



Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals



FOURTH MEETING OF THE FLYWAYS WORKING GROUP

(18 February 2025)

CMS/FLYW4/Meeting Report

MEETING REPORT

(Prepared by the CMS Secretariat)

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms	3
Main meeting outcomes	4
1. Opening of the meeting, welcoming remarks and introduction of participants	5
2. Adoption of the agenda and meeting schedule	6
3. Reminder on CMS Resolution 12.11 (Rev.COP14) mandates related to Flyways and Decision 14.140 directed to the Flyways Working Group	6
4. Updates from the Chair of the New Programme of Work (POW) Gaps and Priorities Sub-group	7
5. Updates from the Chair of the Seabirds Sub-group	9
6. Updates from the Chair of Other Instruments and Platforms/Hubs Sub-group	11
7. Review of FWG and the Thematic Sub-groups Membership and Potential Gaps	13
8. X. Potential creation of a new subgroup to revise CMS Resolution 12.11 (Rev.COP14) Flyways and develop FWG Terms of Reference (TOR)	13
9. Define workplan, timelines and next steps ahead of the 8th Meeting of the Sessional Committee of the Scientific Council (ScC-SC8)	15
10. Any other business, proposed date for next meeting, and Closure of the meeting	15

List of Acronyms

BLI	BirdLife International
CMS	Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals
COP	Conference of the Parties
FWG	Flyways Working Group
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
POW	Programme of Work
ScC-SC	Sessional Committee of the Scientific Council
SG	Sub-group
TAG	Technical Advisory Group
ToR	Terms of Reference

Main meeting outcomes

1. The 4th Meeting of the CMS Flyways Working Group (FWG4) took place on 18 February 2025, 9-11pm (Bonn time, GMT+1) online via MS Teams.
2. The Flyways Working Group (FWG4) meeting was attended by 23 members (at Annex 1), during which the following key discussions and agreements were made:
 1. Updates from the three Sub-groups (SGs)
 - a. New Programme of Work (POW), Gaps, and Priorities SG: Provided updates on the drafting of the FWG 2026-2029 POW.
 - b. Seabirds SG: Shared progress on the draft seabirds and marine flyways resolution and draft decisions for potential later submission to CMS COP15.
 - c. Other Instruments and Platforms/Hubs SG: Presented key discussion points and ongoing work.
 2. Review of FWG Membership & Sub-groups
 - a. The composition of the FWG and its three thematic SGs was reviewed, with gaps in representation identified.
 3. Next Steps and key agreements
 - The [Draft Flyways Working Group Programme of Work for 2026 - 2029 | CMS](#) was discussed and will be shared by the CMS Secretariat after the meeting, both as an email attachment and via a shared link with track changes. The document will remain open for review by FWG members for one month, after which the SG will reconvene at the end of March/early April to finalize it. Mark Carey (chair of the SG) will share a doodle poll with proposed dates, allowing SG members to select their preferred meeting date in due course.
 - The document containing a draft resolution on Seabirds and Marine Flyways ([CMS FWG4 Res Marine Flyways draft Doc.5 0.pdf](#)) was discussed and will be shared by the CMS Secretariat after the meeting, both as an email attachment and via a shared link with track changes. The document will remain open for review by FWG members for one month, after which the SG will reconvene at the end of March/early April to finalize it. Mark Carey (chair of the SG) will share a doodle poll with proposed dates, allowing SG members to select their preferred meeting date in due course.
 - For Other Instruments and Platforms/Hubs, Rob Clay (Chair of the SG) will share a draft discussion document with the relevant SG members in one to two weeks after the meeting for review. This will then be circulated to the FWG members by mid to late March.
 - Members agreed to establish new Flyways Resolution SG to revise the CMS Resolution 12.11 (Rev.COP14) [Flyways](#) and develop FWG Terms of Reference (ToR) for consideration at the Sessional Committee of the Scientific Council (ScC-SC8). The SG will be led by Dr. Mark Carey (Australian Government), with Ms. Nicola Crockford, Dr. Rob Clay, and Ms. Narelle Montgomery volunteering to join. Additionally, the CMS Secretariat and Spike Millington will be included in the communications. The SG would meet to discuss, edit, and revise the document, including the ToR. Once the SG reached broad agreement, the document would be circulated to the FWG members for review and feedback.

