



CONVENTION ON MIGRATORY SPECIES

Distribution: General

UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.19.3
2 October 2014

Original: English

11th MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES

Quito, Ecuador, 4-9 November 2014

Agenda Item 19.3

ANALYSIS AND SYNTHESIS OF NATIONAL REPORTS

Summary:

This analysis summarizes the information provided by Parties to CMS in their national reports submitted to the 11th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties in 2014. The national reporting process aims to assess progress in implementation of the Convention, and helps to guide decisions on current and future strategic priorities. The analysis covers the following specific reporting areas: activities relating to Appendix I species; potential new species listings; development of new Agreements; protected areas; satellite telemetry; mobilization of resources and implementation of Resolutions and Recommendations.

ANALYSIS AND SYNTHESIS OF NATIONAL REPORTS

(Prepared by the UNEP/CMS Secretariat in collaboration with UNEP-WCMC)

Background

1. Article VI(3) of the Convention requires Parties to inform the Conference of the Parties (COP), through the Secretariat, at least six months prior to each ordinary meeting of the Conference, about the measures that they are taking to implement the provisions of the Convention relating to Appendix I and II species. Consequently, the COP adopted, at its Seventh Meeting, a standard report format. The standard report format has since been updated and improved by the Standing Committee, following lessons learnt from previous reporting rounds.
2. At COP9 in 2008, Parties adopted Res.9.4 calling upon the Secretariats and Parties to CMS Agreements to collaborate in the implementation and harmonization of online reporting. In 2014, for the first time, the national report template was made available online via the Online Reporting System (ORS) developed by UNEP-WCMC. The ORS was used by Parties to complete and submit their national reports, and has been used by UNEP-WCMC to produce this analysis.
3. National reports provide an important means to assess the status of implementation of the Convention and help to guide decisions on current and future strategic priorities. The present document provides an overview of the status of implementation of the Convention as reflected in the information provided by the 59 out of 118 eligible Parties¹ which had submitted national reports using the standard online reporting format by 27 June 2014².
4. This analysis summarizes information provided in Sections II (omitting questions on specific Appendix I species), III, V, VI, IX and X of the national reports. A more in-depth summary of this information is provided in document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Inf.42.

Appendix I species overview

5. The **taking of Appendix I species** is prohibited by the majority of Range States for the following major groups: birds (92 per cent of the 59 reporting Parties), aquatic mammals (64 per cent), reptiles (51 per cent), terrestrial mammals (including bats; 32 per cent), and fish (41 per cent). For all groups, exceptions to the prohibition on take are granted by some Parties, principally for scientific or safety reasons or for customary take by indigenous communities.
6. **By-catch** was once again the threat reported most frequently for aquatic mammals and reptiles, and was also highlighted as a threat to birds and fish. Actions taken by Parties to reduce by-catch include regulations relating to the use of appropriate fishing gear and strengthened enforcement measures, for example through use of patrols and observers, and implementation of a range of by-catch mitigation strategies, such as use of turtle exclusion devices and acoustic deterrents and establishment of turtle release tanks at ports. A number of Parties noted that sharing of experiences between Parties in this area would be useful.

¹ The European Union is not required to submit a national report; Kyrgyzstan acceded after the deadline for report submission.

² National reports are available at <http://www.cms.int/en/documents/national-reports>.

7. **Habitat loss and fragmentation** are the main obstacles to migration affecting birds and terrestrial mammals, and were also noted to have a major impact on reptiles. Efforts to address these threats include the creation and expansion of protected areas, including migratory corridors, and habitat restoration. The importance of knowledge-sharing between Range States and trans-boundary management was identified by a number of Parties.

8. **Poaching, collection of eggs and illegal trade** were among the major threats reported by Parties to birds, reptiles and terrestrial mammals, but also affected other taxa. Efforts to alleviate these pressures include the development of new legislation and strengthened enforcement, implementation of species protection measures and campaigns to raise awareness, with many Parties noting the key role of community and stakeholder engagement in ensuring the success of anti-poaching measures.

