



CONVENTION ON MIGRATORY SPECIES

Distribution: General

UNEP/CMS/COP11/REPORT

Original: English

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON THE
CONSERVATION OF MIGRATORY SPECIES OF WILD ANIMALS
11TH MEETING
Quito, Ecuador, 4-9 November 2014

Proceedings of the 11th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties Part I

REPORT OF THE 11TH MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF MIGRATORY SPECIES OF WILD ANIMALS

INTRODUCTION

1. At the invitation of the Government of Ecuador, the 11th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS COP11) was held in Quito, Ecuador, from 4 to 9 November 2014. “Time for Action” was the driving theme of COP11. The Conference was immediately preceded by a High Level Ministerial Panel.

2. **High Level Ministerial Panel:** For the first time before a COP, a High Level Ministerial Panel was held on Monday, 3 November 2014 (1300 to 1600 hrs.) and was presided over by H.E. Ms. Lorena Tapia, the Environment Minister of Ecuador. The concept for this ministerial dialogue was “Green Economy” and the “Rights of Nature”. The concept note for the event is annexed to this Report. This event, facilitated by leading experts, was open to all COP participants. The Statement of the Chair of the High Level Ministerial Panel is annexed to this report.

3. The Conference was attended by representatives of the following 63 Parties and 5 non-Parties.

Parties: Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, European Union, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Honduras, Israel, Italy, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Senegal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Zimbabwe

Non-Parties: Brazil, Canada, Iraq, United Arab Emirates, United States of America

4. Observers from governmental and non-governmental bodies or agencies were also represented. The complete list of participants appears in ANNEX IX to the present report.

I. OPENING OF THE MEETING AND ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

OPENING OF THE MEETING (ITEM 1)

5. The Opening Ceremony was held on Tuesday, 4 November. The Ceremony was divided into informal and formal segments.

Informal Opening Ceremony

6. The Informal Opening Ceremony was held between 1000 and 1130 hrs. and commenced with a short video welcoming participants to Ecuador, followed by inspiring and motivational presentations by three speakers. Ms. Ashlan Gorse Cousteau acted as Master of Ceremonies.

7. Presentations were made by:

- Mr. Achmat Hassiem (South Africa) - a shark attack survivor and Paralympian Bronze Medallist, who was now a shark conservationist and advocate
- Mr. Boyan Slat (Netherlands) - a campaigner and coordinator of an ambitious marine debris reduction programme
- Mr. Philippe Cousteau (United States of America) - a leader in the environmental movement, and award-winning communicator and philanthropist

Formal High-level Opening Ceremony

8. The High-Level Opening Ceremony was held from 1130 to 1200 hrs. and was presided over by Mr. Alfred Oteng-Yeboah, Chair of the CMS Standing Committee.

WELCOMING ADDRESSES (ITEM 2)

KEYNOTE ADDRESS (ITEM 3)

9. Addresses were delivered by:

- H.E. Ms. Lorena Tapia, Minister of the Environment, Ecuador
- H.E. Ms. Tine Sundoft, Minister of Climate and Environment, Norway (by video)
- H.E. Mr. Noël Nelson Messone, Minister of the Environment, Gabon
- Ms. Elizabeth Mrema, Director of the UNEP Division of Environmental Law and Conventions
- Mr. Achim Steiner, Executive Director of UNEP (by video)
- Mr. John E. Scanlon, Secretary-General of CITES
- Mr. Bradnee Chambers, Executive Secretary of CMS

RULES OF PROCEDURE (ITEM 4)

10. Items 4 and 5 of the Agenda were chaired by the Chair of the Standing Committee, Mr. Alfred Oteng-Yeboah (Ghana). He introduced the Rules of Procedure for the 11th

Meeting of the Conference of the Parties (UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.4: *Rules of Procedure*) and invited the Meeting to adopt them.

11. The representative of Uganda noted that there appeared to be a conflict between Rule 16 of the Rules of Procedure and Article 7.7 of the Convention text.

12. This observation was supported by the representatives of Israel, Egypt and Panama.

13. The representative of Uganda proposed that Rule 16 of the Rules of Procedure be amended to read: “*Except where otherwise provided for under the provisions of the Convention, these Rules or the Terms of Reference for the Administration of the Trust Fund, all votes shall be decided by a two-thirds majority of votes cast.*”

14. The Rules of Procedure for COP11, contained in Annex 1 to Doc.4, were adopted, subject to inclusion of the amendment proposed by Uganda and reproduced as ANNEX I to the present report. ANNEX II contains the Rules of Procedure for future meetings of the Conference of the Parties, endorsed for adoption at COP12.

15. Mr. Chris Wold (Secretariat) made further reference to document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.4: *Rules of Procedure*, and explained in detail the consequences of proposed amendments contained in Annexes 2 and 3. If adopted, these amendments would be applied at future COPs.

16. The Chair confirmed that these proposed amendments would be further discussed in the Drafting Group (see Agenda Item 7: *Establishment of Credentials Committee and Other Sessional Committees*) but opened the floor for preliminary comments.

17. The representative of the EU and its Member States supported dealing with this Agenda Item in the Drafting Group. For consistency the EU would welcome an amendment to the Rules of Procedure stating that the credentials for EU delegates to CMS meetings could be signed by the European Commissioner for Environment.

18. The representative of New Zealand recalled that New Zealand had chaired the Standing Committee Working Group that had considered this issue. Thanks were due to all Parties that contributed, as well as to the Secretariat for its support and careful review. Many of the Secretariat’s proposals in Annex 3 to the document were minor ‘tidying-up’ amendments that were consistent with the Working Group’s intentions and New Zealand supported those. Others were more substantive and New Zealand therefore supported the proposal to take this Agenda Item forward in the Drafting Group and looked forward to being an active participant.

19. The Chair invited all those Parties and observers who wished to bring forward further comments or proposed amendments to participate in the Drafting Group discussion of this Agenda Item.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS (ITEM 5)

20. The Chair recalled that Rule 5 of the Rules of Procedure provided for the election of the Chair of the COP, the Chair of the Conference of the Whole (COW) who would also serve as Vice-Chair of the COP, and the Vice-Chair of the COW.

21. The Conference elected the following officers by acclamation:

Conference of the Parties (COP)

Chair: H.E. Ms. Lorena Tapia, Minister of Environment (Ecuador)

Vice-Chair: Mr. Øystein Størkersen (Norway)

Committee of the Whole (COW)

Chair: Mr. Øystein Størkersen (Norway)

Vice-Chair: Ms. Ndeye Sene Epouse Thiam (Senegal)

22. Taking her place on the podium, the Chair of the COP pledged to do her utmost to guide the Meeting in the best way possible in the pursuit of a successful outcome.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND MEETING SCHEDULE (ITEM 6)

Agenda and Documents (Item 6.1)

Annotated Agenda and Meeting Schedule (Item 6.2)

23. The Chair referred the Meeting to documents:

UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.6.1/Rev.2: *Provisional Agenda and Documents*

UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.6.2: *Provisional Annotated Agenda and Meeting Schedule*

24. There being no proposals for amendments, both documents were adopted by consensus.

25. The Agenda is attached as ANNEX III and the List of Documents as ANNEX IV to the present report.

**ESTABLISHMENT OF CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE AND OTHER SESSIONAL COMMITTEES
(ITEM 7)**

(a) Credentials Committee, Bureau and Budget Committee

26. The Chair recalled that Rule 3 of the Rules of Procedure provided for the establishment of a Credentials Committee of five members. It had been common practice at CMS COPs for those five members to be drawn from each of the five regional groupings. She invited nominations accordingly.

27. The following Parties were elected to serve on the Credentials Committee:

Africa: Uganda

Asia: Pakistan

Europe: Italy

Latin America & Caribbean: Ecuador

Oceania: Philippines

28. The Chair recalled that the Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee of the Whole had been elected under Agenda Item 5.

29. The COP approved establishment of a six-member Bureau, in conformity with Rule 7 of the Rules of Procedure.

30. At the invitation of the Chair, the COP appointed South Africa to chair the COP Budget Committee. She noted that participation in the Budget Committee was open to all Parties.

(b) Sub-groups of the Committee of the Whole

31. During the first session of the Committee of the Whole (COW), the Chair suggested that a number of Working Groups would be necessary but that the number of groups and the topics to be covered would be up to delegates to decide.

32. Nevertheless, a number of aquatic and avian issues would be considered by the COW. The Chair asked whether delegates preferred to establish Working Groups immediately, stressing that he was not precluding debate in the COW, but that he wished to maximize opportunities for timely discussion.

33. In addition to possible thematic Working Groups, a Drafting Group, to be chaired by Mr. Oteng-Yeboah, would be open-ended; all delegates would be eligible to participate in this group.

34. The representative of Brazil proposed the establishment of Working Groups to discuss two resolutions that Brazil considered required amendment: Agenda Item 21.3 on relations between CMS and Civil Society, and Agenda Item 23.4.7 concerning Fighting Wildlife Crime Within and Beyond Borders.

35. The representative of Argentina, on behalf of the Latin America & Caribbean region, requested clarification concerning the scope of the Drafting Group (DG).

36. The Executive Secretary stated that the DG would work in parallel to the COW. The documents envisaged for consideration by the DG all relate to governance issues, notably those concerning Rules of Procedure; Synergies between CMS instruments and other MEAs; Restructuring of the Scientific Council; Arrangements for Meetings of the COP; Repeal of Resolutions and the Review Process (i.e. COP11 document numbers 4, 16.2, 17.1, 18.1, 18.2 and 18.3 respectively). Relations between Civil Society and the CMS could also be included to address the proposal of Brazil. The DG would take forward discussions only after they had first been raised in the COW, and would then report back to the COW, prior to final decision by the Plenary. The Budget Committee and other Working/Contact Groups would meet outside of the COW sessions (not in parallel with the COW).

37. The representative of Brazil responded that the only concern was that dealing with Draft Resolutions, only after they had been considered in the COW, would not allow much time for some issues.

38. The Chair instructed the Secretariat to bring forward COW consideration of Agenda Item 21.3 on Relations between CMS and Civil Society, and to inform the COW accordingly when this had been done.

39. The representative of Chile supported the proposal of the Chair to establish Working Groups on specific issues.

40. The Chair concluded that there was support from the COW to establish two Working Groups covering Aquatic Issues and Avian Issues respectively.

41. During the COP, regular updates were presented to the Committee of the Whole on the progress made by the Drafting Group and the two thematic Working Groups.

ADMISSION OF OBSERVERS (ITEM 8)

42. The Chair referred the Meeting to document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.8: *Admission of Observers*.

43. The COP approved admission to the Meeting of all those observers listed in COP11/Doc.8.

II. REPORTS

REPORT OF UNEP (ITEM 9)

44. Expressing regret that this Agenda item was addressed towards the end of the Meeting, following the finalization of Draft Resolutions and other decisions, the representative of UNEP presented highlights of the UNEP's report contained in document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc. 9: *UNEP Report to the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals at its 11th Meeting*.

45. The Chair asked the representative of UNEP to pass on the Parties' thanks to the Executive Director of UNEP.

REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODIES OF THE CONVENTION (ITEM 10)

Standing Committee (Item 10.1)

46. The Chair of the Standing Committee, Mr. Oteng-Yeboah (Ghana) recalled that the present Standing Committee had met for the first time in Bergen, Norway, on 25 November 2011, immediately following the close of COP10. This Meeting had dealt with a limited agenda, confined to election of officers and agreement of the date and venue for the first full intersessional meeting. Ghana had been honoured to be elected to succeed Saudi Arabia as Chair of the Standing Committee. Mr. Oteng-Yeboah wished to place on record his appreciation of the work accomplished by his predecessor, Mr. Mohammad Sulayem (Saudi Arabia), during the 2009-2011 triennium.

47. Three further meetings of the Standing Committee had taken place intersessionally:

- 40th Meeting – November 2012, Bonn
- 41st Meeting – November 2013, Bonn
- 42nd Meeting – November 2014, Quito

48. The Committee had received regular reports from the Secretariat and Depositary. Building on the Future Shape process led by Mr. Olivier Biber, the Standing Committee had

devoted significant attention to preparation of the draft Strategic Plan for Migratory Species to be considered by COP11. Particular thanks were due to Ms. Ines Verleye, Ms. Wendy Jackson and Mr. Dave Pritchard for all their work on the draft Strategic Plan. Among other activities, the Chair of the Scientific Council, Mr. Fernando Spina, had actively represented the interests of CMS in IPBES. The Saker Falcon Task Force had tackled a very difficult issue under the skilful leadership of Mr. Colin Galbraith. The Standing Committee had also dealt with a broad range of implementation issues such as bird poisoning, illegal trapping, marine debris, illegal elephant hunting and management of flyways; much of this work carried out through the CMS Agreements, MoUs and Special Species Initiatives.

49. Mr. Oteng-Yeboah noted that Mr. Bradnee Chambers had kept him apprised of a wide range of issues since being appointed to succeed Ms. Elizabeth Mrema as CMS Executive Secretary. He wished to pay tribute to Ms. Mrema for the tremendous support she had continued to give to the Standing Committee since she had left the CMS Secretariat. He also thanked the Standing Committee Vice-Chair, Mr. Øystein Størkersen (Norway), as well as the other members of the Committee for their unstinting support. He wished his successor as Standing Committee Chair all the very best as he or she took up the important task of leading CMS on its mission to conserve the world's migratory species. We live in changing times; the road ahead would be long and hard, but with determination and mutual support, success was within reach. Mr. Oteng-Yeboah concluded by saying: *“Roll up your sleeves, redouble your efforts, because it's time for action!”*

50. Reports of the 42nd and 43rd Meetings of the Standing Committee are attached as ANNEX V and ANNEX VI respectively to the present Report.

Scientific Council (Item 10.2)

51. The Chair of the CMS Scientific Council, Mr. Fernando Spina (Italy) made a presentation summarizing the activities of the Scientific Council between 2011 and 2014.

52. A number of Working Groups had been very active during the triennium and their work had been facilitated by promotion of the new online Scientific Council workspace. Much work had been done on development of the *modus operandi* of the Scientific Council. Mr. Spina drew attention to the work of the Saker Falcon Task Force, the Landbirds Working Group, the Working Group on Minimizing Poisoning, and work on the conservation implications of cetacean culture. Contacts with other MEAs had been maintained and he, in his role as Chair of the Scientific Council, had represented CMS at meetings of IPBES and the Bern Convention. Mr. Spina had secured funding from the Po Delta Regional Park for a restricted Scientific Council Meeting to be held in Venice, in February/March 2015. The 18th Scientific Council Meeting, held in Bonn from 1-3 July 2014, had been supported by the Government of Germany and outputs of that Meeting would provide key contributions to COP11.

STATEMENTS FROM STATES (ITEM 11)

Depositary and Host Country (Item 11.1)

53. The representative of Germany presented document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.11.1: *Report of Depositary*. Four countries (Fiji, Kyrgyzstan, Swaziland and Zimbabwe), had

acceded to the Convention since COP10, bringing the total number of Parties to 120 (119 States, plus the EU). Afghanistan and Brazil had indicated that they were both in advanced stages of the accession process.

54. The representative of Brazil confirmed that Brazil had finalized the most important steps for ratifying CMS and that the relevant documentation had been submitted to the Presidency for signature. This statement was greeted with applause. Brazil was now actively participating, as it had for some years, in several CMS instruments.

55. H.E. Ms. Lorena Tapia, Minister of Environment of Ecuador, representing the Host Country, highlighted the growing number of species worldwide under threat of extinction. Migratory species should be seen as indicators of wider environmental health. States needed not only to protect wildlife within their national jurisdictions, but also to cooperate with one another to conserve species that crossed international boundaries. This required effective governance systems and innovative approaches to development that moved beyond GDP growth alone. It was important to implement solutions that combined environmentally and economically sustainable development, incorporating, as was the case in Ecuador, the Rights of Nature.

**Party States (including Regional Economic Integration Organizations-REIOs) (Item 11.2)
Non-Party States (Item 11.3)**

56. The Chair observed that Party and Non-Party States were invited to submit statements in writing. Nevertheless, if a State wished to make a very short oral comment they were welcome to do so now. A number of Parties and observers made statements thanking the Government of Ecuador for hosting COP11. These are summarized under Agenda Item 31: *Closure of the Meeting*.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT (ITEM 12)

Overview of Secretariat Activities (Item 12.1)

Report on CMS Activities in North America (Item 12.2)

57. The Executive Secretary made a presentation on Secretariat activities between 2011 and 2014. He reported that Fiji, Kyrgyzstan, Swaziland and Zimbabwe had joined CMS since COP10 and even more countries were taking the last steps to ratify the Convention. CMS had been strengthened by the Future Shape process which was now being implemented. Communication and outreach were becoming core activities and the new multi-instrument website and use of social media were raising the Convention's public profile. Capacity building and implementation support were high priorities. The proposed restructuring of the Scientific Council would strengthen the scientific basis of the Convention, and voluntary contributions from Germany, Switzerland and the United Kingdom had allowed new resolutions on the development of a programme of work on Climate Change, Preventing the Risk of Poisoning to Migratory Birds, an Action Plan for Migratory African-Eurasian Landbirds and a Global Flyways Programme of Work. Further contributions from Australia, Italy and Norway had supported work on Marine Debris, Invasive Species and Ecological Networks. The MoUs continued to grow and attract more Parties and the financial and in-kind support of the Environment Agency, Abu Dhabi had been particularly crucial to successful work on the Dugongs MoU and the African-Eurasian Raptor MoU which were coordinated

from the CMS Office in Abu Dhabi. The Central Asian Mammals Initiative was an example of a successful regional approach, which might provide a way forward for revitalizing instruments in Africa. Nearly half of the income for CMS now came from voluntary contributions from Parties, the Private Sector and public organizations. Threats to biodiversity had never been greater and the Convention's budget should reflect an urgent need to maintain momentum.

58. The Conference took note of the activities of the Secretariat. There were no questions or comments from the floor.

STATEMENTS ON COOPERATION (ITEM 13)

Biodiversity-related MEAs (Item 13.1)

Other Intergovernmental bodies (Item 13.2)

Non-Governmental Organizations (Item 13.3)

59. The Chair observed that written statements had been invited and were posted on the CMS website. He nevertheless wished to give an opportunity for CMS partners to make brief oral statements, should they so wish.

60. Statements were made by the observers from: CITES Secretariat; ASCOBANS Secretariat (referring to the written report contained in document CMS/COP11/Inf.12.3); EUROBATS Secretariat (referring to the written report contained in document CMS/COP11/Inf.12.4); AEWA Secretariat; ACCOBAMS Secretariat (referring to the written report contained in document CMS/COP11/Inf.12.2); and the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific.

III. ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY MATTERS

BUDGET AND ADMINISTRATION (ITEM 14)

Execution of CMS Budget 2012-2014 (Item 14.1)

61. Mr. Bruce Noronha (Secretariat) introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.14.1: *Execution of the CMS Budget during the 2012-2014 Triennium*. This represented the situation as of 31 July 2014. It contained three elements:

- Status of the Trust Fund for Assessed Contributions as at 31 December 2013
- Status of Contributions (income)
- Status of budget implementation for staff and operations (expenditure)

62. As of 31 December 2013, the balance of the Trust Fund was €867,393. Of that amount, approximately €650,000 was committed for the 2014 budget. Therefore, the uncommitted Fund balance was €217,685. It was important to consider that the Fund balance contained unpaid pledges – an amount that had been rising, as shown in Table 3 of the document, standing at €345,981 as of 31 December 2013. Liquidity of the Fund therefore relied on unspent carry-overs and operating reserves. To address this trend the Secretariat had redoubled its efforts to urge Parties to pay their outstanding contributions for 2013 and prior years and all corresponding invoices had been reissued. In response to these measures the

balance of unpaid pledges for 2013 and prior years had fallen to €204,964 by 31 July 2014 and to €174,236 by 31 October 2014. Annex I provided an overview of the contributions status for each Party.

63. With regard to the 2014 budget, the total of unpaid contributions stood at €578,425 on 31 July 2014. However, as of 31 October 2014, this had fallen to approximately €550,000. Following consultations with some Parties, the Secretariat had been informed that the payment of approximately €425,000 could be expected shortly. The 2014 year-end balance of unpaid pledges was expected to be slightly lower than for 2013.

64. With regard to expenditures, all the resources allocated for staff and operation costs in 2014 would be fully allocated. The information presented in the document had been reviewed in the light of expenditure during the period August to October 2014 and projections remained effectively unchanged.

65. Referring to the last two tables presented in Annex II, it was important to take into account that most activities with no or low expenditure when the document was compiled related to COP activities. It was expected that all such funds would be fully allocated.

66. The COW took note of the Secretariat's presentation.

Draft Costed Programme of Work 2015-2017 (Item 14.2)
Draft Budget for 2015-2017 (Item 14.3)

67. Taking Agenda items 14.2 and 14.3 together, the Executive Secretary made a presentation summarizing documents UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.14.2/Rev.1: *Draft Costed Programme of Work 2015-2017* and UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.14.3: *Proposed Budget for the Triennium 2015-2017*.

68. He noted that the draft Programme of Work 2015-2017 was a response to the Parties' call for greater clarity, accountability and transparency. A key feature was its prioritization of tasks. The Programme of Work was closely linked to the draft Budget for 2015-2017 and the two documents should therefore be considered together.