- Consensus was reached to hold the next FWG meeting (FWG5) in late April/early May. To schedule this meeting, the CMS Secretariat will circulate a doodle poll, allowing FWG members to select their preferred date. An additional FWG meeting could potentially be held in late August/early September. Thirdly, during the 8th meeting of the Sessional Committee of the Scientific Council (ScC-SC8), an in-person informal meeting has been suggested to be held for FWG members present.
- Members agreed that the draft documents from the SGs will be submitted by the respective chairs to the CMS Secretariat in early August, ensuring sufficient time for internal edits, processing, and submission to CMS COP15.

1. Opening of the meeting, welcoming remarks and introduction of participants

3. Dr. Rob Clay (FWG Chair, Manomet, CMS COP-appointed Councillor for Birds) opened the meeting, acknowledging the scheduling challenges across time zones and thanking participants for their flexibility. He welcomed the 23 participants to the 4th meeting of the FWG and outlined that the meeting would focus on reviewing the progress of the three thematic subgroups in response to [Decision 14.140](#) from COP14, identifying gaps and priorities for flyway conservation and planning the next steps to finalize key documents ahead of CMS COP15. Given the familiarity among participants, formal introductions were skipped, but attendees were welcome to introduce themselves in the chat, as the CMS Secretariat would circulate a list of attendees after the meeting. Before proceeding, the Chair invited Ms. Narelle

Montgomery (Chair of the CMS Scientific Council, Australian Government) to share her opening remarks.

4. Ms. Narelle Montgomery acknowledged the productivity of the SGs she has been involved in, highlighting their valuable discussions and significant progress. She noted that compartmentalizing workstreams under the broader FWG has been an effective approach. Additionally, she recognized the groups' efforts in being mindful of timeframes and setting realistic, achievable goals. She expressed enthusiasm for the upcoming thematic SG updates, which would bring the FWG4 meeting participants up to speed on the thematic subgroups progress.

2. Adoption of the agenda and meeting schedule

5. The FWG Chair introduced the [Annotated Agenda and Meeting Schedule](#), highlighting topics of draft FWG new POW 2026-2029, draft seabirds and marine flyways resolution and draft decisions, other instruments and platforms/hubs and review of the FWG and the three thematic SGs membership.
6. He invited participants to suggest additional business items not currently included in the agenda and referred them to the documents on the [Meeting's dedicated website](#).
7. Dr. Mark Carey (Australian Government) raised the possibility of discussing a revision of CMS Resolution 12.11 (Rev.COP14) [Flyways](#) and developing formal Terms of Reference (ToR) for the [FWG](#).
 - a. The Chair acknowledged Dr. Carey's suggestion and anticipated time for discussion later in the meeting. He noted that while revisiting the FWG's full history was unnecessary, the group was well-positioned to consider updates. He emphasized that developing the ToR would enhance focus, maximize expertise, and optimize resources.
8. The Chair briefly mentioned two meetings held in Brazil in December 2024: [the second meeting of the Americas Flyways Task Force](#) and the [third meeting of the Southern South American Migratory Grassland Birds and Their Habitats](#). He noted they were not formally on the agenda due to pending report finalization.

3. Reminder on CMS Resolution 12.11 (Rev.COP14) mandates related to Flyways and Decision 14.140 directed to the Flyways Working Group

9. The Chair provided a summary of the FWG's key responsibilities, specifically under [Decision 14.140](#) which includes:
 - Facilitating exchange of best practices, identifying synergies and gaps in flyway conservation.
 - Coordinating with regional initiatives to guide Parties on priorities and implementation gaps.
 - Reviewing the previous Programme of Work (2014–2023) and proposing an updated framework.
 - Addressing scientific and technical issues related to migratory birds.
 - Ensuring coordination across CMS groups and task forces.

