore Fisheries Management Regulations 2014
6. Fisheries Act 1941 (including 2016 revised provisions)
7. Fisheries Regulations 1965

[If selected yes for 'part of the country' this appears]

Please indicate which part of the country or territory/territories:

No information

.....

Please indicate the species for which taking is prohibited:

(select all that apply)

- All Appendix I species
- Species X
- Species Y

[we will consider ways to pre-populate this section with relevant species]

Please identify the legal statute(s) concerned.

Currently, national legislation, specifically the Endangered and Protected Species (EPS) Act 2002, is designed to domesticate and implement CITES obligations rather than those of the CMS. Consequently, statutory prohibitions on 'taking' are only recognized for CMS-listed migratory species if they are concurrently listed under CITES and explicitly included within the schedules of the EPS Act.

.....

.....

Exceptions: Where the taking of Appendix I species is prohibited by national legislation, have any exceptions been granted to the prohibition?

[only to appear if the user selects 'Yes for all Appendix I species' or "Yes for some" in previous question]

- ✓ Yes
- No

If yes, please indicate which species, which reasons among those in CMS Article III(5) (a)-(d) (given in the table below) justify the exception, any temporal or spatial limitations applying to the exception, and the nature of the "extraordinary circumstances" that make the exception necessary.

[we will consider ways to repopulate species list from earlier question on Appendix I species]

Species	Reasons for exception (as defined in Art III (5))	Details of any applicable time or area limitations, and the nature of the "extraordinary circumstances" that make the exception necessary
Turtles	<p>(a) the taking is for scientific purposes.</p> <p>(b) the taking is for the purpose of enhancing the propagation or survival of the affected species.</p> <p>(c) the taking is to accommodate the needs of traditional subsistence users of such species.</p> <p>(d) extraordinary circumstances do require.</p>	Exemptions are provided for cultural use although there is no provision for exemption under the current Fisheries Legislation.
Species Y	No information.	

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 develop new legislation to prohibit the taking of all relevant species?

[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

Comment:

Current efforts focus on amending existing legal frameworks rather than drafting a new statute. Specifically, provisions under the Offshore Fisheries Management Regulations 2014 are being utilized to include migratory sharks under Schedule 2A, complementing the existing protections for marine turtles under the Offshore Fisheries Management Act 2012.

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) *[While no new, standalone legislation is currently being drafted, the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change is undertaking a comprehensive review of existing environmental frameworks. In the interim, the protection of migratory species is managed through the complementary enforcement of the*

Endangered and Protected Species (EPS) Act 2002 and the Offshore Fisheries Management Regulations 2014]

Are any vessels flagged to your country engaged outside national jurisdictional limits in intentionally taking Appendix I species?

- Yes
- No**
- Don't know.

Licenses are provided detailing the species which are prohibited, for example, foreign vessels are limited to species, size and quantity. The Ministry of Fisheries has provision on this under the Offshore License Protocols which covers turtles, sharks, cetaceans and sea birds. We are currently relying on coordination with the Ministry of Fisheries, the Maritime Safety Authority of Fiji (MSAF), Fiji Ports, and the Fiji Navy to verify high-seas surveillance and registry data.

If yes, please provide more information on the circumstances of the take, including any future plans in respect of such take.

V. AWARENESS

(SPMS Target 1: People are aware of the multiple values of migratory species and their habitats and migration systems, and the steps they can take to conserve them and ensure the sustainability of any use.)

During the reporting period, please indicate the actions that have been taken by your country to increase people's awareness of the values of migratory species, their habitats and migration systems (note that answers given in section XVIII on SPMS Target 15 may also be relevant) (select all that apply)

- Campaigns on specific topics- World Migratory Bird Day, World Wildlife Day, World Environment Day, World Oceans Day, International Biological Diversity Day.
- Teaching programmes in schools or colleges.
- Press and media publicity, including social media.
- Community- based celebrations, exhibitions and other events.
- Engagement of specific stakeholder groups.
- Special publications.
- Interpretation at nature reserves and other sites.
- Other (please specify). [\[free text\]](#)
- No actions taken.

[\[the following questions only appear if an action was selected in 'During the reporting period, please indicate the actions that have been taken by your country to increase people's awareness of the values of migratory species, their habitats and migration systems'\]](#)

Please indicate any specific elements of CMS COP Resolutions 11.8 (Rev. COP12) (*Communication, Information and Outreach Plan*) and 11.9 (*World Migratory Bird Day*) which have been particularly taken forward by these actions.

No information.

Overall, how successful have these awareness actions been in achieving their objectives?

Tick one box

- 1 very little impact
- Small impact**
- 3 good impacts
- 4 large positive impact
- not known

There needs to be more awareness campaigns standalone to CMS alone and not as a part of other campaigns for positive impacts.

Please identify the main form(s) of evidence that has/have been used to make this assessment.

Social media posts, press releases and local news coverage by media.

VI. MAINSTREAMING MIGRATORY SPECIES IN OTHER SECTORS AND PROCESSES

(SPMS Target 2: Multiple values of migratory species and their habitats have been integrated into international, national and local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes, including on livelihoods, and are being incorporated into national accounting, as appropriate, and reporting systems.)

Does the conservation of migratory species currently feature in any national or local strategies and/or planning processes in your country relating to development, poverty reduction and/or livelihoods?

- ✓ **Yes, to some extent.**
- No

If yes, please provide a short summary:

[\[free text\]](#)

Do the 'values of migratory species and their habitats' referred to in SPMS Target 2 currently feature in any other national reporting processes in your country?