9. **Pollution**, including marine debris, was also cited as a major threat to aquatic mammals and reptiles, and also affected fish and birds. In particular, Parties highlighted entanglement in fishing nets and ingestion of debris as major concerns. Actions undertaken to mitigate these threats include beach clean-ups, decreased use of plastic bags, development of guidelines for disentanglement and establishment of rescue centres to rehabilitate affected animals.

10. **Other major threats** included: noise pollution, for example from seismic surveys; collision with shipping traffic; man-made barriers such as wind turbines, power lines and dams; and unregulated tourism. Environmental Impact Assessments were frequently cited as actions to minimize the negative impacts of developments and man-made obstacles; the development of best practice guidelines was also commonly highlighted by Parties. Climate change was identified as a threat to all groups other than fish.

11. **Limiting factors** frequently reported by Parties include financial constraints, weak enforcement and governance, lack of capacity and deficiencies in data and information. Other reported constraints included population growth, poverty, lack of political will and climate change.

12. **Assistance required** by Parties to overcome the aforementioned threats was principally in the form of financial support (33 Parties), capacity building/knowledge exchange (27 Parties), technical or material support (23 Parties), scientific support (18 Parties) and regional or international cooperation (11 Parties; Table 1).

Table 1. Assistance required by Parties to overcome obstacles to migration and other threats facing Appendix I species.

Assistance required	Birds	Aquatic Mammals	Reptiles	Terrestrial Mammals	Fish
Financial	Armenia, Argentina, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Burkina Faso, Ghana, Honduras, Kenya, Mali, Madagascar, Pakistan, Rep. of Moldova, Serbia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, The FYR Macedonia, Uganda, Uruguay	Benin, Burkina Faso, Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ghana, Kenya, Honduras, Madagascar, Pakistan, Samoa, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Uruguay	Bolivia, Congo, Croatia, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ghana, Honduras, Israel, Kenya, Madagascar, Netherlands, Pakistan, Samoa, Uruguay	Argentina, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Congo, Egypt, Eritrea, Honduras, Kenya, Mali, Pakistan, Tajikistan, Uganda	Benin, Egypt, Peru,
Regional/international cooperation	Argentina, Bolivia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia	Australia, India, Norway, Pakistan	Bolivia, India, Norway, Pakistan, South Africa	India, Netherlands, Pakistan, Tajikistan	Netherlands, New Zealand, Saudi Arabia
Scientific research/monitoring	Costa Rica, Hungary, Saudi Arabia	Australia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Honduras, Kenya, Peru, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Uruguay	Benin, Costa Rica, Croatia, Honduras, Netherlands, Samoa	Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Mali, Uganda	Peru
Technical/material support/infrastructure	Armenia, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Burkina Faso, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ghana, Mali, Pakistan, Peru, Serbia, South Africa, Tajikistan	Benin, Burkina Faso, Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ghana, Pakistan, Peru, Samoa,	Congo, Croatia, Egypt, Eritrea, Ghana, Honduras, Pakistan, Uruguay	Burkina Faso, Congo, Egypt, Eritrea, Honduras, Mali, Pakistan, Tajikistan, Uganda	Benin, Egypt, Eritrea, Peru, Saudi Arabia
Human resources/training/capacity-building/ knowledge exchange	Benin, Burkina Faso, Congo, Costa Rica, Ecuador, India, Italy, Madagascar, Mali, , New Zealand, Niger, Pakistan, Republic of Moldova, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukraine	Benin, Burkina Faso, Costa Rica, Eritrea, Niger, Pakistan, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukraine, Uruguay	Benin, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Eritrea, India, Niger, Saudi Arabia, Uruguay	Argentina, Bolivia, Congo, Honduras, India, Mali, Netherlands, Niger, South Africa, Uruguay	Benin, Eritrea
Awareness/education	Congo, Costa Rica, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Serbia	Burkina Faso, Honduras, Kenya, Samoa	Samoa, Uruguay		
Other	Armenia, Cyprus, Hungary, New Zealand, Peru, The FYR Macedonia, Ukraine, Uruguay	Australia, Benin, Ghana, Israel, South Africa, Ukraine	Benin, Honduras, Kenya, Netherlands, Peru	Argentina, Bolivia, Congo, Kenya, Mali, Uganda	India, Kenya, Peru

Potential New Species Listings

13. Sixteen endangered migratory taxa that are not currently listed in **Appendix I** were identified by eight Parties (see UNEP/CMS/COP11/Inf.42, Table 3.1 for details). Although the total number of taxa reported decreased compared to 2011, the number of fish species increased from two to six. Nine of the same taxa were identified in 2014 as in 2011; 12 of the taxa identified are already listed in Appendix II.