69. Recognizing the prevailing global economic climate, the draft budget included three modest scenarios: zero real growth; status quo +3%; and status quo +5%. All three scenarios incorporated a 2% year-on-year inflation rate. The Executive Secretary briefly outlined how each of the three scenarios would translate into delivery of the Programme of Work.

70. The Chair recalled that the issues raised in the Executive Secretary's presentation would be discussed in depth by the Budget Committee and encouraged Parties to convey their detailed remarks to that forum.

71. The representative of France called on the Secretariat to provide a fourth scenario based on the principle of zero nominal growth, i.e., minus the 2% inflation adjustment included in the three existing scenarios.

72. The representative of Chile requested a number of adjustments to the Programme of Work to better reflect the priorities of the Latin America & Caribbean region, including the raising of certain activities to the High priority category and a greater emphasis on training.

73. The representative of Fiji called for the CMS Pacific Officer position based with SPREP to be maintained beyond 2014.

74. The representative of the EU and its Member States welcomed the draft Costed Programme of Work, which enabled Parties to have a clearer overview. The EU noted in particular the priority rank assigned to various issues.

75. The Chair referred further discussion of Agenda items 14.1, 14.2 and 14.3 to the Budget Committee.

Resource mobilization (Item 14.4)

76. Ms. Laura Cerasi (Secretariat) introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.14.4/Rev.1: *Resource Mobilization* and made a presentation on fundraising activities by the Secretariat between 2011 and 2014. The goals had been to increase the predictability and stability of funding, to broaden the funding base, to increase synergies, and to promote the mobilization of resources for actions on the ground. A total of €2.6 million had been raised during the triennium. This was equal to one-third of the total amount of the core budget. The Secretariat extended its thanks to all donors, Parties, organizations and institutions, including those who had made indirect or in-kind contributions. A recent significant development had been the support of Environment Agency, Abu Dhabi on behalf of the Government of the United Arab Emirates, which had contributed US\$ 1.3 million for operations in 2015. The Migratory Species Champion Programme would be an important tool. Ms. Cerasi invited the COP to acknowledge the financial and in-kind support provided, to take note of the efforts of the Secretariat in providing innovative solutions and urged Parties to provide even greater support in future.

77. The representative of the United Arab Emirates observed that the United Arab Emirates had pioneered many flagship conservation and reintroduction projects both nationally and internationally, including promotion of international cooperation involving a wide range of migratory animals. The United Arab Emirates had demonstrated its commitment to migratory species conservation in several ways and to date, had signed four CMS MoUs: IOSEA, Dugongs, African-Eurasian Raptors and Sharks.

78. The CMS Office in Abu Dhabi was hosted by Environment Agency, Abu Dhabi on behalf of the Government of the United Arab Emirates. The office provided the Secretariat that oversaw the implementation of two MoUs. Over the last five years, the contribution of the United Arab Emirates had reached almost US\$ 8 million in direct funding, alongside provision of world-class office space and other logistical support.

79. The Representative of Chile strongly supported the activities outlined in the Secretariat's report and congratulated the fundraisers involved on excellent work. She expressed regret that the Latin America & Caribbean region had not been in a position to contribute.

80. The representative of the EU and its Member States welcomed the report. He also strongly encouraged the Secretariat and all Parties to explore all funding possibilities. In this context, attention was drawn to the decision taken at CBD COP12, in relation to the Global Environment Facility, to enhance programmatic synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions. CBD COP12 had invited the governing bodies of the various biodiversity-related

conventions to provide elements of advice concerning the funding of national priorities within their respective mandates that might be referred to the GEF. CMS COP11 should seize this important opportunity to further mobilize resources for CMS priorities and to provide advice to GEF accordingly.

81. In order to support both national resource mobilization as well as funding through GEF, it was necessary to promote further integration of measures to conserve migratory species into National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) and national implementation of national biodiversity targets and plans in line with CMS Resolution 10.18.

82. The Meeting took note of the document and the progress made.

IV. STRATEGIC AND INSTITUTIONAL MATTERS

CMS STRATEGIC PLAN (ITEM 15)

Assessment of the Implementation of the Strategic Plan 2006-2014 (Item 15.1) Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023 (Item 15.2)

83. The Executive Secretary briefly introduced documents UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.15.1: *Assessment of the Implementation of the Strategic Plan 2006-2014*, and UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.15.2: *Final Draft Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023*.

84. Ms. Ines Verleye (Belgium), Chair of the Strategic Plan Working Group said that it was a privilege to present the outcome of this fruitful process in the form of the Draft Strategic Plan and the corresponding Draft Resolution. The Draft Strategic Plan had been developed with financial contributions from Germany, South Africa, Switzerland and UNEP. An extensive consultation process had generated strong support for building the Draft Strategic Plan around the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and for broadened applicability to the whole international community. The Draft Strategic Plan included five Strategic Goals and 16 Targets, which were more specific than the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and had an end date consistent with the CMS COP cycle. How to implement the plan had not been part of the current Working Group mandate, so it was proposed that a Companion Volume should be produced detailing delivery mechanisms and associated activities. The content of such a Companion Volume was scoped in Annex III to COP11/Doc 15.2.

85. The Chair invited comments from the floor.

86. The representative of Chile congratulated the Working Group Chair on an extraordinary job. She noted that the Latin America & Caribbean region had contributed through the participation of two Scientific Councillors in the Working Group. The Region supported continuation of the Working Group for the reasons specified in the Draft Resolution.

87. The representative of New Zealand, speaking in her country's capacity as Vice-Chair of the Working Group, thanked all who had contributed to the work of the Group, and especially the Chair of the Group and the Secretariat. Extensive consultation had led to development of an extremely useful and robust plan, which would also be valuable at the national level. She hoped the COP would adopt the Draft Resolution and New Zealand looked forward to contributing further to the process.

88. The representative of the EU and its Member States, referring to COP11/Doc.15.1, endorsed the usefulness of the report of the Secretariat and agreed that the general recommendations made by the reviewer should be considered in drafting the new Strategic Plan. He then made the following statement:

“The EU and its Member States would like to acknowledge the hard work and commitment of the Strategic Plan Working Group members, and other contributors, whose expertise has produced a clear and comprehensive document. The EU and its Member States wholeheartedly welcome the financial contributions given so far by different Parties to support the drafting of the Strategic Plan. We believe that the Strategic Plan is an important document for providing a coherent direction for the CMS, aiming to ensure that all parts of the CMS Family make a coherent and effective contribution to the delivery of the CBD Aichi Targets. The EU and its Member States endorse the adoption of the draft resolution (Doc. 15.2 Annex I) subject to some amendments. The EU and its Member States also acknowledge the need for additional intersessional work to strengthen the suite of materials to support implementation of the Strategic Plan, including an open-ended register of Plan sub-targets and a Companion Volume on Implementation, and consider that the CMS Family Secretariats should be involved in the Working Group. We expect that the development of sub-targets, where agreed by the appropriate decision-making body, will ensure that matters of particular relevance to specific instruments are recognized. In developing sub-targets we consider it is important to be able to demonstrate how they contribute to the delivery of the broader goals in the Strategic Plan. We note that budgetary pressures may limit the degree to which these activities could be progressed but consider this an important activity that should be given priority. The EU and its Member States fully endorse the vision and mission of the Strategic Plan and agree with the goals and targets identified by the Working Group in the final draft of the Plan. We note that goals and targets are ambitious and recognize that they could be difficult to achieve. We welcome that the Strategic Plan builds on the Aichi Targets and that indicators in the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity provide much of its basis. We also note that the Programmes of Work and Action Plans of the CMS Family instruments have their own indicators and that the decision-making bodies of those instruments will want to consider linking those to the Plan. We agree that efforts should be put in developing clear and effective indicators to track progress towards the achievement of goals and targets over different timeframes, and at various geographical and territorial scales. However, whilst we recognize that some work will be necessary to ensure that indicators are useful in measuring the achievement of the targets, we are conscious that developing new suites of indicators has potential resource implications, risks increasing the reporting burden on Parties, and potentially diverts effort from implementation to monitoring activity. We therefore believe it is important that wherever possible existing indicators should be used, such as those linked to the Aichi Targets, or that indicators should be formulated around information that can currently be drawn from national reports. We also believe that this presents a valuable opportunity to review the current reporting process and to consider opportunities for reducing the current reporting burden on Parties by linking the information requested in National Reports directly to the indicators developed for the Strategic Plan. Finally, we recognize the need for this work to receive the necessary resources and look forward to having a discussion on this in the budget group. However, we are aware of the overall budget restraints and the

need to make the most effective use of available resources. Given the central character of the Strategic Plan, we believe that its follow-up development could equally support the necessary activities regarding other strategic activities for the next period. This will need a coherent approach during the budget discussions to support the development of a Companion Volume that addresses the key elements.”

89. The Executive Secretary of EUROBATS, Mr. Andreas Streit, thanked the Strategic Plan Working Group for its hard work over several years. He reiterated the Chair’s observation that for the first time there was a Strategic Plan covering the entire CMS Family. He observed that this would benefit the conservation of all the species that the CMS Family was working for.

90. The representative of Brazil supported the remarks made by Chile on behalf of the Latin America & Caribbean regional group. He thanked the Working Group and considered it relevant to extend the Group’s mandate into the future. Regarding the Companion Volume, the fourth Global Biodiversity Outlook report demonstrated in 2013 that the world was on track to achieve only five out of 53 indicators for the 20 Aichi Targets. These disappointing outcomes made it important for CMS to prioritize implementation of the Strategic Plan.

91. The representative of South Africa, supported by Uganda, thanked the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Strategic Plan Working Group. She thanked the Secretariat for supporting the process of preparing the Plan, and urged Parties in a position to do so, to provide resources for its implementation.

92. The representative of IFAW congratulated the Chair and members of the Working Group, and observed that implementation of the Strategic Plan would help lift CMS to the next level. He offered assistance with implementation.

93. The representative of the EU and its Member States requested a little more time to submit its amendments to the Draft Resolution, which had been delayed by a technical problem.

94. The Chair agreed to postpone completion of discussion of this issue until the EU’s proposed amendments became available.

95. Following further consideration by Parties, a final version of the Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW on 6 November (see heading: *Endorsement of Amendments Proposed In-Session* page 57 below).

FUTURE SHAPE AND STRATEGIES OF CMS AND THE CMS FAMILY (ITEM 16)

Short- and Medium-Term Activities under Resolution 10.9 (Item 16.1)

96. The Executive Secretary made a presentation introducing document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.16.1: *Future Structure and Strategies of CMS: Short- and Medium-Term Activities under Resolution 10.9*.

97. He recalled that COP10 had adopted a set of activities listed in Resolution 10.9 based on options for the future organization and strategic development of the CMS Family.

Activities in Resolution 10.9 were divided into those for implementation in the short term (2012-2014), medium term (2015-2017) and long term (2018-2020), to be used in the development of the CMS Strategic Plan 2015-2023. The activities for implementation in 2012-2014 were to be carried out with means provided by the core budget (including staff time) and voluntary contributions.

98. Document COP11/Doc.16.1 reported on progress made since November 2012 regarding the short-term activities (as at July 2014) and followed the structure of Resolution 10.9 Annex I. As many activities concerned the CMS Family, decision-making meetings of CMS instruments were invited to become involved with the implementation of those activities, as appropriate.

99. COP11/Doc.16.1 also indicated the Secretariat's plan for carrying out medium-term activities.

100. Key Achievements to date included the following:

- Production of CMS Family website in three languages;
- Development of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023 as an overarching framework for the entire CMS Family (Draft Resolution in COP11/Doc.15.2);
- Restructuring of the Scientific Council to maximize capacity of expertise and knowledge (Draft Resolution in COP11/Doc.17.1);
- Enhancement and use of the existing Online Reporting System by the CMS Family and promotion of its use by other biodiversity-related MEAs;
- Development of criteria for assessing potential new agreements under CMS (Draft Resolution in COP11/Doc.22.2);
- Coordination of capacity efforts within the CMS Family through development of the Manual for the National Focal Points of CMS and its Instruments and related training sessions in the regions; and
- Coordination of fundraising activities through development of the Migratory Species Champion Programme to ensure sustainable and long-term voluntary funding income for the CMS Family.

101. Among highlights for future work were:

- Coordination of scientific research programmes based on identification of common issues/threats shared across the CMS Family (e.g., Draft Resolutions contained in documents: Doc:23.1.1 on Flyways ; Doc.23.4.6 on Marine Debris ; Doc.23.4.3 on Renewable Energy);
- Development of a resource assessment for the Convention (CMS Secretariat and MoUs) if funding becomes available; and
- Collaboration and cooperation on sharing of common services and synergies among the CMS Family (Draft Resolution contained in COP11/Doc.16.2).

102. The Executive Secretary ended his presentation by inviting Parties to take note of the efforts made to date, to implement the short-term activities during 2012-2014 and to provide comments that would further guide the Secretariat in the implementation of medium-term activities during the 2015-2017 triennium.

103. The Chair opened the floor to comments.

104. The representative of Brazil suggested including a line in the matrix of activities for 2015-2017 to extend beyond the CMS Family efforts to maximise synergies and avoid duplication, to include cooperation with all relevant MEA Secretariats.

105. The representative of Chile, supported by the representative of Costa Rica, underlined the importance of CMS capacity-building training workshops for the Latin America & Caribbean region, citing the example of the pre-COP11 workshop held in Santiago, and called for the medium-term work plan to include such activities.

106. The representative of the EU and its Member States welcomed the positive progress made on several fronts. This work cut across the activities of the whole CMS Family, seeking to ensure that it was fit for purpose and could make an effective contribution to the conservation of the species listed on the CMS Appendices. It was, therefore, important that all parts of the CMS Family were fully engaged in the process.

107. The EU noted that much positive collaborative work with the AEWA Secretariat had taken place and would encourage the decision-making bodies of the CMS Family Agreements to engage proactively in the Future Shape work, and to explore opportunities for greater coordination and collaboration, delivering benefits across the whole CMS Family.

108. The EU noted that the Annex to COP11/Doc.16.1 referred to the resources that would be required to continue taking this work forward in the next triennium. Given pressures on resources it was understood that external funding would be key to making good progress. Next steps on the activities proposed would, therefore, need to be considered in the context of the budget negotiations. However, it was difficult from the information provided to assess the likely budgetary pressures arising from this work, with limited detail provided about the medium-term activities that would be undertaken or the expected costs.

109. The EU urged the Secretariat to provide more detail on the activities planned for the coming intersessional period and to provide information on the expected costs in order to enable CMS Parties to make an effective evaluation of the Secretariat's budget proposals as a whole, and the likely need for additional resources from either the core budget or external sources.

110. With regard to medium-term activities, the EU had a number of specific comments and suggested that a Working Group might be a helpful means of considering in more detail, how these could be taken forward.

111. The representative of South Africa congratulated the Secretariat on the work done to implement the Future Shape decisions taken at COP10. Within the Africa region there were constraints on regional coordination for CMS implementation, especially with regard to partnership building and resource mobilization. Among the short-term activities that had been due for completion by 2014 was an activity to "*Regionalize conservation efforts by having local coordinators, with assistance from UNEP, NGOs, Parties and MEAs, leading to greater presence in each of the regions if appropriate.*" However, there was no reported progress in this regard. The Secretariat was requested to deal with this issue proactively; support for enhanced regional coordination was really needed.

112. The Meeting took note of the Executive Secretary's presentation and of the comments made by Parties.

Synergies with the Wider CMS Family: Analysis for Shared Common Services (Item 16.2)

113. The Executive Secretary made a detailed presentation of document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.16.2: *Analysis of Shared Common Services between CMS Family Instruments*. He recalled that discussions on synergies had been taking place for several years and noted a number of the meetings and processes that had stimulated the current debate. The CMS was a complex system of MoUs and Agreements and Parties had long remarked on the need to bring increased coherence to the CMS Family. The Future Shape process was a key response to such concerns.

114. The CMS had proposed to the 9th Meeting of the AEWA Standing Committee that CMS and AEWA should establish common services and a shared Executive Secretary. The AEWA Standing Committee mandated the sharing of services and referred the matter of a shared Executive Secretary to its next Meeting of Parties in November 2015. This decision had been communicated to the 41st Meeting of the CMS Standing Committee, which had agreed to pilot the sharing of common services by AEWA and CMS. Following further consultations, a pilot common Communications and Outreach Unit had been established and an interim report on the outcomes presented to the CMS Standing Committee.

115. The Executive Secretary outlined the benefits to be gained from increased synergies within the CMS Family and possible means of achieving these. He concluded by summarizing the provisions of the Draft Resolution contained in COP11/Doc.16.2.

116. Mr. Jacques Trouvilliez, Executive Secretary of AEWA, confirmed that the 9th Meeting of the AEWA Standing Committee had decided to enhance synergies with CMS to strengthen the efficacy of both instruments. A joint pilot unit had been created at the end of January 2014. The Parties to AEWA would make a final decision on this matter at the 2015 Meeting of Parties.

117. The representatives of a number of Parties, including Argentina, Chile, Egypt, the EU and its Member States, Georgia, Kenya, Monaco, Switzerland and Uganda, as well as the observer from the United States of America, endorsed in principle the desirability of increased synergies and appreciated the opportunity to discuss the issues raised. However, they also expressed concern that much more in-depth analysis would be required before any fundamental decisions could be taken. In particular, several Parties wished to see greater consideration of the potential costs and risks of merging the AEWA and CMS Secretariats; currently the document appeared to highlight mainly the potential benefits. The implications for other CMS daughter instruments also required further consideration.

118. The representative of Uganda was unable to support the Draft Resolution in its present form, while the representative of the EU and its Member States announced that the EU would table a number of proposed amendments to the Draft Resolution. The representative of Switzerland commented that the synergies exercise should not focus primarily on cost-savings, but rather it should prioritize improved implementation. Switzerland would be bringing forward amendments to the Draft Resolution in this regard.

119. The Chair concluded that a Working Group would be established to take forward the debate on this topic.

120. A final version of the Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW on 9 November (see heading: *Endorsement of Amendments Proposed In-Session* page 57 below).

OTHER STRATEGIC AND INSTITUTIONAL MATTERS (ITEM 17)

Options for the Restructuring of the Scientific Council (Item 17.1)

121. Mr. Marco Barbieri (Secretariat) made a presentation introducing document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.17.1: *Options for the Restructuring of the Scientific Council*, including the Draft Resolution contained in Annex II to the document.

122. The current structure of the Scientific Council included 100 Councillors with a bias towards expertise in birds, forests and wetlands. There was a need to use resources more efficiently, to balance expertise and to enhance intersessional activity. Four costed scenarios for restructuring the Scientific Council were put forward in the document. The COP was requested to consider the report on options for the restructuring of the Scientific Council, and to review and endorse the associated Draft Resolution.

123. The Chair advised that this Agenda Item would be discussed further in the Drafting Group but opened the floor to preliminary comments. Interventions were received from the representatives of Australia, Chile, Ecuador, Egypt, the EU and its Member States, New Zealand, Switzerland and Uganda, as well as the observers from the United States of America and Humane Society International.

124. Points raised included the following:

- The importance of representative regional and taxonomic expertise;
- The need for greater use of modern technology such as use of teleconferencing and electronic workspaces;
- The unacceptability of a 'business as usual' approach;
- The necessity for organizations such as IPBES to be represented;
- The need for voluntary participation of Observers including Parties, NGOs, relevant institutions and experts;
- The advantages of starting work intersessionally;
- A reluctance to restrict the number of COP-Appointed Councillors;
- The need to appoint the most appropriate experts regardless of the status within CMS of their country of origin; and
- The advantages of a fully open relationship with all who wished to contribute to the work of the Scientific Council, including NGOs.

125. Mr. Barbieri responded briefly to the comments made and the Chair and deferred further discussion to the Drafting Group, remarking that a balanced compromise was needed.

Election and Appointments to the Scientific Council and the Standing Committee (Item 17.2)

126. Referring to document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.17.2: *Nominations for the COP-Appointed Councillors for Aquatic Mammals and Birds*, the Chair recalled that the Scientific

Council at its 18th Meeting unanimously nominated, for the consideration of COP, Dr. Giuseppe Notarbartolo di Sciara as Appointed Councillor for Aquatic Mammals. There had been two candidates for the position of Appointed Councillor for Birds. The two nominees, Dr. Rob Clay (Paraguay) and Prof. Stephen Garnett (Australia) had agreed to share the position at no extra cost.

127. At the invitation of the Chair, the COP approved the appointment of:

- Dr. Giuseppe Notarbartolo di Sciara as COP-Appointed Councillor for Aquatic Mammals
- Dr. Rob Clay and Professor Stephen Garnett as COP-Appointed Councillors for Birds

128. The Chair read out the list of existing COP-Appointed Councillors eligible and willing to continue serving for a further triennium:

- Mr. Barry Baker, COP-Appointed Councillor for Bycatch
- Prof. Colin Galbraith, COP-Appointed Councillor for Climate Change
- Dr. Zeb Hogan, COP-Appointed Councillor for Fish
- Dr. Colin Limpus, COP-Appointed Councillor for Marine Turtles
- Dr. Rodrigo Medellín, COP-Appointed Councillor for Neotropical Fauna
- Dr. Taej Mundkur, COP-Appointed Councillor for Asiatic Fauna
- Prof. Alfred Oteng-Yeboah, COP-Appointed Councillor for African Fauna

129. At the invitation of the Chair the COP confirmed the re-appointment of these Scientific Councillors for the 2015-2017 triennium.