- Yes
- ✓ **No, not aware of. There is no information sharing platform for agencies to access this information. Important decisions and actions are best captured by repositories of relevant regulated species.**

If yes, please provide a short summary:

[\[free text\]](#)

Describe the main involvements (if any) of non-governmental organizations and/or civil society in the conservation of migratory species in your country.

The government partners with coastal communities and key NGOs to protect migratory species. Marine turtle conservation is supported by the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), C3, Conservation International, NatureFiji-MareqetiViti, BirdLife International, and the National Trust of Fiji. Furthermore, migratory bird conservation is jointly coordinated with BirdLife International and NatureFiji-MareqetiViti.

Describe the main involvements (if any) of the private sector in the conservation of migratory species in your country.

In Fiji, private sector involvement in the conservation of migratory species is primarily driven by the eco-tourism industry, commercial fisheries, and independent environmental consultancies. The eco-tourism sector, particularly marine resorts and commercial dive operators, plays a crucial role by actively participating in sea turtle protection initiatives, such as safeguarding nesting sites, and promoting migratory shark conservation through responsible diving practices. Concurrently, the commercial offshore fishing industry supports national conservation objectives by adhering to bycatch mitigation protocols, implementing gear modifications, and maintaining reporting standards designed to minimize the accidental taking of migratory sharks, marine turtles, and seabirds. Furthermore, private academic consultants and independent research firms contribute essential data to these efforts by conducting targeted Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) and specialized research focused on the critical habitats of these migratory species.

VII. GOVERNANCE, POLICY AND LEGISLATIVE COHERENCE

(SPMS Target 3: National, regional and international governance arrangements and agreements affecting migratory species and their migration systems have improved significantly, making relevant policy, legislative and implementation processes more coherent, accountable, transparent, participatory, equitable and inclusive.)

Have any governance arrangements affecting migratory species and their migration systems in your country, or in which your country participates, improved during the reporting period?

- Yes
- ✓ **No, but there is scope to do so.**
- No, because existing arrangements already satisfy all the points in Target 3

If yes, please provide a short summary:

[\[free text\]](#)

[\[if answered yes for previous question\]](#)

To what extent have these improvements helped to achieve Target 3 of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species (see text above)?

Tick one box

- 1 minimal contribution
- 2 partial contributions
- 3 good contributions
- 4 major contributions
- not known

No information available.

Please describe briefly how this assessment was made

[\[free text\]](#)

Has any committee or other arrangement for liaison between different sectors or groups been established at national or other territorial level in your country that addresses CMS implementation issues?

- Yes
- ✓ **No, aware of although existing agencies for example NatureFiji- MareqetiViti, BirdLife International and Conservation International may have reports that address CMS implementation issues.**

If yes, please provide a short summary:

[\[free text\]](#)

Does collaboration between the focal points of CMS and other relevant Conventions take place in your country to develop the coordinated and synergistic approaches described in paragraphs 23-25 of CMS COP Resolution 11.10 (Rev. COP12) (*Synergies and partnerships*)?

- Yes
- ✓ **No- not aware.**

If yes, please provide a short summary:

[\[free text\]](#)

Has your country or any jurisdictional subdivision within your country adopted legislation, policies or action plans that promote community involvement in conservation of CMS-listed species?

Yes, to some extent.

No

If yes, please identify the legislation, policies or action plans concerned:

- Endangered and Protected Species Act 2002,
- Endangered and Protected Species Regulations 2003,
- Protection of Turtles (Amendment) Regulations 2004,
- Fiji National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan.

VIII. INCENTIVES

(SPMS Target 4: Incentives, including subsidies, harmful to migratory species, and/or their habitats are eliminated, phased out or reformed in order to minimize or avoid negative impacts, and positive incentives for the conservation of migratory species and their habitats are developed and applied, consistent with engagements under the CMS and other relevant international and regional obligations and commitments.)

Has there been any elimination, phasing out or reforming of harmful incentives in your country resulting in benefits for migratory species?

- Yes
- Partly / in some areas
- No, but there is scope to do so, depending on the species and its natural enemies for example The Daunivonu Strategy used by WWF (World Wildlife Foundation) on coastal communities.
- No, because no such incentives have existed.

If yes or partly, please indicate what measures were implemented and the time-periods concerned.

[\[free text\]](#)

Has there been development and/or application of positive incentives in your country resulting in benefits for migratory species?

- Yes
- Partly/ in some areas
- No, but there is scope to do so.
- No, because there is no scope to do so.

If yes or partly, please indicate what measures were implemented and the time-periods concerned.

- Establishment of Marine Protected Areas (MPA),
- Ban on harvesting of endangered species which are Migratory in Nature,
- Local Resource Declaration (LRD) for example the Lau Island Seascape (10 years resource declaration) and the establishment of Nadogo Turtle Sanctuary in 2023.

IX. SUSTAINABLE PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION

(SPMS Target 5: Governments, key sectors and stakeholders at all levels have taken steps to achieve or have implemented plans for sustainable production and consumption, keeping the impacts of use of natural resources, including habitats, on migratory species well within safe ecological limits to promote the favourable conservation status of migratory species and maintain the quality, integrity, resilience, and ecological connectivity of their habitats and migration routes.)

During the reporting period, has your country implemented plans or taken other steps concerning sustainable production and consumption which are contributing to the achievement of the results defined in SPMS Target 5?

