

Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals

48th Meeting of the Standing Committee

Bonn, Germany, 23 – 24 October 2018

UNEP/CMS/StC48/Report

REPORT OF THE 48th MEETING

Opening of the Meeting and Organizational Matters

1. Opening remarks and introductions

1. The Chair, Øystein Størkersen (Norway), welcomed participants to the 48th meeting of the CMS Standing Committee (StC), outlining the need to continue furthering collaboration with relevant partners with the aim of halting the decline of biodiversity. Alignment with the global targets in the post-2020 period related to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) would be a crucial part of this. Biodiversity was threatened more than ever. Activities and priorities needed to be reviewed and new strategies developed and adopted.
2. Marco Barbieri (Secretariat) extended his welcome to the participants, standing in for the Executive Secretary, Bradnee Chambers, pointing out achievements of the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP12) to CMS, that had taken place in October 2017 in Manila. He outlined preparations for the CMS COP13 to take place in February 2020 in India, as a stepping stone to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) COP15 in December 2020.
3. The Chair extended his best wishes for a speedy recovery to the Executive Secretary, who was not attending the meeting for health reasons.
4. The Chair also announced “Brown Bag” presentations and dialogues to be held during lunch on both days, to which all participants were invited. As representative of the Depositary of the CMS, Oliver Schall (Germany), extended an invitation for dinner on the same day in the German Ministry for the Environment.

2. Adoption of the Agenda and Meeting schedule

2.1. Provisional Agenda and Documents

5. Marco Barbieri (Secretariat) referred to the provisional agenda and list of documents contained in document UNEP/CMS/StC48/Doc.2.1/Rev.2. He pointed out that the meeting was also joined remotely by the CMS colleagues in Abu Dhabi, as well as Dr. Margi Prideaux from Wild Migration, participating from Australia.

2.2. Annotated Agenda and Meeting Schedule

6. The Chair referred the meeting to document [UNEP/CMS/StC48/Doc.2.2/Rev1](#) and invited comments or proposals for amendment from the floor.

Decision

The agenda, list of documents, annotated agenda and meeting schedule were adopted by the members of the StC as presented, without comments or additions.

Reports

3. Depositary

7. Oliver Schall (Germany) gave the report on behalf of the Depositary. A document had been made available to the members of the StC ([UNEP/CMS/StC48/Doc.3](#)).
8. Since the last report in July 2017, three Parties had completed their accession to the Convention: the Dominican Republic (Party as of 1 November 2017), Bosnia and Herzegovina (Party as of 1 December 2017) and Trinidad and Tobago (Party as of 1 December 2018). Lebanon was also preparing for accession, which would bring the membership of CMS to 128 Parties.
9. Welcome was extended to the new Parties by the Chair. He also welcomed progress in the accession of Lebanon, a country that wanted to strengthen conservation of biodiversity.

Decision

The StC took note of the report of the Depositary.

4. Standing Committee

10. The Chair noted that written reports had been received from some of the regions. He called upon the regional representatives in turn to bring any highlights or additional information to the attention of the meeting.

4.1. Standing Committee members

11. François Lamarque (France), representing Europe presented for the region. Details of activities of each country and relevant to CMS and its related instruments were contained in document [UNEP/CMS/StC48/Doc.4.1.1](#).
12. Oliver Schall (Germany) informed the meeting that Germany was in the process of preparing a strategy on the conservation of insects, in response to their alarming decline (up to 80 per cent in some regions). More details on the new insect strategy were to be provided during the Brown Bag lunch. Mr. Schall also announced that Germany would open a JPO post to support conservation of African migratory species, especially those covered by the African Carnivore Initiative.
13. Ariuntuya Dorjsuren (Mongolia), speaking as representative of the Asia region, stated that, since inputs from some countries of the region were pending, the written report would only be submitted in a couple of days.
14. The Africa region was not able to submit a written report due to the time-consuming burden, which reporting to the StC presented. An oral report for the Africa region was presented by Jérôme Mokoko Ikonga (Congo). He specifically mentioned the problem of overfishing in the Gulf of Guinea, as well as the capture of turtles. Despite significant efforts by Congo and Gabon to address these issues, the population of turtles was in decline.
15. Joshua Wycliffe (Fiji) presented for the Oceania region, with a written report available in document [UNEP/CMS/StC48/Doc.4.1.3](#).

16. Two documents were provided from the South and Central America and the Caribbean region, one report for Central America and the Caribbean ([UNEP/CMS/StC48/Doc.4.1.2/Rev.1](#)) and one from South America ([UNEP/CMS/StC48/Doc.4.1.4](#)). No oral report was made during the meeting.
17. Europe, Asia, Africa and Oceania noted during their presentations that reporting to the StC required time-consuming efforts from country representatives, which could not always be fulfilled. Europe requested the Secretariat to review the overall need for the report and its usefulness for the Secretariat, as well as the possibility of developing a different format, focusing on the application of resolutions, whilst Oceania suggested that the Secretariat consider preparing a short template with a majority of multiple-choice answers, keeping the individual filling part to a minimum. The Secretariat agreed to look into possibilities to ease reporting.

Action

The **Secretariat** will explore possibilities to lighten the reporting to the StC, possibly by preparing a reporting template with a majority of multiple-choice questions.

Decision

The StC took note of the reports of the StC members.

4.2. Observers

18. The Chair invited the representatives of the Secretariats of CMS Agreements and other observers to make reports.

Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds (AEWA)

19. Jacques Trouvilliez, Executive Secretary of AEWA, invited participants to look at the [AEWA Secretariat report](#) developed for the MOP7 available on the AEWA website. Information on activities carried out in the last triennium was contained in the report. Many programmatic synergies with CMS existed, for example on the phasing out of lead, poaching or poisoning of species. Botswana had acceded to AEWA bringing the members of the Agreement to 77. Serbia was also making plans to join soon.
20. The MOP7 was taking place in Durban on 4-8 December 2018. The new Strategic Plan for AEWA for the next nine years was expected to be adopted at the meeting, as well as the new Plan of Action for Africa covering the same period, aligned to the Strategic Plan. Amongst the many other topics, Action Plans for the Velvet Scooter (*Melanitta fusca*), the White-headed Duck (*Oxyura leucocephala*) and the Dalmatian Pelican (*Pelecanus crispus*), developed together with CMS, as well as two management plans for Geese in Europe (Barnacle Goose (*Branta leucopsis*) and Greylag Goose (*Anser anser*)), would be presented to the MOP for adoption.
21. The shared Information Management, Communications and Awareness-raising (IMCA) Unit of AEWA and CMS was working well in increasing visibility of the Convention and its Agreements; the arrangement between the Secretariats was to be reconfirmed by the MOP7. A good example of the good cooperation between AEWA and CMS also was the report writer for this current meeting, a staff member from AEWA supporting the meeting on short notice.

22. Soumitra Dasgupta (India) stated that bird conservation was of increased importance to the country, as testified by the recent adoption of a national Central Asian Flyway (CAF) Action Plan. Talks with AEWA were taking place about possible cooperation on the work undertaken on flyways and exchange of ideas. Thorough planning and focused financing, as well as support from other governments, were welcome to support the work and help to bring further countries on the flyways either into CMS or CAF. Mr. Trouvilliez also congratulated India for its very good Action Plan, serving as a model. A side event on the subject was also planned during the MOP7 in Durban.
23. The Chair commented on the strides on very interesting issues AEWA had undertaken, specifically mentioning the European Goose Management Platform (EGMP) and the African Initiative as the two largest projects under AEWA and in need of more funding. He also commented positively on the collaboration between CMS and AEWA on CAF, helping to step up conservation and sustainable use. Mr. Barbieri (Secretariat) also commented on the CAF Action Plan, expressing the hope that the talks between AEWA and the Indian Government would help to identify the best institutional and legal settings for the CAF initiative.

Agreement on the Conservation of Populations of European Bats (EUROBATS)

24. Andreas Streit, Executive Secretary of EUROBATS, reported on the activities of the Agreement. In May 2018, the 14th meeting of Standing Committee, held in parallel with the 23rd meeting of the Advisory Committee finalized all draft resolutions for the MOP8, held in Monaco from 8 to 10 October 2018. During the very successful meeting, 13 resolutions on key issues in bat conservation had been adopted. Some of the new topics touched included bats and light pollution, bats and climate change and insect decline as a threat to bat populations - all documents were available online. The Agreement's budget was moderately strengthened, especially scientific support in the mid-term. Two new Parties were finalizing the formalities for their accession: Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia, increasing the total number of Parties to 38. The cooperation with CMS and the CMS Family in all areas of common interest was excellent.
25. The Chair pointed out the availability of eight documents of the EUROBATS Technical Series Publications related to new energy, impact assessment etc. online. Display copies were available and printed copies in various languages could be sent on request.

Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans in the Black Sea, Mediterranean Sea and Contiguous Atlantic Area (ACCOBAMS)

26. A summary of the activities of ACCOBAMS was contained in document [UNEP/CMS/StC48/Doc.4.2.1](#).

Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans of the Baltic, North East Atlantic, Irish and North Seas (ASCOBANS)

27. Melanie Virtue (Secretariat) updated StC members on activities not contained in the report which was available in document [UNEP/CMS/StC48/Doc.4.2.2.](#)
28. The 24th Advisory Committee (AC24) met in Vilnius, Lithuania in late September 2018 and was well attended, including by the EU (DG Environment), the Marine Stewardship Council and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). It was a largely scientific meeting, focusing on bycatch, resource depletion and strandings, with special sessions on the Atlantic White-sided Dolphin (*Lagenorhynchus acutus*) and the White-beaked Dolphin (*Lagenorhynchus albirostris*). A conservation plan for the Common Dolphin (*Delphinus delphis*) had been adopted and a report on Marine Mammals Strandings Database Initiative presented.
29. The Secretariat also reported that Aline Kühl-Stenzel would leave ASCOBANS at the end of the year and the role of Coordinator would be taken on by Jenny Renell in January 2019.

BirdLife International

30. Congratulating India on its leadership on the CAF initiative, Nicola Crockford reported for BirdLife International.
31. In April 2018 the first Global Flyway Summit had taken place in Abu Dhabi, co-hosted by BirdLife International and CMS amongst other partners. The meeting had brought together 70 countries and 100 organizations. Work focused on ways to implement some key resolutions from the CMS COP12 in Manila. Seven workshops had taken place on illegal killing of birds, energy infrastructure, coasts, implementation of the Vulture Multi-Species Action Plan, implementation of the Saker Falcon Global Action Plan, a consolidated approach to bustards and capacity development. An outcome document of the meeting was available, including the conference declaration, as well as the detailed outcome documents for the one-day workshops.

Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)

32. Susan Liebermann reported on work of WCS, expressing first her best wishes for health to Bradnee Chambers and congratulating the Secretariat on the good work.
33. Much work on field programmes of relevance to CMS had been undertaken, for example on wildlife trafficking of many CMS-listed species, such as African Elephants, Gorillas, Chimpanzees, Asian big cats, Saiga, sharks, rays, African carnivores (Cheetah, Lion, Leopard). WCS had also been working on the Atlas developed under the Central Asian Mammals Initiative (CAMI) Programme of Work. The Health Programme was expanding their work on disease risks to CMS-listed species, including the outbreak of the peste des petits ruminants (PPR)-Virus affecting the Saiga populations in Mongolia, mange in Vicuña populations, Ebola-surveillance in great apes in Africa and white-nose disease for bats.

Sahara Conservation Fund (SCF) - Europe

34. The activities of the Sahara Conservation Fund (SCF) were reported by François Lamarque as vice-president of the association. The association worked on the sub-Saharan fauna in Africa. SCF had run a project in northern Chad recently financed by the EU, successfully reintroducing Oryx antelopes, which were now reproducing. The project was being conducted in cooperation with Abu Dhabi, which also provided the animals and, with the new EU financing, was aiming to support the entire ecosystem of the antelopes, including the nomadic tribes in the area. For the following year, it was planned to reintroduce Addax into the region. The work tied in well with that of CMS on Sahelo-Saharan antelopes and gazelles which had started almost 20 years ago. Mr. Barbieri noted with satisfaction that CMS pioneering work on these species had continued to develop. The lead had now been taken on by other organizations such as SCF. However, CMS could still lend political support and assessment to such initiatives.