14. Although six Parties reported that they were taking steps to propose taxa for inclusion in Appendix I, only one gave further details relating to such a proposal: Hungary noted the proposal to list European Roller *Coracias garrulus* on Appendix I that has been submitted to COP 11 by the European Union and its Member States. Other taxa identified that have been formally proposed for listing at COP 11 were Gazelles (Red-fronted Gazelle *Eudorcas rufifrons* proposed for listing in Appendix I by Niger and Senegal) and European Eel *Anguilla anguilla* (proposed for listing in Appendix II by Monaco). Seven Parties reported a requirement for financial and/or technical support to initiate species listings, while two Parties reported a need for support from other countries to develop listing proposals (Benin) and share experiences (Bolivia).

15. Sixteen endangered migratory taxa that are not currently listed in **Appendix II** were identified by seven Parties (see UNEP/CMS/COP11/Inf.42, Table 3.2 for details). As was the case in the section on Appendix I listings, the number of taxa reported by Parties decreased compared to 2011 but there was an increase in the number of fish species identified. Two of the same taxa were mentioned in 2014 as in 2011: Ortolan Bunting *Emberiza hortulana* and European Eel *Anguilla anguilla*. The last mentioned of these species has been proposed for inclusion in Appendix II at COP11 by Monaco.

16. Four Parties reported taking steps to propose species for inclusion in Appendix II, of which only one provided further details relating to the species in question: Egypt reported that it was consulting with Range States regarding the listing of sharks, and has submitted a proposal for listing the Silky Shark *Carcharhinus falciformis* in Appendix II at COP11. Six Parties reported that financial and/or technical assistance is required to initiate species listings; Bolivia noted that there was a need for standard methodological guidelines.

Development of new Agreements

17. Although 24 Parties (41 per cent of reporting Parties) reported their involvement in **initiating, participating in or planning** the development of new CMS Agreements, the details provided in many cases related to Agreements already in force; no new Agreements or MoUs have come into force during the current reporting period.

18. **Plans for new Agreements** reported by Parties covered a range of taxa, including Grey-cheeked Parakeet *Brotogeris pyrrhopterus* and Peruvian Tern *Sterna lorata* (Ecuador), Snow Leopard *Uncia uncia* (India) and African bat species (South Africa). South Africa also indicated its intention to evaluate the extent of the MoU on Atlantic Turtles, while Ecuador and Samoa both noted the need for new turtle MoUs (on Hawksbill Turtle *Eretmochelys imbricata* and turtles in the Pacific Island region, respectively). Costa Rica mentioned that it was working with Honduras and Panama, but provided no further details.

19. **Other activities** reported in this section included development of the African-Eurasian Migratory Landbirds Action Plan (Croatia, Slovakia and Switzerland); participation in the Grey-crowned Crane Single Species Action Planning Workshop (South Africa); development of a Single Species Action Plan for Loggerhead Turtle *Caretta caretta* in the South Pacific (Australia); development of an international action plan for Argali *Ovis ammon* (Tajikistan); promotion of the Central Asian Mammal Initiative (Germany); and supporting a website to share information on Saiga Antelope *Saiga tatarica* (Switzerland).

20. Thirteen Parties reported the **requirement for assistance** to initiate or participate in the development of new Agreements, generally in the form of financial and/or technical support. Australia noted that support and coordination of the consultation process by the CMS Secretariat is helpful.

Protected areas

21. Migratory species are reportedly taken into account in the **selection, establishment and management** of protected areas within 56 (95 per cent) of the reporting Parties; this is an apparent improvement relative to both 2011 and 2008 (91 per cent and 93 per cent of reporting Parties, respectively). Twenty-seven Parties indicated that migratory species are taken into account in legislation or criteria pertaining to the designation of national protected areas, while 23 Parties reportedly apply international designations that consider migratory species, notably EU-specific designations within the Natura 2000 framework, Ramsar Sites and Important Bird Areas.