- Engaging Parties and non-Party Range States in conservation efforts.
10. He highlighted that, following the [third FWG meeting](#) these tasks had been consolidated into three active SGs that had been working over the past months. Their work will be critical for CMS COP15, tentatively expected to be held in March 2026, and documents needed to be submitted in line with the COP submission deadlines.
 11. Tilman Schneider (CMS Secretariat) welcomed participants on behalf of the Secretariat and conveyed regards from Ivan Ramirez and Umberto Gallo-Orsi, who were attending the Raptors MOU TAG meeting. He confirmed that while the 150-day deadline applies to documents submitted by Parties, Secretariat-prepared documents follow an earlier timeline due to internal drafting and editing processes. If the FWG planned to submit documents via the Secretariat, the deadline would be early August, though final dates were still pending confirmation of the COP15 schedule.
 12. Mr. Schneider emphasized the importance of considering these timelines when planning SG outputs and official submissions. He shared the CMS COP submission rules which is as below:

Submission of Documents

Rule 18: Submission of Resolutions and Decisions

1. *Parties must submit any proposed Resolutions and Decisions that include a scientific element to the Executive Secretary at least one hundred and fifty days prior to the commencement of the meeting.*
 2. *Parties should endeavour to submit any proposed Resolutions and Decisions not including a scientific element to the Executive Secretary within the timeline set out in paragraph one. In any event, Parties must submit such proposals at least ninety days prior to the commencement of the meeting.*
 3. *All proposed Resolutions and Decisions that include a scientific element shall be submitted by the Executive Secretary to the Scientific Council for scrutiny of their scientific and technical accuracy at least one hundred and twenty days prior to the commencement of the meeting. The Scientific Council shall provide appropriate advice to the Standing Committee on such proposed Resolutions and Decisions.*
 4. *The Executive Secretary shall transmit the documents to the Conference of the Parties at least sixty days before the meeting. [...]*
13. The Chair emphasized the urgency of finalizing the FWG's work by early August to ensure timely submission and processing ahead of COP15. He acknowledged that the CMS Secretariat would greatly appreciate adherence to this timeline.
 14. He outlined the process for reporting the next agenda item: the Chair of each SG would present updates, followed by feedback and discussion by participants on revisions. He clarified that the Other Instruments and Platforms/Hubs SG had no formal documents yet but would be addressed in his report. He noted that the focus at this stage was to gather initial feedback, assess any gaps or missing elements, and discuss the way forward over the coming months.
- #### **4. Updates from the Chair of the New Programme of Work (POW) Gaps and Priorities Sub-group**
15. The Chair introduced this agenda item and invited Dr. Carey (Chair of the new POW, gaps and priorities SG) to present.

16. Dr. Carey presented the [Draft Flyways Working Group Programme of Work for 2026 - 2029 | CMS](#).
17. He gave a history of the SG's work, consisting of 12 members representing various flyways and CMS instruments. The SG had met three times (29 Oct 2024, 19 Dec 2024, and 6 Feb 2025). The first meeting focused on establishing a working approach and defining a framework for the new PoW 2026-2029 drawing inspiration from the [Samarkand Strategic Plan for migratory species 2024 - 2032](#).
18. The SG reviewed COP14 mandates related to the development of a revised global POW, including, [Resolution 12.11 \(Rev.COP14\) Flyways](#) and [Decision 14.140](#). Additionally, they examined key documents such as the [Programme of Work on Migratory Birds and Flyways \(2014-2023\)](#), [Strategic Review of the Flyways Mandates under CMS](#) and [A Review of Migratory Bird Flyways and Priorities for Management \(CMS Technical Series Publication No.27\)](#). These documents are available on the [meeting's dedicated website](#).
19. A key decision was made to structure the POW over one triennium (2026-2029), allowing for a more focused and adaptable approach. The new POW was organized into thematic areas and sub-themes, detailing; Activity, Deliverables, Mandate, Timeframe, Responsible entity and Supporting Partner(s) and Funding needs.
20. Between meetings, SG members contributed to refining the document. The latest draft was circulated before the FWG4 meeting for discussions. Dr. Carey invited further feedback from the meeting's participants.
21. The Chair thanked him and opened the floor for questions and comments.
22. Graeme Taylor asked about prioritization of actions within the timeframes.
23. Dr. Carey responded that the SG initially considered a priority column but was later omitted, as all listed actions were designed to be achievable within one triennium (2026-2029). The timeframe column differentiated between actions that could be completed within one triennium and those that were ongoing or considered "business as usual." These ongoing actions were identified within the new POW to ensure continued progress. He reaffirmed that all listed activities were considered realistic and achievable within the triennium.
24. The Chair acknowledged Dr. Carey's clarification and welcomed further input to validate the approach from the FWG members.
25. Mr. Schneider commended Mark and the SG for their work on the new POW, describing it as a well-structured and valuable document. He acknowledged that he had a similar observation to Graeme regarding prioritization and found the approach logical. He then inquired about the timeline for collecting feedback from the FWG members.
26. Dr. Carey proposed that a reasonable timeframe for receiving comments from the FWG members would be one month.
27. Sharon Kitony asked for clarification on whether access to edit the new POW should be extended to all FWG members or just the SG members, as the SG members already had editing access.