Decision

The StC took note of the reports of the StC Members and Observers alike.

5. COP Presidency

35. For the Philippines, the host of the last CMS COP (COP12 held in Manila), Armida Andres reported. A summary of the activities is available in document [UNEP/CMS/StC48/Doc.5](#).
36. The COP12 adopted a resolution formalizing the role of the COP Presidency during the intersessional period, which included to help facilitate political action that would further advance the objectives of the Convention. The Philippines, in its role as COP President, through the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, had undertaken various activities, attending a large number of meetings and workshops and working on synergies with other Conventions.
37. The country was promoting conservation of critical inter-tidal and other coastal habitats for migratory species and had proposed a draft resolution to the Ramsar COP13 in this context, seeking to establish a multi-stakeholder working group under the proposed coastal forum to develop global guidance on the conservation and sustainable management of coastal habitats. The draft guidance would be presented to the Ramsar COP14.
38. Various workshops, congresses and meetings had been held and were planned in the region, some in cooperation with other States, to further the goals of the Convention on the subject of coastal and marine conservation issues. Further, some national initiatives in the Philippines had been started on various themes within sustainable development.
39. The Chair reiterated the value of the idea to have a COP Presidency in the intersessional period and commented on the impressive list of activities. The Secretariat would continue the strong bond with the Philippines to cooperate in these activities.

Decision

The StC members took note of the report of the COP President.

6. Chair of the Scientific Council

40. Fernando Spina as Chair of the CMS Scientific Council (ScC) presented on the activities of the Scientific Council and its Sessional Committee since COP12. The report of the 3rd meeting of the Sessional Committee of the CMS Scientific Council (ScC-SC3) was available as document [UNEP/CMS/StC48/Inf.5](#).
41. ScC-SC3 took place from 29 May to 1 June 2018. The meeting focused on developing the Programme of Work (POW) for the Sessional Committee for the triennium until COP13, also including work on the Rules of Procedure for the ScC (presented to the StC at this meeting for adoption), the review of COP-appointed Councillor Subject Areas, contributions to the 2nd POW for IPBES and Concerted Actions.
42. An interesting workshop had been held on animal culture, social complexity and social learning in animals: The Animal Culture Workshop, held in Parma, Italy, 12-14 April 2018, had been supported by the Apennine National Park, the Fondazione Monteparma and the Government of Monaco, and organized as a follow-up to the CMS workshop in London some years ago. A statement from the CMS workshop on Conservation Implications of Animal Culture and Social Complexity had been issued and a scientific paper was in the final stages before publication in the Science Policy Forum.

Decision

The StC took note of the report of the Chair of the ScC.

7. United Nations Environment Programme

43. The report of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) contained in document [UNEP/CMS/StC48/Doc.7](#), was presented by Andreas Obrecht, providing a snapshot of the most significant areas of collaboration between UNEP and the Convention since the previous meeting of the StC, as well as on the Secretariat administrative and financial management support UNEP supplied to CMS.
44. The Chair commented that UNEP had been engaging with many initiatives, taking leadership on the national legislation programme and training, two very important areas. The Executive Director of UNEP often mentioned marine litter as possibly the best initiative he supported, being a very concrete issue affecting biodiversity, with much measurable action possible to be taken.

Decision

The StC took note of the report of UNEP.

8. Secretariat and

14. Implementation of the Programme of Work 2018-2020

45. The two agenda items were taken together. Mr. Barbieri (Secretariat) gave an overview of the activities of the Secretariat on a general level with the Heads of Units providing highlights of activities under the responsibility of their units. The information given was based on document [UNEP/CMS/StC48/Doc.14](#).
46. The Programme of Work (POW) of CMS for the triennium 2018-2020 was quite ambitious. So far 12 per cent of the total budget for the triennium, which amounted to about €7 million, had been secured. The written report on the status of implementation of the POW included a narrative part and a tabular section giving an overview on progress of the various activities through a traffic-light rating system. A small number of activities not covered under other agenda items were brought to the attention of the meeting in the oral report.

Strategic Plan

47. Mr. Barbieri reported that the online version of the Companion Volume was in the process of being updated to take into account the outcomes of COP12. A register of sub-targets supporting the achievement of the targets in the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species (SPMS) was to be launched, as well as a preliminary assessment of progress towards the achievement of the SPMS goals and targets to be prepared for COP13.

Scientific Advisory Services

48. Activities in the POW related to Climate Change (Resolution 12.21) were all dependent on external funding, and no significant progress had been made due to lack of funding. However, two activities had been initiated within the limited available resources: the development of a project concept on the establishment of a Climate Resilient Site Network in the East Asian–Australasian Flyway to be further developed and submitted to appropriate donors for funding, and the establishment of a series of fact sheets outlining actual and projected impacts of climate change on selected migratory species and some of their critical habitats. Contacts with partners on synergies and collaborations, as well as fundraising were being pursued on an ongoing basis.
49. Progress in the preparation of a review report on the status of migratory species had been limited. This activity had already been part of the POW for the last triennium and had been given highest importance this triennium, as it was relating to a number of other CMS processes. With the help of the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) a concept note for the establishment of the “State of the World’s Migratory Species” report had been produced before COP12. However, despite active fundraising, the resources to produce the report had not yet been pledged. While fundraising was still being pursued, the Secretariat was considering reducing the scope of the concept note in order to have a product available for COP13.

Aquatic Species

50. Ms. Virtue (Secretariat) reported for the Aquatic Species Unit, giving details on the activities, achievements, challenges and next steps under MOUs for the IOSEA Marine Turtles, Dugong and Sharks, also contained in the report. Under the Dugong MOU a new “Dugong and Seagrass Research Toolkit” had been launched and Timor Leste had recently signed the MOU, bringing the number of Signatories to the MOU to 27. Additional countries had also signed the Sharks MOU, bringing the total to 48, ahead of the 3rd Meeting of Signatories, which was scheduled for December 2018.

51. Of the seven Concerted Actions relating to Aquatic Species, adopted at COP12, Ms. Virtue reported specifically on the European Eel Concerted Action and the Concerted Action for the Humpback Whale in the Arabian Sea, each having recently made progress.
52. Ms. Virtue further reported on the implementation of various Resolutions and Decisions of which two were mentioned in detail: on Aquatic Wild Meat (Resolution 12.15) and Conservation Implications of Animal Culture and Social Complexity (Resolution 11.23 (Rev. COP12)), on which productive working group meetings and workshops had been held.
53. Soumitra Dasgupta (India) reported that the Humpback Whale had been included by the National Board for Wildlife in the list of a critically endangered species, thereby aiming to enhance its conservation status. He reported that further discussions on the Concerted Action had been held during the International Whaling Commission Meeting the previous month, along with efforts to engage Oman in the conservation efforts.
54. France, represented by François Lamarque, communicated the intention to sign the Sharks MOU at the next Meeting of Signatories in Monaco.

Avian Species

55. Referring to the information given on avian species in the report for details, Borja Heredia (Secretariat) elaborated on activities under the Raptors MOU, for which the Coordinating Unit was in Abu Dhabi, the Great Bustard MOU and the Southern South American Grassland Birds MOU. The Saker Falcon Task Force, as part of the Raptors MOU, had just published a progress report and the Abu Dhabi office was participating in an EU LIFE project on the Saker Falcon in Eastern Europe.
56. Furthermore, details were given on the Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds Task Force (Resolution 11.16 (Rev. COP12), Decision 12.28, 12.30), which held a workshop jointly organized with the European Network of Prosecutors for the Environment (ENPE), bringing environmental prosecutors together. The Intergovernmental Task Force also worked closely with the East Asian-Australasian Flyway Partnership (EAAFP) regarding illegal hunting, taking and trade of migratory birds in East Asia.
57. In the area of Prevention of Bird Poisoning (Resolution 11.15 (Rev. COP 12), Decision 12.19) a further Task Group on the lead issue has been established and was planning to meet early in 2019.
58. A new coordinator of the Energy Task Force, Dr. Ashton Berry, had entered on duties, based at the BirdLife Secretariat in Cambridge, UK. Side events had taken place at the UNFCCC COP23 in November 2017 and were planned for the CBD COP14 in November 2018.
59. More information was also given on the Multi-Species Action Plan to Conserve African-Eurasian Vultures (Resolution 12.10 and Decisions 12.37-39), for which a strategic implementation plan was being developed, and on the African-Eurasian Migratory Landbirds Action Plan (Resolution 11.17 (Rev. COP12), Decision 12.23), with an update to the species list according to the new taxonomic reference adopted at COP12. The chair of the Landbirds Working Group, Olivier Biber, had recently put together a summary of activities of the action plan, that could be shared with interested parties.

60. Regarding flyways some progress had been made during the First Meeting of the America's Flyways Framework Task Force in Florianopolis, Brazil, in July 2018. A Task Force for the Americas Flyways had been inaugurated and a POW until 2020 has been developed.
61. On enquiry from Mr. Lamarque (France) about the outcome of the LIFE project on the Saker Falcon in Eastern Europe mentioned in the report, foreseen for September, Mr. Heredia promised to enquire with the colleagues in Abu Dhabi.

Terrestrial Species

62. Yelizaveta Protas (Secretariat) reported on the Gorilla Agreement and the cooperation with the Great Apes Survival Partnership (GRASP); the Saiga MOU, recently attracting support from Germany for the maintenance and upkeep of the Saiga Resource Centre, a website with much information aimed at different stakeholders; and the Central Asian Mammals Initiative (CAMI), on which information was available in the report, as well as further information to be given at the Brown Bag lunch.
63. New projects were planned for the Wild Camel, focusing on the border between China and Mongolia along the migration route of the camels, to start in spring 2019, as well as on illegal wildlife trade in Central Asia, strengthening information exchange around the CAMI countries. A separate project, funded through the International Klimaschutzinitiative (IKI) was in the final stages before approval, focusing on much of the CAMI POW.
64. Ms. Protas also updated the meeting on the joint CMS-CITES African Carnivore Initiative (ACI) (Decision 12.60) with a first Range State meeting taking place in November 2018, to discuss future conservation measures for the four-target species: the Lion, Leopard, Cheetah and African Wild Dog, and the way forward on the Initiative. The Lion Conservation Framework, a new policy guidance document, would be presented to the Range States during the meeting for endorsement, as well as presentations on a draft Leopard roadmap, and on the regional strategies for the Cheetah and African Wild Dog.
65. Work on the project "Cross-Regional Wildlife Conservation in Eastern and Southern Africa and the Indian Ocean" promoting Transfrontier Conservation Areas (Decision 12.94-97) was in the early stages of implementation with the Secretariat initiating the project in partnership with CITES and UNODC.
66. On request from Mark Jones (Born Free Foundation) for information on possible activities on chimpanzees, now listed on CMS Appendices I and II, the Secretariat stated discussions were foreseen to explore the best way of linking activities on Great Apes under CMS.
67. Juan Pablo Torrico (Bolivia) remarked that high emphasis was given to migratory species from Europe, Africa and Asia. The Latin American region was working on some proposals for fresh water fish (Resolution 10.12) and on migration routes (Resolution 12.17 and 12.53) and some proposals focusing on whales. The Secretariat was requested to assist the region in efforts to raise financial support for these initiatives, thereby also strengthening the presence of the region in the Convention. Regarding carnivores, threats in South and Central America were currently increasing. Work in this respect on the Jaguar and the Puma were under way, also potentially interesting to other countries. Mr Torrico also reinforced the point that collaboration with IPBES was of utmost importance to strengthen these initiatives.

68. The Secretariat stated the importance for Parties to work towards listing species such as the Jaguar under the Convention. There were possibilities for further transfrontier conservation areas, especially important in regions like Latin America where so many countries were concentrated. It added the importance of work on flyways, with NGOs contributing to the work, scientific research on critical habitats of migratory birds and regional meetings held, showing some presence of CMS on migratory birds in the region to be further developed. On Aquatic Species the Secretariat welcomed the efforts of the region working on fresh water species, as well as whales in the South Atlantic with respect to the Action Plan adopted during the COP. Efforts to raise further funding were continuously being undertaken to support the work of the range states.
69. The recent conference in London on illegal wildlife trade, as a first major international summit on wildlife trafficking was perceived by many present as very successful. WCS specifically reiterated the proposal to collaborate with any interested Range State on issues discussed and specific species.