22. **Important sites** for migratory species were identified by 53 Parties, the majority of which are protected under national and international designations; private reserves were also mentioned by two Parties, while three Parties identified a total of eight sites that reportedly have no formal protection status.

23. Information on the **number and/or extent** of protected areas covering marine, aquatic and terrestrial habitats was provided by 51 Parties. In total, Parties declared 27,451 protected areas covering a total area of 6,383,634 km². The Parties reporting the greatest area of coverage of terrestrial, aquatic and marine protected areas, respectively, were Finland (37,000 km²), Bolivia (over 148,000 km²) and Australia (over three million km²).

24. **Positive outcomes** relating to protected areas were identified by 37 Parties; the most commonly reported outcomes included the establishment or expansion of protected areas, protection of vulnerable species and habitats, implementation of specific conservation measures, increased research and monitoring and greater public engagement. Four Parties reported that population sizes of migratory species had increased as a result of protection, for example Uganda reported increased numbers of Mountain Gorilla *Gorilla beringei*.

Satellite telemetry

25. Satellite telemetry projects were reportedly carried out **during the reporting period** by 43 Parties (73 per cent of reporting Parties); this represents an increase compared to 2011 (59 per cent of reporting Parties). The number of CMS-listed taxa involved in reported studies also increased compared with 2011, from 61 to 66 taxa. Two thirds of these taxa are birds, of which almost half are birds of prey. Notably, six Parties reported projects involving fish taxa (primarily sharks) in the current reporting period, compared to none in the period 2008-2011.

26. **Future projects** using this technology are planned by 34 Parties (58 per cent of reporting Parties) and involve a total of 37 taxa, over half of which are birds. Reasons most commonly cited by Parties for lack of planned projects were financial constraints and shortage of technical expertise and/or equipment. Although one Party reported the lack of suitable tags for small-bodied species as a constraint, Switzerland reported that a new low-weight geolocator device had been developed by the Swiss Ornithological Institute that was suitable for small bird species.

27. **Positive outcomes** of satellite telemetry studies were reported by 27 Parties and included improved knowledge of migratory routes allowing the identification and prioritization of important areas for conservation, greater understanding of causes of mortality, development of targeted conservation and management measures and enhanced knowledge of species biology and behaviour.

Resource mobilization

28. Financial resources were made available by 46 Parties (78 per cent of reporting Parties) for conservation activities **in their own country** that directly benefited migratory species; this proportion is equivalent to that in 2011. Of the 74 taxa identified as having benefited from such funding, over two thirds were birds. Conservation activities most frequently reported by Parties included monitoring animal populations, establishment and management of protected areas, habitat restoration, hosting workshops, awareness-raising, development and implementation of species action plans and implementation of national environmental policies.

29. Five Parties reported **voluntary contributions to the CMS Trust Fund** to support requests from developing countries; contributions were reportedly directed to the CMS Secretariat, various CMS Family meetings and workshops and the AEWA African Initiative. Twelve Parties reported that they made voluntary financial contributions to support conservation activities having direct benefits for migratory species in other countries, while 16 Parties reportedly provided **technical and/or scientific assistance** to developing countries to facilitate initiatives for the benefit of migratory species.

30. Ten Parties reported the **receipt of financial assistance from the CMS Trust Fund** for national conservation activities having direct benefits for migratory species; twelve taxa were identified by these Parties as having benefited from these activities, of which half are mammals. Twenty-eight Parties reported the receipt of financial assistance from **sources other than the CMS Secretariat** for such activities; these included various EU funding sources, national governments, GEF/UNDP, and international NGOs and agreements. The majority of the 53 taxa cited as having benefited from these activities are birds.

Implementation of Resolutions and Recommendations

31. Parties were asked to report on measures undertaken to address issues highlighted in 34 Resolutions and 6 Recommendations. Party responses are summarized below by grouping together Resolutions and Recommendations covering similar topics (see UNEP/CMS/COP11/Inf.42 for details on responses relating to specific Resolutions and Recommendations).