28. Dr. Carey confirmed this would be ideal for broader FWG members' input.
29. Ms. Montgomery commended the SG for their collaborative effort in getting the new POW to its current stage. She also requested sharing the document via email due to potential technical issues.
30. Barry Baker supported Ms. Montgomery's comment.
31. Dr. Carey thanked everyone for their contributions and welcomed comments via his email, assuring that incorporating them into the document would be manageable. He also highlighted that SG membership remained open and encouraged anyone interested to join by reaching out to him via email.
32. The Chair asked if there were any further comments regarding the draft new POW 2026-2029.
33. With no further comments, the [Draft Flyways Working Group Programme of Work for 2026 - 2029 | CMS](#) was agreed upon to be shared by the CMS Secretariat after the meeting, both as an email attachment and via a shared link, with edits to be proposed in track changes. The document would remain open for review by FWG members for one month, after which the SG would reconvene at the end of March/early April to finalize it. Dr. Carey would share a Doodle poll with proposed dates.

5. Updates from the Chair of the Seabirds Sub-group

34. The Chair introduced this agenda item and invited Dr. Carey (Chair of the seabirds SG) to present.
35. Dr. Carey presented the document on [Seabirds and marine flyways | CMS](#). He gave a history of the SG's work, consisting of 13 members representing various flyways and CMS instruments. The group had met twice (24 Oct 2024 and 3 Dec 2024). The first meeting focused on establishing a working approach and defining a framework for the seabirds and marine flyways, inspired by BirdLife International's (BLI) work on marine flyways. He noted that a paper from BLI on the subject had been recently accepted by a scientific journal and would be published soon.
36. The SG reviewed COP14 mandates related to the development of seabirds and marine flyways, including, [Resolution 12.11 \(Rev.COP14\) Flyways](#) and [Decision 14.140](#). Additionally, they examined key documents such as the [Strategic Review of the Flyways Mandates under CMS, Programme of Work on Migratory Birds and Flyways \(2014-2023\)](#), [A Review of Migratory Bird Flyways and Priorities for Management \(CMS Technical Series Publication No.27\)](#) and [Marine Flyways](#). These documents are available on the [meeting's dedicated website](#).
37. The SG proposed to prepare a draft resolution and draft decisions on seabirds and marine flyways, for potential submission to and consideration by CMS COP15. Dr. Carey was assigned the draft, and SG members contributed to refining it between meetings. The latest draft was circulated prior to the FWG4 meeting for further discussion.
38. Dr. Carey outlined the primary goal of the resolution: to formalize marine flyways as a concept under CMS, highlighting the challenges faced by seabirds and actions for their conservation. The draft resolution would reference case studies, such as on Salvin's Albatross and Flesh-footed Shearwater, to demonstrate the importance of marine flyways and ocean connectivity.

It would also include annexes on seabirds, the first would describe marine flyways as per BirdLife International's definition and key CMS-listed species, while the second would list seabirds covered by CMS and its family instruments. The list would also include seabirds proposed by BLI and potentially new avian listings under CMS Resolution 14.20 [Potential Avian Taxa for Listing](#).