130. Nominations for the Standing Committee: At the invitation of the Chair, nominations for election to the Standing Committee were made as follows:

Africa (nominated on behalf of the region by Uganda)

Representatives: Republic of Congo, South Africa, Uganda

Alternate Representatives: Algeria, Mali, United Republic of Tanzania

Asia (nominated on behalf of the region by Pakistan)

Representatives: Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia

Alternate Representatives: Pakistan, Tajikistan

Europe (nominated on behalf of the region by Poland)

Representatives: France, Norway, Ukraine

Alternate Representatives: Georgia, Latvia, Switzerland

Oceania (nominated on behalf of the region by New Zealand)

Representative: Australia

Alternate Representative: Philippines

South & Central America and the Caribbean

Representatives: Bolivia, Costa Rica

Alternate Representatives: Argentina, Panama

131. The Chair confirmed that the Chair and Vice-Chair of the new Standing Committee would be elected during a short meeting of the Committee that would take place immediately after the close of COP11.

132. At the invitation of the Chair, the COP approved the composition of the Standing Committee for the 2015-2017 triennium.

Gap Analysis of the Convention on Migratory Species (Item 17.3)

133. Mr. Barbieri (Secretariat) introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.17.3: *Draft Global Gap Analysis of the Convention on Migratory Species*. He recalled that Resolution 10.9 had requested a global gap analysis at Convention level to be supported through voluntary contributions. In the absence of voluntary contributions, the Secretariat had undertaken a draft analysis with its own capacity, COP11/Doc.17.3 being the outcome of this exercise. An initial draft had been prepared by the Secretariat and presented at the Strategic and Planning Meeting of the Scientific Council in October 2013 and at the 18th Meeting of the Scientific Council in July 2014. The COP was asked to consider whether any further development of this activity was needed or feasible, in the absence of voluntary resources to support it.

134. The Chair felt it fair to say that those who had followed the development of the document would know it had been a difficult task. He invited comments from Parties.

135. The representative of Switzerland was of the view that a gap analysis should be a regular agenda item for the Scientific Council, but was not in favour of it being a special activity needing additional financial support.

136. The representative of the EU and its Member States was grateful to the Secretariat for preparing the document. The analysis showed that the potential for further work was enormous. The EU proposed taking the current gap analysis into account when developing the Companion Volume for the Strategic Plan and recommended that all further work on gap analysis should be done in the framework of the Companion Volume.

137. The Chair invited the EU to participate in the proposed intersessional Working Group on the Companion Volume.

138. The Meeting took note of document COP11/Doc.17.3 and of the comments made by Switzerland and the EU.

V. INTERPRETATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION

PROCEDURAL ISSUES (ITEM 18)

Arrangements for Meetings of the Conference of the Parties (Item 18.1)

139. Mr. Wold (Secretariat) introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.18.1: *Arrangements for Meetings of the Conference of the Parties* and the Draft Resolution annexed to it. The Standing Committee had established a Working Group on this issue and the Standing Committee had accepted all the Group's recommendations at its 41st Meeting. The

document also contained additional recommendations from the Secretariat including *inter alia*:

- Whether certain proposals of the Standing Committee might better be addressed through adjustments to the Rules of Procedure;
- Observations relating to practical concerns, especially with regard to the proposed timing of specific meetings;
- Provision of documents on memory sticks; and
- A lack of reference to the flexibility that would be needed for the Secretariat to put in place the best possible arrangements for each meeting of the COP.

140. Taking these and other considerations into account, the Secretariat wondered whether a Resolution on this topic would be the best way forward.

141. The Executive Secretary noted that the document entered into very fine detail. It was sometimes extremely difficult to abide by very strict rules in all regards. It might be better to retain flexibility. Some of the current proposals could have the effect of tying the hands of the Secretariat. Therefore, rather than a Resolution, it might be better for the COP to simply take note of the document as guidance to the Secretariat.

142. The Chair opened the floor for comments.

143. The representative of the EU and its Member States stated that the EU supported the principle of improving the operation of the COP, but wished to bring forward a number of proposed amendments. He detailed these proposals to the Meeting and confirmed they had been sent to the Secretariat.

144. Referring to the substantive comments from the Secretariat and from the EU, the representative of New Zealand felt it would be possible to build in the necessary flexibility requested by the Secretariat, while maintaining the Draft Resolution. She suggested referring the matter to the Drafting Group or to a small 'Friends of the Chair' group.

145. The Chair invited New Zealand and the EU to hold bilateral discussions.

146. A final version of the Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW on 7 November (see heading: *Endorsement of Amendments Proposed In-Session* page 57 below).

Repeal of Resolutions (Item 18.2)

147. Mr. Wold (Secretariat) made a presentation introducing document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.18.2: *Repeal of Resolutions and Recommendations*, prepared by the Secretariat on behalf of the Standing Committee. At its 41st Meeting, the Standing Committee had considered recommendations of a Working Group established to consider: (a) the lack of definition of the terms "Resolution" and "Recommendation"; and (b) the need to retire Resolutions and Recommendations (or specific paragraphs thereof) that were no longer in force. The Standing Committee had accepted all of the Working Group's recommendations. A Draft Resolution was contained in the Annex to the document and this set out proposed definitions, as well as a process for retiring Resolutions and Recommendations. Within the Draft Resolution, the Secretariat had also proposed changing the term "Recommendation" to "Decision", as well as a provision for Resolutions and Decisions to come into effect 90 days after the meeting at which they were adopted, unless otherwise specified.

148. The Chair invited comments from the floor.

149. The representative of the EU and its Member States indicated that the EU could support the Draft Resolution subject to the inclusion of two amendments which he proceeded to table. These would be communicated to the Secretariat in writing.

150. The representative of Australia believed that further clarification was required surrounding the definition proposed for “Decision” in the Draft Resolution. She tabled a specific amendment in this regard.

151. There being no further comments, the Chair invited Australia and the EU to come together with the Secretariat in a ‘Friends of the Chair’ group in order to finalize the text of the Draft Resolution.

152. A duly revised Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW on 7 November (see heading: *Endorsement of Amendments Proposed In-Session* page 57).

A Review Process for the Convention (Item 18.3)

153. Mr. Wold (Secretariat) made a presentation introducing document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.18.3/Rev.1: *Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Convention through a Process to Review Implementation*. He noted that CMS was in a very small category of MEAs without such a review process. The paper summarized the relevant processes used by other MEAs and other relevant agreements to enhance implementation and compliance. The Draft Resolution contained in the Annex to the document proposed a way forward by which the Parties could consider establishing such a review process for CMS.

154. The Chair opened the floor for comments.

155. Interventions were made by the representatives of Chile (on behalf of the Latin America & Caribbean region), Ecuador, Egypt, the EU and its Member States, Israel, Switzerland, Uganda and the Observers from ACCOBAMS, EUROBATS, IFAW, UNEP and Wild Migration.

156. While some of the above-mentioned delegations expressed general support for the Draft Resolution, others raised substantive concerns, relating in particular to the justification for, and likely effectiveness of, a review process or compliance mechanism.

157. The Chair emphasized that the Draft Resolution would only establish a process for undertaking work on this issue in the run-up to COP12. It would not be obliging the Parties to establish a review process or compliance mechanism at the present COP. He recalled that the slogan of COP11 was “Time for Action” and it therefore seemed a pity to defer this important topic.

158. The representatives of Switzerland and Egypt supported the Chair’s comments.

159. The representative of New Zealand tabled a specific amendment to operative paragraph 2 of the Draft Resolution, which she felt might offer a way forward that all Parties could be comfortable with.

160. Following further discussion, with additional remarks made by the representatives of Chile, Ecuador, the EU and its Member States, Peru and Uganda, the Chair concluded that this matter should be referred to the Drafting Group.

161. At a subsequent session of the Committee of the Whole, the Chair invited the Secretariat to update the COW on the progress of discussions within the Drafting Group.

162. Mr. Wold (Secretariat) reported that there had been a lively debate, with views for and against the proposals set out in the paper and Draft Resolution. Other participants had stated that while they felt the case for embarking on such a review process had not been sufficiently justified until now, they would be open to looking at the issue in the future.

163. Mr. Wold recalled that the intent of proposals contained in the Draft Resolution was to establish a targeted means of providing capacity building support to assist Parties with implementation. It was not a case of applying sanctions.

164. The Chair felt that it could be helpful to simplify the proposals somewhat, but he invited comments from Parties to help identify whether there was a need for a further Working Group to meet.

165. The representative of the EU and its Member States appreciated the report from the Drafting Group but still felt there was insufficient justification of why a review process was needed. That had to be the first step; only then could other issues be addressed.

166. The Chair emphasized that the Draft Resolution was not establishing a review process, but simply initiated the necessary intersessional analysis required to inform an eventual decision at COP12.

167. The representative of Switzerland shared the view of the Chair. Switzerland supported the Draft Resolution and was open to considering a role as a funding partner.

168. The Chair indicated that Norway would also be inclined to find financial support.

169. The representative of the EU and its Member States proposed that Terms of Reference for a possible intersessional Working Group on this matter should be submitted to the Standing Committee for its consideration.

170. The Born Free Foundation, speaking on behalf of a coalition of NGOs, felt that the issue of justification had been fully addressed within the existing documentation. To defer action on this issue would send the wrong signal to the public and be a missed opportunity to drive the Convention forward.

171. Following further discussion, with contributions from the representatives of Australia and the EU and its Member States, the Chair proposed a series of amendments to the Draft Resolution.

172. The representatives of the EU and its Member States and of Switzerland indicated that they could support the Draft Resolution as amended by the Chair's proposal.

173. A final version of the Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW on 9 November (see heading: *Endorsement of Amendments Proposed In-Session* page 57 below).

COMMUNICATION, INFORMATION AND OUTREACH (ITEM 19)

Implementation of the Outreach and Communication Plan 2012-2014 (Item 19.1) Communication, Information and Outreach Plan 2015-2017 (Item 19.2)

174. Mr. Florian Keil (Secretariat) made a presentation introducing documents UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.19.1: *Implementation of the Outreach and Communication Plan 2012-2014* and UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.19.2/Rev.1: *Communication, Information and Outreach Plan 2015-2017: Promoting Global Action for Migratory Species*, including the Draft Resolution contained in the Annex to the latter document.

175. He highlighted in particular the pilot CMS/AEWA Joint Communications Team.

176. Benefits of the Joint Team included:

- Sharing many of the same communication activities, products and tools;
- Sharing specialist expertise – information management, campaigns, press/media work, publications, social media, audio-visual, multi-media, website etc.;
- Strengthened coordination, sharing of resources; and
- A more strategic approach to communications.

177. Challenges included:

- Adapting to the changes inherent in merging the teams;
- Little time for the Joint Team to settle in prior to the COP;
- Limited capacity to cope with the workload;
- Balancing CMS and AEWA needs;
- The need for further strategic direction (hence proposed Communication Strategy); and
- The absence of a budget for communications – a critical issue.

178. Priority activities for 2015-2017 included:

- Development of a global Communication Strategy and Common Branding;
- Strengthening the Joint Communications, Information Management and Awareness-raising Team; and
- Initiating the development of a Communication, Education and Public Awareness (CEPA) Programme.

179. The observer from UNEP highlighted work underway through the Information Knowledge Management Initiative for MEAs (MEA IKM) that was coordinated by UNEP.

180. The Executive Secretary of AEWA thanked Mr. Keil and his team. 2014 had been a year of transition and there had not yet been much time for the team to settle in. Thanks were due to colleagues for the efforts made to adapt to working together and he wished to reaffirm his confidence in the whole team. The work being undertaken would ensure greater visibility for CMS, AEWA and the wider CMS Family. The AEWA Secretariat encouraged support for the Draft Resolution and also voluntary contributions to enable implementation of the 2015-2017 Communications Plan.

181. The representative of the EU and its Member States considered that the establishment of the Joint Team was a relevant example of synergy and could be considered as a pilot project demonstrating the advantages of sharing services. With regard to CEPA, the EU suggested that integration with CEPA efforts, developed under CBD and Ramsar, should be considered, rather than a stand-alone CMS/AEWA CEPA initiative. The EU endorsed the Communication, Information and Outreach Plan 2015-2017, while recognizing that implementation was dependent upon the availability of adequate resources. The EU supported the Draft Resolution, subject to incorporation of some minor amendments that had been communicated to the Secretariat.

182. The representative of Senegal agreed that it was beneficial for CMS and AEWA to work together in this way and the benefits of synergy had been seen in the field, for example through support provided for World Migratory Bird Day.

183. The Chair concluded that the documents under this item had been broadly supported by the COW, subject to some minor amendments to the Draft Resolution.

184. A final version of the Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW on 9 November (see heading: *Endorsement of Amendments Proposed In-Session* page 57 below).

Analysis and Synthesis of National Reports (Item 19.3)

185. Mr. Francisco Rilla (Secretariat) briefly introduced this Agenda Item and invited Ms. Patricia Cremona (UNEP/WCMC) to make a presentation introducing document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.19.3: *Analysis and Synthesis of National Reports*.

186. Ms. Cremona recalled that the online reporting system had been used for the first time for national reports to COP11. Half of CMS Parties had submitted national reports in time to be included in the analysis. Europe was the region with the highest response rate (69 per cent of 42 Parties); Africa was the region with the lowest response rate (32 per cent of 44 Parties). Among the principal conclusions were that: Parties were taking action against threats; a majority of Parties prohibited taking of Appendix I species; migratory species had increased in certain areas; Parties were collaborating to implement transboundary measures; and there was evidence of increasing public awareness.

187. Recommendations arising from the analysis were that Parties should complete adoption of legislation prohibiting take of Appendix I species; take increased action to mitigate threats; and increase cooperation, capacity-building and knowledge-sharing.

188. In addition, CMS should enhance collaboration with related international agreements and bodies, and advance online information management to support implementation. There was also a need for increased funding and capacity for effective implementation.

189. UNEP/WCMC would welcome feedback from Parties on their experience of using the online reporting system.

190. The representatives of Costa Rica, Egypt, Kenya and South Africa welcomed the online reporting system, emphasizing the value to Parties. However, attention was also drawn to opportunities for further streamlining the system to make it more user-friendly, particularly with regard to generating printed reports.

191. Mr. Rilla and Ms. Cremona confirmed that the online reporting format would be further developed under the framework of the new CMS Strategic Plan. The CMS Secretariat and UNEP/WCMC were committed to making the revised format as helpful as possible to Parties. Feedback such as the comment on the difficulty of printing clear reports from the system would be valuable in making such changes.

World Migratory Bird Day (item 19.4)

192. The representative of Kenya briefly introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.19.4: *World Migratory Bird Day*, which included a Draft Resolution on this topic.

193. The representative of the EU and its Member States supported the Draft Resolution.

194. The Chair, supported by the representative of Kenya, confirmed that the square brackets around one section of text should be removed.

195. The representative of Ecuador invited all delegations to support the Draft Resolution but noted that May was not a suitable month for World Migratory Bird Day (WMBD) to be held in much of the Latin America & Caribbean region; October would be much better.

196. The Chair noted that the issue of the timing of WMBD had been raised on a number of previous occasions and asked the Secretariat to take note of Ecuador's concerns and to engage with Ecuador bilaterally on this matter after the COP.

197. The Chair concluded that the document and its associated Draft Resolution appeared to be ready for endorsement and forwarding to the Plenary for adoption.

198. A final version of the Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW on 9 November (see heading: *Endorsement of Amendments Proposed In-Session* page 57 below).

CAPACITY BUILDING (ITEM 20)

Implementation of the Capacity Building Strategy 2012-2014 (Item 20.1)

Capacity Building Strategy 2015-2017 (Item 20.2)

199. Mr. Rilla (Secretariat) introduced documents UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.20.1: *Implementation of the Capacity Building Work Plan 2012-2014* and UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.20.2: *CMS Capacity Building Strategy 2015-2017*.

200. The observer from UNEP recalled that UNEP had supported the CMS Manual for National Focal Points, CMS regional consultations in Africa and the Pacific and development of a CMS e-learning course under the umbrella of the InforMEA initiative. UNEP had also furthered the objectives of biodiversity-related MEAs through capacity building workshops for the development of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs). UNEP welcomed the CMS Capacity Building Strategy 2015-2017 and stood ready to continue to assist.

201. The representative of the EU and its Member States underlined that all capacity building work should be within the framework of the new Strategic Plan for Migratory Species and the associated Companion Volume.

202. The representative of Argentina, speaking on behalf of the Latin America & Caribbean region supported the Capacity Building Strategy 2015-2017, which would be of great importance to the region. He asked the COP to consider the region as a focal point for CMS training activities.

203. The representative of New Zealand welcomed capacity building activities by CMS, especially the recent regional workshop for the Pacific, which had an important positive effect in the region.

204. The Chair concluded that the COW had endorsed the Capacity Building Strategy 2015-2017 for forwarding to the Plenary.

SYNERGIES AND PARTNERSHIPS (ITEM 21)

Report on Synergies and Partnerships (Item 21.1)

205. Ms. Melanie Virtue (Secretariat) briefly introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.21.1: *Report on Synergies and Partnerships*.

206. The Chair opened the floor to comments.

207. The observer from the CITES Secretariat noted that the grouping of Chairs of the Scientific Advisory Bodies of the Biodiversity-related MEAs, currently not mentioned in the document, offered a useful platform for collaboration.

208. There being no other interventions, the Chair concluded that the COW had taken note of the report.

Draft Resolution: Synergies and Partnerships (Item 21.2)

209. The representative of Switzerland made a presentation introducing document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.21.2: *Draft Resolution Synergies and Partnerships*.

210. The Chair opened the floor for comments.

211. The representative of the EU and its Member States endorsed the Draft Resolution and encouraged the Secretariat and other CMS bodies to continue developing effective and practical cooperation with relevant stakeholders, including other biodiversity instruments and international organizations. However, the EU wished to see stronger integration with the Convention on Biological Diversity and increased cooperation with the Ramsar Convention and therefore requested that these aspects be covered more explicitly in a revised Draft Resolution. Written amendments to this effect had been provided to the Secretariat.

212. The observer from the United States of America tabled amendments to the Draft Resolution and confirmed that these had been transmitted to the Secretariat.

213. There being no further requests for the floor, the Chair invited the representatives of the EU and its Member States and Switzerland and the observer from the United States of America to work together to finalize the Draft Resolution for forwarding to the Plenary.

214. A final version of the Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW on 9 November (see heading: *Endorsement of Amendments Proposed In-Session* page 57 below).

Draft Resolution Enhancing the Relationship between the CMS Family and Civil Society (Item 21.3)

215. Mr. Oteng-Yeboah (Ghana) made a presentation introducing document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.21.3/Rev.1: *Enhancing the Relationship between the CMS Family and the Civil Society*, which included a Draft Resolution submitted by the Government of Ghana.

216. It was timely and appropriate that CMS Parties were fully apprised of what the NGO community might be able to contribute to CMS in future. Models needed to be explored to facilitate NGO involvement in CMS processes, and Wild Migration had agreed to take a lead in this. Mr. Oteng-Yeboah concluded by inviting the COW to support the Draft Resolution contained in document COP11/Doc.21.3.

217. The Chair reminded the Meeting that this Agenda Item had been brought forward at the request of Brazil so that it could be referred to the Drafting Group for further discussion and amendment. The floor was opened for preliminary comments.

218. Interventions were made by the representatives of Australia, Brazil, Chile, Egypt and the EU and its Member States, together with observers from the Born Free Foundation, IFAW and Wild Migration. All speakers thanked the Government of Ghana for preparing the document and all looked forward to further discussions in the Drafting Group.

219. Substantive points raised included the need for enhanced cooperation – not only with NGOs as expressed in the text, but also among CMS Parties – and the need to make full use of available ‘citizen science’.

220. A final version of the Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW on 6 November (see heading: *Endorsement of Amendments Proposed In-Session* page 57 below).

CMS INSTRUMENTS (ITEM 22)

Implementation of Existing Instruments (Item 22.1)

Developing, Resourcing and Servicing CMS Agreements (Item 22.2)

Assessment of MoUs and their Viability (Item 22.3)

221. Ms. Virtue (Secretariat) introduced documents UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.22.1: *Implementation of Existing CMS Instruments* and UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.22.3: *An Assessment of MoUs and their Viability*. These covered 19 MoUs, plus the Gorilla Agreement which was implemented in the same way as an MoU. A total of 14 MoUs and the Gorilla Agreement were serviced by the Secretariat, three instruments were serviced by out posted offices of the Secretariat and two by Parties themselves. A difficult situation had arisen since

the number of instruments had increased but not the funding for their coordination or implementation.

222. Ms. Virtue introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.22.2: *Developing, Resourcing and Servicing CMS Agreements: A Policy Approach* and in particular the Draft Resolution contained in Annex 2. Parties had requested the development of a set of criteria to guide the development of any future agreements and 14 such criteria were presented.

223. The representative of Chile, referring to document COP11/Doc.22.1, observed that a Plan of Action for Andean Flamingos had been developed under the Andean Flamingo MoU but that the First Meeting of Signatories to the MoU was still pending. She expressed a wish to schedule such a meeting during COP11 so that the relevant countries could take forward the MoU. Document COP11/Doc.22.3 indicated incorrectly that there were information gaps for certain species in the Latin America & Caribbean region. All relevant information had already been communicated to the Secretariat.