Information, Communication and Outreach (IMCA)

70. Aydin Bahramlouian (Secretariat) reported on the activities of the Joint Information Management, Communication and Awareness Raising (IMCA) Unit for CMS and AEWA, established in January 2014.
71. Details of the activities were available in the report, broken down into information management, communications and outreach campaigns (Resolution 11.8 (Rev. COP12)).
72. Highlights were the COP12 brochure in the form of an in-flight magazine, which won silver award in the Best of Content Marketing (BCM) Awards 2018 in the categories of “Cover of the Year” and “Specials and Annuals”, as well as the merging of the International Migratory Bird Day (IMBD), coordinated by Environment for the Americas (EFTA) and the World Migratory Bird Day (WMBD) events into a truly global WMBD with two peak campaign days on the second Saturday in both May and October of each year. The theme for WMBD 2019 was to be “migratory birds and plastic pollution”, with campaign materials being developed and a new fundraising strategy being launched at the global level.
73. Mr. Lamarque (France) pointed out some inconsistencies between the English and French versions of the Implementation of the POW (Doc 14), which would be communicated in writing to the Secretariat for revision of the French version.

Actions

The **Secretariat** will enquire with the colleagues in Abu Dhabi about the outcome of the LIFE project.

France to communicate inconsistencies in the French version of Document 14 to the Secretariat for revision.

Decision

The StC took note of the report of the Secretariat on the Implementation of the POW for 2018-2020.

Administrative and Budgetary Matters

9. Financial and Human Resources

9.1 Implementation of the CMS Budget

74. Enkhtuya Sereenen (Secretariat) gave a presentation on the status of the budget summing up document [UNEP/CMS/StC48/Doc.9.1](#). Ariuntuya Dorjsuren (Mongolia), Chair of the Finance and Budget Sub-Committee supported the report given by Ms. Sereenen and elaborated on the issues discussed during the meeting of the committee held on 22 October 2018. The committee included representatives from Brazil, Fiji, France, Mongolia and Germany. The Finance and Budget Sub-Committee also urged the Parties in arrears to pay their outstanding contributions.
75. Three main points were brought to the attention and decision of the StC:

Status of the Trust Fund for Assessed Contributions & Payment Plan for Outstanding Contributions

76. Reporting on the status of the Trust Fund for assessed contributions, Ms. Sereenen noted that arrears of five Parties accounted for 80 per cent of the outstanding contributions (€ 630,325): Brazil with €325,240, Libya with €74,466, the Islamic Republic of Iran with €42,756, Greece with €37,893 and Portugal with €26,563. After deduction of the outstanding contributions from previous years, the estimated Trust Fund balance at the end of 2018 would stand at around €500,000.
77. With regard to the outstanding contributions, the Finance and Budget Sub-Committee proposed to the StC the development of payment plans with the Parties concerned to facilitate clearance of arrears.
78. Marilia Marini (Brazil) gave information on the status of the country's contributions and the reason for the arrears. Whilst the accession document was deposited in 2015, it only took effect at the national level in 2017 since the publication of a presidential decree. 2019 contribution was incorporated in the country's budgetary law in 2018. It was not possible to anticipate the 2020 budget until the year before – each year's budget would be determined in the previous year. Ms. Marini also stated that, in relation to arrears, it would be helpful if the Secretariat could send a high-level communication to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to strengthen the message from the Ministry of Environment on the need of payment of those arrears and have them solved in 2019.

Timing of payment of contributions with a view to COP13 Servicing

79. Due to the revised timeline of COP13, expenses for meeting servicing and staff travel (€410,000) for the COP would already be incurred in the year 2019, while in the COP-approved budget they were scheduled in 2020. Due to the UN accounting system, no expenses could be made without the contributions available in the accounts.
80. In the discussion of the issue, two main options were considered:
1. Issuance of a single invoice in 2019 to cover assessed contributions for 2019 and 2020;
 2. Shift €410,000 from the 2020 to the 2019 budget for the purpose of servicing COP13.

81. Concerns on the single invoice option were voiced by India, the UK, Australia and France, because many countries allocated funds annually and therefore advance payment for two years was difficult, even leaving flexibility for each Party to pay the amount in one payment or in two instalments over 2019 and 2020. Proposal 2 was also not supported by the StC.
82. However, if Brazil and possibly other Parties with significant arrears were able to pay outstanding contributions in the first half of 2019, the funding gap might be closed, and no action would be necessary. It was agreed that if the payments from those Parties with arrears were not made within the first half of 2019, the Chair of the StC would consult the members of the Committee with a view to finding a solution to fill the gap within the following six months.

Minimum Contributions

83. A further suggestion from the Finance and Budget Sub-Committee was to introduce minimum contributions for the next budget adoption, similarly to what is done in AEWA and EUROBATS. A minimum contribution would be calculated as part of the full budget agreed and therefore reduce the contributions of Parties whose payments according to the UN scale of assessment lay above the minimum threshold. Any contributions from new Parties after the adoption of the budget would be added to the Trust Fund.
84. Some discussion took place around the minimum contributions of Parties, with the UK expressing concern about the cumulative effect of payments of a minimum sum across a number of MEAs for some Parties. Supporting a minimum payment, Mr. Lamarque (France) stated that in the case of AEWA the minimum contribution had been set in place at the request of African States that had experienced difficulties to obtain approval for contributions as small as €100; however, €2,000 would be approved more easily. The Chair also noted that in his experience the total cost of a contribution had been calculated at around €1,000, justifying a minimum threshold of contributions.
85. The StC mandated the Secretariat to elaborate a proposal on the minimum contributions to be brought to COP13 for consideration.

Actions

The **Secretariat** will send a high-level communication to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Brazil to strengthen the message from the Ministry of Environment on outstanding contributions.

The **Secretariat** will liaise with the Parties in arrears and ask the Parties to provide payment plans if they are not in a position to pay in one settlement.

The **StC Chair** will consult with the StC in mid-2019 on a solution for the COP13 Servicing budget in case the gap had not been filled by payment of arrears.

The **Secretariat** will prepare a proposal for minimum contributions including rationale for COP13 consideration.

Decision

The StC took note of the report on the implementation of the budget.

9.2 Resource mobilisation

86. Laura Cerasi (Secretariat) presented on the issue of resource mobilization efforts undertaken by the Secretariat, summing up document [UNEP/CMS/StC48/Doc.9.2](#).
87. With active fundraising efforts for voluntary contributions by the Secretariat, a total of almost €3.5 million had been raised since October 2017. In addition, around US\$ 505,000 for the Sharks MOU and US\$ 184,000 for the IOSEA MOU had been raised and the Environment Agency Abu Dhabi contributed US\$ 1.2 million on behalf of the Government of the UAE to host the CMS office in Abu Dhabi.
88. The total funds raised up in 2017 and in 2018 for the implementation of the POW amounted to around €7 million. However, this was only 12 per cent of the amount necessary for the triennium. The Secretariat thanked all donors for their contributions, as well as all governments and organizations that provided indirect and in-kind funding to projects and activities of the CMS.
89. Fundraising efforts were being further pursued. Two large grants from the International Klimainitiative (IKI) were expected in support of the Seagrass Ecosystem Project and the Central Asian Mammal Initiative.
90. The Secretariat urged Parties to consider contributions not only for the implementation of the POW, but also for the fast-approaching COP13.

Decision

The StC took note of the report on resource mobilization.

Strategic and Institutional Matters

10 Conference of the Parties

10.1 Document management and scheduling

91. Melanie Virtue (Secretariat) introduced document [UNEP/CMS/StC48/Doc.10.1](#).

Document Management

92. Ms Virtue noted that with the introduction of the Sessional Committee of the Scientific Council following COP11, and the timing of its last meeting of the triennium approximately four months before COP, the Secretariat had to adopt a number of new document handling practices. After one complete cycle the Secretariat had reviewed how these practices worked and took note of feedback from Parties and other stakeholders. She outlined the modifications proposed.

Proposals to amend the appendices:

93. There was unanimous agreement to maintain the way of handling comments from Parties, the ScC-SC and other stakeholders on proposals to amend the Appendices, with the addition that the Secretariat would inform proponents of any comments received in a timely manner.

Revision of Proposals by proponents:

94. Regarding the revision of proposals by proponents, Ms. Virtue explained that before COP11, a number of proponents had submitted revised proposals to the Secretariat. The majority of revisions related to technical improvements, adding or clarifying information, which had no impact on the scope of the proposal. While some proponents submitted amendments based on these comments to the Secretariat in good time, others submitted them just before or immediately after the opening of COP, by which time it was extremely difficult for the Secretariat to issue revisions.
95. Two options were presented by the Secretariat. Option 1 was supported by Australia, the UK, France and WCS and subsequently adopted by the StC.
96. It was agreed that the Secretariat would post the unedited proposals as received, as soon as possible. If necessary, the Secretariat may append its own comments to the proposal, including notes on any errors in species name, geographic distribution etc. Proponents should provide any such additional information in a new document that will become an addendum to the proposal.
97. Australia urged that proponents are strongly encouraged to respond to comments which are directed towards the eligibility of their proposal.
98. The committee supported the need for a deadline for receipt of such addenda by the Secretariat. After some discussion, with options ranging from 30 to 60 days, it was set at 45 days before COP. In addition to assisting the Secretariat, this would ensure that other Parties would have sufficient time to review and react to the changes before COP.
99. The Chair noted that the Rules of Procedure (ROP) for the COP could not be amended by the StC. The Secretariat reiterated that if a proponent decided to reduce the scope of its proposal after submission, as per the ROP, this could be communicated to the Secretariat at any time.

COP documents with a scientific component submitted by Parties, the Secretariat or Bodies other than the StC:

100. The StC decided to maintain the existing procedure of appending comments by the ScC-SC to each document.

COP documents submitted by the Scientific Council (including WG and members):

101. The Secretariat proposed to deviate from the COP11 procedure of simply appending ScC comments to the documents arising from working groups, and individual Councillors. Ms. Virtue noted that it was felt by many that the ScC should be able to amend its own documents for presentation to COP.
102. The Secretariat would produce the amended documents shortly after the ScC-SC meeting to be available to Parties for consultation well in advance of the COP.
103. James Williams (UK) stated a preference for maintaining the practice of appending comments to the documents for more transparency sake. Mr. Spina (ScC Chair) was in favour of the revision, as he felt it would better reflect the consolidated view of the ScC at COP.

104. Since usually revisions made at the ScC-SC were minor, the Chair suggested to incorporate such comments into the document. Mr. Barbieri (Secretariat) clarified that the special situation of documents produced by the ScC-SC was due to the timing of the session, which fell after the 150-day deadline for COP documents.
105. The StC adopted the process for COP documents submitted by the ScC as recommended by the Secretariat and the Chair.

COP decisions regarding reporting to Subsidiary Bodies:

106. The StC adopted the recommendation by the Secretariat that COP Decisions should only contain the instruction to report back to the StC or ScC if there were specific, concrete actions to be taken by that body at that meeting.
107. The adopted procedures are summarized in Annex 1.

Scheduling

108. Ms. Virtue explained how the timing of COP13 in February 2020 would affect the timing of the next StC meeting. She presented the timeline of meetings and document deadlines leading up to COP13. Holding StC49 around March-June 2019 was presented as one option. However, she noted it would not be long after the present meeting, raising questions about the agenda items to be discussed.
109. The UK and Germany expressed the opinion not to hold a meeting if the agenda was too thin, noted the timing of the CITES COP in May/June 2019, which may be attended by many of the same participants, as well as the 40th anniversary of CMS at the end of June 2019. For these reasons, they were against a meeting in the second quarter of 2019. There was a suggestion to hold StC49 back-to-back with the ScC-SC meeting in November or to increase the length of the StC just before COP13, supported by Bolivia, the UK, Germany, France and Australia speaking on behalf of Fiji.
110. After further discussion on whether another meeting prior to COP was required, the StC decided to request the Secretariat to carefully consider the possible agenda and decide on the need for the meeting. If so, the Secretariat should determine whether to hold it back-to-back with the ScC-SC in November 2019 or hold a longer meeting than usual just before COP13 in February 2020.

Action

The **Secretariat** will inform Parties of the decisions from the StC regarding COP13 document preparation and revision.

The Secretariat will advise the StC on the need and timing for the next StC meeting.