✓ **Yes, to some extent.**

- In development / planned
- No

[\[if answered 'yes' or 'in development/planned' for previous question\]](#)

Please describe the measures that have been planned, developed or implemented.

- National Plan of Action on Sharks, which is currently being updated,
- Shark Management Plan,
- Manta ray Management Plan,
- Ban on the Harvesting of Sea Turtles.

Please describe what evidence exists to show that the intended results of these measures are being achieved.

Prosecutions and fines imposed on those who are caught harvesting Sea Turtles.

[\[if answered no for first question above\]](#)

What is preventing progress?

[\[free text\]](#)

X. THREATS AND PRESSURES AFFECTING MIGRATORY SPECIES; INCLUDING OBSTACLES TO MIGRATION

(SPMS Targets 6+7: Fisheries and hunting have no significant direct or indirect adverse impacts on migratory species, their habitats or their migration routes, and impacts of fisheries and hunting are within safe ecological limits; Multiple anthropogenic pressures have been reduced to levels that are not detrimental to the conservation of migratory species or to the functioning, integrity, ecological connectivity and resilience of their habitats.)

Which of the following pressures on migratory species or their habitats are having an adverse impact in your country on migratory species included in the CMS Appendices? (tick the boxes that apply)

No available information.

Pressure	Appendix I species	Appendix II species	Species/species groups affected; and any other details	Overall relative severity of impact 1 = severe 2 = moderate 3 = low
Direct killing and taking				
Illegal hunting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Legal hunting				
Other harvesting and take	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Illegal trade	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Deliberate poisoning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Bycatch				
Bycatch	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Collisions and electrocution				
Electrocution	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Wind turbines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Other collisions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Other mortality				
Predation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Disease	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Accidental/indirect poisoning				
Unexplained stranding events	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Alien and/or invasive species				
Alien and/or invasive species	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Disturbance & disruption				
Disturbance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Light pollution	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Underwater noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Habitat destruction/degradation				

Habitat loss/destruction (including deforestation)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Habitat degradation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Mineral exploration/extraction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Unsustainable land/resource use	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Urbanization	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Marine debris (including plastics)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Other pollution	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Too much/too little water	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Fire	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Physical barriers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Climate change				
Climate change	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Levels of knowledge, awareness, legislation, management etc.				
Lack of knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Inadequate legislation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Inadequate enforcement of legislation				
Inadequate transboundary management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Other (please specify)				

What are the most significant advances that have been made since the previous report in countering any of the pressures identified above? (Identify the pressures concerned).
No available information.

What are the most significant negative trends since the previous report concerning the pressures identified above? (Identify the pressures concerned).
No available information

Have you adopted new legislation or other domestic measures in the reporting period in response to CMS Article III(4) (b) (*"Parties that are Range States of a migratory species listed in Appendix I shall endeavor ... 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"*)?

- Yes
- No

If so, please give the title or other reference (and date) for the measure concerned:

.....

.....
No available information

Please add any further comments on the implementation of specific provisions in relevant CMS COP Resolutions, including for example:

- Resolution 12.22 on by-catch.
- Resolution 12.14 on underwater noise.
- Resolution 12.20 on marine debris.
- Resolution 7.3 (Rev. COP12) on oil pollution
- Resolution 11.22 (Rev. COP12) on live captures of cetaceans (and Decision 12.48).
- Resolutions 7.5 (Rev. COP12) and 11.27 (Rev. COP12) on renewable energy.
- Resolutions 7.4 and 10.11 on power lines and migratory birds.
- Resolution 11.15 (Rev. COP12) on poisoning of migratory birds.
- Resolution 11.16 (Rev. COP12) on illegal killing, taking and trade of migratory birds (and Decision 12.26).
- Resolution 11.31 on wildlife crime.
- Resolution 12.21 on climate change (and Decision 12.72).
- Resolution 11.28 on invasive alien species.
- Resolution 12.6 on wildlife disease.
- Resolution 12.25 on conservation of intertidal and coastal habitats.
- Resolution 10.2 on conservation emergencies
- Resolution 7.2 (Rev. COP12) on impact assessment.

No available information.

XI. CONSERVATION STATUS OF MIGRATORY SPECIES
(SPMS Target 8: The conservation status of all migratory species, especially threatened species, has considerably improved throughout their range.)

What (if any) major changes in the conservation status of migratory species included in the CMS Appendices (for example national Red List category changes) have been recorded in your country in the current reporting period?

Terrestrial mammals (not including bats)

Species/subspecies (indicate CMS Appendix where applicable)	Change in status (including time period concerned)	Source reference	Comments

No available information for the table above.

Aquatic mammals

Species/subspecies (indicate CMS Appendix where applicable)	Change in status (including time period concerned)	Source reference	Comments
<i>Balaenoptera edeni</i> (Bryde's Whale, Tropical Whale)	Least Concern; population trends unknown.	International Union for Conservation of Nature International Organization, IUCN Red List of Threatened Species	
<i>Megaptera novaeangliae</i> (Humpback Whale)	Least Concern but increasing population trend.	International Union for Conservation of Nature International Organization, IUCN Red List of Threatened Species	The Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) reported sighting of humpback whale in Vatu-i-ra seascape.
<i>Balaenoptera musculus</i> (Blue Whale)	Endangered but increasing population trend.	International Union for Conservation of Nature International Organization, IUCN Red List of Threatened Species	

Bats

Species/subspecies (indicate CMS Appendix where applicable)	Change in status (including time period concerned)	Source reference	Comments

No available information for the table above.