224. The representative of Belarus, as a key Range State, reported on the status of the Aquatic Warbler MoU. Belarus considered the MoU to be a useful tool for management of the species, and the sharp declines that had occurred during the 20th century had been stabilized. Belarus thanked the Secretariat for its support and invited those Range States that were not yet Signatories to join the MoU as soon as possible.

225. The representative of the EU and its Member States expressed satisfaction with progress reported on most MoUs but found it unfortunate that some were not functioning properly. The EU tabled proposed amendments to the Annex of the Draft Resolution contained in document COP11/Doc.22.2.

226. The representative of Argentina followed up the intervention of Chile on document COP11/Doc.22.1, by noting that information provided by Argentina on actions taken for the conservation of the Ruddy-headed Goose (*Chloephaga rubidiceps*) were not reflected in the report. Argentina had reported actions under the MoUs on the Ruddy-headed Goose and Huemul (*Hippocamelus bisulcus*) at a workshop held in Santiago, and offered to provide any further information required.

227. The representative of Switzerland welcomed the reports and the suggested criteria and supported the Draft Resolution. However, some improvements in clarity were needed in document COP11/Doc.22.2, for the benefit of those developing new instruments in the future.

228. The representative of Senegal enquired about the MoU on the Atlantic Marine Turtles. The Coordination Unit in Dakar had been closed, since then the MoU had ceased to function effectively.

229. The observer from the United States of America noted that her country was a Signatory to several CMS MoUs. Under Agenda Item 22.2 the United States of America supported the concept of criteria for assessing proposals for species-specific instruments. With regard to Agenda Item 22.3, it was pleasing to note that the vast majority of comments made by the United States of America and other countries had been reflected in the document.

230. Ms. Virtue responded on behalf of the Secretariat. She thanked Chile and Argentina for their comments regarding information on South American species. The Secretariat greatly

appreciated the efforts of the region and confirmed that all the expected information had been received by the Secretariat, even if this was not explicit in the document. The Secretariat had noted the request for a Meeting of Signatories to the Andean Flamingo MoU. The point raised by Senegal had been taken on board and underlined the difficulty of working on many MoUs with so little funding.

231. The Chair observed that Parties had endorsed the Draft Resolution contained in document COP11/Doc.22.2 subject to inclusion of the amendments tabled by the EU. He concluded that that the Draft Resolution could then be forwarded to the Plenary for adoption.

232. A final version of the Draft Resolution was subsequently endorsed by the COW on 9 November (see heading: *Endorsement of Amendments Proposed In-Session* page 57).

Concerted and Cooperative Actions (Item 22.4)

233. Mr. Barbieri (Secretariat) introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.22.4: *Concerted and Cooperative Actions*, drawing attention to the Draft Resolution contained in the document. A voluntary contribution from Germany had supported a consultant to develop a proposed rationale, criteria and guidance on designating species for Concerted or Cooperative Actions, and on the outcomes sought when species were proposed for such Actions.

234. The EU and its Member States supported consolidating the two categories of actions in a single category of “Concerted Actions”. The Draft Resolution should specify this explicitly and it might be appropriate to repeal parts of Res.3.2 and Res.5.2 which had defined Concerted and Cooperative Actions thus far. Implementation of the measures set out in the consultant’s recommendations should be completed by COP12 and undertaken in the framework of preparing the Companion Volume under the new Strategic Plan.

235. Mr. Barbieri confirmed that the Secretariat would liaise with the consultant to clarify whether the proposal of the EU would require revision of the Draft Resolution.

236. The Chair observed that the absence of comments from other delegates suggested that the EU’s proposal could be endorsed. He invited the EU to liaise directly with the Secretariat to amend the Draft Resolution, if necessary, so that it could be taken forward to Plenary.

237. A final version of the Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW on 9 November (see heading: *Endorsement of Amendments Proposed In-Session* page 57 below).

CONSERVATION ISSUES (ITEM 23)

Avian Species (Item 23.1)

Programme of Work for Migratory Birds and Flyways (Item 23.1.1)

238. Mr. Borja Heredia (Secretariat) referred the Meeting to document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.23.1.1: *Programme of Work for Migratory Birds and Flyways* including the Draft Resolution contained in Annex I to the document, as well as the Programme of Work on Migratory Birds and Flyways (2014-2023) contained in Annex 2, and the Americas Flyways Framework contained in Annex 3.

239. Mr. Taej Mundkur, Chair of the Intersessional Working Group on Flyways, made a presentation introducing these documents and the supporting information papers. This work had been mandated by Resolution 10.10 and there had been two meetings, in Jamaica in March 2014 and in Bonn in July 2014. The main focus of the Draft Resolution was the implementation of the Programme of Work, and the Americas Flyway Framework.

240. The representative of Switzerland welcomed and fully supported the Draft Resolution, the Programme of Work (POW) and its Annexes. The POW provided a good example of how to implement the mission of CMS under the new Strategic Plan. The Plan was very ambitious, and the POW would help the Parties and others to focus on priority actions.

241. The representative of the United States of America believed that the Migratory Bird Framework for the Americas could make an important contribution to bird conservation, at last extending substantial CMS efforts on migratory birds to the Western Hemisphere. Thanks were due to the Secretariat, including the Washington Officer, for strengthening links between CMS and the Western Hemisphere Migratory Species Initiative (WHMSI).

242. The representative of the EU and its Member States supported the adoption of the Draft Resolution and the associated documents, and recognized a need to streamline and focus the actions foreseen by Resolution 10.10 (on Guidance on Global Flyway Conservation and Options for Policy Arrangements) into more detailed and specific programmes. The EU considered the POW to be a useful tool to better drive the planning and development of conservation actions for migratory birds and their habitats, and hoped that there would be adequate funds dedicated to the implementation of the POW.

243. The representative of Egypt endorsed the Draft Resolution with minor suggested amendments.

244. The representative of Ecuador, on behalf of the Latin America & Caribbean region, welcomed this very complete and ambitious document. The region especially recognized the value of the Migratory Bird Framework for the Americas. A wide range of initiatives would be able to use this as a common platform to protect migratory bird species. An amendment to the Draft Resolution was suggested to ensure an effective framework in the intersessional period.

245. The representative of the Philippines endorsed the documents, particularly welcoming the clear timeline and indicators. The Philippines belonged to the East Asian – Australasian Flyway Partnership and the POW provided guidance relevant to this and all flyways.

246. The representative of Kyrgyzstan welcomed and supported the POW, and in the light of continuing decreases in populations of Central Asian migratory birds, supported the initiative to join the Central Asian Flyway to AEWA. AEWA was a more powerful conservation tool than the Central Asian Flyway Action Plan, which had not implemented any significant activities in its nine years of existence.

247. The representative of Brazil supported the Draft Resolution, recalling that Brazil had participated since 2008 in implementing the Action Plan of the MoU on the Conservation of Southern South American Migratory Grassland Bird Species and Their Habitats. Brazil implemented large-scale bird banding activities, and a team from the National Center for Bird Conservation Research was also working continuously on the standardization of data

collection protocols for migratory birds in Brazil, with published protocols available online. Brazil offered to host a workshop in 2015 with the goal of integrating and merging initiatives in order to implement the POW, especially through an integrated Action Plan for the Americas Flyways.

248. The representative of Pakistan welcomed the document and requested information from the Secretariat about the proposed merger of the Central Asian Flyway Action Plan and AEWA.

249. The representative of Argentina supported the comments made by Ecuador and welcomed Brazil's offer to host a workshop. A minor proposed amendment would be provided to the Secretariat.

250. Final versions of the Draft Resolution and POW were endorsed by the COW on 9 November (see heading: *Endorsement of Amendments Proposed In-Session* page 57 below).

Guidelines to Prevent Poisoning of Migratory Birds (Item 23.1.2)

251. Mr. Heredia (Secretariat) introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.23.1.2: *Review and Guidelines to Prevent the Risk of Poisoning of Migratory Birds* including the Draft Resolution contained in Annex I of the document. The document had been prepared by the Intersessional Working Group to Prevent Bird Poisoning and the draft Guidelines, which covered different types of poisoning, had been discussed in a technical workshop.

252. The Chair noted that the document was undergoing detailed consideration in the Avian Issues Working Group and requested only brief interventions in the COW.

253. The observer from the United States of America stated that regulation of ammunition for the protection of wildlife was the responsibility of individual states of the USA. She confirmed that the US Federal Government would not be in a position to implement the portions of the guidelines relating to lead in ammunition.

254. The observer from SEO/BirdLife International noted that COP11 could mark the beginning of the end with regard to lead poisoning of migratory birds, as well as of many other forms of poisoning. He urged Parties to adopt the Draft Resolution.

255. The representative of the EU and its Member States confirmed that the EU strongly supported the objectives of the document, and would welcome close cooperative working on this issue with other organizations such as the Bern and Ramsar Conventions. The EU had raised a number of issues for discussion in the Avian Issues Working Group.

256. The representative of Tunisia recalled that the Tunisian Government had hosted a Working Group meeting on bird poisoning in May 2013. He supported the Draft Resolution and Guidelines and called on all Parties to support the prevention of poisoning of migratory birds, which often also affected people.

257. The representative of Peru fully supported implementing the actions contained in the Draft Resolution and reported that lead shot was already banned for shooting over wetlands in her country.

258. The representative of the Philippines supported the Draft Resolution and Guidelines as well as the associated technical review (UNEP/CMS/COP11/Inf.34: *Review of the Ecological Effects of Poisoning on Migratory Birds: Report*).

259. The Chair invited all interested participants to contribute to discussions in the Avian Issues Working Group.

260. A duly revised Draft Resolution and associated Guidelines were endorsed by the COW on 9 November (see heading: *Endorsement of Amendments Proposed In-Session* page 57 below).

Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds (Item 23.1.3)

261. Mr. Heredia (Secretariat) introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.23.1.3: *Preventing the Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds* including the Draft Resolution contained in the Annex to the document. He stressed that this Draft Resolution had nothing to do with legal, regulated hunting. The Draft Resolution called for a special Task Force to address illegal killing in the Mediterranean region, which was one of the areas where the issue was most prevalent. This Draft Resolution complemented Draft Resolution 23.4.7 on Wildlife Crime.

262. The Chair noted that the document was undergoing detailed discussion by the Avian Issues Working Group and requested brief interventions only.

263. The representative of the European Union and its Member States appreciated the recent efforts made by the CMS Secretariat, including work with the Bern Convention, regarding prevention of the illegal killing, taking and trade of migratory birds. The development of synergies among several international organizations represented an important step forward in combating wildlife crime. In this context, CMS could play an important role, promoting cooperation and sharing of information. For these reasons, the EU and its Member States supported the aims of the Draft Resolution, but had tabled a number of amendments within the Avian Issues Working Group.

264. The representative of Egypt endorsed the Draft Resolution. His country was a migratory bottleneck for over 250 migratory bird species and in recent years, illegal killing had become a major problem. The Governments of Germany and Switzerland, together with BirdLife International, had pledged to assist with the prevention of illegal killing, and the issue had been discussed at ministerial level. A framework of action with well-defined objectives had been prepared, and the formation of the Task Force was seen as being a crucial development.

265. The representative of Ecuador noted that hunting was still unregulated in some South American countries. A pilot activity similar to that for the Mediterranean region would be worth considering for Latin America. Marine birds on the Pacific coast and shorebirds on north-east coast were particularly at risk.

266. The Chair noted that the document was undergoing detailed discussion within the Avian Issues Working Group and postponed further discussion in the COW, pending receipt of a revised text.

267. A duly revised Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW on 9 November (see heading: *Endorsement of Amendments Proposed In-Session* page 57 below).

Conservation of Landbirds in the African-Eurasian Region (Item 23.1.4)

268. Mr. Heredia (Secretariat) referred the Meeting to document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.23.1.4: *Conservation of Migratory Landbirds in the African-Eurasian Region*, including the Draft Resolution contained in Annex I of the document.

269. Mr. Olivier Biber (Switzerland), the Chair of the Working Group that had drafted the Action Plan, introduced the document in more detail. The Action Plan had been mandated under Resolution 10.27, and had been finalized during a meeting held in Accra at the invitation of the Government of Ghana, with financial support from the Swiss Government. Following wide consultation by email, the final document had been reviewed by the 41st Meeting of the CMS Standing Committee in November 2013. The Action Plan was a complementary instrument to AEWA and the Raptors MoU, covering the remaining migratory bird species in the African-Eurasian flyways. A number of proposed modifications to the Draft Resolution and Action Plan were being considered by the Avian Issues Working Group.

270. The Chair postponed further discussion in the COW, pending receipt of a revised text from the Avian Issues Working Group.

271. A duly revised Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW on 9 November (see heading: *Endorsement of Amendments Proposed In-Session* page 57 below).

Conservation of the Saker Falcon (Item 23. 1.5)

Summary Report of the Saker Falcon Task Force (Item 23.1.5.1)

Saker Falcon Global Action Plan (SakarGAP) (Item 23.1.5.2)

272. Mr. Nick Williams (Secretariat) referred the Meeting to documents UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.23.1.5.1: *Summary Report of the Saker Falcon Task Force*, including the Draft Resolution contained in an Annex to the document, and UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.23.1.5.2: *Saker Falcon Falco cherrug Global Action Plan (SakarGAP), including a Management and Monitoring System to Conserve the Species*.

273. Mr. Colin Galbraith gave a presentation summarizing the work of the Saker Falcon Task Force and the development of the Global Action Plan (GAP). The Task Force had been established by Resolution 10.28. An open process of cooperation involving dialogue and compromise among all stakeholders had been a key part of the successful development of the GAP. The main objective of the GAP was to re-establish a healthy and self-sustaining population of Saker Falcons throughout the species' range. A core issue was sustainable use, with a move towards legal, sustainable harvesting. A programme of conservation management would be established in nesting areas with robust monitoring and regular reporting. The Draft Resolution had seven objectives, including generating resources, continuing stakeholder engagement and facilitating implementation.

274. Mr. Galbraith warmly thanked the Parties and other organizations that had contributed to the partnership. He acknowledged the Parties for approving funding for the Task Force; CITES for its high-quality input; and the Saudi Wildlife Authority and the EU for funding and

support. Long-term support had been provided by the Environment Agency, Abu Dhabi on behalf of the Government of the United Arab Emirates. Thanks were also due to the International Association for Falconry and Conservation of Birds of Prey and to the members of the Task Force themselves. Finally, the support provided by the Coordination Unit for the Raptors MoU had been nothing short of superb.

275. The representative of the United Arab Emirates expressed his gratitude for the work of the Saker Falcon Task Force and appreciation of the transparent approach taken. The United Arab Emirates had hosted two meetings of the Task Force and stakeholder workshops involving 100 participants. He expected the work of the Task Force to continue and saw the GAP as an opportunity to re-establish flourishing populations of Saker Falcons.

276. The representative of Pakistan, speaking as a member of the Task Force, congratulated both Mr. Galbraith and Mr. Williams and his team. He urged Parties to endorse the GAP and the Draft Resolution.

277. The representative of Egypt thanked members of the Saker Falcon Task Force for their excellent work and urged all Parties to endorse the Draft Resolution.

278. The representative of the European Union and its Member States considered the high-quality GAP to be a good model for future Single Species Action Plans. It was now important to endorse the Draft Resolution and to implement the GAP.

279. The observer from the CITES Secretariat welcomed the Task Force report and the GAP. International trade was a significant issue for this species, and CITES had taken an active part in the preparation of the GAP including the leveraging of funds. CITES appreciated the open way the process had been conducted, and Mr. Galbraith and the Environment Agency, Abu Dhabi deserved great credit. Implementation was now crucial and CITES stood ready to assist. He hoped that the Parties would be able to adopt the GAP.

280. The observer from the International Association for Falconry and Conservation of Birds of Prey (IAF) welcomed the GAP and its four proposed flagship projects to initiate the conservation programme for this species. The IAF offered to take the lead in funding and managing one of the four projects: establishment of an internet portal to facilitate information exchange and build trust between falconers, trappers, falcon hospitals, researchers and conservationists.

281. The final text of the Draft Resolution, together with the GAP, was endorsed by the COW on 9 November (see heading: *Endorsement of Amendments Proposed In-Session* page 57 below).

Bird Taxonomy (Item 23.1.6)

282. Mr. Heredia (Secretariat) introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.23.1.6: *The Taxonomy and Nomenclature of Birds Listed on the CMS Appendices*. The document had been discussed in the Avian Issues Working Group and a number of amendments had been agreed. A revised text would be submitted to the COW in due course.

283. The Chair postponed further discussion pending receipt of the amended document.

284. A duly revised Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW on 7 November (see heading: *Endorsement of Amendments Proposed In-Session* page 57 below).

Aquatic Species (Item 23.2)

Conservation of Migratory Sharks and Rays (23.2.1)

285. Ms. Andrea Pauly (Secretariat) introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.23.2.1: *Conservation of Migratory Sharks and Rays*, including the Draft Resolution contained in the Annex to the document.

286. The Chair opened the floor for comments.

287. The representative of Brazil summarized national measures taken for the conservation of sharks and rays and underlined his country's commitment to this pressing issue. Brazil supported the Draft Resolution.

288. The representative of Ecuador supported the Draft Resolution.

289. The representative of the EU and its Member States believed the proposed listing of additional shark species under Appendix II of CMS could help generate momentum for the conservation of those species, without undermining the work carried out by Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs) and bring added value to collective efforts for ensuring the conservation and sustainable use of sharks. Nevertheless, the EU wished to see several amendments incorporated before it would be able to endorse the Draft Resolution, and, therefore, proposed forwarding the document to the Aquatic Issues Working Group for further consideration.

290. The representative of the United Arab Emirates noted that shark-finning was banned in his country. The United Arab Emirates should, therefore, be included in the listing contained in the document of countries where shark-finning was banned.

291. The representatives of Argentina, Chile, Egypt and Senegal all endorsed the Draft Resolution.

292. The observer from Humane Society International (speaking also on behalf of a coalition of other NGOs), supported the Draft Resolution, congratulated Sweden for becoming the newest signatory to the Sharks MoU, and called on other Range States that had yet to sign the MoU to do so as soon as possible.

293. The representative of the United States of America, noting that her country was a Signatory of the Sharks MoU, supported the Draft Resolution subject to inclusion of a few minor amendments. The United States of America was ready to work with others on this Agenda Item in the Aquatic Issues Working Group.

294. The Chair concluded that further consideration would indeed be referred to the Aquatic Issues Working Group and that the COW would revert to this Agenda Item in a later session.

295. A duly revised Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW on 9 November (see heading: *Endorsement of Amendments Proposed In-Session* page 57 below).

Action Plan for the Loggerhead Turtle in the South Pacific Ocean (Item 23.2.2)

296. The representative of Australia reported that, following the emergence of this issue at the Strategic Scientific Council Meeting in October 2013, Australia had worked closely with the COP-Appointed Councillor for Marine Turtles, Mr. Colin Limpus, to organize a technical meeting to elaborate a Single Species Action Plan (SSAP) for Loggerhead Turtles in the South Pacific Ocean. The Technical Meeting had been held in Brisbane, Australia, in March 2014 and brought together experts from all relevant countries, to produce a draft SSAP addressing the threats to this population. This draft was considered at the 18th Meeting of the Scientific Council and was supported unanimously. It was now being submitted to COP11 for consideration by Parties. The Aquatic Issues Working Group had reviewed the draft SSAP and associated Draft Resolution and agreed to it being presented to the COW, subject to comments from the United States of America being resolved. Australia, the United States of America and the COP-Appointed Councillor had now reached consensus on the amendments to be included. The revised Draft Resolution would now be considered further by the Aquatic Issues Working Group.

297. Mr. Colin Limpus made a presentation introducing document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.23.2.2: *Draft Single Species Action Plan for the Loggerhead Turtle in the South Pacific Ocean*, including the Draft Resolution contained in Annex 1 to the document.

298. The representative of Ecuador, supported by Chile, endorsed the adoption of the Single Species Action Plan. She stressed the importance of establishing the synergies mentioned in the presentation and referred to Ecuador's national action plan for marine turtles.

299. The representative of the EU and its Member States endorsed the Draft Resolution and SSAP, pointing to the current lack of international conservation measures to reduce bycatch in pelagic fishing gear.

300. The representative of Peru supported adoption of the SSAP and offered to submit additional text resulting from new data available from his country. Peru supported the view of Ecuador concerning the importance of synergies, especially with the Inter-American Convention for the Protection of Marine Turtles.

301. The representative of the United States of America supported the adoption of the SSAP and requested the Secretariat and Parties to work on implementation and awareness-raising.

302. The representative of Argentina also supported the SSAP and highlighted an opportunity for cooperation with the Inter-American Convention for the Protection of Marine Turtles at its next COP, due to be held in Mexico in 2015.

303. The representative of Fiji recognized the importance of cooperation with the SPREP Regional Turtle Action Plan, and pledged to voice support for the SSAP at the forthcoming meeting of the Western Pacific Fisheries Commission in Samoa.

304. The Chair invited the representative of Australia to collate any further proposed amendments and to forward the final draft of the SSAP and Draft Resolution for endorsement by the COW in due course.

305. A duly revised Draft Resolution and the associated SSAP were endorsed by the COW on 9 November (see heading: *Endorsement of Amendments Proposed In-Session* page 57 below).