Decisions

The Decisions of the StC regarding document handling are contained in Annex 1.

10.2 Preparation for COP13

111. Soumitra Dasgupta (India) made a presentation about hosting COP13. The information given included a geographical overview, an overview on biodiversity in the country and India's contribution towards wildlife conservation, as well as more detailed information on the region of Gujarat and Gandhinagar (capital city of Gujarat). Information was also given on the venue chosen, the Mahatma Mandir, and its facilities, nearby hotels, distance to the airport and sites for excursions.
112. The Chair thanked India for an excellent presentation and encouraged the StC members to liaise with the Secretariat and with India as the host country on any further ideas and suggestions for COP13.

11 CMS Contribution Towards 2020 and Beyond

113. A presentation given by Laura Cerasi (Secretariat) on the contribution of CMS to the development of the Post-2020 Biodiversity Framework, based on document [UNEP/CMS/StC48/Doc.11](#) outlined the work undertaken in this respect to date. A dedicated Working Group was established by the ScC-SC3. StC members were invited to take part in the group and many expressed their interest to do so. The WG would meet immediately after the StC48 meeting. The StC was asked to endorse the joint Working Group of the Scientific Council and Standing Committee.
114. James Williams (UK) pointed out the need to develop an overall strategic view on the actions of CMS and other MEAs (CBD, Ramsar, etc.) engaging with colleagues across organizations. This was one issue that would be discussed in detail in the Working Group meeting the next day.
115. The Working Group had a first meeting during the Scientific Council, in which the discussion revolved around connectivity, a fundamental principle in terms of ensuring intact and functioning ecosystems but also to encompass the human dimension through people networking, cooperation and participation. The Working Group agreed on the development of a scoping paper on concrete inputs to be put forward by CMS and its community for the development of the framework as well as on a timeline of key events until 2020. A draft roadmap had been prepared, available to the StC in document [UNEP/CMS/StC48/Inf.10](#), mapping out consultations and meetings leading to the CBD COP15 in November 2020.
116. Susan Lieberman (WCS) pointed out the importance for CMS of communicating its positions to the Parties to enable them to take them into account in their own position papers for the COP. She also made the point of the fortunate timing of COP13 in India, allowing outcomes to be fed into the CBD COP 15 in China.
117. Whilst members to the Working Group had been identified, there was still a possibility for StC members to join the Working Group if interested.

Decision

The StC endorsed the joint Working Group under the Scientific Council and Standing Committee on the CMS contributions to the Post-2020 Biodiversity Framework.

12. Revision of the template for National Reports

118. Marco Barbieri (Secretariat) introduced the item by summarizing the steps that had led to the proposal for the revision of the National Report Format submitted to the meeting for consideration. The last of these steps had been a meeting of the informal Advisory Group on the revision of the Format for National Reports, held on 22 October 2018. The meeting had produced a revised version of the proposal which was now in front of StC48. The aim was to adopt the revised format at StC48 in order to be able to launch the national reporting cycle and undertake the analysis within the time available until COP13.
119. James Williams (UK) as chair of the Advisory Group, guided the meeting through document [UNEP/CMS/StC48/Doc.12/Rev.2](#), containing the proposals for a revised format for CMS National Reports as revised by the Group. The outline of the proposed revised format had been made available in document [UNEP/CMS/StC48/Doc.12/Rev.2/Annex](#). Decision 12.4 requested the Secretariat to develop a revision of the format for the national reports to be submitted to this Standing Committee meeting. Issues to consider were how the format could serve as source of information for the review mechanism, how the improved format, aligned with the SPMS, could allow progress towards the achievement of the Strategic Plan targets to be assessed better, while at the same time not creating additional reporting burdens for Parties. Lessons learnt from one reporting cycle should also be fed into the following cycle by the Secretariat.
120. The possibility of using the Online Reporting System (ORS) had been considered, as well as linkages with the review mechanism and the national legislation programme. Whilst such linkages did exist, the group had agreed that the review mechanism should be established first in order not to anticipate outcomes, therefore linkages might be established more strongly at a later date. The relationship between the proposals for a revised National Report Format and the proposals for a Review Mechanism and National Legislation Programme are outlined in [UNEP/CMS/StC48/Inf7](#).
121. The development of a guidance document was proposed to support Parties answering the questions and identifying the type of information requested, as well as on the interpretation of questions themselves.
122. A few further issues were identified, with a view to be addressed in the longer term. These included:
- Development of advice by the Scientific Council and its Sessional Committee on:
 - (i) how to determine when a country had to be considered a Range State for a species, and when a species was to be considered a vagrant for the country;
 - (ii) a strategic approach to determine which species merited listing proposals – notably in relation to section III of the new report format.
 - In relation to the work to be taken forward under the Review Mechanism and the National Legislation Programme, clarification on the interpretation to be given in the national reports to issues concerning
 - (i) Taking and exceptions under Article III.5 of the Convention;
 - (ii) Take by vessels flagged to a Party – specifically in Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction.

123. The advisory group also suggested that once the new format was in use, lessons learnt should be taken into account in the following cycle, further improving the format – especially regarding the section on protected areas, notably whether it needed further development or not.

The suggested timeline for the national reporting format was as follows:

StC 48	Adoption of the template
End Nov 2018	Revised template (in word) available to Parties in three languages
Mid Feb 2019	New revised template available to Parties in three languages in the ORS
17 Aug 2019	Deadline for submission of national reports
COP13	Presentation of analysis of national reports by the Secretariat

124. François Lamarque (France) inquired about whether track change versions of revised documents were available to help ease the burden of reviewing documents for the meeting, as well as whether pre-filled information was expected to be made available from the last cycle of national reporting. Mr. Williams confirmed availability of track change documents for StC consideration and that work will be undertaken to set links to pre-fill information from COP12 reporting when feasible.
125. The meeting was guided through the Rev. 2 document, containing track changes (changes made for Rev.1) and yellow highlights (changes made for Rev.2), section by section, giving background information for each change. The linkage to the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species had been ensured throughout the document. In this report only, discussions on changes in Rev. 2 document are included.
126. Referring to Section III on Species, Juan Pablo Torrico (Bolivia) enquired about the possibility of including a link to [Species+](#), which was planned, pending confirmation from WCMC on the technical viability of including this in the ORS. Individual species names would be linked into the Species+, enabling countries to check the Range States of a particular species.
127. Susan Lieberman (WCS) suggested including the possibility of linking to national legislation and regulations in Section IV on Legal Prohibition of the Taking of Appendix I Species, as they were often available online. Following suggestions from WCS and Australia, the StC agreed, to follow the wording of the CMS Convention in the section on flagged vessels of the draft template: "...vessels flagged to your country engaged outside national jurisdiction limits in intentionally taking Appendix I species".
128. Questions by France and Fiji on the objectivity of impacts of a campaign (Section V Awareness) were posed. It was decided to include the question nevertheless with some direction given in the guidance document accompanying the national reporting. Further assessment on the answers given will also take place to feed into the lessons learnt.
129. Discussion arose around the correct wording of hunting as a pressure in column one of Section X. Ms. Lieberman specified that "hunting" could include subsistence hunting, hunting for local consumption, trophy hunting, commercial hunting, illegal hunting or poaching for illegal trade, which could be confusing and separation into subdivided categories might be necessary to increase the utility of the data obtained. France raised the point that legal hunting in countries was authorized for the explicit reason that it was not perceived as a threat of pressure, in which case only poaching was considered a pressure. From the other perspective any type of taking was to be seen as a removal from the

- population and should be included in population models. After taking all arguments on board, the StC agreed to separate legal and illegal hunting into two separate rows.
130. In Section XIV the option “partially” or “in process” will be added to capture all possible answers.
131. It was clarified that in Section XVII on Traditional Knowledge, the option “not applicable” should be chosen by States that did not distinguish between indigenous and local communities, as raised by Mr. Lamarque during the meeting.
132. The national reporting format as presented in Revision 2 of the document was adopted by the StC pending integration of the small changes documented during the meeting. The final version is attached to this report as Annex 2. A guidance document would be produced for which guidance already has been given by the advisory group, which would be posted on the ORS along with the national reporting template. Mr. Barbieri pointed out that for development of the guidance document some resources were available, while additional resources would be desirable to be able to produce the document without resource constraints.
133. Mr. Lamarque congratulated the Secretariat and the Advisory Group on the production of the new format and suggested the simplification that had been applied throughout to be extrapolated to other Agreements within the CMS Family to ease the reporting burden on Parties.

Actions

The Secretariat to finalize the national report format incorporating agreed changes and make it available to Parties in three languages as a Word document.

The Secretariat to produce an online version of the revised format using the Online Reporting System, pre-filling information available from the COP12 reporting cycle into the new national reporting template when feasible.

The **Secretariat** to produce a guidance document to support Parties in compiling the National Reports according to the revised format.

Decision

The revised National Report Format as included in [UNEP/CMS/StC48/Doc.12/Rev.2/Annex is adopted upon](#) integration of the small changes documented during the meeting.

13. Rules of Procedure of the Scientific Council

134. Marco Barbieri (Secretariat) presented the revision of the Rules of Procedure of the Scientific Council and its Sessional Committee mandated at COP12 (Decision 12.2), underpinned by document [UNEP/CMS/StC48/Doc.13](#), available to the StC members. The Annex of the document contained the Rules of Procedure as finalized by the 3rd Meeting of the Sessional Committee of the Scientific Council (ScC-SC3). The revision was submitted for approval to the StC at this meeting. It was also proposed that, once adopted by the StC, the revised rules be integrated into Resolution 12.4 on the Scientific Council and thereby come to the attention of the COP as a proposed amendment to the Resolution.

135. François Lamarque (France) commented on the use of tenses in the French version, applying conditional and future, where present should be used in French for rules and regulations (Article 2f was cited as an example). The Secretariat explained the use of tenses had been carefully considered by the Sessional Committee in the development of the new rules, and that changes, even if in the languages, would risk distorting the intentions behind individual rules.

Decision

The StC approved the revised Rules of Procedure for the Scientific Council as contained in document UNEP/CMS/StC48/Doc.13.

Interpretation and Implementation of the Convention

15. Review Mechanism and National Legislation Programme

136. María José Ortiz (Secretariat) was introduced to the StC by Marco Barbieri. She would be fully joining the Secretariat in January, taking charge of the Review Mechanism and National Legislation Programme as part of her duties.
137. Ms. Ortiz outlined the progress since COP12 in the operationalization of the Review Mechanism and the National Legislation Programme ([UNEP/CMS/StC48/Doc.15](#)), which was established at COP12 in Manila in 2017 (Resolution 12.9). Annex 1 of Document 15 contained the proposed Case-Information Template for the CMS Review Mechanism, and Annex 2 the Draft Questionnaire for the CMS National Legislation Programme. Both templates were for review and adoption by the StC at this meeting.

Case-Information Template (Review Mechanism) – Annex 1 to doc. UNEP/CMS/StC48/Doc.15

138. Information Document 9 ([UNEP/CMS/StC48/Inf.9](#)) outlined the background and process of the Review Mechanism, giving additional information to the StC members. The Case-Information Template for the Review Mechanism had been developed taking the admissibility criteria adopted by the Parties in Resolution 12.9 fully into account. The template was planned to be made publicly available after adoption by the StC. Parties would then review the implementation of the Review Mechanism at COP13. Ms. Ortiz described in detail the template proposed.
139. Elaine Kendall (UK) noted that the focus of the Review Mechanism was to secure compliance from the Parties, not punish for non-compliance. Therefore, the name “Case-Information Template” might be controversial and suggested “report on possible implementation matters” as an alternative.
140. Further suggestions by the UK included a) to remove requests for information on habitats (in sections “The possible case concerns” and “Summary of facts”), leaving the focus on species, b) to tighten the wording in the summary of facts asking for evidence, avoiding unsubstantiated allegations being made, c) to add guidance on the second section under “Efforts taken to address the matter with the Party concerned”, clarifying that engagement is the normal/desired state and d) to firm the second sentence in the last section on “Supporting documentation and other information” up to read: “The supporting materials should consist of documentation substantiating the information provided above”.