39. Dr. Carey acknowledged New Zealand's progress in proposing the listing of gadfly petrels and flesh-footed shearwaters and hoped the seabird and marine flyways resolution would encourage other Parties to submit additional proposals.
40. He emphasized the need for further revisions on the draft document and proposed a one-month period for receiving comments from FWG members. After refining the text, the SG would reconvene and present the final draft resolution envisaged to be submitted to the Eighth meeting of the Sessional Committee of the Scientific Council (ScC-SC8) later this year. He invited further feedback from the meeting's participants.
41. The Chair thanked him and opened the floor for questions and comments.
42. Nicola Crockford expressed support for the work and proposed BLI's contribution to conduct a policy gap analysis on marine flyways to inform policy recommendations for CMS COP15. This analysis would accelerate progress, potentially saving three years, and complement the situation analysis planned by BLI. She offered to share proposed wording for inclusion in the draft programme of work and suggested adding it as a specific action item. *"By ScC-SC8 (i.e. before end 2025) undertake a policy gap analysis on the six marine flyways. Submit policy recommendations to COP15 ensuring that marine flyways and their ecological site networks are adequately considered by ongoing processes including BBNJ."*
43. Dr. Carey raised concerns about the timing of the policy gap analysis in relation to document submission deadlines of end of August/September for the ScC-SC8.
44. Ms. Crockford acknowledged Dr. Carey's concerns and suggested that they could explore ways to align the analysis with document submission deadlines, potentially by completing assessments for some flyways ahead of schedule. She also proposed that, at COP15, it might be possible to incorporate key findings into an already well-structured resolution.
45. Dr. Carey suggested a prioritized approach, possibly that BLI could focus on one marine flyway as a case study to ensure timely completion. He also expressed his willingness to work with the SG to integrate the suggested revisions effectively.
46. Ms. Crockford agreed and proposed discussing the feasibility of prioritizing a highest priority marine flyway with her team.
47. The Chair pointed out that Dr. Eduardo Gallo Cajiao was interested in participating in the gap analysis and mentioned that he and his colleagues had already conducted a similar analysis for the South Pacific (see; [Environmental Law and Governance in the Pacific; Climate Change, Biodiversity and Communities](#).)
48. Graeme Taylor provided an update on ongoing and planned collaborative projects related to marine flyways. He noted that while the current draft resolution aligned with existing knowledge, ACAP was initiating efforts to address seabird movement gaps. A key initiative was a collaborative Grey-headed Albatross tracking project next summer, where multiple countries would track birds simultaneously to understand colony overlaps. Similar projects for

species like giant petrels were also being planned to improve knowledge of marine flyways and support conservation efforts.

49. Mr. Schneider noted minor editorial adjustments to the document shared by Dr. Carey on 14 February, confirming that the latest version would be sent to him for reference. The CMS Secretariat would share the edited version to avoid confusion.
50. Dr. Carey acknowledged the ongoing work on the shared files and thanked Mr. Schneider for his input. He reaffirmed his commitment to working with the SG on text edits and integration of feedback, noting that SG membership was open, inviting anyone interested to join by reaching out to him via email to anyone interested.
51. The Chair asked if there were any further comments regarding the draft seabirds and marine flyways resolution.
52. With no further comments, the draft [CMS FWG4 Res Marine Flyways draft Doc.5 0.pdf](#) was agreed upon to be shared by the CMS Secretariat after the meeting, both as an email attachment and via a shared link with edits to be proposed in track changes. The document would remain open for review by FWG members for one month, after which the SG would reconvene at the end of March/early April to finalize it. Dr. Carey (Chair of the SG) would share a Doodle poll with proposed dates, allowing SG members to select their preferred meeting date.
53. The Chair expressed a special thank you to Dr. Carey for his excellent chairing of the two SGs that had made significant progress.

6. Updates from the Chair of Other Instruments and Platforms/Hubs Sub-group

54. The Chair introduced this agenda item and noted that after the Secretariat had reached out for a volunteer to chair the SG without receiving any nominations, he stepped in to lead as the the Chair of the Other Instruments and Platforms/Hubs SG .
55. He provided an overview of the SG's history, consisting of 9 members representing different flyways and CMS instruments. The group met once (21 January 2025). The first meeting focused on discussions inspired by suggestions and recommendations from the [Global Interflyway Network: Korea Workshop 2011 - Wetlands International](#) and [Inter-Flyways Workshop Samarkand, Uzbekistan 10 February 2024](#).
56. The SG reviewed COP14 mandates related to the development of other instruments and platforms/hubs, including, [Resolution 12.11 \(Rev.COP14\) Flyways](#) and [Decision 14.140](#). Additionally, they examined key documents such as the [existing CMS and non-CMS instruments](#) and [A review of CMS and non-CMS existing administrative/management instruments for migratory birds globally](#). These documents are available on the [meeting's dedicated website](#).
57. Dr. Clay provided an update on the SG discussing the role of CMS and the FWG in facilitating exchanges of best practices and building synergies across flyway initiatives. The SG aimed to improve communication and coordination between CMS and non-CMS instruments, enhance conservation governance, and develop a centralized platform for information sharing. They also addressed challenges to effective implementation and emphasized the importance of collaboration, proposing that representatives from different flyways participate in each other's workshops.