Birds			
Species/subspecies (indicate CMS Appendix where applicable)	Change in status (including time period concerned)	Source reference	Comments
<i>Calidris alba</i> (Sanderling)	Least Concern, decreasing	International Union for Conservation of Nature International Organization, <u>IUCN Calidris alba</u> <u>(Sanderling)</u>	Pacific Biodiversity Fund Information last record in 2019. <u>PBIF Sanderling</u>
<i>Arenaria interpres</i> (Ruddy Turnstones)	Near Threatened, decreasing	<u>Ruddy Turnstone</u> <u>Arenaria Interpres</u> <u>Species Factsheet </u> <u>BirdLife DataZone</u>	Dillioseasea Observations off the Suva Foreshore over the years (1999- 2024) have not seen any drastic change.
<i>Falco peregrinus</i> (Peregrine Falcon)	Least Concern, increasing (globally)	International Union for Conservation of Nature International Organization, <u>IUCN Falco</u> <u>peregrinus</u> <u>(Peregrine Falcon)</u> Pacific Biodiversity Fund Information, <u>PBIF Peregrine</u> <u>Falcon</u>	
<i>Numenius tahitiensis</i> (Bristle- thighed Curlew)	Near Threatened, decreasing	International Union for Conservation of Nature International Organization, <u>IUCN Numenius</u> <u>tahitiensis (Bristle-</u> <u>thighed Curlew)</u> Pacific Biodiversity	Not an annual visitor. Rarely seen, mostly around Lau Islands.

		Fund Information, PBIF Bristle-thighed Curlew	
<i>Numenius madagascariensis</i> (Far Eastern Curlew)	Endangered, decreasing	Numenius madagascariensis (Far Eastern Curlew) Pacific Biodiversity Fund Information, PBIF Far Eastern Curlew	No records under Pacific Biodiversity Fund Information (PBIF)
<i>Limosa lapponica</i> (Bar-tailed Godwit)	Near Threatened, decreasing	Bar-tailed Godwit Limosa Lapponica Species Factsheet BirdLife DataZone	Batibalavu Observations off the Suva Foreshore over the years (1999-2024) have not seen any drastic change.
<i>Tringa incana</i> (Wandering Tattler)	Least Concern, unknown	Wandering Tattler Tringa Incana Species Factsheet BirdLife DataZone	Juli More research required for their routes and breeding. Observations of the Suva Foreshore over the years (1999-2024) have not seen any drastic change.
<i>Pluvialis fulva</i> (Pacific Golden Plover)	Least Concern, decreasing	Pacific Golden Plover Pluvialis Fulva Species Factsheet BirdLife DataZone	Dilio Observations off the Suva Foreshore over the years (1999-2024) have not seen any drastic change.

<i>Numenius phaeopus</i> (Whimbrel)	Least Concern, decreasing	Whimbrel Numenius Phaeopus Species Factsheet BirdLife DataZone	Turi Observations off the Suva Foreshore over the years (1999-2024) have not seen any drastic change.
<i>Ardenna pacifica</i> (Wedge-tailed Shearwater)	Least Concern, decreasing	Wedge-tailed Shearwater Ardenna Pacifica Species Factsheet BirdLife DataZone	Breeding
<i>Pterodroma brevipes</i> (Collared Petrel)	Vulnerable, decreasing	Collared Petrel Pterodroma Brevipes Species Factsheet BirdLife DataZone	Breeding
<i>Pseudobulweria rostrata</i> (Tahiti Petrel)	Near Threatened, decreasing	Tahiti Petrel Pseudobulweria Rostrata Species Factsheet BirdLife DataZone	Breeding
<i>Procellaria parkinsoni</i> (Black Petrel)	Vulnerable, stable	Black Petrel Procellaria Parkinsoni Species Factsheet BirdLife DataZone	
<i>Ardenna carneipes</i> (Flesh-footed shearwater)	Near Threatened, decreasing	Flesh-footed Shearwater Ardenna Carneipes Species Factsheet BirdLife DataZone	Breeding
<i>Pterodroma leucoptera</i> (Goulds)	Vulnerable, decreasing	International Union for Conservation of Nature International	Possibly in Fiji – more surveys

<i>Petrel)</i>		Organization, IUCN Pterodroma leucoptera (White-winged Petrel)	required
<i>Pterodroma nigripennis</i> (Black-winged petrel)	Least Concern, decreasing	Black-winged Petrel Pterodroma Nigripennis Species Factsheet BirdLife DataZone	
<i>Pterodroma heraldica</i> (Herald Petrel)	Least Concerned, decreasing	International Union for Conservation of Nature International Organization, IUCN Pterodroma heraldica (Herald Petrel)	
<i>Ardenna bulleri</i> (Buller's Shearwater)	Vulnerable, stable	International Union for Conservation of Nature International Organization, IUCN Ardenna bulleri (Buller's Shearwater)	
<i>Ardenna grisea</i> (Sooty Shearwater)	Near Threatened, decreasing	Sooty Shearwater Ardenna Grisea Species Factsheet BirdLife DataZone	
<i>Puffinus nativitatis</i> (Christmas Shearwater)	Least Concern, Stable	International Union for Conservation of Nature International Organization, IUCN Puffinus nativitatis (Christmas Shearwater)	