141. Susan Liebermann (WCS) suggested removing the word “final” in the section on compliance with other MEAs and add “or implementation”, leaving the sentence as “Decisions on compliance or implementation”.
142. Comments from the StC were taken into account in a revised version made available and presented to the meeting on day two. Ms. Ortiz once again presented the document detailing all changes applied overnight.
143. Some discussion arose on the use of “habitat” instead of “sites”, deciding finally that references to “habitat” would be removed from the sections:” Summary of facts” and “The possible implementation matter concerns:”.
144. The StC adopted the format for the CMS Review Mechanism “Template for the Communication of a Possible Implementation Matter” presented in document [UNEP/CMS/StC48/Doc.15/Rev.1/Annex 1 with the changes above-mentioned](#). The final version is attached to this report as Annex 3.

Draft Questionnaire (National Legislation Programme) – Annex 2 to doc. UNEP/CMS/StC48/Doc.15

145. Ms. Ortiz (Secretariat) reported that a questionnaire had been drafted and legislation by country compiled based on the information available from national reports between COP9 and COP12, in legislation inventories available online. After adoption by the StC, the questionnaire developed would be completed by Parties and submitted for analysis by the Secretariat for presentation and recommendation to COP13. Afterwards the Secretariat would prepare model legislation and technical guidance on best practices and other capacity-building activities to be offered to Parties as mandated by COP12.
146. Document 15 referred to issues arising from insufficient information available on national legislation due to the nature of questions in the national reporting in the past. The Secretariat expressed the view that with the review of the national reporting format these issues had now been addressed to a great extent. An opportunity would be given for Parties to include information on legislation not included in past national reports.
147. The timeframe suggested by the Secretariat to receive the completed questionnaires was one year before the COP, bringing it to February 2019. Guidance from the StC was sought on this timeline.
148. Elaine Kendall (UK) commented on the National Legislation Questionnaire, pointing out that Resolution 12.9 aims at identifying Parties that had not implemented Article III.5, whilst Article III.4a and 4b were much contested at the COP. The proposed questionnaire was very detailed and would take some time to be finalized and adopted in its current extent. It was ambitious to try to achieve this by COP13. The suggestion of Ms. Kendall was to concentrate on Article III.5 and focus on finding out the information on how its provisions were implemented by the Parties. Oliver Schall (Germany) reiterated the need for a focused questionnaire to minimize reporting needs for the Parties whilst receiving all important information. Narelle Montgomery (Australia) supported the approach to limit the questionnaire to current national legislation in relation to Article III.5. This approach would also fulfil the requirements of Resolution 12.9. During a second stage, Parties could be encouraged to submit information relating to Article III.4a and 4b.

149. François Lamarque (France) noted that in the French text the reference to Decision 12.6 was missing and needed to be added – between points 3 and 4. Also in other places the French version did not match the English, for example in paragraph 13 on page 4 where “migratory behaviour” was translated as “comportement normale”. Mr. Lamarque would send the proposed changes for the French text to the Secretariat.
150. On the inventories, Australia made the point that the text in some places would need clarification on the context. The Secretariat clarified that Parties would have the opportunity to confirm, complete or comment on the inventories provided.
151. Based on the comments received, the Secretariat undertook to prepare a revised version of the template to be considered by the Standing Committee on day two of the meeting, while highlighting that, in order to comply with the mandate from COP12, Parties needed to submit information on Article III.4a and 4b. The Secretariat would assess whether the information on Article III.4a and 4b to be submitted by Parties through the National Reports in 2019 would be sufficient to comply with the mandate of the COP.
152. In the revised Annex 2 presented to the StC on the second day of the meeting sections referring to Article III.4a and 4b were removed. The StC received a presentation on the details of the changes taken into account.
153. Some small further changes were brought forward by Mr. Lamarque (France), Ms. Marini (Brazil), Ms. Kendall and Mr. Williams (UK) to be incorporated:
 - Question 1.1 to be deleted;
 - Replace “indicate” with “state” or “give” in question 1.2;
 - Replace “obstacles” with “reasons” in question 1.5, ending the sentence after “...what the reasons are.”;
 - Use “law(s) and regulations(s)” instead of only “law(s)”;
 - Find a simple way for Parties to select Appendix I species in question 4.1. Possibly a spreadsheet with all species and the relevant questions for each, rather than a drop-down menu.
154. No further comments were received. The next steps after adoption of the template would be to make the questionnaire available to Parties as soon as possible. The deadline for input once the questionnaire was available online was set for the end of February 2019, one year before the COP. It was important to note for Parties that this was a one-off exercise and their input was invaluable to find out best practices in order to assist other Parties.
155. Once input had been received and analyzed, the capacity-building phase of developing model laws and giving support to Parties struggling with compliance would commence. WCS suggested to consult with CITES in this phase, who might work with the same countries in some cases on review of legislations.
156. The StC adopted the format for the CMS National Legislation Programme Questionnaire with the above-mentioned changes. The final version is attached to this report as Annex 4.

Actions

The **Secretariat** to finalize the Template for the Communication of a possible Implementation Matter (Review Mechanism) and the Questionnaire (National Legislation Programme) with the agreed changes and make them available.

France to send proposed changes to the French translation of the Draft Questionnaire on the National Legislation Programme to the Secretariat.

Decision

The StC approved the format for the CMS Review Mechanism Template for the Communication of a possible Implementation Matter and the CMS National Legislation Programme Questionnaire presented in document [UNEP/CMS/StC48/Doc.15/Rev.1](#), pending the changes discussed during the meeting to be applied, as well as the timeframe suggested with a deadline for input by the end of February 2019. The Secretariat will assess whether the information on Article III.4a and 4b to be submitted in the National Reports in 2019 is sufficient to comply with the mandate of the COP as set out in Resolution 12.9, Section II, paragraph 2 and Decision 12.6, paragraph c) or whether a second stage is required as proposed by the meeting.

17. Synergies and Partnerships

157. Laura Cerasi (Secretariat) made a presentation on Synergies and Partnerships, referring to document [UNEP/CMS/StC48/Doc.17](#), outlining existing cooperation with various stakeholders, international organizations and MEAs as mandated by Resolution 11.10 (Rev. COP12).
158. The Africa, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) Capacity-Building Project in cooperation with UNEP was highlighted, with funding received in the second phase of the project, leading into the third phase of the project.
159. The Born Free Foundation had become the latest formal partner to sign an agreement with CMS, bringing the number of cooperating partners to 37.
160. Also, cooperation with other Biodiversity-Related Conventions (BLG) such as CITES, Ramsar, CBD, the IWC and IPBES had been furthered through the implementation of joint work plans. The joint POWs with Ramsar and CBD had reached their expiration. It was proposed to extend them and revise them at a later time with the view to including the outcome of their respective COPs and any consideration of the development of the post-2020 framework. The StC endorsed the extension of the joint workplans of the Secretariat with CBD and Ramsar.
161. Brazil added information on the approval of the Florianopolis Declaration (Declaration 2018/5) at the last International Whaling Commission (IWC) meeting, which also took note of the CMS Resolution on whales on the South Atlantic, encouraging Range States to implement the Action Plan.
162. Resolution 11.10 (Rev. COP12) also referred to strengthening of cooperation with civil society, extending opportunities for civil society to be involved in CMS processes and implement the Convention. In August 2018, the Secretariat had issued a notification asking for inputs, of which three were received from Australia, Poland and Wild Migration on behalf of BirdLife International, OceanCare and Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS). Australia suggested the possibility of extending an invitation to provide a written report to those non-

government organizations that regularly attended COPs. Margi Prideaux (Wild Migration) briefly presented on the input from the NGOs to produce a report on the value of CMS to NGO Partners for the consideration of COP13. A Steering Group would be established to lead the work. Details of all inputs are contained in document [UNEP/CMS/StC48/Inf.4](#). It was suggested that as part of the report to COP13, the steering group would produce a reporting format for civil society.

Decisions

The StC endorsed the extension of the joint workplans with the Secretariats of CBD and Ramsar. The StC took note of the report by the Secretariat, as well as the inputs received on the relationship between the CMS Family and the civil society and particularly of the suggestion of NGOs to produce a format for civil society report to COP.

17.1. Cooperation with IPBES

163. Marco Barbieri (Secretariat) outlined information on the cooperation with IPBES, giving a brief summary of document [UNEP/CMS/StC48/Doc.17.1](#) and its annex 1.
164. The cooperation with IPBES had been ongoing since the launch of the platform in 2012 and was formally based on CMS Resolution 10.8 (Rev.COP12). Regular communication between the Secretariats, including CMS participation in IPBES meetings and in multidisciplinary expert panel meetings as observer through the Scientific Council was taking place. The three items discussed under this agenda item were:
1. Review of the Summaries for Policymakers (SPMs) of IPBES Regional and Thematic Assessments;
 2. CMS contribution to the Review of the Functions of IPBES;
 3. CMS contributions to the IPBES 2nd POW (2020-2030).

Review of the Summaries for Policymakers (SPMs) of IPBES Regional and Thematic Assessments

165. The review showed only partial relevance of the Assessments to CMS, mainly due to biodiversity being addressed as a whole and limited data integrated on wildlife and migratory species in particular. The feedback had already been presented to IPBES at the 11th IPBES Bureau and Multidisciplinary Expert Panel (MEP) meeting.
166. The Secretariat suggested to undertake a more in-depth evaluation of the full assessments and submit a comprehensive review to COP13. Reservations on this approach were expressed by the UK and France regarding the investment of much time and resources into a full review possibly not revealing much more substantive information than included in the SPMs. Based on this feedback, the Secretariat would limit investment of resources into a further assessment to a minimum.

CMS Contribution to the Review of the Functions of IPBES

167. IPBES had commissioned a review of the effectiveness of administrative and scientific functions of IPBES, inviting the CMS Secretariat for input. The main recommendation of the Secretariat based on the assessment of the SPMs was the establishment of a formal link between IPBES and the decision-making bodies of the Biodiversity-related MEAs. At the moment, CMS was an observer to the IPBES Plenary and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel (MEP) and the Secretariat had signed a MOU with the IPBES Secretariat. However, there

were no formal links between IPBES and decision-making bodies of the CMS. Also, the establishment of mechanisms for biodiversity-related MEAs to feed into the IPBES priority setting could be considered in this context, as well as the involvement of CMS in the inception phase of the development of terms of reference of relevant new assessments.

168. The UK added to relay to IPBES the opportunities that exist through InforMEA, acting as a collation of the resolutions and decisions that have been taken across MEAs, helping to assess issues relevant across a number of MEAs.

CMS Contributions to the IPBES 2nd POW (2020-2030)

169. IPBES was in the process of developing its 2nd POW (2020-2030) to be presented for adoption at the IPBES-7 Plenary in April 2019. Inputs had been solicited from a variety of stakeholders, including Conventions. The timeframe for input from conventions was still open. The Secretariat had developed a proposal to undertake an assessment on connectivity conservation, which was included in [UNEP/CMS/StC48/Doc.17.1/Annex](#). The proposal included input received from members of the Scientific Council. The proposal had also been shared with other MEAs with a view to a possible joint submission, and several of them had indicated interest in collaborating on specific areas of interest for them (UNCCD, CITES, Ramsar and World Heritage Convention, possibly others). Fernando Spina reported of having introduced the proposal to the meeting of the IPBES MEP taking place in parallel with StC48, which had received it with interest.
170. Oliver Shall (Germany) noted that further cooperation with IPBES was also desirable for Germany, specifically concerning a new study on pollinators in connection with the insect strategy being developed, as well as the effect of plastic garbage on various species.
171. The StC took note of the report and progress on the raised issues and agreed on the further development and submission to IPBES of the proposal for an assessment on connectivity.
172. The Secretariat also reminded the StC that Regional Members were requested by Res. 10.8 (Rev. COP12) to liaise with CMS Focal Points in their regions and with their IPBES counterparts in every relevant forum to promote the steps discussed above, improving the Convention's science-policy interface.

Actions

The **Secretariat** to further develop the proposal for an assessment on connectivity conservation in consultation with other interested MEAs and submit it to IPBES.

Regional Members are requested to liaise with CMS Focal Points in their regions and with their IPBES counterparts in every relevant forum to promote cooperation and collaboration in the mentioned areas of work.

Decision

The **Secretariat** to limit resources invested in further review of the IPBES Assessments to a minimum.

The **StC** took note of the report and progress on the raised issues and agreed on the development of the proposal on assessment on connectivity for submission to IPBES.