32. Twenty-six Parties reported on Resolutions relating to efforts to reduce **by-catch**, which included work to improve fisheries legislation and management; awareness raising; use of deterrents; gear restrictions; establishment of protected areas; and monitoring of by-catch levels. Several EU Member States referred to EU Regulations that prohibit the discharging of by-catch.

33. Marine debris, oil pollution, electrocution, wind turbines, and noise pollution are some of the **man-made obstacles and human-induced impacts** that Parties took measures to address; 37 Parties reported on efforts made to reduce the impacts of such threats on migratory species. Marine debris is being addressed through on- and off-shore clean-ups, awareness raising, regulatory measures and participation in relevant international agreements. Measures to prevent and mitigate oil pollution include legislation, emergency response plans (including facilities to treat oiled birds) and regular monitoring. New Zealand reported the establishment of a wildlife treatment and rehabilitation facility capable of housing 500 oiled birds in response to an oil spill in 2011. Parties reported various measures to reduce the risk of electrocution to birds, while 25 Parties reported the use of Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) for major developments, including wind farms. Further actions included research into the impact of noise pollution and disentanglement programmes.

34. Fifteen Parties reported on **global flyway conservation**, with several Parties underlining the relevance of their national protected areas. Other activities include monitoring and research on migration routes, international cooperation and fostering the involvement of stakeholders from a range of sectors. Twenty-five Parties took measures in the context of **ecological networks**, with many again highlighting the importance of their national protected areas. Parties reportedly applied spatial planning processes and regulatory measures to improve habitat connectivity, and several EU Member States referred to the role of Natura 2000 sites in forming an ecological network.

35. Thirty-four Parties reported on actions taken in relation to **migratory birds**. Various monitoring and research activities have taken place or are underway to study albatrosses, and many Range States reported actions to protect the Saker Falcon *Falco cherrug*. Several Parties have signed or ratified ACAP or the Birds of Prey MoU, while others noted their involvement in the preparation of the Saker Falcon Global Action Plan, AEWa and EAAFP. Actions to combat poisoning included awareness raising, national legislation, enforcement measures and the controlled distribution or banning of poisonous substances such as zinc oxide and lead shot. Parties also reported on monitoring of populations and national Red List assessments.

36. Actions for **migratory marine species** were taken by 19 Parties and include the development of conservation/action plans for several species, including African Penguin *Spheniscus demersus*, Dugong *Dugong dugon* and Whale Shark *Rhincodon typus*. Comprehensive status assessments are under way in Australia for Minke Whale *Balaenoptera bonaerensis* and Bryde's Whale *Balaenoptera edeni*. Parties expressed their support of existing CMS Agreements and of the IWC, particularly regarding the promotion of good management and mitigation of threats. Further measures included various by-catch reduction measures, regulation of whale watching and facilities to rescue and release injured animals.

37. Measures to support the conservation of **migratory freshwater fish** were reported by seven Parties and included efforts to increase natural reproduction, provision of suitable habitat and removal of obstacles to migration. Parties also carried out population status assessments and research into the impact of non-native species.

38. Four Parties reported on Recommendations relating to **migratory terrestrial mammals**. Tajikistan is seeking trans-boundary cooperation through the Global Snow Leopard Ecosystem Protection Program, while Germany organized and financially supported workshops on migratory **central Eurasian aridland mammals** and supported **elephant** *Loxodonta africana* anti-poaching activities. India reported the identification of five trans-boundary reserves for the conservation of **tiger** *Panthera tigris* in the context of Recommendation 9.3 on Asian Big Cats, and is in the process of signing cooperation agreements with neighbouring countries.

39. Concerted actions for **Appendix I species** taken by 14 Parties included the development of action plans, implementation of relevant CMS Agreements, national legislation and workshops. Activities benefiting the Lesser White-fronted Goose *Anser erythropus*, Aquatic Warbler *Acrocephalus paludicola*, Great Bustard *Otis tarda*, Ferruginous Duck *Aythya nyroca* and Mountain Gorilla *Gorilla beringei* were cited by Parties.