<i>Pterodroma inexpectata</i> (Mottled Petrel)	Near Threatened, decreasing	Mottled Petrel Pterodroma inexpectata Species Factsheet BirdLife DataZone	
<i>Nesofregatta fuliginosa</i> (Polynesian Storm-Petrel)	Endangered, decreasing	Polynesian Storm-petrel Nesofregatta Fuliginosa Species Factsheet BirdLife DataZone	Likely breeding
<i>Oceanites oceanicus</i> (Wilson's Storm-petrel)	Least Concerned, stable	Wilson's Storm-petrel Oceanites Oceanicus Species Factsheet BirdLife DataZone	
<i>Fregatta maoriana</i> (New Zealand Storm-petrel)	Critically Endangered, unknown	International Union for Conservation of Nature International Organization, IUCN Fregatta maoriana (New Zealand Storm-petrel)	
<i>Fregatta tropica</i> (Black-bellied Storm-petrel)	Least Concerned, decreasing	International Union for Conservation of Nature International Organization, IUCN Fregatta tropica (Black-bellied Storm-petrel)	
<i>Fregatta grallaria</i> (White-bellied Storm-petrel)	Least Concerned, decreasing	International Union for Conservation of Nature International Organization, IUCN Fregatta grallaria (White-bellied Storm-	

		petrel)	
<i>Skuas & Jaegers</i>	Least Concerned, stable	International Union for Conservation of Nature International Organization, <u>IUCN Skuas and Jaegers</u>	Vagrant

Note: There is a proposal to list all gadfly petrels on Annex 1 and 2 of the CMs at the upcoming COP.

Reptiles

Species/subspecies (indicate CMS Appendix where applicable)	Change in status (including time period concerned)	Source reference	Comments
<i>Chelonia mydas</i> (Green Turtle)	Still endangered	<u>Urgent action needed for sea turtle conservation in Fiji Pacific Environment</u>	Frequently harvested than hawksbill
<i>Crocodylus porosus</i> (Salt-Water Crocodile, Estuarine Crocodile)	Least Concerned	International Union for Conservation of Nature International Organization, <u>IUCN Red List of Threatened Species</u>	Has there been any recent sightings in Fiji? "Large, vagrant individuals of <i>Crocodylus porosus</i> , the saltwater crocodile, are regular visitors to western Oceania and even reach Fiji (Spennemann, 2020)"
<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i> (Leatherback Turtle, Leathery Turtle)	Critically endangered		<u>Urgent action needed for sea turtle conservation in Fiji Pacific Environment</u>
<i>Caretta caretta</i> (Loggerhead Turtle)	Critically endangered		<u>Urgent action needed for sea turtle conservation in Fiji Pacific Environment</u>
<i>Eretmochelys imbricata</i> (Hawksbill Turtle)	Critically endangered		<u>Urgent action needed for sea turtle conservation</u>

Fish

Species/subspecies (indicate CMS Appendix where applicable)	Change in status (including time period concerned)	Source reference	Comments
<i>Isurus oxyrinchus</i> (Shortfin Mako Shark)	Endangered (decreasing)	International Union for Conservation of Nature International Organization, <u>IUCN Red List of Threatened Species</u>	Listed as endangered in Fiji
<i>Rhincodon typus</i> (Whale Shark)	Endangered (decreasing)	International Union for Conservation of Nature International Organization, <u>IUCN Red List of Threatened Species</u>	
<i>Manta alfredi</i> (Reef Manta Ray, Prince Alfred's Ray, Inshore Manta Ray, Coastal Manta Ray, Resident Manta Ray)	Vulnerable (Vulnerable)	International Union for Conservation of Nature International Organization, <u>IUCN Red List of Threatened Species</u>	
<i>Mobula japonica</i> (Spinetail Mobula, Spinetail Devil Ray, Japanese Devil Ray)	Critical (Decreasing)	International Union for Conservation of Nature International Organization, <u>IUCN Red List of Threatened Species</u>	
<i>Mobula tarapacana</i> (Box Ray, Chilean Devil Ray, Devil Ray, Greater Guinean Mobula, Sicklefin Devil Ray, Spiny Mobula)	Critical (Decreasing)	International Union for Conservation of Nature International Organization, <u>IUCN Red List of Threatened Species</u>	

For further information, please kindly refer to:
Protecting Our Sharks | WWF (World Wildlife Foundation)

Insects

Species/subspecies (indicate CMS Appendix where applicable)	Change in status (including time period concerned)	Source reference	Comments

Monarch butterfly (<i>Danaus plexippus</i>)	Currently listed as Least Concern	International Union for Conservation of Nature International Organization, <u>IUCN Red List of Threatened Species</u>	No recent sighting reported in Fiji
--	--------------------------------------	---	--

[ability to add more species/subspecies]

XII. COOPERATING TO CONSERVE MIGRATION SYSTEMS

(SPMS Target 9 : International and regional action and cooperation between States for the conservation and effective management of migratory species fully reflects a migration systems approach, in which all States sharing responsibility for the species concerned engage in such actions in a concerted way.)

In the current reporting period, has your country initiated or participated in the development of any proposals for new CMS Agreements, including Memoranda of Understanding, to address the needs of Appendix II species (following the advice in COP Resolution 12.8)?

- Yes
- No

If yes, please provide a short summary.

[\[free text\]](#)

In the current reporting period, have actions been taken by your country to encourage non-Parties to join CMS and its related Agreements?

- Yes
- No

If yes, please specify which countries have been approached.

Additional information can be obtained from

<https://www.bluenaturealliance.org/locations/lau-seascape-fiji/>

In the current reporting period, has your country participated in the implementation of concerted actions under CMS (as detailed in COP Resolution 12.28, and see species list [\[here\]](#)) to address the needs of relevant migratory species?