Live Capture of Cetaceans from the Wild for Commercial Purposes (Item 23.2.3)

306. Ms .Heidrun Frisch (Secretariat) introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.23.2.3/Rev.1: *Live Captures of Cetaceans from the Wild for Commercial Purposes*, including the Draft Resolution contained in Annex II of the document, which had been submitted by the Principality of Monaco. Annex I provided background information and was a result of deliberations of the Aquatic Mammals Working Group of the Scientific Council, which had reviewed and amended the Draft Resolution.

307. The Chair advised that this Agenda Item would be discussed further in the Aquatic Issues Working Group, but opened the floor to preliminary comments.

308. The representative of Monaco said that live capture of cetaceans had consequences for their populations, and especially for the structure of their social groups. The Draft Resolution strengthened the conservation of small cetaceans by providing strict protection measures and by stressing the importance of regional and international cooperation.

309. The representative of Chile, representing the Latin America & Caribbean region, observed that the document conformed with the Buenos Aires group under the International Whaling Commission in respecting the moratorium on commercial hunting of cetaceans. The region was committed to non-lethal use of cetaceans through whale watching.

310. The observer from the ACCOBAMS Secretariat stated that the document was in line with ACCOBAMS objectives, especially Article 2 of the Agreement.

311. The observer from the CITES Secretariat recalled that the capture of live cetaceans was within the purview of CITES. He sought amendments to two operative paragraphs of the Draft Resolution, to ensure that this did not lead to a conflict of interests.

312. The observer from the Whale and Dolphin Conservation expressed support for the document.

313. The representative of the EU and its Member States, supported by Egypt, drew attention to the animal welfare implications of live cetacean capture and supported the Draft Resolution.

314. The representative of Ecuador supported the Draft Resolution and reported that ten years of whale watching in Ecuador had generated US\$ 60 million and greatly assisted local communities. Non-lethal use of cetaceans was considerably more effective than capture.

315. The observer from Humane Society International called for a strong and vigorous Resolution to maximize its effectiveness.

316. The Chair recalled that this Agenda Item would be further discussed in the Aquatic Issues Working Group and an amended version of the Draft Resolution would be brought forward for the COW to consider in due course.

317. A duly revised Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW on 7 November (see heading: *Endorsement of Amendments Proposed In-Session* page 57 below).

Conservation Implications of Cetacean Culture (Item 23.2.4)

318. Ms. Frisch (Secretariat) introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.23.2.4: *Conservation Implications of Cetacean Culture*, including the Draft Resolution contained in the Annex to the document. This work had arisen from CMS Resolution 10.15. A workshop in London in April 2014 had defined ‘culture’ as “*information or behaviours that are shared by a community and acquired through social learning from conspecifics*”. Culture could increase negative outcomes or increase population viability, and help define boundaries for the delineation of units for conservation. The Draft Resolution highlighted the implications of cetacean culture, requested the Scientific Council to appoint an intersessional Expert Group, and provided advice to Parties on a precautionary approach.

319. The Chair advised that this Agenda Item would be discussed further in the Aquatic Issues Working Group, but opened the floor to preliminary comments.

320. The representative of Monaco remarked that this document represented a new stage in terms of the concepts and application of CMS.

321. The representative of Chile, on behalf of the Latin America & Caribbean region, endorsed the Draft Resolution.

322. The representative of the EU and its Member States acknowledged the pioneering nature of this work and, subject to inclusion of a number of amendments, supported the Draft Resolution. The EU looked forward to contributing to discussions in the Aquatic Issues Working Group.

323. The representative of New Zealand considered many aspects of cetacean culture to be relevant to other vertebrates, probably involving all groups.

324. The observer from the Whale and Dolphin Conservation observed that units for conservation purposes were usually defined on the basis of genetics. The identification of cultural units presented a new challenge, but conservation measures could be improved by recognizing cultural units.

325. The observer from Humane Society International considered that it made solid scientific sense to include social biology in efforts to conserve cetaceans. He noted that the Meeting had received a letter of support for the Resolution from Mr. Rendell and Mr. Whitehead, which was available under ‘statements’ on the CMS COP11 webpage and annexed to the present report.

326. The Chair recalled that this Agenda Item would be further discussed in the Aquatic Issues Working Group and an amended version of the Draft Resolution would be brought forward for the COW to consider in due course.

327. A duly revised Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW on 7 November (see heading: *Endorsement of Amendments Proposed In-Session* page 57 below).

Terrestrial Species (Item 23.3)

Central Asian Mammals Initiative (Item 23.3.1)

Guidelines on Wildlife-friendly Infrastructure Design for Central Asia (Item 23.3.2)

Draft Action Plan for the Conservation of Argali (Item 23.3.3)

328. Ms. Christiane Röttger (Secretariat) made a presentation presenting three documents: UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.23.3.1/Rev.1: *Central Asian Mammals Initiative (CAMI)*, including the Draft Resolution contained in an Annex to the document; UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.23.3.2: *Guidelines on Mitigating the Impact of Linear Infrastructure and Related Disturbance on Mammals in Central Asia*; and UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.23.3.3: *Draft International Single Species Action Plan for the Conservation of the Argali*.

329. The Draft Resolution contained in the Annex to Doc.23.3.1 had been considered by the 18th Meeting of the Scientific Council and at a regional workshop of Range States hosted by the Government of Kyrgyzstan and funded by the Governments of Germany and Switzerland, together with the European Union.

330. Doc.23.3.2 included guidelines on addressing a number of issues related to the roads, railways, boundary fences and other linear infrastructure which were a growing problem for migratory mammals in Central Asia. A workshop held in Germany in 2013, with financial support from the Government of Germany, had resulted in a Declaration of Intent and an Action Plan. Subsequently, Conservation Guidelines covering 12 species in eight Central Asian countries had been developed by the Wildlife Conservation Society with funding from the Swiss Government.

331. Doc.23.3.3 concerned an Action Plan that had been developed for the largest wild sheep species, found in 11 countries of Central Asia.

332. Ms. Lira Joldubaeva, focal point for the Central Asian Mammals Initiative (CAMI), in Kyrgyzstan, presented CAMI's Programme of Work (POW) in more detail. Central Asia was one of the last regions in the world still supporting long-distance migrations of large mammals. CAMI covered 14 countries and 14 species. The Programme of Work 2014-2020 included a vision of secure and viable populations of migratory mammals that ranged across the landscapes of Central Asia in healthy ecosystems, and that were valued by, and brought benefits to, local communities and all stakeholders. Its principal goal was to improve the conservation of migratory large mammals and their habitats in the Central Asian region by strengthening coordination and cross-border cooperation.

333. The representative of Switzerland noted that Central Asia hosted some of the most important mammal migrations in the world but had been neglected by international conservation initiatives for too long. He considered the work of CAMI to be deserving of full support, and suggested that the approach could be useful in other regions.

334. The representative of Pakistan welcomed the initiative and stressed that the success of CAMI had only been possible because of local community involvement. He urged Parties to support CAMI and community managed conservation.

335. The representative of Kyrgyzstan, supported by Tajikistan, endorsed the Argali Action Plan and the Draft Resolution.

336. The representative of the European Union and its Member States welcomed the progress made since COP10. There was a need to establish a Central Asia Officer and to make a provisional budget for the Argali Action Plan. The EU noted that the guidelines on linear infrastructure had not been reviewed by the Scientific Council and invited the Secretariat to ensure that in future any such technical reports were submitted to the Scientific Council for review.

337. The observer from the CITES Secretariat recalled that many mammal species in Central Asia were listed on CITES Appendices. International trade in hunting trophies of some of them could, in certain circumstances, be an important conservation incentive. The two Conventions needed to work together on this. CITES had therefore played an active part in the drafting of both CAMI and the Argali Action Plan, and had also commissioned three study reports as a contribution to this effort. CITES hoped that the Meeting would adopt CAMI and the Action Plan for the Argali and looked forward to working with CMS on their implementation.

338. The observer from the Conservation Force, speaking also on behalf of the Wild Sheep Foundation, welcomed the much-needed unified conservation approach to Central Asian mammals. The Argali Action Plan was a very useful basis for community-based conservation and both organizations looked forward to helping where they could.

339. At the invitation of the Chair, the COW (at its session on 9 November) endorsed the final versions of the Draft Resolutions relating to CAMI and the Argali Action Plan, as well as the Guidelines on linear infrastructure (see heading: *Endorsement of Amendments Proposed In-Session* page 57 below).

Crosscutting Conservation Issues (Item 23.4)

Ecological Networks (Item 23.4.1)

Application of Ecological Networks to CMS to CMS (Item 23.4.1.1)

Strategic Review of Aspects of Ecological Networks relating to Migratory Species (Item 23.4.1.2)

340. Mr. Barbieri (Secretariat) made a presentation introducing documents UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.23.4.1.1: *Review of the Application of Ecological Networks to CMS* and UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.23.4.1.2: *Ecological Networks: A Strategic Review of Aspects relating to Migratory Species*, as well as the associated information papers COP11/Inf.22, COP11/Inf.23, COP11/Inf.24 and COP11/Inf.25. Mr. Barbieri drew particular attention to the Draft Resolution contained in the Annex to COP11/Doc.23.4.1.1.

341. The Chair opened the floor to comments on what he considered to be an important and exciting initiative.

342. The representative of the EU and its Member States supported the adoption of the Draft Resolution, recognizing it as an indispensable step to addressing the needs of migratory species from the perspective of ecological networks. Given that the Draft Resolution had already benefitted from the evaluation of the CMS Scientific Council, the EU saw no need for further amendments to the present version. The EU and its Member States looked forward to the initiatives that would be undertaken to address this key conservation issue based on the use of the best scientific information to guide prioritization of actions.

343. The representative of Ukraine welcomed the work being undertaken to promote the development of ecological networks. Ecological networks, both national and regional, were a priority of Ukraine's ecological policy and Ukraine supported the Draft Resolution.

344. The representative of the Philippines welcomed the Draft Resolution and detailed a number of proposed amendments that had been submitted electronically to the Secretariat.

345. The representative of Argentina thanked the Scientific Council and Secretariat for their efforts and, while supporting the Draft Resolution in general, tabled several proposed amendments, which would be submitted to the Secretariat electronically.

346. The observer from BirdLife International welcomed the excellent Strategic Review and the Draft Resolution and particularly welcomed the proposed amendments tabled by the Philippines. BirdLife International was pleased to offer further assistance on the topics covered by the Draft Resolution.

347. The representative of South Africa supported the statement made by BirdLife International and welcomed what it considered to be an excellent review. South Africa wished to propose a few amendments to the Draft Resolution. These would be submitted in writing to the Secretariat.

348. The representative of New Zealand proposed minor amendments to one operative paragraph of the Draft Resolution and undertook to send these to the Secretariat.

349. The Chair invited all those who had commented to send any proposed amendments to the Secretariat as soon as possible. A small Working Group would be established to take forward this Agenda Item and the COW would return to the issue later.

350. At a subsequent session of the COW, the representative of the European Union and its Member States reported that the EU and Argentina had held a bilateral meeting on the Draft Resolution concerning Ecological Networks and an agreed version had been forwarded to the Secretariat.

351. A duly revised Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW on 9 November (see heading: *Endorsement of Amendments Proposed In-Session* page 57 below).

Programme of Work on Climate Change and Migratory Species (Item 23.4.2)

352. Mr. Heredia (Secretariat) briefly introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.23.4.2: *Programme of Work on Climate Change and Migratory Species*, which included a Draft Resolution submitted by Costa Rica.

353. Ms. Gina Cuza Jones, the CMS National Focal Point for Costa Rica, and Mr. Colin Galbraith, Chair of the Working Group on Climate Change, made a joint presentation introducing the documents in more detail.

354. The representative of Ecuador considered the Programme of Work (POW) to be an excellent practical example of cooperation and synergy for the CMS Family as a whole, as well as for CMS itself. UNFCCC COP20 would soon take place in Peru, amid high expectations. IPCC had recently highlighted the inter-relationships between climate change and species. Ecuador, therefore, looked forward to approval by COP11 of both the POW and the Draft Resolution itself.

355. The representative of the EU and its Member States considered the POW as a first starting point. Much further work was still necessary. An in-depth review of the existing scientific literature on the effects of climate changes on wild species was urgently needed, as well as activities to stimulate analyses of relevant scientific information. At the same time there was a need to make the best possible use of existing key case studies that provided guidance on how best to react to the effects of climate change on migratory species. The EU and its Member States invited the CMS Secretariat to support the Intersessional Working Group on Climate Change, including, through promotion of fundraising activities, to guarantee adequate financial resources.

356. However, the EU considered that this further work should be fully coordinated with the overall work of CMS. The appropriate tool for this coordination would be the Companion Volume under the new Strategic Plan. At national level, specific actions should be integrated into NBSAPs and into national plans for the mitigation of and adaptation to climate change. The EU wished to table a number of amendments to the Draft Resolution in this regard, and confirmed it would submit these in writing. Finally, the EU invited the Secretariat to collaborate more closely with IUCN in order to avoid duplication of species vulnerability assessments and to report on progress in the implementation of the POW in terms of the measures taken and their effectiveness.

357. The representative of Australia supported the proposed POW and the present version of the Draft Resolution. Given the significant resources that would be required for implementation, Australia suggested evaluation and prioritization of activities within the POW.

358. The representative of Argentina welcomed the POW but indicated that it would submit to the Secretariat some specific amendments to the Draft Resolution, in particular to make it clear that the POW should be implemented according to the circumstances of each individual Party.

359. Endorsing the Draft Resolution and welcoming the POW, the representative of Egypt considered that a clearer timeframe for implementation was required, and underlined the need for significant resources. He urged countries to reflect the POW in their NBSAPs and suggested that one pilot project should be developed to serve as a demonstration.

360. Mr. Galbraith briefly responded to some of the points raised, observing that there seemed to be a general view that prioritization was required.

361. The Chair asked that concrete comments and proposed amendments be submitted to the Secretariat promptly. However, it seemed as if there was broad support and it was therefore likely that any amendments would be fairly limited in scope.

362. A duly revised Draft Resolution and the associated POW were endorsed by the COW on 6 November (see heading: *Endorsement of Amendments Proposed In-Session* page 57 below).

Renewable Energy Technologies Deployment and Migratory Species (Item 23.4.3)

Renewable Energy and Migratory Species (Item 23.4.3.1)

363. The Chair informed the Meeting that, due to shortage of time, a video message by the Director of IRENA could not be played, and invited participants to watch the video from the COP11 website.

364. Mr. Barbieri (Secretariat) briefly introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.23.4.3.1: *Renewable Energy and Migratory Species* and the Draft Resolution contained in Annex I to the document.

Guidelines for Sustainable Deployment (Item 23.4.3.2)

365. Mr. Jan van der Winden (Bureau Waardenburg bv.) made a presentation introducing document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.23.4.3.2: *Renewable Energy Technologies and Migratory Species: Guidelines for Sustainable Deployment*.

366. On behalf of the Secretariat, Mr. Barbieri thanked the Bureau Waardenburg for the good work done under extremely tight time limits.

367. The representative of Brazil welcomed the efforts of the CMS Secretariat, AEWA Secretariat, BirdLife International and IRENA in compiling the report and guidelines. Considering that adverse impacts of renewable energy technologies could be substantially minimized through careful site selection and planning, Brazil agreed with, and emphasized the need to work carefully on, sensitivity mapping to inform planners and developers about the potential importance of birds in choices regarding renewable energy construction sites. A resolution from Brazil's National Environmental Council had mandated the Brazilian environment authorities to publish annually a national report detailing the main aggregation sites known for migratory birds, as well as the known flyways within its territory, to assist in the development of such mapping. This was now a legal obligation on the Government.

368. Brazil believed that information on which species were the most impacted could only be achieved by means of comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) and appropriate post-construction monitoring, resulting in a complete meta-data overview.

369. Taking these comments into account, Brazil supported the Draft Resolution and wished to be part of this initiative when the moment came to expand the geographical scope of the Energy Task Force beyond the African-Eurasian region to South America.

370. The representative of Egypt welcomed the guidelines and endorsed the Draft Resolution. He suggested the removal of the square brackets from one of the operative paragraphs and provided information on relevant experience in Egypt.

371. The representative of the EU and its Member States supported the Draft Resolution and suggested that in its further work the Task Force should make use of existing guidelines and experience from other conventions (e.g., Bern and Ramsar), Agreements such as

EUROBATS and other organizations (e.g., IUCN) to avoid duplication of work and to ensure identification of best practices.

372. The representative of South Africa welcomed the Draft Resolution and supported the guidelines document. South Africa joined Egypt in suggesting that the square brackets could be removed and also indicated it would submit an amendment in writing to the Secretariat.

373. The representative of Chile wondered if it was appropriate to be adopting an information document through the Draft Resolution.

374. The observer from the ACCOBAMS Secretariat noted that the Draft Resolution was in line with the objectives of ACCOBAMS, notably ACCOBAMS Resolution 4.17 on Guidelines to Address the Impact of Anthropogenic Noise on Cetaceans in the ACCOBAMS Area. The ACCOBAMS Secretariat would provide the CMS Secretariat with the relevant reference to Resolution 4.17 to be included in the guidelines.

375. The representative of Argentina supported the Draft Resolution and guidelines but pointed out that document Inf.26 had been prepared without an opportunity for Parties to make contributions. Relevant experience from Argentina could usefully be included as an input and to help ensure there was no regional bias in the document. Argentina also wished to bring forward amendments to the Draft Resolution emphasizing the voluntary nature of the guidelines, whose implementation would depend on the specific circumstances of each Party.

376. The Chair asked all participants who wished to propose amendments to communicate these to the Secretariat.

377. A duly revised Draft Resolution and the associated Guidelines were endorsed by the COW on 7 November (see heading: *Endorsement of Amendments Proposed In-Session* page 57 below).

Invasive Alien Species (Item 23.4.4)

378. Mr. Heredia (Secretariat) made a presentation introducing document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.23.4.4: *Review of the Impact of Invasive Alien Species on Species under the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS)*, including the Draft Resolution contained in Annex II to the document. He noted that document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Inf.32 included the full version of the study of the impact of invasive alien species (IAS) on migratory species. Both the study and the Draft Resolution had been reviewed by the Scientific Council.

379. The representative of Australia supported the work of CMS on IAS and offered to share its experiences on this issue with other Parties and organizations. He tabled a proposed amendment to one preambular paragraph of the Draft Resolution.

380. The representatives of Chile, Costa Rica, Fiji, Peru and the United States of America endorsed the Draft Resolution. Further amendments were tabled, involving three preambular paragraphs.

381. While supporting the Draft Resolution, the representative of Egypt considered that the issue of IAS required more innovative thinking. He suggested that a pilot project might be helpful.

382. The representative of the EU and its Member States referred to the recent adoption of an EU Regulation on IAS, which laid down a framework for effective EU-wide measures. The EU supported the Draft Resolution and was pleased that it underlined the importance of coordination with other institutions and MEAs, notably CBD. The conclusion in the report that seabird and marine turtle populations at their breeding and nesting grounds on islands were under greatest threat from IAS, suggested that this should be a priority for future work. A number of minor textual amendments had been submitted to the Secretariat.

383. The representative of New Zealand was delighted that the IAS Specialist Group of IUCN, based at the University of Auckland, had prepared the report upon which the document was based. Proposed textual amendments had been forwarded to the Secretariat.

384. The representative of Argentina joined others in supporting the Draft Resolution and referred to a GEF project on this issue, as well as a bilateral initiative with Chile on two shared IAS.

385. A final version of the Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW on 7 November (see heading: *Endorsement of Amendments Proposed In-Session* page 57 below).

Sustainable Boat-Based Wildlife Watching Tourism (Item 23.4.5)

386. Ms. Frisch (Secretariat) made a presentation introducing document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.23.4.5: *Sustainable Boat-Based Wildlife Watching Tourism*, including the Draft Resolution contained in Annex I to the document. This issue affected all marine species groups under CMS. There had been wide discussion within the Aquatic Issues Working Group, and the document had already changed significantly. A revised version would be provided to the COW for its further consideration in due course.

387. The Chair suspended further COW deliberations on this Agenda Item, pending receipt of the revised document.

388. A duly revised Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW on 7 November (see heading: *Endorsement of Amendments Proposed In-Session* page 57 below).

Management of Marine Debris (Item 23.4.6)

389. Ms. Frisch (Secretariat) made a presentation introducing document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.23.4.6: *Management of Marine Debris*, including the Draft Resolution contained in Annex I to the document. Resolution 10.4 had instructed the Scientific Council to coordinate three reviews, funded by a voluntary contribution from Australia, covering knowledge gaps, relating to debris pathways, management and impacts on migratory species, waste management on marine vessels, and the effectiveness of a public awareness campaign. The reports were presented as documents UNEP/CMS/COP11/Inf.27, Inf.28 and Inf.29. The Draft Resolution was based on the recommendations in these reviews. The Aquatic Issues Working Group would be addressing this Agenda Item later in the day.

390. The observer from UNEP tabled an amendment to the Draft Resolution drawing attention to the resolution on marine plastic debris and micro plastics adopted by the first United Nations Environment Assembly (UNEA) in June 2014.

391. The representative of Argentina considered the existence or otherwise of gaps in legislation to be a matter for consideration at national levels. It was inappropriate to include this topic in the present document.

392. The Chair concluded that further discussion by the COW should await receipt of a revised text from the Working Group.

393. A duly revised Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW on 7 November (see heading: *Endorsement of Amendments Proposed In-Session* page 57 below).