40. Twenty-six Parties reported on **cooperation with other bodies, Conventions and processes and synergies and partnerships**. Parties reported work with CBD, CITES, UNCCD, UNDP, UNEP, UNFCCC and Ramsar and cooperation with a number of other organizations and NGOs. Several Parties underlined the importance of close cooperation amongst the national focal points of the different Conventions and fostering synergies between Conventions; some noted that CMS National Focal Points are involved in the NBSAP development process. Further relevant actions included trans-boundary cooperation and sharing of expertise.

41. The impacts of **climate change** on migratory species were addressed by 19 Parties, of which 11 have developed national strategies to address this potential threat. Habitat restoration and improving habitat connectivity are further actions taken by Parties to facilitate migration and shifting distributions. Many Parties are monitoring migratory species and other elements of biodiversity to assess their vulnerability to climate change; New Zealand noted a major decline in numbers of trans-equatorial migratory birds, which it considered partly attributable to climate change and habitat loss.

42. Actions to address risks from **avian influenza** were taken by 19 Parties, the majority undertaking monitoring and screening of wild and domesticated birds; further measures included awareness raising, improved biosecurity systems, research and action plans. Several EU Member States also referred to the measures in place within the EU to report and respond to avian influenza.

43. Work on **outreach and communication issues** was reported by 16 Parties, with actions ranging from public awareness campaigns, organizing popular events and producing publications and websites with information on migratory species. Parties underlined the importance of information exchange amongst a wide range of stakeholders and the wider public to support the implementation of CMS targets. Parties also reported on **capacity building** activities such as the organization of conferences and training workshops; Slovakia reported the establishment of a training centre for Carpathian countries.

44. Measures taken to ensure **sustainable use** were reported by 20 Parties, including the development of national strategies, regional outreach activities, and commitment to sustainable hunting practices. Activities to promote sustainable use by indigenous people, including non-consumptive use and benefit-sharing, were also reported.

45. Actions relating to the **CMS Strategic Plan 2006-2011** were reported by 14 Parties and included integration of migratory species into national biodiversity strategies and legislation, support through workshops and financial contributions, and activities to build regional capacity and raise awareness. Fourteen Parties assisted **CMS in contributing to achieving the 2010 biodiversity target**, through national strategies, implementation of conservation action and promotion of ecosystem services. Eleven Parties reported actions in relation to **existing** CMS Agreements, including the MoUs for Sharks, Gorilla, Great Bustard, Pacific Island Cetaceans, Birds of Prey and Aquatic Warbler. Parties also expressed their commitment to development of **future Agreements**. The **“Future Shape” process** was supported by seven Parties through involvement in the Strategic Plan Working Group, national activities and regional and international collaboration.

46. Fourteen Parties reported on activities undertaken to **promote coordination of CMS with related conventions**, in particular CBD, CITES and Ramsar, such as close cooperation between the national focal points for different conventions. Seven Parties reported on **CMS information priorities**, including support for the online reporting format and promotion of further harmonization of reporting formats, both within the CMS Family as a priority and across MEAs.

Conclusions and Recommendations

47. On the basis of this analysis, the following priority recommendations have been identified for the consideration of the Parties to CMS to improve implementation of the Convention and ensure the conservation of migratory species. It is worth noting that COP11 will discuss a number of documents that relate to improving implementation of the Convention and that may have implications regarding future national Reporting, such as UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.15.2 (Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023) and Doc.18.3 (A Review Process for the Convention).

Species-related activities

48. **New species listings:** The CMS Scientific Council is encouraged to consider the suggestions by Parties of species that may merit listing in Appendix I and/or II (see UNEP/CMS/COP11/Inf.42, Tables 3.1 and 3.2 for details) to determine whether listing is merited on the basis of the Criteria for Amendment of the Appendices (UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.24.2), and indicate priority species for further research so that resources can be allocated or raised by Parties and the Secretariat.

49. **Threat mitigation:** Threats frequently cited by Parties as having negative impacts on a range of migratory species included by-catch, habitat loss and degradation, illegal hunting, pollution, ship strikes and man-made obstacles (such as wind farms and power lines). Parties are encouraged to take action to mitigate the impact of these threats on migratory species as a priority, making use of the CMS guidelines available (for example Guidelines on Wildlife-friendly Infrastructure Design, UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.23.3.2), and those Parties with effective threat reduction strategies are encouraged to share experiences and resources with other Parties (see below).