- Yes
- No

If yes, please describe the results of these actions achieved so far: [\[free text\]](#)

Have any other steps been taken which have contributed to the achievement of the results defined in Target 9 of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species (*all relevant States engaging in cooperation on the conservation of migratory species in ways that fully reflect a migration systems approach*), including for example (but not limited to) measures to implement Resolution 12.11 (and Decision 12.34) on flyways and Resolution 12.17 (and Decision 12.54) on South Atlantic whales?

- Yes
- No
- If yes, please provide details.

XIII. AREA-BASED CONSERVATION MEASURES

(SPMS Target 10 : All critical habitats and sites for migratory species are identified and included in area-based conservation measures so as to maintain their quality, integrity, resilience and functioning in accordance with the implementation of Aichi Target 11, supported where necessary by environmentally sensitive land-use planning and landscape management on a wider scale.)

Have critical habitats and sites for migratory species been identified (for example by an inventory) in your country?

- Yes, fully.
- ✓ **Partially- to a large extent**
- Partially – to a small or moderate extent
- No

Mudflats have been identified as critical habitats for migratory shorebird; Fiji's EEZ (Exclusive Economic Zone) was declared a whale sanctuary in 2003, and the Dreketi River, Rewa River, and Beqa Waters have been identified as critical habitats for sharks.

What are the main gaps and priorities to address, if any, to achieve full identification of relevant critical habitats and sites as required to achieve SPMS target 10?

Some gaps and priorities are adopted by Government and integrated into sectoral plans, inclusion in land use maps and are demarcated, these are further recognized as High Conservation Areas or *Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs)*.

Fiji is currently undergoing updating of legacy KBAs to fully establish 2016 Standard Compliant KBAs. Some of the KBAs do have records of migratory species – of which their presence may or may not trigger KBA criteria.

Current list (including KBAs proposed for delisting):

- 9 Marine KBAs,
- 49 Terrestrial KBAs,
- 4 KBAs triggered solely by seabirds.

All KBAs are not legally designated but can be used to plan Protected Areas.

Has any assessment has been made of the contribution made by the country's protected areas network specifically to migratory species conservation?

- Yes
- Partly / for some areas
- In development
- ✓ **No**

If yes or partly, please provide a short summary.

[\[free text\]](#)

[\[ability also to add hyperlinks and/or upload documents\]](#)

Currently unaware of any specific assessments carried out for migratory species conservation under the protected area network. There are many plans that have been developed separately that include migratory species such as:

In Fiji, assessments regarding migratory species conservation are generally integrated within broader protected area and biodiversity strategies rather than existing as a single, standalone document. Notable frameworks that encompass migratory species include site-specific strategies like the Vatu-i-Ra Conservation Park Management Plan and the Lau Seascape Strategy (2018–2030). Additionally, specific taxonomic groups are covered under dedicated frameworks such as the National Shark Management Plan and the Manta Ray Management Plan. Broader threat evaluations are also captured in Fiji’s Final Report on National Biodiversity Threat Assessment (BIODEV 2030). The Ministry continues to work alongside NGO partners, such as WWF, to consolidate data from localized conservation initiatives across the protected area network.

Has your country adopted any new legislation or other domestic measures in the reporting period in response to CMS Article III(4) (a) (“Parties that are Range States of a migratory species listed in Appendix I shall endeavor ... 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”)?

- Yes
- ✓ No

If yes, please give the title or other reference (and date) for the measure concerned:

.....

[\[insert link\]](#)

[\[ability to add additional rows of text and hyperlinks\]](#)

In respect of protected areas in your country that are important for migratory species, have any assessments of management effectiveness been undertaken in the reporting period?

- Yes
- Partly / for some areas
- In development
- ✓ No

If yes, please provide a reference and/or summarize what is covered:

[\[free text\]](#)

Beyond Protected Areas, are other effective area-based conservation measures implemented in your country in ways which benefit migratory species?

- ✓ Yes
- No

If yes, please describe: [\[free text\]](#)

Yes, while sites like the Dreketi River, Nasese Mudflats, and Beqa Lagoon are not legally

gazetted as formal Protected Areas, they serve as critical Other Effective area-based Conservation Measures (OECMs). These areas are subject to traditional, community-based spatial zoning and local management plans that provide vital protection for the habitats of migratory species.

Please add any particular information about key steps taken to implement specific provisions in relevant CMS COP Resolutions, including for example:

- Resolution 12.7 on ecological networks.
- Resolution 12.13 on Important Marine Mammal Areas.
- Resolution 12.24 on Marine Protected Area networks in the ASEAN region.
- Resolution 12.25 on intertidal and other coastal habitats.

[free text]

No available information.

XIV. ECOSYSTEM SERVICES

(SPMS Target 11 : Migratory species and their habitats which provide important ecosystem services are maintained at or restored to favourable conservation status, taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities and the poor and vulnerable.)

Has any assessment of ecosystem services associated with migratory species (contributing to the achievement of SPMS Target 11) been undertaken in your country since the adoption of the SPMS in 2014?

- Yes
- Partly / in progress
- ✓ No

If 'yes' or 'partly / in progress', please provide a short summary (including source references where applicable):

[\[free text\]](#)

Source: Year of publication: Link:

Source: Year of publication: Link:

Source: Year of publication: Link:

[\[add more\]](#)

XV. SAFEGUARDING GENETIC DIVERSITY

(SPMS Target 12 : The genetic diversity of wild populations of migratory species is safeguarded, and strategies have been developed and implemented for minimizing genetic erosion.)