Wildlife Crime (Item 23.4.7)

394. Mr. Oteng-Yeboah (Ghana) presented document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.23.4.7/Rev.1: *Fighting Wildlife Crime Within and Beyond Borders*, including the Draft Resolution, sponsored jointly by Ghana and Monaco, contained in the Annex to the document. Wildlife crime affected economic development, national and international security, as well as biodiversity. The Draft Resolution included measures to improve management of shared wildlife populations, improve transboundary law enforcement, increase awareness, promote alternative livelihoods and reduce demand for illegal wildlife products.

395. The representative of Monaco, supported by Uganda, stressed the importance of strengthening cooperation among different bodies, including INTERPOL and CITES, and highlighted risks to economic development and tourism. He considered improving the traceability of illegally trafficked products in importing countries to be an important issue.

396. The representative of the EU and its Member States considered that fighting wildlife crime was a top priority. EU Member States had been initiating, organizing and supporting several high-level events including:

- African Elephant Summit (Gaborone, December 2013)
- Elysée Summit for Peace and Security in Africa (Paris, December 2013)
- London Summit on Illegal Wildlife Trade (London, February 2014)

397. The EU and its Member States recognized that CMS had an important role to play in the global response to wildlife crime, both within Range States and across national borders. The EU had tabled two amendments to an operative paragraph of the Draft Resolution.

398. The representative of Uruguay regarded the Draft Resolution as a logical strengthening of cooperation between CMS and CITES. Almost all CMS Parties were also Parties to CITES but not all species on CMS Appendices were also listed by CITES. The language used in reference to crime needed to be amended, since illegal wildlife crime was not subject to criminal penal action in many countries. Use of terms such as “violation” or “offence” would help in this regard.

399. The representative of Brazil, supported by Chile, endorsed the Draft Resolution. He considered it an advantage that it did not involve new lines of work for the CMS Secretariat. Brazil considered references to national and regional security to be exaggerated and in need of amendment or deletion. Brazil believed the Draft Resolution could be strengthened in its operative part by means of the inclusion of two additional paragraphs. These would suggest additional measures for Parties and non-Parties to enhance cooperation for preventing and minimizing the damage created by wildlife crime within and beyond borders. With these and other minor amendments, Brazil was ready to support the Draft Resolution.

400. The representative of Kenya expressed strong concern over poaching for elephant ivory and rhino horn. The document provided a means for CMS to respond to the seriousness of these threats. He suggested an amendment to one operational paragraph, but urged all Parties to support the Draft Resolution.

401. The representative of Pakistan referred to the widespread illegal trade in the Asia region for groups such as geckos, pangolins, freshwater turtles and scorpions. He suggested that this issue should be reflected in the document.

402. The representative of South Africa underlined the commitment of her country in dealing with wildlife crime, and particularly the scourge of rhino poaching. She indicated that amendments to two paragraphs of the Draft Resolution would be sent to the Secretariat.

403. The representative of Egypt declared that it was time for action. Cooperation between international organizations was essential, and truly innovative solutions were needed. There was also a need to address the root causes of wildlife crime, such as poverty, corruption, political instability and insecurity.

404. The representative of Israel emphasized the issue of prevention. Israel was implementing a major anti-poaching project in Africa using innovative technologies. He offered to assist any Parties or organizations who might be interested in adopting such methods. He refuted the statement of Brazil objecting to the reference to heightened national and international security problems resulting from wildlife crime, because of abundant evidence that this was indeed the case.

405. The representative of Ecuador drew attention to necessary changes in language in two places in the document where reference was incorrectly made to “fauna and flora”. Since the document referred to wildlife crime involving animals, the mention of flora should be deleted.

406. The observer from the CITES Secretariat recalled that the main focus of CITES was on international crime and that an additional focus by CMS on crime within national borders would be complementary. He would present text for a proposed amendment to one operative paragraph. He commended the Draft Resolution and hoped it would be adopted by the COP.

407. The observer from UNEP referred to Resolution UNEP/EA.1/3 on Illegal Trade in Wildlife that had been adopted at the First Meeting of UNEA in June 2014. This requested UNEP to take collaborative action to strengthen responses to the illegal trade in wildlife. This effort included providing support to legal, judicial and enforcement measures, and a targeted approach to awareness-raising and demand reduction for illegally sourced wildlife products.

408. The observer from the Born Free Foundation urged Parties to ensure that the language of the Draft Resolution added value to existing measures.

409. The Chair asked the representative of Monaco to collate all suggested amendments and to submit a revised text to the COW for further consideration in due course.

410. A duly revised Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW on 9 November (see heading: *Endorsement of Amendments Proposed In-Session* page 57 below).

AMENDMENT OF CMS APPENDICES (ITEM 24)

Proposals for Amendment of Appendices I and II of the Convention (Item 24.1)

Proposals submitted for the inclusion of species on Appendix I and /or II (Item 24.1.x)

411. The Chair of the COW indicated that the proponent of each proposal for amendment of CMS Appendices I and II would be invited to introduce the proposal briefly. The COW would not discuss at length possible amendments to the proposal. Amending the proposal would be the responsibility of the proponent(s). Participants were invited to hand in to the Secretariat any statements they wished to make and to avoid lengthy oral interventions as far as possible. The most important thing was to state clearly, yes or no, whether the proposal was supported. If there was clear widespread support, or even full consensus, he would recommend to the Chair of the Plenary that the Plenary should be able to adopt the proposal without difficulty. However, if there were clear differences of view, or even widespread opposition, he would inform the Plenary Chair that there was no consensus in the COW, so that she could determine an appropriate way forward in Plenary.

412. The representative of the EU and its Member States introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.24.1.1: Proposal for the inclusion of the Mediterranean subpopulation of Cuvier's beaked whale (*Ziphius cavirostris*) on CMS Appendix I (**Proposal I/1**).

413. The observer from Wild Migration, speaking also on behalf of Born Free Foundation, Humane Society International, IFAW, NRDC, OceanCare and Whale and Dolphin Conservation (and, he anticipated, many other NGOs present) welcomed and supported the proposal.

414. The observer from the ACCOBAMS Secretariat noted that the proposal had originally been prepared by the ACCOBAMS Scientific Committee. She was grateful to Spain and the EU for having endorsed and supported the proposal.

415. Chile, speaking on behalf of the Latin America & Caribbean regional group, supported the proposal.

416. The observer from the CITES Secretariat made the following statement:

“It is true that all sub-species, races, populations, sub-populations and so forth and indeed all individual specimens are of value for the conservation of the species and the text of CMS reflects this in its definition of the term ‘Species’ which includes “any geographically separate part of the population of any species or lower taxon of wild animals”. However, we struggle collectively to properly address the conservation of full species and if we divide all species to consider them at sub-population level, then we will surely have a big job before us. It would seem that addressing issues at a taxonomic level lower than species should be done sparingly and when there is a particular need for such a fine-grained approach. This species is listed in CITES Appendix II and we observe that if adopted, this listing would mean that the CMS status of this particular sub-population would be out of sync with the listing in CITES, a situation that we regret.”

417. The representative of Monaco strongly supported the proposal.
418. In view of the support expressed by Parties, the Chair concluded that this proposal could be forwarded to Plenary, with the recommendation that it could be adopted by consensus.
419. In relation to the proposal contained in document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.24.1.2: Proposal for the inclusion of the Asiatic Lion (*Panthera leo persica*) on CMS Appendix I and of all other subspecies of *Panthera leo* in CMS Appendix II (**Proposal I/2 & II/2**), the representative of Kenya informed the COW that, in its capacity as the proponent of the proposal, Kenya was in consultation with the Secretariat to take forward issues relating to the listing proposal in the form of a Draft Resolution.
420. The Chair confirmed that document COP11/Doc.24.1.2 was, therefore, being withdrawn.
421. Speaking on behalf of the proponents, Senegal and Niger, the representative of Senegal introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.24.1.3: Proposal for the inclusion of the Red-fronted Gazelle (*Eudorcas rufifrons*) on CMS Appendix I (**Proposal I/3**).
422. The proposal was supported by the representatives of Benin, Ethiopia and the EU and its Member States.
423. In view of the support expressed by Parties, the Chair concluded that this proposal could be forwarded to Plenary with the recommendation that it could be adopted by consensus.
424. The representative of Mongolia introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.24.1.4/Rev.1: Proposal for the inclusion of the global population of the Great Bustard (*Otis tarda*) on CMS Appendix I (**Proposal I/4**).
425. The proposal was strongly supported by the representatives of the EU and its Member States, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan, Ukraine and IUCN (through its Bustard Specialist Group).
426. The observer from the CITES Secretariat noted that this species was included in CITES Appendix II and that if the proposal was adopted and the species was indeed endangered, it was to be hoped that a proposal would be put to a future CITES COP, so that the status of Great Bustard under the two Conventions could be harmonized in order to support efforts to conserve the species.
427. In view of the strong support expressed by Parties, the Chair concluded that this proposal could be forwarded to Plenary, with the recommendation that it could be adopted by consensus.
428. Speaking on behalf of the proponents, Ecuador and Paraguay, the representative of Ecuador introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.24.1.5: Proposal for the inclusion of the Semipalmated Sandpiper (*Calidris pusilla*) on CMS Appendix I (**Proposal I/5**).
429. The proposal was supported by the representatives of Argentina (who thanked Ecuador and Paraguay for accommodating Argentina's comments on an earlier draft), Chile (on behalf of the Latin America & Caribbean region), and the EU and its Member States.

430. In view of the strong support expressed by Parties, the Chair concluded that this proposal could be forwarded to Plenary with the recommendation that it could be adopted by consensus.

431. The representative of the Philippines introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.24.1.6: Proposal for the inclusion of the Great Knot (*Calidris tenuirostris*) on CMS Appendix I (**Proposal I/6**).

432. The proposal was supported by the representatives of Australia, Chile (on behalf of the Latin America & Caribbean region), the EU and its Member States, Fiji and New Zealand.

433. In view of the strong support expressed by Parties, the Chair concluded that this proposal could be forwarded to Plenary with the recommendation that it could be adopted by consensus.

434. The representative of the EU and its Member States introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.24.1.7: Proposal for the inclusion of the European Roller (*Coracias garrulus*) on CMS Appendix I (**Proposal I/7**).

435. The proposal was supported by the representatives of Belarus, Chile (on behalf of the Latin America & Caribbean region) and Pakistan.

436. In response to a question from the representative of Norway, the representative of the EU and its Member States provided additional information concerning the reasons behind the proposal.

437. The representative of Israel supported the proposal but pointed out that a reference in the document to the problem of illegal hunting was not applicable throughout the species' flyways. Israel was on a major migration route for European Roller but there was no illegal hunting of the species in Israel. On the contrary, it was highly valued, not least because of its importance for ecotourism.

438. In view of the widespread support expressed by Parties, the Chair concluded that this proposal could be forwarded to Plenary with the recommendation that it could be adopted by consensus.

439. The representative of Kenya introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.24.1.8: Proposal for the inclusion of all species of Sawfish (Family Pristidae) on CMS Appendices I & II (**Proposal I/8 & II/9**).

440. The Chair noted that under the Rules of Procedure, it was not possible for listing proposals covering groups of species to be adopted *en bloc* by the Plenary. Instead, the Plenary would have to adopt each separate listing proposal, species-by-species. However, there was no such procedural constraint in the COW and it would be efficient to consider the proposal as a whole.

441. The representative of Chile supported the comments of the Chair and confirmed that Chile would be comfortable with taking the proposal species-by-species when it came to adoption in Plenary.

442. Shark Advocates International, speaking also on behalf of Defenders of Wildlife, Humane Society International, IFAW, Manta Trust, Marine Megafauna Foundation, Pew, PRETOMA, Project AWARE, Wildlife Conservation Society and WWF, strongly supported the proposal.

443. The proposal was supported by the representatives of Australia, Ecuador, Egypt, the EU and its Member States, Fiji, Senegal, South Africa and United Arab Emirates and by the observer from IUCN (through its Shark Specialist Group).

444. In view of the widespread support expressed by Parties, the Chair concluded that this proposal could be forwarded to Plenary with the recommendation that it could be adopted by consensus.

445. The representative of Fiji introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.24.1.9: Proposal for the inclusion of Reef Manta Ray (*Manta alfredi*) in CMS Appendix I & II (**Proposal I/9 & II/10**).

446. The proposal was supported by the representatives of Chile (on behalf of the Latin America & Caribbean region), Ecuador, the EU and its Member States and the representative of the United States of America.

447. The proposal was also strongly supported by the observer from Marine Megafauna Foundation, speaking also on behalf of other NGO observers, including Defenders of Wildlife, Humane Society International, Manta Trust, Pew, PRETOMA, Project AWARE, and Sharks International.

448. The observer from the CITES Secretariat commented on the proposed inclusion of the species in Appendix I. At CITES COP16 the Reef Manta Ray had been included in Appendix II of CITES, meaning that international trade in the species was allowed, provided that such trade was legal, sustainable and traceable. However, if the species was included in Appendix I of CMS, taking of specimens should be prohibited under the terms of CMS. This would mean conflicting obligations under the two Conventions for the 117 States that were Party to both. The CITES Secretariat appealed to States present at CMS COP11 to coordinate their positions under different Conventions and to act in a coherent fashion in this regard.

449. The representative of South Africa recognized the conservation needs set out in the proposal but stated that, at present, South Africa could only support listing on Appendix II since the species was only offered partial protection under national law; a situation that would hopefully be addressed.

450. In view of the widespread support expressed by Parties, the Chair concluded that this proposal could be forwarded to Plenary with the recommendation that it could be adopted by consensus. He asked if there was any objection to this course of action.

451. The representative of South Africa indicated that South Africa was not against the proposal being submitted to Plenary, but requested that its reservation be noted for the record.

452. The representative of Fiji introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.24.1.10 Proposal for the inclusion of all species of Mobula Rays (Genus *Mobula*) in CMS Appendices I & II (**Proposal I/10 & II/11**).

453. The proposal was supported by the representative from New Zealand and the observer from IUCN (through its Shark Specialist Group, which advised that listing was urgently required).

454. The observer from the Manta Trust, speaking on behalf of the aforementioned NGO coalition, also supported the proposal.

455. In view of the widespread support expressed by Parties, the Chair concluded that this proposal could be forwarded to Plenary with the recommendation that it could be adopted by consensus.

456. The representative of Norway introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.24.1.11/Rev.1: Proposal for the inclusion of the Polar Bear (*Ursus maritimus*) on CMS Appendix II (**Proposal II/1**), and tabled two amendments to section 4.3.1.

457. The representative of Canada outlined measures taken nationally, over many years, for Polar Bear conservation. Canada was aware of the new challenges and threats facing Polar Bears and was committed to the completion and implementation of a new circumpolar action plan that would address those new threats. This was evidence that all requirements of CMS Appendix II listing were already met. Canada had been working with Norway to improve the accuracy of the proposal. As a result, a number of improvements had been included and Canada was pleased to see the text evolving in line with its input. In conclusion, while Canada still struggled to see the benefit that would be gained from the proposed listing, it welcomed the support of the CMS community for its conservation effort, especially in the implementation of the forthcoming circumpolar action plan.

458. The representative of Canada invited Mr. Larry Carpenter from the Arctic community of Sachs Harbour to complement these observations. Mr. Carpenter noted that Inuit in Canada and across the Arctic lived with and respected Polar Bears. Inuit had worked with Canada to develop effective co-management systems that blended traditional knowledge and modern science in a way that ensured sustainability. This system led to better decision making. Inuit welcomed the support of CMS Parties but asked that Inuit ways and values be respected. Inuit considered that Appendix II listing was not warranted at the present time, as there were already numerous international agreements in place that would protect and conserve Polar Bears for the future.

459. The representatives of the EU and its Member States, and the observer from the United States of America supported the proposal.

460. The observer from Wildlife Migration speaking also on behalf of the Born Free Foundation, Humane Society International, IFAW, NRDC, and OceanCare, also supported the proposal.

461. The observer from Inuit Kapiriit Kanatami made a statement observing *inter alia*:

“As the everyday stewards who co-exist with Polar Bears, it is crucial that the CMS and its members take our views and concerns very seriously and engage us in a timely and appropriate manner. In regard to the Polar Bear proposal, we have not been engaged by any minimum standard owed to us. We do not support this proposal. It is redundant based on the many agreements, as recognized in the

proposal itself, that serve to protect and conserve this species through international, national and sub-national cooperation. We are a part of these processes. Furthermore, we are not convinced how the CMS proposal will add value to our current conservation efforts and management. Rhetoric-driven concerns about the demise of Polar Bears are not constructive to our serious and difficult work in managing and conserving this species. The on-going use of negative publicity toward our practices is both disrespectful and non-constructive. Our management systems are built to be responsive to changes that take place over time whether they are human-induced or naturally occurring. We have been experiencing the impacts of climate change in the Arctic for the past 30 years, but this has not reduced Polar Bear populations in our regions. This is a fact. We continue to state that the real solutions to climate change are in the mitigation of emissions that have created this problem; not in the listing of Polar Bears, which undermines our management efforts and vilifies our way of life that is integral to the Arctic.”

462. The representative of Monaco had listened with great attention to what Inuit representatives had said. Monaco supported the proposal adding that the efforts of Inuit people needed to be recognized within the CMS.

463. The Chair noted that, listening to both Parties and the United States of America, he had heard support for the proposal. He, therefore, concluded that this proposal could be forwarded to Plenary with the recommendation that it could be adopted by consensus.

464. The representative of Ethiopia introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.24.1.12: Proposal for the inclusion of the White-eared Kob (*Kobus kob leucotis*) on CMS Appendix II (**Proposal II/3**).

465. The proposal was supported by the representatives of Egypt, the EU and its Member States, Kenya and Senegal.

466. In view of the widespread support expressed by Parties, the Chair concluded that this proposal could be forwarded to Plenary with the recommendation that it could be adopted by consensus.

467. The representative of Ecuador introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.24.1.13: Proposal for the inclusion of the Canada Warbler (*Cardellina canadensis*) on CMS Appendix II (**Proposal II/4**).

468. The proposal was supported by the representatives of Canada, Chile (on behalf of the Latin America & Caribbean region), Egypt, the EU and its Member States, and the United States of America.

469. In response to a question from the representative of Norway, the representative of Ecuador confirmed that the Range States were already working in a coordinated way at a regional level, for example through WHMSI and Partners in Flight. Inclusion of the species in CMS Appendix II would underpin these efforts.

470. In view of the support expressed by Parties, the Chair concluded that this proposal could be forwarded to Plenary with the recommendation that it could be adopted by consensus.

471. The representative of Egypt introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.24.1.14/Rev.1: Proposal for the inclusion of the Silky Shark (*Carcharhinus falciformis*) on CMS Appendix II (**Proposal II/5**).

472. The proposal was supported by the representatives of Australia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, the EU and its Member States, Fiji, Senegal and the United States of America, and by the observer from the IUCN Shark Specialist Group (who presented a summary of recent scientific information that underlined the adverse conservation status of this species).

473. The observer from PRETOMA, speaking also on behalf of Turtle Restoration Network and other NGOs, strongly supported the proposal.

474. The representative of Chile considered that the updated information provided by IUCN Shark Specialist Group should be reflected in the document. Chile was unable to support the proposal in its present form.

475. The representative of Peru believed that the proposal might overlap with existing management measures and was also unable to support the document.

476. The Chair noted widespread support for the proposal, though two Parties, Chile and Peru, were not in a position to support the proposal at this stage. He concluded that the document should nevertheless be forwarded to Plenary, stressing that this would not preclude any Party from reiterating their position at that time.

477. Speaking on behalf of the proponents, Costa Rica and Ecuador, the representative of Ecuador introduced documents UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.24.1.15: Proposal for the inclusion of the Great Hammerhead shark (*Sphyrna mokarran*) on CMS Appendix II (**Proposal II/6**) and document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.24.1.16: Proposal for the inclusion of the Scalloped Hammerhead shark (*Sphyrna lewini*) on CMS Appendix II (**Proposal II/7**).

478. These proposals were supported by the representatives of Chile (on behalf of the Latin America & Caribbean region), Costa Rica, Egypt, the EU and its Member States, Fiji, Monaco and Peru, and by the observer from Defenders of Wildlife, speaking also on behalf of a coalition of NGOs (including Humane Society International, IFAW, Manta Trust, Marine Megafauna Foundation, Pew, PRETOMA, Project AWARE, Shark Advocates International, Turtle Island Restoration Network, WCS and WWF) supported the proposal. The observer from IFAW (also on behalf of the NGO coalition) argued that Hammerhead Sharks would also qualify for CMS Appendix I listing and suggested Parties might consider amending the proposal in this respect, at least for the North Atlantic.

479. In view of the widespread support expressed by Parties, the Chair concluded that both proposals could be forwarded to Plenary with the recommendation that they could be adopted by consensus.

480. The representative of the EU and its Member States introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.24.1.17: Proposal for the inclusion of all species of Thresher shark, Genus *Alopias* on CMS Appendix II (**Proposal II/8**).

481. This proposal was supported by the representatives of Ecuador, Fiji, Israel and New Zealand, and by the observers from IUCN (through its Shark Specialist Group) and Pew (speaking also on behalf of other NGOs).

482. The representative of Australia reported that his country has carefully studied the documentation provided and had sought advice from a range of scientific and other stakeholders. Australia felt that there remained a number of outstanding questions surrounding the population trend of thresher sharks that occurred in Australian waters, which appeared not to show any evidence of decline. However, Australia recognized that there was evidence that species of thresher shark were showing significant declines in many other parts of their ranges.