50. **Legislation prohibiting take:** Many Parties do not currently have specific legislation in place prohibiting the take of Appendix I species, particularly for taxa other than birds. Parties are encouraged to share model legislation and to adopt such legislation to assist in protecting vulnerable populations.

Capacity-building and information access

51. **Cooperation, capacity-building and knowledge sharing:** A lack of capacity and relevant expertise were frequently cited by Parties as limiting factors in taking action to mitigate the threats to migratory species. Many Parties specifically requested knowledge transfer from other countries, in particular with regard to monitoring and research (such as satellite telemetry studies) and the implementation of particular threat mitigation measures (such as the use of by-catch mitigation devices in fisheries). Parties are encouraged to provide assistance in the form of training and knowledge sharing to other countries (particularly developing countries) to aid with implementation of the Convention, potentially through development of an online capacity-building 'marketplace' as part of the NFP Forum.

52. **Online information management:** Although the re-development of the CMS website has resulted in improvements in the accessibility of information relating to the Convention, many Parties still do not appear to be actively using these resources, as evidenced by some confusion over the listing, nomenclature and distribution of certain species. It is recommended that Parties utilize the resources available on the CMS website, as well as the Species+³ database developed by UNEP-WCMC, which includes information on synonyms and allows users to search for species by country and to download species listing information in CSV format. A lack of awareness of the coverage of certain Resolutions and Recommendations by some Parties was also apparent; for example, several Parties indicated that Res.7.3 relating to oil pollution did not apply to them since their country is landlocked; however, this Resolution covers terrestrial and freshwater as well as marine environments. A user-friendly search facility for accessing the valid Resolutions and Recommendations should be considered in order to assist with implementation and reporting.

Linkages with other international agreements and bodies

53. **Collaboration with other MEAs:** Many of the issues that CMS is striving to address are also being discussed in other relevant fora. Fostering links and collaborating closely with MEAs that have made progress in areas of interest to CMS would be advantageous. These include, for example, CBD, CCAMLR, CITES, MARPOL, OSPAR, Ramsar and UNCLOS. The InforMEA portal developed by the MEA Information and Knowledge Management Initiative, of which CMS is a part, may prove useful in this regard. The outputs of the UNEP project *Improving the effectiveness of and cooperation among the biodiversity related Conventions and exploring opportunities for further synergies*, including the *Sourcebook of opportunities for enhancing cooperation and collaboration among the biodiversity-related conventions at the national and regional levels*, may be helpful in identifying synergies amongst the biodiversity related Conventions.

54. **Engagement in IPBES:** Continued close engagement in IPBES is encouraged, to ensure that issues of concern to CMS are taken into consideration, where appropriate, and relevant outputs (such as the thematic assessments and catalogue of policy support tools and methodologies) are disseminated and utilized.

55. **Collaboration with RFMOs:** As by-catch was cited as a major threat to many CMS-listed species and many Parties are members of RFMOs, Parties are encouraged to raise CMS-specific concerns through these fora in order to strengthen by-catch mitigation measures and monitoring. Collaboration with RFMOs and other regional or international bodies with a

³ <http://speciesplus.net/>.

focus on marine management issues may also assist in addressing threats to migratory species in areas beyond national jurisdiction.

National reporting

56. **Uptake of the ORS across the CMS Family:** Uptake of the ORS for national reporting across all CMS Agreements would facilitate streamlining of reporting, both within the CMS Family and with other related MEAs using the ORS. Such streamlining could encourage synergies and potentially result in a substantial reduction in duplication of effort by Parties in meeting their reporting obligations.

57. **Revision of the national report form:** It is recommended that future revisions of the national report form following adoption of the new CMS Strategic Plan, as envisaged in UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.15.2/Annex I, tailor all questions to solicit targeted responses relating to specific objectives. This would not only allow a more meaningful assessment of progress in implementation of the Convention, but would also reduce the reporting burden on Parties by ensuring that only the most relevant information is requested. UNEP-WCMC will provide more specific recommendations for improvements to the national report form to the Secretariat directly.

Action requested:

The Conference of the Parties is invited:

- To take note of the analysis and its recommendations.