Are strategies of relevance to migratory species being developed or implemented to minimize genetic erosion of biodiversity in your country?

- ✓ Yes
- No

If yes, please select the relevant strategies:
(select all that apply)

- captive breeding
- ✓ captive breeding and release – *Fiji implements targeted captive breeding and release (head-starting) programs to safeguard genetic diversity. A primary initiative is the Hawksbill turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*) captive breeding and release program conducted at the Kula Environment Centre. This strategy is formally guided by and aligned with the national Turtle Recovery Management Plan.*
- gene typing research.
- reproductive material archives/repositories
- Other (please specify) [\[free text\]](#)

XVI. NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS

(SPMS Target 13 : Priorities for effective conservation and management of migratory species, their habitats and migration systems have been included in the development and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans, with reference where relevant to CMS agreements and action plans and their implementation bodies.)

Are priorities for the conservation and management of migratory species, their habitats and migration systems explicitly addressed by your country's national biodiversity strategy or action plan?

Yes

No

If yes:

a. please provide a link to or attachment of the strategy/action plan.

Priorities for migratory species are currently integrated into Fiji's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) 2020–2025, which was originally aligned with the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Aichi Targets. Furthermore, Fiji is currently in the process of drafting an updated NBSAP. This revised strategy is being strictly aligned with the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF), ensuring that robust, updated global targets to safeguard and sustainably manage biodiversity, including critical habitats and migration systems for migratory species – are established for 2030 and beyond. The link to the updated NBSAP may be provided when available.

b. please identify the elements in the plan/strategy that are particularly relevant to migratory species, and highlight any specific references to the CMS/CMS instruments.

[free text]

No available information.

c. please add comments on the implementation of the strategy or action plan concerned.

The updated National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) for 2026–2030 is currently under review and awaiting formal government endorsement. In the interim, species-specific conservation strategies continue to be actively implemented by various government institutions and NGO partners to ensure the ongoing protection of priority migratory species under the CMS framework. Additionally, significant progress has been made in addressing direct threats to these species and their habitats: the Minister for Environment has recently endorsed the Cabinet Paper for the National Invasive Species Framework and Action Plan (NISFSAP), as submitted by the Fiji Invasive Species Taskforce (FIST). The NISFSAP now serves as the primary national policy framework for mitigating the impacts of Invasive Alien Species (IAS) on vulnerable biodiversity

XVII. TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE, INNOVATIONS AND PRACTICES OF INDIGENOUS AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES

(SPMS Target 14 : The traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of migratory species, their habitats and migration systems, and their customary sustainable use of biological resources, are respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations, with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, thereby contributing to the favourable conservation status of migratory species and the ecological connectivity and resilience of their habitats.)

Have actions been taken in your country to foster consideration for the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities that are relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of migratory species, their habitats and migration systems?

- Yes
- Partly / in some areas
- No
- Not applicable

Have actions been taken in your country to foster effective participation of indigenous and local communities in the conservation and sustainable use of migratory species, their habitats and migration systems?

- Yes
- Partly / in some areas
- No
- Not applicable

In Fiji, the conservation of migratory species is deeply intertwined with traditional ecological knowledge and customary governance. The Ministry of Fisheries collaborates extensively with the Fiji Locally Managed Marine Area (FLMMA) network to empower indigenous communities to use traditional spatial closures (*tabu*) within their customary fishing grounds (*qoliqoli*) to protect critical habitats. Furthermore, the Ministry partners with key NGOs to conduct extensive local and national outreach. For instance, joint initiatives with the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) actively integrate sea turtle conservation with cultural heritage, while BirdLife International drives community engagement and Port Based Outreach (PBO) to mitigate seabird bycatch.

Link: <https://www.fisheries.gov.fj/fiji-hosts-regional-sea-turtle-workshop-to-boost-conservation-and-cultural-heritage/>

If 'yes' or 'partly/in some areas' to either of the preceding two questions, please select which actions have been taken:

(select all that apply)

- research & documentation.
- engagement initiatives
- formal recognition of rights

- ✓ inclusion in governance mechanisms
- ✓ management strategies & programmes that integrate traditional & indigenous interests.
- other (please specify) [free text]

Please add comments on the implementation of the actions concerned.

How would you rank progress since the previous report in your country to achieving Target 14 of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species (see text above)?

Please select one option:

- 1 little or no progress
- ✓ 2 some progress but more work is needed.
- 3 positive advances have been made.
- 4 target substantially achieved (traditional knowledge is fully respected and there is effective participation from communities)

Please add comments on the progress made (where applicable).

While positive advances have been made, achieving full compliance requires continued effort and data consolidation across key stakeholders, namely the Ministry of Fisheries and the Ministry of iTaukei Affairs. However, the foundational integration of traditional practices into conservation is clearly evidenced by several national initiatives. Notable examples of community participation include the establishment of the Vatu-i-Ra Conservation Park using customary *tabu* systems, the economic empowerment of communities through the Locally Managed Marine Area (LMMA) network, and the collaborative Port Based Outreach (PBO) program addressing seabird bycatch.

XVIII. KNOWLEDGE, DATA AND CAPACITY-BUILDING

(SPMS Target 15 : The science base, information, training, awareness, understanding and technologies relating to migratory species, their habitats and migration systems, their value, functioning, status and trends, and the consequences of their loss, are improved, widely shared and transferred, and effectively applied.)