483. The Chair concluded that he had not heard any opposition to the proposal. Therefore, in view of the widespread support expressed by Parties, this proposal could be forwarded to Plenary with the recommendation that it could be adopted by consensus.

484. The representative of Monaco introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.24.1.18: Proposal for the inclusion of the European eel (*Anguilla anguilla*) on CMS Appendix II (**Proposal II/12**).

485. This proposal was supported by the representatives of Chile (on behalf of the Latin America & Caribbean region), Ecuador, the EU and its Member States, Morocco, Norway and the United States of America.

486. Citing a need to ensure that relevant information from all parts of the species' range were taken into account, the representatives of Tunisia and Egypt proposed establishing an intersessional Working Group on European eel.

487. The representative of Monaco thanked Egypt and Tunisia for their suggestion, which could serve to strengthen the proposal.

488. In view of the widespread support expressed by Parties, the Chair concluded that this proposal could be forwarded to Plenary, with the recommendation that it could be adopted by consensus. He asked the Secretariat to liaise with Monaco and the other Parties concerned to see how work to respond to the proposed listing could be taken forward intersessionally.

Criteria for Amendment of the Appendices (Item 24.2)

489. Mr. Barry Baker (COP-Appointed Scientific Councillor for Bycatch) presented document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.24.2/Rev.1: *Assessing Proposals for the Amendment of CMS Appendices*. A Draft Resolution was contained in Annex II of the document.

490. The representative of Chile considered that some of the proposals regarding the use of IUCN Red List Criteria were not applicable to all Parties, and suggested that an online intersessional group could review this and report to the next COP.

491. The representative of Ethiopia expressed concern about the use of IUCN criteria which were not always appropriate for the unique characteristics of migratory species. He presented the example of the White-eared Kob (*Kobus kob leucotis*) as a species for which high numbers did not necessarily reflect a favourable conservation status. He suggested a mixed approach should be applied, complementing the use of IUCN Red List Criteria with additional criteria to be developed specifically for migratory species.

492. The representative of New Zealand supported the Draft Resolution, but expressed concern over the proposal in square brackets to develop more detailed guidelines for consideration by the next COP. This implied that successive CMS COPs would be applying different criteria; a potentially confusing situation.

493. The representative of Brazil considered criteria for amendment of the Appendices to be fundamental to the work of CMS. However, greater clarity was needed in some parts of the document and Brazil made specific proposals on how this could be achieved. Brazil supported the suggestion of Chile for additional work to be carried out intersessionally.

494. The representative of the EU and its Member States recognized both the importance of clarity in the process of reviewing listing proposals and the value of using the existing IUCN Red List assessments to support listing decisions. The EU was conscious of the importance of coherence between different MEAs, in this case CMS and CITES. In the case of marine species, coherence with Regional Fisheries Management Organizations should also be ensured.

495. Subject to inclusion of some minor amendments, the EU strongly supported the adoption of the Draft Resolution.

496. The representative of CITES noted that Rio+20 had emphasized the importance of using agreed criteria for the listing of species. He welcomed the clarity of the proposal, which, if adopted, would make it easier for CITES and CMS to work together. At present there were mismatches between the Appendices of the two Conventions, resulting in conflicting obligations for many States which were Party to both Conventions, as well as lost opportunities for shared action. It was important that stakeholders received clear and consistent messages from both CITES and CMS. Periodic reviews of Appendices under CITES ensured that they reflected current needs, and CMS might want to consider this.

497. The representative of Australia, tabling a number of minor amendments, considered it important to note that this was only a guidance document and that the Scientific Council would retain flexibility to exercise its judgement when considering proposals for inclusion of species in the CMS Appendices. It would be unfortunate if the new guidelines were not tested further before more detailed ones were developed.

498. Following brief responses from Mr. Baker to the points raised, the Chair concluded that there appeared to be broad support for adopting the Draft Resolution subject to inclusion of a small number of amendments. All participants with proposals for amendments were asked to send these to the Secretariat promptly. The document would be revised and the COW would revisit this Agenda Item in due course.

499. A duly revised Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW on 9 November (see below).

Endorsement of Amendments Proposed In-Session

500. During its sessions on 6 & 7 November, the Committee of the Whole endorsed the following revised texts to go forward to Plenary without further amendment, unless stated otherwise:

- **UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP1:** Draft Resolution *Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023*

- **UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP2:** Draft Resolution *Programme of Work on Climate Change and Migratory Species*
- **UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP3:** Draft Resolution *Enhancing the relationship between the CMS Family and Civil Society*
- **UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP4:** *Proposal to add Panthera leo to Appendix II:* Draft Resolution *Conservation and Management of the African Lion Panthera leo* (Note that a further amended version of this Draft Resolution was distributed subsequently as CRP4/Rev.1 and endorsed on 9 November).
- **UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP5:** Draft Resolution *Future CMS Activities Related to Invasive Alien Species*
- **UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP6:** Draft Resolution *Review of Decisions*
- **UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP8:** Draft Resolution *Arrangements for Meetings of the Conference of the Parties*
- **UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP9:** Draft Resolution *Sustainable Boat-Based Marine Wildlife Watching*
- **UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP10:** Draft Resolution *Renewable Energy and Migratory Species*
- **UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP12:** Draft Resolution *The Taxonomy and Nomenclature of Birds Listed on the CMS Appendices*
- **UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP13:** Draft Resolution *Conservation Implications of Cetacean Culture*
- **UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP15:** Draft Resolution *Live Captures of Cetaceans from the Wild for Commercial Purposes* (Note that a further amended version of this Draft Resolution was distributed subsequently as CRP15/Rev.1 and endorsed on 9 November.)

501. In relation to **CRP4** on the African Lion, the observer from the Born Free Foundation felt that listing on Appendix II would have been appropriate, but given the lack of consensus, the initiative of Kenya to bring forward the present Draft Resolution had been a fair compromise. He suggested a minor amendment to one paragraph. A further amended version of this Draft Resolution was distributed subsequently as CRP4/Rev.1 and endorsed by the COW on 9 November.

502. With regard to **CRP15**, the observer from the CITES Secretariat regretted that the second operative paragraph did not support the existing multilateral measures agreed by CITES for the import and international transit of live cetaceans, even if the text of the Convention permitted Parties to take stricter domestic measures.

503. The Chair underlined that CRP15 had been agreed by the Aquatic Issues Working Group and regardless of the validity of the point made by the CITES Secretariat the text of the Draft Resolution was in the hands of the Parties.

504. The representative of Argentina advised that a minor adjustment to the translation into Spanish of CRP15 was required, but that this was not a question of substance.

505. A further amended version of this Draft Resolution was distributed subsequently as CRP15/Rev.1 and endorsed by the COW on 9 November (see below).

506. During its session on 9 November, the COW considered the remaining Draft Resolutions and proposed amendments to the Rules of Procedure (CRP25) to go forward to

Plenary for adoption. The Chair of the COW noted that 11 Draft Resolutions, contained in documents CRP1 to CRP6, CRP8 to CRP10, and CRP12 and CRP13, respectively, had already been endorsed by earlier sessions of the COW.

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP4/Rev.1: *Proposal to add Panthera leo to Appendix II: Draft Resolution Conservation and Management of the African Lion, Panthera leo*

507. The representative of Kenya noted that an incomplete draft had inadvertently been distributed by the Secretariat. The Chair ruled that further consideration of this Draft Resolution should be deferred for a short while to enable the representative of Kenya to confer with the Secretariat.

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP7/Rev.1: *Draft Resolution Guidelines for Assessing Listing Proposals to Appendices I and II of the Convention*

508. This Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW without further amendment.

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP11: *Draft Resolution Action Plan for Migratory Landbirds in the African-Eurasian Region*

509. This Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW without further amendment.

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP14: *Draft Resolution Management of Marine Debris*

510. This Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW without further amendment.

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP15/Rev.1: *Draft Resolution Live Captures of Cetaceans from the Wild for Commercial Purposes*

511. An earlier version of this Draft Resolution (CRP15) had been endorsed by the COW on the afternoon of 7 November, but the preamble had subsequently been amended at the request of the representative of Argentina. The revised Draft Resolution (CRP15/Rev.1) was endorsed by the COW without further amendment.

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP16: *Draft Resolution Single Species Action Plan for the Loggerhead Turtle (Caretta caretta) in the South Pacific Ocean*

512. This Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW without further amendment.

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP17: *Draft Resolution The Central Asian Mammals Initiative*

513. This Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW without further amendment.

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP18: *Draft Resolution Advancing Ecological Networks to Address the Needs of Migratory Species*

514. This Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW subject to the inclusion of a minor amendment to the preamble tabled by the representative of South Africa.

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP19: *Draft Resolution Fighting Wildlife Crime and Offences within and beyond Borders*

515. This Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW subject to the inclusion of amendments tabled by the representative of Monaco and the observer from UNEP and on the understanding that language versions would be harmonized (inconsistencies in the French and Spanish texts having been pointed by the representatives of Brazil, Chile, Monaco and Uruguay).

516. The representative of the United States of America, supported by the representative of Egypt, referred to the Resolution on the Illegal Trade in Wildlife approved by Ministers at the first United Nations Environment Assembly in June 2014. This had recognized that "*illegal trade in wildlife and its adverse impacts...undermine good governance and the rule of law and threatens national security*". The United States of America considered that CRP19 would have been stronger had it recognized this threat.

517. The representative of Brazil reiterated his Government's view (expressed in an earlier session of the COW) that matters of national and regional security were not within the purview of CMS.

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP20: Draft Resolution *Conservation of Migratory Sharks and Rays*

518. This Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW without further amendment.

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP21: Draft Resolution *Communication, Information and Outreach Plan*

519. This Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW without further amendment.

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP22: Draft Resolution *Concerted and Cooperative Actions*

520. This Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW without further amendment.

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP23: Draft Resolution *Criteria for Assessing Proposals for New Agreements*

521. This Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW without further amendment.

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP24: Draft Resolution *Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Convention through a Process to Review Implementation*

522. This Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW without further amendment.

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP25: *Amendments to the Rules of Procedure*

523. The proposed amendments to the Rules of Procedure were endorsed by the COW without further revision.

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP26: Draft Resolution *World Migratory Bird Day*

524. This Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW without further amendment.

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP27: Draft Resolution *Saker Falcon (Falco cherrug) Global Action Plan (SakerGAP)*

525. This Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW without further amendment.

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP28: Draft Resolution *Enhancing Synergies and Common Services among CMS Family Instruments*

526. This Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW without further amendment.

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP29: Draft Resolution *Programme of Work on Migratory Birds and Flyways*

527. This Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW without further amendment.

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP30: Draft Resolution *The Prevention of Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds*

528. This Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW without further amendment.

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP31: Draft Resolution *Preventing Poisoning of Migratory Birds*

529. This Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW without further amendment.

530. The observer from SEO/BirdLife International, supported by the observer from the Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust, welcomed the Draft Resolution and associated Guidelines. He thanked the Parties for reconciling diverging positions and underlined the need to work with hunting organizations on replacing the use of lead ammunition. He urged the prompt creation of a sub-group within the framework of the CMS Working Group on Poisoning, involving all stakeholders, including ammunition manufacturers, to develop transition schedules for different types of ammunition and to advise all actors on best practices.

531. The observer from the European Federation of Associations for Hunting & Conservation (FACE) made the following statement for the record:

“Thank you, Chair, for giving FACE the opportunity to express its concerns on the Guidelines to Prevent the Risk of Poisoning of Migratory Birds, specifically and limited to the delicate issue of lead.

FACE appreciates the availability of the CMS Secretariat to have an open ended discussion on the Review and Guidelines to Prevent the Risk of Poisoning of Migratory Birds by setting up a dedicated Task Group on Lead Ammunition.

We further welcome the efforts by the EU to reach a workable compromise among Parties.

FACE regrets however that the Guidelines fail to make the distinction between lead shot and bullets, which are different products specifically designed for different uses. The absence of this distinction risks jeopardising the feasibility of the proposed timeline.

FACE, representing 7 million users has the expertise to provide an informed and objective point of view on lead ammunition, including the impact that a blanket ban of lead in all ammunition will have on consumers.

FACE would like to go on the record listing the arguments for this distinction allowing Parties to make an informed decision:

- *FACE supports the ban on the use of lead shot in wetlands and would like to see this effective throughout the EU, through legal provisions and appropriate awareness measures. However we consider that a total ban on the use of lead in all ammunition would have a disproportionate negative impact on the greater majority of hunters.*
- *Through the process of phasing out lead shot in wetlands there is a long experience of using alternatives to lead shot in certain countries. The same cannot be said for lead bullets, where experience is limited, as alternatives do not exist for all calibres. Indeed no country has phased out the use of lead in bullets. The often quoted California ban will enter into force in 2019.*
- *The dispersion of lead bullets in the environment does not warrant such a draconian measure as the absolute number of shot bullets is relatively low.*
- *The risk of poisoning endangered scavengers can easily be minimized if not reduced to zero by implementing local bans in the interested areas. A total ban on bullets is disproportionate to risks. FACE proposes to limit the use of lead bullets wherever risk assessments demonstrate the real risk of a negative impact on migratory birds' populations.*
- *Concerns related to human health in the consumption of game meat shot with lead bullets are addressed by risk management practices in treating the meat (FACE, respectfully points out that human health does not fall in the remit of CMS).*

FACE appreciates that the Guidelines will be open for improvement and that a review process is enshrined in the Resolution in the light of developing research findings and other relevant information. FACE is willing to proactively participate to this process in view of reaching workable solutions in the interest of migratory birds' conservation and the principle of sustainable use.

The success of this resolution depends on the willing cooperation of all parties. FACE truly hopes that in the course of future discussions - under the Task Group on Lead Ammunition - proportionate solutions can be found among all stakeholders."

532. The observer from the International Association for Falconry and the Conservation of Birds of Prey (IAF) called on the Secretariat and the Parties to promote the banning of rodent poisoning within the breeding range of the Saker Falcon. He also raised the issue of diclofenac and its devastating impact on vultures, as well as neonicotinoid insecticides, the impacts of which were less well known. He called on the Secretariat and Parties to work with the international manufacturers to prevent production of these chemicals moving from country to country. Finally, he supported the medium-term phasing out of lead shot, especially in wetlands, while respecting the rights of all stakeholders.

533. The representative of Israel, supported by the representative of Ecuador, endorsed the Draft Resolution. He expressed the view that FACE should play a leadership role in educating hunters rather than resisting the phasing out of lead. He encouraged CMS Parties to reduce illegal hunting through both education and enforcement, as well as reduction in the use of lead ammunition.

534. Mr. Heredia (Secretariat) noted that the COP11 Working Group on Avian Issues had introduced a number of amendments to the original text of the Draft Resolution, adding flexibility to the implementation of the Guidelines at national level. Over the coming intersessional period, the Secretariat would continue to work with all stakeholders to optimize the implementation of the Guidelines.

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP32: Draft Resolution *Synergies and Partnerships*

535. Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW subject to the inclusion of a new preambular paragraph tabled by the observer from UNEP.

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP33: Draft Resolution *Restructuring of the Scientific Council*

536. Draft Resolution was endorsed by the COW without further amendment.

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP34: Draft Resolution *Financial and Administrative Matters*

537. The representative of South Africa requested a short extension to facilitate final preparations for consideration of this document. The Chair of the COW ruled that, in the interests of time, discussion of this Agenda Item would be deferred to the Plenary.

538. Closing the session of the COW, the Chair thanked Parties for the significant steps forward that endorsement of the Draft Resolutions represented. Subject to the final adoption of the Draft Resolutions in Plenary, he underlined the need for implementation and invited additional voluntary contributions to maximize the effectiveness of CMS.

VI. FORMAL AND CONCLUDING BUSINESS

INTERIM AND FINAL REPORTS OF THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE (ITEM 25)

539. The representative of Pakistan (Chair of the Credentials Committee) presented interim reports to the Committee of the Whole on 5 and 6 November. At the Committee's First Meeting on 4 November the Credentials of 53 Parties had been examined and found to be in order. At the Second Meeting, held on 6 November, the credentials of two further Parties, Georgia and United Republic of Tanzania, had been examined and found to be in order. The number of Parties whose credentials had been found to be in order therefore stood at 55.

540. The Chair of the Credentials Committee presented the Committee's final report to the Plenary on 9 November. He noted that since the Committee's second interim report to COW, the credentials of the delegation from Ecuador had been examined and found to be in order, bringing the total of credentials examined and found to be in order to 56. Parties were to be congratulated for complying with the Rules of Procedure and thanks were due to the Secretariat for its diligent work with Parties before and during the COP to enable such a high level of compliance.

541. There being no questions or comments from the floor, the Chair of the Plenary ruled that the final report of the Credentials Committee had been approved.

REPORTS OF SESSIONAL COMMITTEES (ITEM 26)

542. The Chair of the Committee of the Whole, Mr. Øystein Størkersen (Norway) reported that the COW had met daily from Tuesday 4 November to Friday 7 November and again during the morning of Sunday 9 November. It had been a very fruitful week and the COW had been able to complete its work on all issues with the exception of the Draft Resolution on the budget. The COW had otherwise endorsed all Draft Resolutions and proposals for listing of species on CMS Appendices.

543. The Chair of the Budget Committee, Ms. Malta Qwathekana (South Africa) reported that the Committee had met on several occasions to consider the proposed Programme of Work for 2015-2017, the proposed budget for 2015-2017 and the relevant Draft Resolution. Following lengthy discussions, agreement had now been reached.

544. The Executive Secretary confirmed that the relevant revised documents had been posted in three languages since the previous day, giving delegates adequate time for review. He recommended that any further discussion should take place under Agenda Item 27: *Adoption of Resolutions and Amendments to the Appendices*.

545. The Plenary Chair thanked the Chairs of the COW and the Budget Committee for the work done throughout the COP.

ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS AND AMENDMENTS TO THE APPENDICES (ITEM 27)

Adoption of Amendments to the Appendices

546. The Chair invited the Meeting to take a bloc decision on proposals for additions of 29 species to the CMS Appendices, as recommended by the Scientific Council and endorsed by the Committee of the Whole.

547. There being no comments from the floor to the contrary, the following species, whose common and scientific names, together with the corresponding proposed Appendix listing(s), were read out individually by the Chair of the COW, were approved by the Plenary of the COP for listing in the Appendix or Appendices indicated:

- Cuvier's beaked whale (*Ziphius cavirostris*) – Appendix I
- Red-fronted Gazelle (*Eudorcas rufifrons*) – Appendix I
- Great Bustard (*Otis tarda*) – Appendix I
- Semipalmated Sandpiper (*Calidris pusilla*) – Appendix I
- Great Knot (*Calidris tenuirostris*) – Appendix I
- European Roller (*Coracias garrulus*) – Appendix I
- Narrow Sawfish (*Anoxypristis cuspidata*) – Appendix I & Appendix II
- Dwarf Sawfish (*Pristis clavata*) – Appendix I & Appendix II
- Smalltooth Sawfish (*Pristis pectinata*) – Appendix I & Appendix II
- Green Sawfish (*Pristis zijsron*) – Appendix I & Appendix II
- Largetooth Sawfish (*Pristis pristis*) – Appendix I & Appendix II
- Reef Manta Ray (*Manta alfredi*) – Appendix I & Appendix II
- Giant Devil Ray (*Mobula mobular*) – Appendix I & Appendix II
- Spinetail Mobula (*Mobula japanica*) – Appendix I & Appendix II

- Bentfin Devil Ray (*Mobula thurstoni*) – Appendix I & Appendix II
- Box Ray (*Mobula tarapacana*) – Appendix I & Appendix II
- Pygmy Devil Ray (*Mobula eregoodootenkee*) – Appendix I & Appendix II
- Shortfin Devil Ray (*Mobula kuhlii*) – Appendix I & Appendix II
- Atlantic Devil Ray (*Mobula hypostoma*) – Appendix I & Appendix II
- Lesser Guinean Devil Ray (*Mobula rochebrunei*) – Appendix I & Appendix II
- Munk’s Devil Ray (*Mobula munkiana*) – Appendix I & Appendix II
- Polar Bear (*Ursus maritimus*) – Appendix II
- White-eared Kob (*Kobus kob leucotis*) – Appendix II
- Canada Warbler (*Cardellina canadensis*) – Appendix II
- Great Hammerhead Shark (*Sphyrna mokarran*) – Appendix II
- Scalloped Hammerhead Shark (*Sphyrna lewini*) – Appendix II
- Bigeye Thresher Shark (*Alopias superciliosus*) – Appendix II
- Common Thresher Shark (*Alopias vulpinus*) – Appendix II
- Pelagic Thresher Shark (*Alopias pelagicus*) – Appendix II

548. The decision to list the above-mentioned species was marked by applause from the participants.

549. The Chair invited the COP to consider the following two listing proposals that had been endorsed by an overwhelming majority of the COW:

- Silky Shark (*Carcharhinus falciformis*) – Appendix II
- European eel (*Anguilla anguilla*) – Appendix II

550. There being no objections, the Chair confirmed that these two proposals had also been adopted by the COW.

551. Species added to Appendices I and II by the 11th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties is listed in ANNEX VII to the present report.

552. The Chair invited comments from Parties.

553. The representatives of Chile and Peru indicated that their countries joined the consensus regarding the decision to list Silky Shark on CMS Appendix II.