58. Key strategies included compiling existing resources, using interactive engagement methods such as webinars, and setting SMART objectives for targeted conservation themes. The SG also planned to analyse lessons learned from other initiatives to improve implementation. Recognizing the need for resource mobilization, they emphasized the importance of securing funding for these activities.
59. He noted that the SG had started drafting a discussion document outlining simple, actionable steps, such as hosting webinars to share case studies and best practices, as well as thematic meetings (e.g., bringing together communications teams from different flyway initiatives).
60. Dr. Clay said he would share the document to the SG members in one to two weeks after the meeting. The SG members would then reconvene and thereafter circulate it to the broader FWG members by mid-to-late March.
61. Rob noted that the CMS Secretariat was planning to update its website to enhance functionality which would also support these efforts.
62. Mr. Schneider added that the revamped website would feature a more user-friendly structure, improving access to resources, data, and information. It would also streamline the organization of CMS instruments for easier navigation.
63. The FWG Chair opened the floor for questions and comments.
64. Ms. Montgomery acknowledged the productive discussions and asked how the SG's activities would align with the new draft POW. She inquired whether the SG could provide input within the next month to ensure relevant actions were represented.
65. Dr. Clay agreed on the importance of alignment but noted that contributions should not introduce significant new action items unless resources were allocated. However, minor adjustments, such as incorporating a webinar series, would be beneficial. While organizing webinars seemed simple, coordination efforts should be reflected in the new POW. He highlighted that a one-month feedback period for the new POW might be challenging, especially if extensive feedback on the SG's discussion document emerged. Extending the new POW review period would allow for better coordination across SGs.
66. Ms. Montgomery supported ensuring the SG's efforts were reflected in the POW, noting that there was some flexibility in the comment period. She suggested including a general entry such as "conduct webinars on relevant topics as needed" to ensure the SG's contributions were recognized.
67. Dr. Clay suggested taking concrete steps, even small ones, in the new POW, drawing conclusions from the 2011 workshop in Korea and 2024 workshop in Uzbekistan to ensure effective implementation is achieved. He thanked everyone for their contributions and reaffirmed his commitment to working with the SG. He also noted that SG membership remains open, inviting anyone interested to join by reaching out to him via email.
68. The Chair asked if there were any further comments regarding the Other Instruments and Platforms/Hubs.
69. With no additional remarks, it was agreed Dr. Clay (Chair of the SG) would share a draft discussion document with the relevant SG members in one to two weeks after the meeting for

review. This would then be circulated to the FWG members by mid to late March.

7. Review of FWG and the Thematic Sub-groups Membership and Potential Gaps

70. The Chair introduced this agenda item and invited the CMS Secretariat to present.
71. Mr. Schneider introduced the document [Review of the Flyways Working Group and the Thematic Subgroups Membership and Potential Gaps | CMS](#). The document outlined membership representation in the context of [Decision 14.142](#). While some regions were well represented, others had less participation, indicating areas for improvement. He emphasized that increasing representation was an ongoing effort rather than an immediate action item, encouraging members to review the document and suggest additional individuals or institutions that could contribute to the group.
72. Ms. Crockford noted difficulties in understanding the document due to duplications, with individuals appearing multiple times under different affiliations or groupings. She specifically questioned Table 2 on thematic SG members, suggesting that a column indicating the specific SG might be missing. She recommended reviewing and streamlining the document for better clarity and organization.
73. Mr. Schneider clarified that the document consisted of multiple tables covering different aspects of the FWG: Table 1 listed government representatives (10 members), institutional/organizational representatives (regional: 14 members; and global:11 members), CMS Scientific Council members (7 members) , and observers (awaiting official confirmation: 13).Table 2 tracked thematic SG membership, which was more flexible and subject to change after COP if new tasks arose. He emphasized that Table 1 was the key reference, while Table 2 was less critical for detailed review. Additionally, the last page of the document, which highlights regional representation, may be the most useful for analysis.
74. Ms. Crockford pointed out that regional affiliations in Table 2 might be misleading. Some individuals representing global organizations are categorized under a specific region (e.g., Europe) simply because their office is located there, potentially distorting regional representation.
75. Ms. Kitony (CMS Secretariat) clarified that Table 2 categorized thematic SG members based on their location rather than the actual scope of their work. While some members represent global organizations, their regional affiliation was listed based on where they were based. She emphasized that Table 1 was the primary reference, as it accurately distinguished between global, regional, and government representation.
76. Ms. Crockford shared an annotated version with suggestions to improve clarity and organization.
77. Mr. Schneider thanked and acknowledged Ms. Crockford's point.
78. The Chair emphasized that the document's main purpose was to identify gaps in representation and ensure that important regions or areas were not missing. He reiterated that the document was evolving and should be kept updated as new members join. The working group remained open to all, provided that discussions stay focused and relevant.