In the current reporting period, which steps taken in your country have contributed to the achievement of the results defined in Target 15 of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species? (see text above, and the answers given in Section V concerning SPMS Target 1 on awareness)

(select all that apply)

- Education campaigns in schools
- ✓ Public awareness campaigns
- ✓ Capacity building
- ✓ Knowledge and data-sharing initiatives
- ✓ Capacity assessments/gap analyses
- Agreements at policy level on research priorities
- Other (please specify): [free text]
- No steps have been taken.

In addition to national initiatives, Fiji actively collaborates with regional intergovernmental bodies to enhance the science base and data-sharing networks for migratory species. A primary example is our ongoing partnership with the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA), which facilitates critical regional knowledge sharing, data collection, and capacity building concerning highly migratory tuna populations.

Please describe the contribution these steps have made towards achieving the results defined in Target 15:

[question will only appear for those strategies selected above]

Public Awareness Campaigns

- Education programs and campaigns have increased knowledge about migratory species such as marine turtles, seabirds, and whales.
- Communities are more aware of the ecological importance of migratory species and the need to protect their habitats.

Community Engagement Programs

- Locally managed marine areas (LMMAs) and community-based conservation initiatives involve local populations directly in monitoring and protecting migratory species.
- This engagement encourages sustainable practices and supports long-term conservation.

Regional and International Collaboration

- Engagement with regional partners like Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme supports knowledge-sharing and promotes best practices in awareness-raising.

Integration into National Strategies

- Awareness and education initiatives have been integrated into Fiji's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP), aligning national priorities with Target 15.

This ensures a consistent, coordinated approach across government and communities.

What assistance (if any) does your country require in order to build sufficient capacity to implement its obligations under the CMS and relevant Resolutions of the COP?
(select all that apply)

- ✓ Funding support
- ✓ Technical assistance
- ✓ Education/training/mentoring
- ✓ Other skills development
- ✓ Provision of equipment or materials
- ✓ Exchange of information & know-how
- ✓ Research & innovation.
- ✓ Mobilizing volunteer effort (e.g. citizen science)
- Other (please specify): [free text]

XIX. RESOURCE MOBILIZATION

(SPMS Target 16: The mobilization of adequate resources from all sources to implement the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species effectively has increased substantially.)

During the reporting period, has your country made financial or other resources available for conservation activities specifically benefiting migratory species?

- Yes, made available for activities within the country.**
- Yes, made available for activities in one or more other countries.
- No

If yes, to which particular targets [\[texts of targets to be linked here\]](#) in the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species has this made a contribution? (Identify all those that apply).

If yes, please indicate whether the overall levels of resourcing concerned are the same or different from those in the previous reporting period:

- Increased
- The same
- Decreased
- Not known**

During the reporting period, has your country received financial or other resources for conservation activities specifically benefiting migratory species?

- Yes**
- No

If yes, please select the source(s) concerned (select all that apply)

- Multilateral investment bank
- The Global Environment Facility (GEF)**
- Other intergovernmental programme
- Private sector
- Non-governmental organization(s)**
- Individual country governments/government agencies [\[drop down list allowing multiple selections\]](#)
- Other (please specify): [\[free text\]](#)

If yes, to which particular targets [\[texts of targets to be linked here\]](#) in the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species has this made a contribution? (Identify all those that apply).

Resources from the GEF and NGO partners have supported several key initiatives contributing to the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species (SPMS). Specifically, funding has advanced SPMS Targets 1.2 and 2.2 through the Conservation International SAMBIO Project (Safeguarding Marine and Terrestrial Biodiversity in Fiji). Contributions to SPMS Targets 2.3 and 3.2 are being achieved via Blue Prosperity Fiji and the Lau Seascape Program. Furthermore, SPMS Targets 3.4

and 3.5 are actively addressed through Island Restoration and Invasive Alien Species (IAS) programs designed to protect migratory petrels and shearwaters. These integrated efforts concurrently advance broad alignment with GBF Target 16.

If yes, which migratory species have benefited as a result of this support?

This support has directly benefited several critical migratory species. Beneficiary sea and shorebirds include the Wedge-tailed Shearwater (*Ardenna pacifica*), Wandering Tattler (*Tringa incana*), Pacific Golden Plover (*Pluvialis fulva*), Ruddy Turnstone (*Arenaria interpres*), and the White-throated Storm Petrel (*Nesofregetta fuliginosa*). Additionally, the funding has provided direct conservation benefits to migratory marine turtles.

.....

[\[option to add more rows\]](#)

If yes, please indicate whether the overall levels of resourcing concerned are the same or different from those in the previous reporting period:

- Increased
- ✓ **The same**
- Decreased
- Not known

Which are the most important CMS implementation priorities requiring future support in your country? (name up to three specific types of activity)

The three foremost CMS implementation priorities requiring future support in Fiji are:

1. **Targeted Research and Capacity Building:** Identifying specific scientific research gaps for CMS-listed species to inform the development of evidence-based public awareness and national advocacy campaigns.
2. **Strengthening National Reporting Mechanisms:** Establishing formal, standardized data collection and reporting pathways that seamlessly bridge local community observations with national institutional frameworks.
3. **Expansion of Customary Management Plans:** Developing comprehensive, species-specific Community-Based Management Plans across all customary fishing grounds (qoliqoli). This will ensure all CMS species are systematically managed, scaling up beyond current fragmented initiatives led by various institutions.

Please add any further comments you may wish on the implementation of specific provisions in COP Resolution 10.25 (Rev. COP12) on *Enhancing Engagement with the Global Environment Facility*.

No available information.