18. Adoption of Bird Species Action Plans

173. Borja Heredia (Secretariat) presented the three draft International Single Species Action Plans (ISSAPs) for the Conservation of the [White-headed Duck](#), the [Dalmatian Pelican](#) and the [European Turtle Dove](#), referring to document [UNEP/CMS/StC48/Doc.18](#) and its three annexes.
174. At COP12 the StC was mandated to adopt various Bird Action Plans. The three ISSAPs presented at this meeting were recommended for adoption by the StC under this mandate.
175. The ISSAP for the White-headed Duck (*Oxyura leucocephala*) was a revision of an existing Action Plan. The species was included in CMS Appendix 1 and 2 and in danger of extinction. The main problems were the degradation and loss of habitat, as well as hybridization with an invasive species, the Ruddy Duck (*Oxyura jamaicensis*). Countries in Europe were taking some actions towards control or eradication of this species. This issue was taken care of with a separate Action Plan. The ISSAP was presented for adoption under the CMS, as well as under AEWA at its MOP7 in December 2018.
176. The Dalmatian Pelican (*Pelicanus crispus*) was a species included in CMS Appendix 1 and 2, with a very wide range from the Mediterranean to Mongolia and China. Main threats included loss of habitat and degradation of breeding sites, as well as illegal hunting, for example in Mongolia and Kazakhstan, where the upper part of beak was traditionally used to make horse brushes. The ISSAP had been drafted under the leadership of AEWA. The ISSAP was presented for adoption under the CMS, as well as under AEWA at the MOP7 and at the meeting of the East Asian Australasian Flyway Partnership in China in December 2018, thereby covering all relevant MEAs.
177. The third ISSAP was for the European Turtle Dove (*Streptopelia turtur*), a CMS Appendix 2 species that was huntable in many Range States. Conservation issues were in relation to habitat changes and agricultural intensification, as well as illegal hunting and questions of sustainability of legal hunting. The ISSAP had been adopted by the EU with reservations from various countries on a disclaimer in the Action Plan concerning hunting. Positions of the few countries that had expressed them would be added to the disclaimer at a later stage.

Decision

The StC adopted the three ISSAPs for the Conservation of the White-headed Duck, the Dalmatian Pelican and the European Turtle Dove.

Concluding Items

19 Dates and Venue of the 49th Meeting of the Standing Committee

178. In introducing this agenda item, the Chair referred to the relevant discussion held under item 10.1. The Secretariat was mandated to evaluate whether a full meeting of the StC before COP13 was needed, and if so, whether holding the meeting back-to-back to the 4th Meeting of the Sessional Committee of the Scientific Council or expanding the scope of the StC meeting immediately preceding the COP. In relation to an expression of interest by Mongolia to host the next meeting of the StC, the Chair expressed his gratitude for the kind offer and asked Ms. Dorjsuren to relay the message that the StC was keen to consider the offer. However, due to scheduling issues, this would not be possible for the 49th meeting, and Mongolia was asked whether it would be possible for it to host the first intersessional meeting of the StC after COP13.
179. Mr. Barbieri (Secretariat) noted that an information document ([UNEP/CMS/StC48/Inf.6](#)) had been prepared by the Secretariat on the conditions and requirements to host StC meetings.

20 Any other business

180. A celebration for Borja Heredia, Head of the Avian team, who was to retire by the end of October 2018 after more than eight years at the Secretariat took place after the Brown Bag lunch. The Chair reiterated his good wishes for the future, also in the name of the StC.
181. Patricia Moss would also leave the Secretariat soon after more than 20 years with CMS, starting in 1998. She had supported every COP since CMS COP6 in Cape Town and serviced 30 meetings of the StC, the first one being StC19 in January 1999, at a time when the Secretariat had 10 staff and the Convention consisted of 57 Parties. The Chair and StC members congratulated her on this long-year achievement and wished her well.
182. The Secretariat requested feedback on the Brown Bag lunches. The StC members expressed appreciation for the initiative, thanking the Secretariat for the stimulating information and ideas proposed.

21. Concluding remarks

183. Concluding the meeting, the Chair reiterated the feelings of the StC members about the Brown Bag lunches as an informative initiative and thanked the Secretariat. He expressed once more best wishes from the whole StC for Bradnee Chambers, wishing health and recovery.
184. After the customary exchange of courtesies, the Chair declared the meeting for closed.

HANDLING OF COMMENTS AND AMENDMENTS ON PROPOSALS AND DOCUMENTS FOR COP13

Following the discussion of Document StC48/Doc.10.1, the Standing Committee agreed the following procedures for handling comments and amendments:

I. Proposals to Amend the Appendices

1. ScC-SC Comments on Proposals:

Mandate: CMS Resolution 12.4, Annex, paragraph. 12c

“assessing proposals for the amendment of Appendices I and II from a scientific and technical standpoint, and providing advice to the Conference of the Parties regarding proposed amendments;”

Procedure:

- Comments arising from the ScC-SC meeting will be appended to the proposal and posted online as soon as possible after the meeting.
- The Secretariat will send a copy of comments to relevant proponents for their information and possible action, as soon as possible.

2. Comments by Parties on Proposals:

Mandate: CMS, Article X, paragraph 3:

“Any comments on the text [of a proposed amendment] by the Parties shall be communicated to the Secretariat not less than 60 days before the meeting begins”.

Procedure:

- After the 60-day deadline, all comments will be compiled into a single document, and posted on the web.
- The Secretariat will inform all proponents of Party comments on their proposals as soon as possible after receipt by the Secretariat.

3. Comments by Inter-governmental bodies on Proposals:

Mandate: Res.11.33, Para 5:

“Requests the Secretariat to consult other relevant intergovernmental bodies, including RFMOs, having a function in relation to any species subject to a proposal for amendment of the Appendices....”.

Procedure:

- As with the Party comments, and using the same deadline, all comments will be compiled into one document and posted on the web.
- The Secretariat will inform all proponents of IGO comments on their proposals as soon as possible after they are posted.

4. Revisions of Proposals by proponents:

Mandate: Rule 21, paragraph 2 of the Rules of Procedure (below) allow proponents to amend proposals at any time. A footnote clarifies how this relates to the scope of the proposal but is silent on amendments which amount to improvements to background information.

“The Representative of the Party that has submitted a proposal for amendment of Appendices I or II may, at any time, withdraw the proposal or amend it to reduce its scope² or to make it more precise. Once a proposal has been withdrawn, it may not be re-submitted during the meeting. Once a proposal has been amended to reduce its scope, it may not be reamended during the meeting to increase the scope of the amended proposal”.

Footnote 2: The phrase “reduce its scope” includes situations, such as amending a proposal to include a species in Appendix I so as to include that same species in Appendix II; and amending a species listing proposal to include fewer populations. However, it does not include situations, such as amending a proposal to include a species in Appendix II to include that same species in Appendix I; or amending a species listing proposal to add populations to the proposal or include different populations in the proposal.

Procedure:

- The Secretariat will post the unedited Proposals as received, as soon as possible.
- If necessary, the Secretariat may append its own comments to the proposal, including notes on any errors in species name, geographic distribution etc.
- Proponents are strongly encouraged to respond to comments which are directed towards the eligibility of their proposal. Proponents should provide any such additional information in a new document that will become an addendum to the proposal.
- The deadline for receipt of such addenda by the Secretariat is 45 days before COP.
- If a proponent decides to reduce the scope of their proposal after submission, this can be communicated to the Secretariat at any time.

II. **COP documents with a scientific component submitted by Parties, the Secretariat or bodies other than the Scientific Council**

Mandate: Rule 22, paragraph 3 of the COP Rules of Procedure:

“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 120 days prior to the commencement of the meeting. The Scientific Council shall provide appropriate advice to the Standing Committee on all proposed Resolutions and Decisions”.

Procedure:

- As for proposals to amend the Appendices, comments by the ScC-SC on proposed Resolutions and Decisions will be appended to each document.

III. **COP documents submitted by the Scientific Council (including its working groups and members)**

Procedure:

- All documents submitted by the ScC will be amended after the ScC-SC meeting, to incorporate any changes or comments proposed during that meeting.

IV. **COP Decisions regarding reporting to subsidiary bodies.**

StC Advice to Secretariat and Parties drafting Decisions:

- Decisions should only contain the instruction to report back to StC or ScC if there are specific, concrete actions to be taken by that body at that meeting.

Outline of proposed revised format for
CMS National Reports

Contents

<u>HIGH-LEVEL SUMMARY OF KEY MESSAGES</u>	33
<u>I. ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION</u>	33
<u>II. ACCESSION/RATIFICATION OF CMS AGREEMENTS/MOUs</u>	35
<u>III. SPECIES ON THE CONVENTION APPENDICES</u>	36
<u>IV. LEGAL PROHIBITION OF THE TAKING OF APPENDIX I SPECIES</u>	38
<u>V. AWARENESS</u>	41
<u>VI. MAINSTREAMING MIGRATORY SPECIES IN OTHER SECTORS AND PROCESSES</u>	42
<u>VII. GOVERNANCE, POLICY AND LEGISLATIVE COHERENCE</u>	43
<u>VIII. INCENTIVES</u>	44
<u>IX. SUSTAINABLE PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION</u>	45
<u>X. THREATS AND PRESSURES AFFECTING MIGRATORY SPECIES; INCLUDING OBSTACLES TO MIGRATION</u>	46
<u>XI. CONSERVATION STATUS OF MIGRATORY SPECIES</u>	49
<u>XII. COOPERATING TO CONSERVE MIGRATION SYSTEMS</u>	51
<u>XIII. AREA-BASED CONSERVATION MEASURES</u>	52
<u>XIV. ECOSYSTEM SERVICES</u>	54
<u>XV. SAFEGUARDING GENETIC DIVERSITY</u>	54
<u>XVI. NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS</u>	55
<u>XVII. TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE, INNOVATIONS AND PRACTICES OF INDIGENOUS AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES</u>	56
<u>XVIII. KNOWLEDGE, DATA AND CAPACITY-BUILDING</u>	57
<u>XIX. RESOURCE MOBILIZATION</u>	58

HIGH-LEVEL SUMMARY OF KEY MESSAGES	
In your country, in the reporting period, what does this report reveal about:	
The most successful aspects of implementation of the Convention? (List up to five items):	
.....	
.....	
The greatest difficulties in implementing the Convention? (List up to five items):	
.....	
.....	
The main priorities for future implementation of the Convention? (List up to five items):	
.....	
.....	

I. ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION	
Name of Contracting Party
Date of entry into force of the Convention in your country	DDMMYY [automatic population]
Any territories which are excluded from the application of the Convention [this question can be left blank]
Report compiler	Name and title:..... Full name of institution:..... Telephone:..... Email:

<p>Designated CMS National Focal Point</p>	<p>Name and title of designated Focal Point:..... Full name of institution: Mailing address:..... Telephone: Email:..... [automatic population]</p>
<p>Representative on Scientific Council</p>	<p>Name and title: Full name of institution:..... Mailing address:..... Telephone: Email:..... [automatic population]</p>

II. ACCESSION/RATIFICATION OF CMS AGREEMENTS/MOUs

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

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

Updates or corrections:

[free text box]

CMS Instrument [automatic population]

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

III. SPECIES ON THE CONVENTION APPENDICES

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

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

Terrestrial mammals (not including bats):

- Addax nasomaculatus*
- Bos grunniens*
- etc....

Aquatic mammals:

- Balaena mysticetus*
- Megaptera novaeangliae*
- etc....

Bats:

- Tadarida brasiliensis*

Birds:

- Oxyura leucocephala*
- Anser erythropus*
- etc...

Reptiles:

- Chelonia mydas*
- Eretmochelys imbricata*
- etc...

Fish:

- Acipenser sturio*
- Pangasianodon gigas*
- etc.....

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

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

Terrestrial mammals (not including bats):

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

Aquatic mammals:

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

Bats:

- Eidolon helvum*
- Otomops madagascariensi*
- etc...

Birds:

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

Reptiles:

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

Fish:

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

Insects:

- Danaus plexippus*

IV. LEGAL PROHIBITION OF THE TAKING OF APPENDIX I SPECIES

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

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

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

Please identify the legal statute(s) concerned

.....
.....

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

[If selected yes for 'some' this appears]

Please indicate the species for which taking is prohibited:

(select all that apply)

- Species X
- Species Y

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

Please identify the legal statute(s) concerned

.....
.....