554. These statements were greeted by warm applause.

Adoption of Resolutions

555. All the Adopted Resolutions can be found in ANNEX VIII to the present Report

556. The Chair referred the Meeting to document **CRP4/Rev.1: Proposal to add *Panthera leo* on Appendix II: Draft Resolution Conservation and Management of the African Lion, *Panthera leo*** that had been deferred from an earlier session of the COW.

557. The representative of Kenya tabled amendments to the Draft Resolution to bring it into line with the version that should have been distributed to participants.

558. The Plenary adopted the Draft Resolution subject to the inclusion of the amendments detailed by Kenya. The adopted version of the Resolution is published as **Resolution 11.32: Conservation and Management of the African Lion, *Panthera leo***.

559. The Chair invited the Plenary to consider each of the remaining Draft Resolutions and associated documents, together with the relevant recommendations of the Committee of the Whole, one by one. She noted that many of the Draft Resolutions now being tabled had been amended from their original versions to take into account discussion during the Committee of the Whole, the Drafting Group, the Budget Committee and/or specific Working Groups set up by the COW.

560. The Plenary of the COP decided as follows:

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP1: Draft Resolution *Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023*

561. The COP adopted the Draft Resolution, including the *Strategic Plan 2015-2023* and *Terms of Reference for the Strategic Plan Implementation Working Group*, without further amendment. The COP also took note of the *Assessment of Implementation of the Strategic Plan 2006-2014* contained in document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.15.1 (Adopted version of the Resolution published as **Resolution 11.2**).

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP2: Draft Resolution *Programme of Work on Climate Change and Migratory Species*

562. The COP adopted the Draft Resolution, including the *Programme of Work* annexed to it, without further amendment (Adopted version of the Resolution published as **Resolution 11.26**).

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP3: Draft Resolution *Enhancing the Relationship between the CMS Family and Civil Society*.

563. The COP adopted this Draft Resolution without further amendment, although the Secretariat noted that, in conformity with the agreement reached in the Drafting Group, an editorial adjustment would be made to ensure that references within the text to “NGOs” were expanded to “NGOs and CSOs”, with CSOs referring to Civil Society Organizations (Adopted version of the Resolution published as **Resolution 11.11**).

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP5: Draft Resolution *Future CMS Activities Related to Invasive Alien Species*

564. The COP adopted this Draft Resolution without further amendment (Adopted version of the Resolution published as **Resolution 11.28**).

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP6: Draft Resolution *Review of Decisions*

565. The COP adopted this Draft Resolution without further amendment (Adopted version of the Resolution published as **Resolution 11.6**).

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP7/Rev.1: Draft Resolution *Guidelines for Assessing Listing Proposals to Appendices I and II of the Convention*

566. The COP adopted this Draft Resolution, including the *Guidelines* annexed to it, without further amendment (Adopted version of the Resolution published as **Resolution 11.33**).

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP8: Draft Resolution *Arrangements for Meetings of the Conference of the Parties*

567. The COP adopted this Draft Resolution without further amendment (Adopted version of the Resolution published as **Resolution 11.5**).

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP9: Draft Resolution *Sustainable Boat-Based Marine Wildlife Watching*

568. The COP adopted this Draft Resolution, including the *Recommended Elements for National Guidelines* annexed to it, without further amendment (Adopted version of the Resolution published as **Resolution 11.29**).

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP10: Draft Resolution *Renewable Energy and Migratory Species*

569. The COP adopted this Draft Resolution, and endorsed the associated *Guidelines*, without further amendment (Adopted version of the Resolution published as **Resolution 11.27**).

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP11: Draft Resolution *Action Plan for Migratory Landbirds in the African-Eurasian Region*

570. The COP adopted this Draft Resolution, including the associated *Action Plan*, without further amendment (Adopted version of the Resolution published as **Resolution 11.17**).

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP12: Draft Resolution *The Taxonomy and Nomenclature of Birds Listed on the CMS Appendices*

571. The COP adopted this Draft Resolution without further amendment (Adopted version of the Resolution published as **Resolution 11.19**).

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP13: Draft Resolution *Conservation Implications of Cetacean Culture*

572. The COP adopted this Draft Resolution without further amendment (Adopted version of the Resolution published as **Resolution 11.23**).

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP14: Draft Resolution *Management of Marine Debris*

573. COP adopted this Draft Resolution without further amendment (Adopted version of the Resolution published as **Resolution 11.30**). The COP also took note of the key findings set out in annexes 2, 3 and 4 to document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.23.4.6: *Management of Marine Debris*.

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP15/Rev.1: Draft Resolution *Live Captures of Cetaceans from the Wild for Commercial Purposes*

574. The COP adopted this Draft Resolution without further amendment (Adopted version of the Resolution published as **Resolution 11.22**).

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP16: Draft Resolution *Single Species Action Plan for the Loggerhead Turtle (*Caretta caretta*) in the South Pacific Ocean*

575. The COP adopted this Draft Resolution, including the associated *Action Plan*, without further amendment (Adopted version of the Resolution published as **Resolution 11.21**).

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP17: Draft Resolution *The Central Asian Mammals Initiative*

576. The COP adopted this Draft Resolution, including its annexes: (a) the *Programme of Work for the Conservation of Large Mammal Migrations in Central Asia*; (b) the *Guidelines to Mitigate Impact from Mining and Infrastructure on Migratory Mammals*; and (c) the *International Single Species Action Plan for the Conservation of Argali (Ovis ammon)* (Adopted version of the Resolution published as **Resolution 11.24**).

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP18: Draft Resolution *Advancing Ecological Networks to Address the Needs of Migratory Species*

577. The COP adopted this Draft Resolution without further amendment, but subject to the inclusion of the amendment that had been endorsed in the final session of the COW, immediately prior to the current Plenary session (Adopted version of the Resolution published as **Resolution 11.25**).

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP19: Draft Resolution *Fighting Wildlife Crime and Offences within and beyond Borders*

578. The COP adopted this Draft Resolution without further amendment, but subject to the inclusion of the amendments and language corrections that had been endorsed in the final session of the COW, immediately prior to the current Plenary session (Adopted version of the Resolution published as **Resolution 11.31**).

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP20: Draft Resolution *Conservation of Migratory Sharks and Rays*

579. The COP adopted this Draft Resolution without further amendment. (Adopted version of the Resolution published as **Resolution 11.20**).

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP21: Draft Resolution *Communication, Information and Outreach Plan*

580. The COP adopted this Draft Resolution, including the associated *Plan*, without further amendment (Adopted version of the Resolution published as **Resolution 11.8**).

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP22: Draft Resolution *Concerted and Cooperative Actions*

581. The COP adopted this Draft Resolution, including its annexes: (a) the *Lists of Species for Concerted Actions and Cooperative Actions*, and (b) the *Recommendations for Enhancing Effectiveness of the Concerted and Cooperative Actions* (Adopted version of the Resolution published as **Resolution 11.13**).

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP23: Draft Resolution *Criteria for Assessing Proposals for New Agreements*

582. The COP adopted this Draft Resolution, including the *Criteria* annexed to it, without further amendment (Adopted version of the Resolution published as **Resolution 11.12**).

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP24: Draft Resolution *Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Convention through a Process to Review Implementation*

583. The COP adopted this Draft Resolution without further amendment (Adopted version of the Resolution published as **Resolution 11.7**).

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP25: *Amendments to the Rules of Procedure*

584. The Chair recalled that this document, relating to the Rules of Procedure for future meetings of the Conference of the Parties, had originated from Annex 2 to document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.4. Following discussion in the Committee of the Whole, the Drafting Group of the COW had agreed amendments to the originally tabled document and the revised text was now before the Plenary for its consideration and endorsement. The COW had recommended that the amended Rules of Procedure be submitted for adoption at COP12. The COW had also recommended that the following rules should apply intersessionally:

- Rule 3 relating to credentials;
- Rule 6 relating to the composition of the Bureau;
- Rule 21 relating to the submission of proposals for amendment of the convention and appendices; and
- Rule 22 relating to the submission of resolutions and recommendations.

585. The Chair further recalled that the COP had adopted the Draft Resolution contained in document UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP6: *Review of Decisions*, which called on the Parties and the Secretariat to use the term “Decision” instead of “Recommendation”. As a consequence, the Secretariat would be making the appropriate editorial adjustments to UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP25.

586. There being no objections or other interventions from the floor, the COP decided to submit the Rules of Procedure contained in CRP25 to Parties for adoption at COP12 (reproduced as ANNEX II to the present report) and that, in the meantime, Rules 3, 6, 21 and 22 (as contained in CRP25) should apply intersessionally.

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP26: Draft Resolution *World Migratory Bird Day*

587. The COP adopted this Draft Resolution without further amendment (Adopted version of the Resolution published as **Resolution 11.9**).

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP27: Draft Resolution *Saker Falcon (Falco cherrug) Global Action Plan (SakerGAP)*

588. The COP adopted this Draft Resolution, including the *Action Plan* annexed to it, without further amendment (Adopted version of the Resolution published as **Resolution 11.18**).

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP28: Draft Resolution *Enhancing Synergies and Common Services among CMS Family Instruments*

589. The COP adopted this Draft Resolution without further amendment Adopted version of the Resolution published as **Resolution 11.3**.

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP29: Draft Resolution *Programme of Work on Migratory Birds and Flyways*

590. The COP adopted this Draft Resolution, including the *Programme of Work and Americas Flyways Framework* annexed to it, without further amendment (Adopted version of the Resolution published as **Resolution 11.14**).

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP30: Draft Resolution *The Prevention of Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds*

591. The COP adopted this Draft Resolution, including the *Terms of Reference of the Intergovernmental Task Force to Address Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds in the Mediterranean* annexed to it, without further amendment (Adopted version of the Resolution published as **Resolution 11.16**).

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP31: Draft Resolution *Preventing Poisoning of Migratory Birds*

592. The COP adopted this Draft Resolution, including the associated guidelines, without further amendment (Adopted version of the Resolution published as **Resolution 11.15**).

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP32: Draft Resolution *Synergies and Partnerships*

593. The COP adopted this Draft Resolution without further amendment, but subject to the inclusion of the amendment that had been agreed in the final session of the COW, immediately prior to the current Plenary session (Adopted version of the Resolution published as **Resolution 11.10**).

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP33: Draft Resolution *Restructuring of the Scientific Council*

594. The COP adopted this Draft Resolution without further amendment (Adopted version of the Resolution published as **Resolution 11.4**).

595. The representative from Brazil thanked members of the *ad hoc* ‘Friends of the Chair’ Working Group that had finalized the text of this Draft Resolution.

UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP34: Draft Resolution *Financial and Administrative Matters*

596. The COP adopted this Draft Resolution without further amendment, including, as recommended by the Budget Committee: (a) the *Budget for the Triennium 2015–2017*; (b) the *Contributions of Parties to Fund the 2015–2017 Budget*; (c) the *Revised Terms of Reference of the Finance and Budget Subcommittee*, (d) the *Terms of Reference for the Administration of the Trust Fund for the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals*; and (e) the *Programme of Work for the Triennium 2015–2017*. All of these documents were annexed to the Draft Resolution, as adopted (Adopted version of the Resolution published as **Resolution 11.1**).

597. At the recommendation of the COW, the Plenary also took note of the following related documents:

- UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.14.1: *Execution of the CMS Budget during the 2012–2014 Triennium*;
- UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.14.4: *Resource Mobilization*;

- UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.16.1: *Future Structure and Strategies of CMS: Short- and Medium-Term Activities under Resolution 10.9*;
- UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.17.3: *Draft Global Gap Analysis of the Convention on Migratory Species*;
- UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.19.1: *Implementation of the Outreach and Communication Plan 2012-2014*;
- UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.19.3: *Analysis and Synthesis of National Reports*;
- UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.20.1: *Implementation of the Capacity Building Strategy 2012-2014*;
- UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.22.1: *Implementation of Existing CMS Instruments*; and
- UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.22.3: *An Assessment of MoUs and their Viability*.

598. The representatives of Chile, Fiji and Egypt underlined the importance of capacity-building and the related pre-COP workshops, and thanked the Capacity-Building Unit of the Secretariat for its work to date.

DATE AND VENUE OF THE 12TH MEETING OF COP (ITEM 28)

599. The Chair drew attention to document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.28: *Arrangements for Hosting the 11th and 12th Meetings of the Conference of the Parties*.

600. At the invitation of the Chair, the representative of the Philippines confirmed that his country would be privileged to host the CMS COP12 in 2017. The Philippines was a mega-diverse country and an important pathway and habitat of migratory species. He continued: *“From the highlands of Ecuador to the shores of the Philippines, at the other end of the world, this is what we call the ridge to reef approach. We hope to approximate the efficiency, hospitality and friendship of the people of Ecuador. If allowed by the COP, we would like to invite everybody to the Oceania region, and the Philippines, in particular, for COP12. As our tourism slogan goes, ‘It’s more fun in the Philippines’!”*

601. The confirmation of the Philippines’ offer to host COP12, which was followed by a short video presentation, was welcomed with applause from participants.

602. The Chair confirmed that the COP had taken note of the Philippines’ interest and stated that Ecuador stood ready to assist the next hosts.

603. Through this Agenda Item the COP also endorsed UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP35: *Draft Resolution Arrangements for Hosting the 11th and 12th Meetings of the Conference of the Parties*, commending the Government of Ecuador for hosting COP11 and instructing the Secretariat to work with the Government of the Philippines to make the necessary arrangements for COP12. Adopted version of this Resolution published as **Resolution 11.34**.

ADOPTION OF THE REPORT (ITEM 29)

604. The Chair drew attention to the draft Daily Reports that had been circulated to delegates. She confirmed that comments and corrections could be submitted to the Secretariat, provided this was done within a period of one month of closure of COP11. However, any Party that wished to intervene with regard to the draft Daily Reports was invited to do so now.

605. The representatives from Canada and the United Arab Emirates confirmed that they had submitted minor amendments to the Secretariat in relation to paragraph 463, and paragraphs 78, 620 and 621, respectively.

606. There being no other comments, the Report of the Meeting was adopted subject to inclusion of the amendments tabled by Canada and United Arab Emirates, and any other amendments submitted by participants within the one-month deadline.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS (ITEM 30)

607. In response to a question from the representative of South Africa, in her capacity as Chair of the Budget Committee, the Chair of the Plenary confirmed that the Draft Resolution on Financial and Administrative Matters (UNEP/CMS/COP11/CRP34) and the documents annexed to it had now been adopted by the COP. Discussions would not be reopened.

608. The Chair of the Budget Committee, supported by the representative of Switzerland, expressed concern that operative paragraph 28 of the Resolution, relating to the preparation of budget scenarios at COP12, was not very comfortable for many Parties and might prove to be a burden to the Convention.

609. The representatives of France and Belgium recalled that the substance of operative paragraph 28 had been fully discussed in the Budget Committee; many delegations had strict instructions requiring zero nominal growth as a starting point in MEA budget negotiations. Having operative paragraph 28 in place would simply save time at COP12. In any case, the relevant Draft Resolution had already been adopted by the Plenary.

610. The representative of Brazil, while acknowledging that his country was not yet a CMS Party, suggested deletion of the operative paragraph in question. Generally Parties should support environmental MEAs instead of allowing them to deteriorate. By going for zero nominal growth the COP was actually cutting funding to CMS. Parties should not continue with what was a euphemism for reducing the budget indefinitely into the future, at the same time as adding more and more tasks.

611. The representative of Germany reiterated that the text of the Resolution properly reflected what happened in the Budget Committee and had already been adopted. Germany would therefore not wish to follow the advice of Brazil. It was indeed a pity that so many Parties had such limited financial possibilities at the present time and it was to be hoped that a better situation would pertain in future. It should be stated clearly that operative paragraph 28 applied to COP12 but would of course be reviewed in relation to subsequent triennia.

612. The Chair reminded participants once more, that the Resolution in question had already been adopted. She was grateful for all comments made and participants were welcome to comment further in writing within the next 30 days, but the Resolution, as adopted, was final.

613. The observer from Humane Society International, speaking on behalf of a coalition of NGOs, made the following statement

"We leave this 11th Conference of the Parties in beautiful Ecuador with much to celebrate and I speak here on the behalf of the following organizations, the Pew Charitable Trusts, Whale and Dolphin Conservation, Born Free, IFAW, Shark

Advocates International, Project Aware, the Humane Society International and BirdLife International; and others may also wish to associate.

Ground-breaking resolutions have been agreed in terms of both the integration of animal social biology and culture into the work of this Convention and also the call that has gone out to the wider world to end the live capture of cetaceans at sea for commercial purposes. These are inspiring developments and put CMS firmly into a leadership role in the international conservation community.

This has also been the most innovative COP ever for the avian agenda. Guidance, with associated working groups to promote implementation on the ground, was adopted to address key threats to migratory birds, namely illegal killing, taking and trade, poisoning and poorly planned renewable energy developments. The action adopted for African-Eurasian landbirds, with a lead from African Parties, will complement existing instruments for waterbirds and raptors and provide a framework for linking with other stakeholders to ensure sustainable land use in Africa. Parties from Latin American have taken a similar lead with respect to the newly adopted Americas Flyways Framework.

Similarly, we salute all the Parties and the Secretariat in successfully carrying forward a number of excellent and important marine initiatives, including of course the listings of sharks and rays. These listings are just the start of the further urgent work that these species need to ensure that they have a future. We congratulate you on the listing of the great ice bear. We look forward to new initiatives being developed under the auspices of CMS for this emblematic species and hope that the peoples of the region will come to see this as a friendly, appropriate and respectful attempt from the wider international community to protect this species which is revered, admired and appreciated across the whole planet. While disappointed to see the withdrawal of the Appendix II listing for the lion, we appreciate the effort that has gone into developing a meaningful resolution and urge the CMS Family and all stakeholders to work together to ensure future generations can see these iconic animals in the wild, and not just behind bars or fences.

We highly commend CMS for taking far-reaching decisions to strengthen the Convention overall via the new Strategic Plan, the new Listing Criteria and other governance decisions. These things make COP11 a key meeting in the history of this Convention, increasing the chance for better conservation and well-being of migratory species around the world. We urge governments to take action resulting in adequate financial support for the work ahead. We encourage you all to build further on what has been agreed here on the cross-cutting threats including marine debris, poisoning, illegal trade and of course climate change.

The role of civil society is primarily to help you to help the migratory species. We deeply appreciate the openness of the dialogue that we have here. We sometimes have our differences, of course, but this is all part of a healthy process of dialogue and debate, as is the ability of a convention to appropriately review and accordingly amend and develop its work programmes. As partner and non-partner organizations, we commit to work with you all in achieving the best outcomes for all species and all threats.

Madam Chair, we thank the Secretariat for their excellent facilitation of this meeting and thank you one last time for the kind hospitality that Ecuador has shown to us.”

614. The representatives of Costa Rica, Ecuador and Uruguay paid tribute to the outstanding work undertaken by Chile, and by Ms. Nancy Céspedes in particular, in its capacity as Regional Representative for South and Central America and the Caribbean during the past two triennia.

615. The representative of Chile thanked Parties from the region for their kind words.

SIGNING CEREMONY

616. The Executive Secretary invited representatives of countries ready to sign Memoranda of Understanding under the CMS and with appropriate full powers to do so, to come forward to sign the relevant instruments.

617. The representative of Sweden signed the Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation of Migratory Sharks.

618. The Secretariat noted that the Government of Samoa would also sign the Sharks MoU in the coming days, bringing the number of signatories to 38.

619. Switzerland and the Czech Republic signed the MoU on the Conservation of Migratory Birds of Prey in Africa and Eurasia, bringing the number of signatories to 48.

620. The Executive Secretary invited the representative of the United Arab Emirates to witness his countersigning of the extension of the Partnership Agreement between UNEP/CMS and Environment Agency - Abu Dhabi (EAD), first concluded in October 2009, which provided for the CMS Office - Abu Dhabi. The Agreement had been signed in Abu Dhabi earlier in the day by Ms. Razan Al Mubarak, Secretary General of EAD.

621. The representative of the United Arab Emirates stated that his country was pleased to continue supporting the CMS Office in Abu Dhabi.

622. The Executive Secretary invited the observer from Humane Society International to sign a Partnership Agreement with CMS.

623. The Meeting acknowledged the signing of the MoUs and Partnership Agreements with warm applause.

CLOSURE OF THE MEETING (ITEM 31)

624. Closing remarks were made by the Chair as representative of the Host Country and by the Executive Secretary.

625. Speaking on behalf of their respective regional groupings, the representatives of Chile, the EU and its Member States, New Zealand and Uganda (supported by Egypt), thanked the

Government and people of Ecuador for their warm hospitality in hosting the Meeting; H.E Ms. Lorena Tapia for presiding over the COP; the Chairs of in-session committees and working groups; the supportive NGO community; and the Secretariat for its preparatory work. They also reflected on fruitful outcomes but highlighted the need for enhanced implementation and the additional resources this would require.

626. The observer from the Pew Charitable Trusts thanked the Government of Ecuador for hosting the Meeting and showing impressive leadership on the conservation of sharks. Thanks were due to all NGOs present for working cooperatively on this issue. Pew would be leaving the COP very happy with the outcomes and looked forward to continuing to work for the protection of sharks.

627. H.E. Ms. Lorena Tapia and senior colleagues from the Ministry of Environment were presented with tokens of appreciation on behalf of delegates and the CMS Secretariat.

628. Thanking all participants, the Chair declared the 11th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties as closed.