8. Potential creation of a new subgroup to revise CMS Resolution 12.11 (Rev.COP14)

Flyways and develop FWG Terms of Reference (TOR)

79. The Chair introduced this agenda item, which had been added to the agenda at the beginning of the meeting. He proposed addressing it at this point to stay on schedule before circling back to timelines and next steps. He then invited Dr. Carey to share his thoughts on the potential creation of a new SG to revise the CMS Resolution 12.11 (Rev.COP14) [Flyways](#) and develop a formal TOR for the FWG.
80. Dr. Carey raised the idea of revisiting Resolution 12.11 (Rev.COP14) [Flyways](#) to ensure it remained relevant to the group's work. He noted that with new developments, including the new POW, seabird and marine resolutions, and the history of the FWG's establishment without formal TOR, this was an appropriate time to review and refine its structure. He proposed creating a small SG to review the flyways resolution and draft the FWG TOR to be considered at the ScC-SC8, bringing recommendations back to the larger group when the Flyways Working Group next meets. He then opened the floor for discussion.
81. Ms. Crockford expressed her support for Dr. Carey's suggestion and offered to join the proposed SG.
82. Dr. Carey thanked Ms. Crockford for her willingness to participate and emphasized that the new POW provides an opportunity to review and adjust the group's objectives. He invited nominations for the SG, encouraging interested members to contact him directly, while also welcoming any feedback or concerns.
83. The Chair thanked Dr. Carey and volunteered to join the SG. He acknowledged the Secretariat's efforts in streamlining the resolution, making it more readable, and emphasized that, given the evolving nature of the work, revising the resolution could enhance its usefulness for both CMS Parties and non-Parties
84. Ms. Montgomery agreed with the Chair, noting that the Flyways resolution had been in place for multiple COP cycles. While the Secretariat had already streamlined it, she highlighted that with the new POW and ongoing developments in the FWG, this was a good opportunity to ensure the resolution remained updated, focused, and fit for purpose. She expressed her willingness to contribute and thanked Dr. Carey for leading the SG.
85. Spike Millington supported the idea and asked for clarification on whether the process would mirror previous approaches, where a small group drafts a document before circulating it for broader review. He expressed interest in providing feedback once a draft was available.
86. Dr. Carey clarified that the SG would meet to discuss, edit, and revise the document, including drafting the TOR. Once the SG reached broad agreement, the document would be circulated to the FWG members for review and feedback. After addressing any concerns, the final version would be submitted to the ScC-SC8 for review and endorsement. He also mentioned that Mr. Millington could be included in SG communications and join discussions as time allowed.
87. Mr. Taylor agreed with the approach of having a small group handle the drafting before opening the document up for broader review.
88. The Chair seconded this approach and highlighted the importance of considering time zones when scheduling meetings to ensure inclusive participation. He thanked Dr. Carey for volunteering to lead the SG.

89. Dr. Carey thanked everyone and confirmed that the Secretariat would be included in SG communications. If they had the capacity to participate in SG's work, they would be welcome to join.

90. The Chair asked if there were any further comments regarding the proposed creation of the new Flyways Resolution SG.

91. With no further comments, it was agreed that a SG would be established to revise the Flyways resolution and to develop FWG TOR for consideration at the ScC-SC8 . The SG would be led by Dr. Carey, with Ms. Crockford, Dr. Clay, and Ms. Montgomery volunteering to join. Additionally, the Secretariat and Mr. Millington would be included in the communications.