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

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

.....

Please indicate the species for which taking is prohibited:

(select all that apply)

- All Appendix I species
- Species X
- Species Y

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

Please identify the legal statute(s) concerned

.....
.....

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

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

- Yes
- No

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

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

Species	Reasons for exception (as defined in Art III(5))	Details of any applicable time or area limitations, and the nature of the “extraordinary circumstances” that make the exception necessary
Species X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> a) the taking is for scientific purposes. <input type="checkbox"/> b) the taking is for the purpose of enhancing the propagation or survival of the affected species. <input type="checkbox"/> c) the taking is to accommodate the needs of traditional subsistence users of such species. <input type="checkbox"/> d) extraordinary circumstances so require. 	[free text]
Species Y		
....		

Where the taking of all Appendix I species is not prohibited and the reasons for exceptions in Article III(5) do not apply, are steps being taken to develop new legislation to prohibit the taking of all relevant species?

[only appears if 'Yes for some species' or 'Yes for part of the country' or 'No' was selected in 'Is the taking of Appendix I species prohibited by national legislation in accordance with CMS Article III(5)?']

- Yes
- No

If yes, please indicate which of the following stages of development applies:

- Legislation being considered
- Legislation in draft
- Legislation fully drafted and being considered for adoption in [insert year.....]
- Other (please specify) [free text]

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

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

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

[free text box]

V. AWARENESS

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

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

(select all that apply)

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

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

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

[\[free text\]](#)

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

Tick one box

- 1 very little impact
- 2 small impact
- 3 good impact
- 4 large positive impact
- not known

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

[\[free text\]](#)

VI. MAINSTREAMING MIGRATORY SPECIES IN OTHER SECTORS AND PROCESSES

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

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

- Yes
- No

If yes, please provide a short summary:

[\[free text\]](#)

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

- Yes
- No

If yes, please provide a short summary:

[\[free text\]](#)

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

[\[free text\]](#)

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

[\[free text\]](#)

VII. GOVERNANCE, POLICY AND LEGISLATIVE COHERENCE

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

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

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

If yes, please provide a short summary:

[\[free text\]](#)

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

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

Tick one box

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

Please describe briefly how this assessment was made

[\[free text\]](#)

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

- Yes
- No

If yes, please provide a short summary:

[\[free text\]](#)

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

- Yes
- No

If yes, please provide a short summary:

[\[free text\]](#)

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

- Yes
- No

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

[\[free text\]](#)

VIII. INCENTIVES

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

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

- Yes
- Partly / in some areas
- No, but there is scope to do so
- No, because no such incentives have existed

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

[\[free text\]](#)

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

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

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

[\[free text\]](#)

IX. SUSTAINABLE PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION

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

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

- Yes
- In development / planned
- No

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

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

[\[free text\]](#)

Please describe what evidence exists to show that the intended results of these measures are being achieved. [\[free text\]](#)

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

What is preventing progress?

[\[free text\]](#)

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

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

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

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

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

What are the most significant advances that have been made since the previous report in countering any of the pressures identified above? (Identify the pressures concerned).
[\[free text\]](#)

What are the most significant negative trends since the previous report concerning the pressures identified above? (Identify the pressures concerned).
[\[free text\]](#)

Have you adopted new legislation or other domestic measures in the reporting period in response to CMS Article III(4) (b) (*“Parties that are Range States of a migratory species listed in Appendix I shall endeavor ... to prevent, remove, compensate for or minimize, as appropriate, the adverse effects of activities or obstacles that seriously impede or prevent the migration of the species”*)?

- Yes
- No

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

.....

.....

[\[add link\]](#)

[\[options to add more links and legislation numbers\]](#)

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

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

[\[free text\]](#)

XI. CONSERVATION STATUS OF MIGRATORY SPECIES

(SPMS Target 8: The conservation status of all migratory species, especially threatened species, has considerably improved throughout their range.)

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

Terrestrial mammals (not including bats)

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

Aquatic mammals

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

Bats

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

Birds

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

Reptiles

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

Fish

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

Insects

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

[ability to add more species/subspecies]

XII. COOPERATING TO CONSERVE MIGRATION SYSTEMS

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

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

- Yes
 No

If yes, please provide a short summary.

[\[free text\]](#)

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

- Yes
 No

If yes, please specify which countries have been approached.

[\[Add country drop-down list, allowing multiple selections\]](#)

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

- Yes
 No

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

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

- Yes
 No

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

XIII. AREA-BASED CONSERVATION MEASURES

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

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

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

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

[\[free text\]](#)

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

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

If yes or partly, please provide a short summary.

[\[free text\]](#)

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

Has your country adopted any new legislation or other domestic measures in the reporting period in response to CMS Article III(4) (a) (*“Parties that are Range States of a migratory species listed in Appendix I shall endeavor ... to conserve and, where feasible and appropriate, restore those habitats of the species which are of importance in removing the species from danger of extinction”*)?

- Yes
- No

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

.....

[\[insert link\]](#)

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

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

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

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

[\[free text\]](#)

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

- Yes
- No

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

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

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

[\[free text\]](#)

XIV. ECOSYSTEM SERVICES

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

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

- Yes
- Partly / in progress
- No

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

[\[free text\]](#)

Source: Year of publication: Link:

Source: Year of publication: Link:

Source: Year of publication: Link:

[\[add more\]](#)

XV. SAFEGUARDING GENETIC DIVERSITY

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

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

- Yes
- No

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

- captive breeding
- captive breeding & release
- gene typing research
- reproductive material archives/repositories
- Other (please specify) [\[free text\]](#)

XVI. NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS

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

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

- Yes
- No

If yes:

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

[\[insert link\]](#) [\[upload attachment / relevant extract\]](#)

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

[\[free text\]](#)

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

[\[free text\]](#)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(select all that apply)

- research & documentation
- engagement initiatives
- formal recognition of rights
- inclusion in governance mechanisms
- management strategies & programmes that integrate traditional & indigenous interests
- other (please specify) [\[free text\]](#)

Please add comments on the implementation of the actions concerned.

[\[free text\]](#)

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

Please select one option:

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

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

[free text]

XVIII. KNOWLEDGE, DATA AND CAPACITY-BUILDING

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

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

(select all that apply)

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

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

[question will only appear for those strategies selected above]

E.g.

Education campaigns in schools

[free text]

Public awareness campaigns

[free text]

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

(select all that apply)

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

XIX. RESOURCE MOBILIZATION

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

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

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

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

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

- Increased
- The same
- Decreased
- Not known

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

- Yes
- No

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

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

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

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

.....

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

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

- Increased
- The same
- Decreased
- Not known

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

[\[free text\]](#)

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

[\[free text\]](#)

CMS NATIONAL LEGISLATION PROGRAMME

QUESTIONNAIRE

Contracting Party _____

Submitted by:

First Name: _____

Surname(s): _____

Position: _____

Full name of institution: _____

Telephone: _____

Email: : _____

Section I - General

1. Does your country have in place any kind of legislation to implement the CMS?

Yes

No

1.1. If yes, please give the following details:

1.1.1. Does the law(s) you have in place require regulations, ordinances or decrees to implement the law(s)?

1.1.2. List the name of the law(s) and regulation(s). Please attached the law(s) and regulation(s) or they are available online, please provide the links to the relevant law(s) and regulation(s).

1.2. If no legislation is in place, please explain what the reasons for not having in place such law(s) and regulation(s)

2. Do the law(s) and regulation(s) above include a list of all CMS species currently included in Appendix I?

Yes
No

2.1 If yes, what process is required to apply the law(s) and regulation(s) to additions to Appendix I made at Conferences of the Parties?

2.2 If no, what process is required to apply the law(s) and regulation(s) to additions to Appendix I made at Conferences of the Parties?

2.3 Do the law(s) and regulation(s) distinguish between CMS-listed species for which you are a Range State and those for which you are not?

Yes
No

3. Are any of the law(s) and regulation(s) included in your most recent national report no longer in force?

Yes
No

3.1 If yes, please identify the law(s) and regulation(s).

Section II - Article III.5 “Take” Prohibition

Article III.5 prohibits the “taking” of Appendix I-listed species. “Taking” is defined to include “taking, hunting, fishing capturing, harassing, deliberate killing, or attempting to engage in any such conduct.”

4. Do the law(s) and regulation(s) you have in place prohibit taking (as defined by the Convention) of all CMS Appendix I species?

Yes
No

4.1 If no, which species are not covered by the prohibition against taking (as defined by the Convention)?

Drop down menu of all Appendix I species

4.2. If no, explain why your country does not prohibit the taking (as defined by the Convention) of all CMS Appendix I species.

*If the law(s) and regulation(s) you have in place do prohibit the taking of all CMS Appendix I species in regard to **all aspects** of the definition of taking by the Convention, please move on to Section III.*

*If there is **no legislation at all** prohibiting the taking of Annex I species, you may move on to Question 10.*

5. Do the law(s) and regulation(s) you have in place prohibit hunting or fishing of all CMS Appendix I species?

Yes
No

5.1 If no, which species are not covered by the prohibition against hunting?

Drop down menu of all Appendix I species

5.2 If no, explain why your country does not prohibit the hunting of all CMS Appendix I species.

6. Do the law(s) and regulation(s) you have in place prohibit capturing of all CMS Appendix I species?

Yes
No

6.1 If no, which species are not covered by the prohibition against capturing?

Drop down menu of all Appendix I species

6.2 If no, explain why your country does not prohibit the capturing of all CMS Appendix I species.

7. Do the law(s) and regulation(s) you have in place prohibit harassing of all CMS Appendix I species?

Yes

No

7.1 If no, which species are not covered by the prohibition against harassing?

Drop down menu of all Appendix I species

7.2 If no, explain why your country does not prohibit the harassing of all CMS Appendix I species.

8. Do the law(s) and regulation(s) you have in place prohibit deliberate killing of all CMS Appendix I species?

Yes

No

8.1 If no, which species are not covered by the prohibition against deliberate killing?

Drop down menu of all Appendix I species

8.2 If no, explain why your country does not prohibit the deliberate killing of all CMS Appendix I species.

9. Do the law(s) and regulation(s) you have in place prohibit “attempting” to engage in hunting, fishing, capturing, harassing, deliberate killing of all CMS Appendix I species?

Yes

No

9.1 If no, which species are not covered by the prohibition against “attempting” to engage in hunting, fishing, capturing, harassing, deliberate killing of CMS Appendix I species?

Drop down menu of all Appendix I species

9.2 If no, explain why your country does not prohibit “attempting” to engage in hunting, fishing, capturing, harassing, deliberate killing of all CMS Appendix I species.

9.3 Please explain how your country would enforce against individuals you suspected of attempting to take Appendix I species.

10. If you have no legislation in place, do you have any plans to ensure that the taking, as defined by CMS, of all Appendix I species is prohibited?

Yes
No

10.1 If no, please explain the reasons why there are no plans to enact legislation to prohibit taking of Appendix I species

Section III - Article III.5: Exceptions to the “Take” Prohibition

Article III.5 allows exemptions to the prohibition against taking only if the taking is for scientific purposes, enhancing the propagation or survival of the species, accommodating the needs of traditional subsistence users, and in extraordinary circumstances.

11. Do the law(s) and regulation(s) you have in place allow taking of Appendix I species for scientific purposes?

Yes
No

11.1 If yes, for which species?

All Appendix I species
Drop down menu of all Appendix I species

12. Do the law(s) and regulation(s) you have in place allow taking for the purpose of enhancing the propagation or survival of the affected species?

Yes
No

12.1 If yes, for which species?

All Appendix I species
Drop down menu of all Appendix I species

13. Do the law(s) and regulation(s) you have in place allow taking to accommodate the needs of traditional subsistence users of such species?

Yes
No

13.1 If yes, for which species?

All Appendix I species
Drop down menu of all Appendix I species

14. Do the law(s) and regulation(s) you have in place allow taking when extraordinary circumstances so require?

Yes
No

14.1 If yes, what are the extraordinary circumstances under which an exception may be granted?

14.2 If yes, for which species?

All Appendix I species
Drop down menu of all Appendix I species

15. Do the law(s) and regulation(s) you have in place allow taking for any other purpose (for example, public display)?

Yes
No

15.1 If yes, what are those other purposes?

15.2 If yes, for which species?

All Appendix I species
Drop down menu of all Appendix I species

16. Article III.5 allows the exceptions described above provided that such exceptions are “precise as to content and limited in space and time. Such taking should not operate to the disadvantage of the species.” Do the law(s) and regulation(s) of your country allow exceptions consistent with these limitations?

Yes
No

16.1 If yes, please describe the language in the law(s) and regulation(s) you have in place that limits the use of these exceptions to the prohibition against the taking of Appendix I species.

16.2 If no, please explain the reasons that limit the use of these exceptions to the prohibition against the taking of Appendix I species.

Section IV - Reservations, territorial inclusions, and territorial exclusions

Under international law, treaties are presumed to apply to the entirety of a State’s territory, including that State’s overseas territories. A State has the right to exclude overseas territories from application of a treaty in its instruments of ratification. A State also has the right to adopt the opposite presumption through State practice. Consequently, the Secretariat is not certain in all circumstances whether a CMS Party has agreed to apply CMS to all of its territory.

In addition, Article I.1(h) defines a Range State as any State that exercises jurisdiction over any part of the range of that migratory species, or a State, flag vessels of which are engaged outside national jurisdictional limits in taking that migratory species (emphasis added). Thus, a Party must extend the prohibitions of Article III.5 to vessels that it flags and which operate on the high seas.

17. Do the prohibitions of Article III.5 of CMS apply to all of your land-based territory, including all overseas territories and semi-autonomous zones within your country?

Yes
No

17.1 If no, please list the overseas territories and semi-autonomous ones to which CMS does not apply.

18. Do the prohibitions of Article III.5 of CMS apply in your territorial seas?

Yes
No

19. Do the prohibitions of Article III.5 of CMS apply in your exclusive economic zone?

- Yes
- No

20. Do the prohibitions of Article III.5 of CMS apply to any vessels flagged by your country and which operate outside national jurisdiction?

- Yes
- No

20.1 If yes, which vessels?

- All vessels
- Fishing vessels only
- Other (please explain).

20.2 If no, does your country flag vessels (fishing, cargo, cruise, other) that operate in areas beyond national jurisdiction?

Section V – Final comments

Please add any further relevant information regarding the law(s) and regulation(s) you have in place to implement Art. III.5, such as success stories or challenges you may be facing in the development and/or enforcement of legislation.

CMS REVIEW MECHANISM

TEMPLATE FOR THE COMMUNICATION OF A POSSIBLE IMPLEMENTATION MATTER

Submitted by:

First Name: _____

Surname(s): _____

On behalf of (Please select one of the following options):

a Party, please specify: _____

the Secretariat

the Standing Committee

an Organization¹, please specify: _____

Position: _____

Address: _____

City/Town: _____ Postcode: _____

County/State/Province: _____ Country: _____

Telephone: _____

Email: _____

Website: _____

¹ Any body or agency technically qualified in the protection, conservation and management of migratory species, which is either: 1) an international non-governmental agency or body; or 2) an accredited national non-governmental agency or body (Res.12.9, Section I. B. 2. e)

The possible implementation matter concerns

Party *(Please provide the name of the CMS Party involved)*

Species/Population(s) *(Please name the CMS-listed species or population(s) potentially affected) [See CMS Appendix I and II](#)*

Site(s) *(Please name the relevant site(s) potentially affected)*

Specific implementation matters

Please describe how the case concerns the non-implementation of Articles III.4, III.5, III.7 and VI.2 of the Convention

Non-implementation of Article III, paragraph 4 *(please describe) See Article III.4*

Non-implementation of Article III, paragraph 5 *(please describe) See Article III.5*

Non-implementation of Article III, paragraph 7 *(please describe) See Article III.7*

Non-implementation of Article VI, paragraph 2 *(please describe) See Article VI.2*

Summary of facts *(Please briefly detail the evidence you have found of non-implementation describing the possible negative effects for the species/population(s)/sites(s) involved. Please do not exceed 1500 words)*

Efforts taken to address the matter with the Party concerned

Please indicate which measures or procedures you have invoked to address the matter of non-implementation with the Party concerned. Specify which measures you used, when they were used, and what the results were:

Compliance with other Multilateral Environmental Agreements

Have the potentially affected species or their habitats been the subject of decisions on compliance and/or implementation by other Multilateral Environmental Agreements? *(In particular, CMS Family Agreements and Instruments, the Bern Convention, Ramsar Convention, CITES and the World Heritage Convention. If yes, please describe.)*

Supporting documentation and other information

Please attach sufficient evidence substantiating the submission. The supporting materials should consist of any documentation substantiating the information provided above, including material evidence such as photos; relevant national legislation - highlighting the most relevant provisions; decisions/results of other procedures; relevant correspondence with the authorities.

Attach files

ANNEX 5

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS/LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS/LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES

MEMBERS/MEMBRES/MIEMBROS

Norway (Chair)

Mr. Øystein **Størkersen**
Principal Adviser
Norwegian Environment Agency
oystein.rune.storkersen@miljodir.no

AFRICA/AFRIQUE/ÁFRICA**Congo**

M Jérôme **Mokoko Ikonga**
Directeur Adjoint de Wildlife Conservation
Society
Programme Congo
Ministère de l'Economie Forestière
jrmokoko@gmail.com

ASIA**Mongolia (Vice-Chair)**

Ms. Ariuntuya **Dorjsuren**
Senior Officer
Division of Climate Change and International
Cooperation
Ministry of Environment and Tourism
ariuntuya@mne.gov.mn

EUROPE**France**

Mr. Francois **Lamarque**
International and European Affairs Officer
Ministère de la transition écologique et solidaire
(MTES)
francois.lamarque@developpement-durable.gouv.fr

SOUTH & CENTRAL AMERICA & CARIBBEAN**Bolivia**

Mr. Juan Pablo **Torrigo**
Knowledge Management Officer
Ministry of Water and Environment
torrigo.juanpablojose@gmail.com

Costa Rica

Ms. Gina **Cuza**
Jefe Departamento de Área Silvestres
Protegidas-ACLAC
Ministerio de Ambiente, Energía y
Telecomunicaciones
Sistema Nacional de Áreas de Conservación,
SINAC
gina.cuza@sinac.go.cr ; gincuza@hotmail.com

OCEANIA**Fiji**

Mr. Joshua **Wycliffe**
Permanent Secretary
Ministry of Waterways and Environment
joshua.wycliffe@govnet.gov.fj

DEPOSITARY/DEPOSITAIRE/DEPOSITARIO

Germany

Ms. Anke **Adams**
Federal Ministry for the Environment
anke.adams@bmu.bund.de

Mr. Oliver **Schall**
Federal Ministry for the Environment
oliver.schall@bmu.bund.de

HOST COP12/ HÔTE COP12/ANFITRION COP12

Philippines

Ms. Armida **Andres**
Assistant Director
Biodiversity management Bureau
nenengandres@yahoo.com.au

Mr. Anson **Tagtag**
Chief Wildlife Management Section
Biodiversity management Bureau
anson_tagtag@yahoo.com

HOST COP13/ HÔTE COP13/ANFITRION COP13

India

Mr. Soumitra **Dasgupta**
Inspector General Forests
Ministry of Environment Forest and Climate
Change
igfwl-mef@nic.in

Mr. Gopinaht **Rajamanickam**
Joint Director Wildlife
Ministry of Environment Forest and Climate
Change
jd-wl@nic.in

Mr. Suresh **Kumar**
Scientist
Wildlife Institute of India
suresh@wii.gov.in

OBSERVERS/OBSERVATEURS/OBSERVADORES

Party Observer

Australia

Ms. Narelle **Montgomery**
Assistant Director
Department of the Environment and Energy
narelle.montgomery@environment.gov.au

Brazil

Ms. Marilia **Marini**
General Coordinator of Species Conservation
Brazilian Ministry of Environment
marilia.marini@mma.gov.br

United Kingdom

Ms. Elaine **Kendall**
Head of International Species Conservation
Department of Environment, Food and Rural
Affairs
elaine.kendall@defra.gsi.gov.uk

Mr James **Williams**
Biodiversity Indicators Manager
Joint Nature Conservation Committee
james.williams@jncc.gov.uk

CMS Scientific Council and Working Groups

Chair of Scientific Council

Mr. Fernando **Spina**
Senior Scientist
ISPRA - Istituto Superiore per la Protezione e la
Ricerca Ambientale
fernando.spina@isprambiente.it

Chair of Landbird Working Group (AEMLWG)

Mr. Olivier **Biber**
Nos Oiseaux
o.biber@bluewin.ch

IGO

UNEP

Mr. Andreas **Obrecht**
Programme Management Officer
andreas.obrecht@un.org

UNEP-WCMC

Ms. Frances **Davis**
Programme Officer, Species Programme
frances.davis@unep-wcmc.org

Ms. Kelly **Malsch**
 Head, Species Programme
Kelly.Malsch@unep-wcmc.org

International NGO

BirdLife International

Ms. Nicola **Crockford**
 Principal Policy Officer
nicola.crockford@rspb.org.uk

Born Free Foundation

Mr. Mark **Jones**
 Head of Policy
markj@bornfree.org.uk

NABU

Mr. Samuel **Fournet**
 AfriBiRds project coordinator
 International Africa Department
Samuel.Fournet@NABU.de

Wildlife Conservation Society

Mr. Arnaud **Goessens**
 EU Policy Manager
agoessens@wcs.org

Ms. Susan **Lieberman**
 Vice President International Policy
slieberman@wcs.org

Wild Migration

Margi **Prideaux**
 International Policy Development
margi@wildmigration.org
 (Connected remotely)

CMS AGREEMENTS/ACCORDS DE LA CMS/CMS ACUERDOS

AEWA

Mr. Jacques **Trouvilliez**
 Executive Secretary
Jacques.trouvilliez@unep-awea.org

Mr. Sergey **Dereliev**
 Technical Officer
Sergey.dereliev@unep-awea.org

Ms. Christina **Irvén**
 Programme Management Assistant
 (Report Writer)
christina.irven@unep-awea.org

Ms. Eva **Meyers**
 Programme Management Officer
eva.meyers@unep-awea.org

EUROBATS

Mr. Andreas **Streit**
 Executive Secretary
Andreas.Streit@eurobats.org

UNEP/CMS SECRETARIAT / SECRETARIAT PNUE/CMS / SECRETARIA PNUMA/CMS

Mr. Marco **Barbieri**
 Scientific Adviser
marco.barbieri@cms.int

Ms. Laura **Cerasi**
 Associate Programme Officer
 Fundraising and Partnerships
laura.cerasi@cms.int

Mr. Borja **Heredia**
 Head of Avian Species Team
borja.heredia@cms.int

Ms. María José **Ortíz**
 Interim Programme Officer

Ms. Andrea **Pauly**
Associate Programme Officer
Aquatic Species Team
andrea.pauly@cms.int

Ms. Yelizabeta **Protas**
Associate Programme Officer
Terrestrial Species Team
yelizaveta.protas@cms.int

Ms. Christiane **Röttger**
Associate Programme Officer
CAMI – Terrestrial Species Team
christiane.roettger@cms.int

Ms. Jenny **Renell**
Associate Programme Officer
Abu Dhabi Office
jenny.renell@cms.int
(connected remotely)

Ms. Enkhtuya **Sereenen**
Administrative Officer
enkhtuya.sereenen@cms.int

Mr. Tilman **Schneider**
Associate Programme Officer
Avian Species Team
Tilman.Schneider@cms.int

Ms. Melanie **Virtue**
Head of Aquatic Species Team
melanie.virtue@cms.int

Consultants

Mr. Aydin **Bahramlouian**
Website and Knowledge Management
aydin.bahramlouian@cms.int

Ms. Polina **Orlinskiy**
IOSEA Marine Turtles MOU
polina.orldinskiy@cms.int

Mr. Dave **Pritchard**
davepritchard@care4free.net

INTERPRETERS/INTERPRÈTES/INTÉRPRETES

Ms. Caroline **Bechtold**
BMU

Ms. Inés de **Chavarría**
BMU

Ms. Sabine **Haarkamp**
BMU

Ms. Sabine **Kohl**
BMU

Ms. Viviana **Puhlmann**
BMU

Ms. Enken **Tadsen-Duch**
BMU