9. Define workplan, timelines and next steps ahead of the 8th Meeting of the Sessional Committee of the Scientific Council (ScC-SC8)

92. The Chair introduced this agenda item.

93. He proposed a timeline for future meetings and workplan as follows:

- Next FWG meeting in late April/early May to review SG progress. The Secretariat would circulate a doodle poll, allowing FWG members to select their preferred date.
- Completion of draft documents and submission to the Secretariat by early August, aiming for finalization ahead of COP document deadline.
- An additional meeting in late August or early September if needed.
- An informal in-person meeting during the ScC-SC8 at the end of the year.

94. The Chair asked if there were any further comments regarding the proposed timelines and workplan. With no further comments, the members agreed to the proposed timelines and workplan.

95. Members agreed that the draft documents from the SGs would be submitted by the respective SG chairs to the CMS Secretariat in early August, ensuring sufficient time for internal edits, processing, and submission to CMS COP15.

10. Any other business, proposed date for next meeting, and Closure of the meeting

96. The Chair introduced this agenda item.

97. Mr. Schneider took a moment to express his gratitude to Ms. Kitony for her outstanding support during her internship with the FWG and other CMS avian work streams, including preparing the meetings of the Americas Flyways Task Force, and of the MOU on the Southern South American Grasslands Birds and Their Habitats.

98. Ms. Kitony expressed heartfelt gratitude to everyone in the group and especially the FWG Chair and SG Chairs for their support during her internship. She thanked the Secretariat and its Avian Team, Rob, Mark, and many others, acknowledging the collaborative teamwork and valuable learning experience. She also acknowledged the lack of African representation in the FWG but expressed hope for future progress in this regard. She wished everyone the best and looked forward to reuniting in the conservation field.

99. The Chair expressed deep gratitude on behalf of the FWG to Sharon for her hard work, persistence, and patience, particularly in supporting the group's progress over the past few months.

Closure of the meeting

100. The Chair thanked all participants for their involvement, recognizing the great progress made by each SG and highlighting that having thematic SGs has proven to be a highly effective approach for advancing work under the FWG. He assured the members that they would be in touch with more updates and progress in the near future.

101. The Chair declared meeting closed at 23.00hrs GMT+1.

ANNEX1

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Representative	Position Institution Organization	Email
Mark Carey	Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water, Australia	mark.carey@dcceew.gov.au
Narelle Montgomery	Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water, Australia; Chair CMS Scientific Council	narelle.montgomery@dcceew.gov.au
Eduardo Gallo-Cajiao	Colorado State University	e.gallocajiao@colostate.edu
Barry Baker	Latitude 42 Environmental Consultants	barry.baker@latitude42.au
Alexander Griffin	FACE (European Federation for Hunting and Conservation)	cy.griffin@face.eu
Juliana Bosi de Almeida	Manomet	jbosi@manomet.org
Courtney Price	Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna, Arctic Council	courtney@caff.is
Tilman Schneider	UNEP/CMS Secretariat	tilman.schneider@un.org
Sergey Dereliev	UNEP/AEWA Secretariat	sergey.dereliev@un.org
Kristine Meise	Common Wadden Sea Secretariat/WSFI	meise@waddensea-secretariat.org
Ramesh Kumar Selvaraj	Independent Expert	ramesh.wild@gmail.com
Sharon Kitony	UNEP/CMS Secretariat	sharon.kitony@un.org
Nyambayar Batbayar	Wildlife Science and Conservation Center of Mongolia	nyambayar@wscc.org.mn
Ward Hagemeijer	Wetlands International	ward.hagemeijer@wetlands.org
Graeme Taylor	Department of Conservation TePapa Atawhai, New Zealand	gtaylor@doc.govt.nz
Nathalia Aguilar	Manomet	naquillar@manomet.org
Rob Clay	WHSRN Executive Office / Manomet Conservation Sciences, COP-appointed Councillor for Birds	rclay@manomet.org
Minjae Baek	Secretariat of the East Asian-Australasian Flyway Partnership	communication@eaaflyway.net
Hyun-Ah Choi	Hanns Seidel Foundation Korea	hachoi@hss.or.kr
Nicola Jane Crockford	BirdLife International	nicola.crockford@rspb.org.uk
Matt Parsons	Joint Nature Conservation Committee, United Kingdom	matt.parsons@jncc.gov.uk
Maksim Mitropolskiy	Ramsar Regional initiative For Central Asia	max_raptors@list.ru

Apologies:

1. Karen Baird
2. Ruth Cromie