

**53<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the Standing Committee**

*Bonn, Germany, 19 – 20 October 2022*

UNEP/CMS/StC53/Doc.12/Add.1

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO SUPPORT CONSIDERATION OF OPTIONS FOR FOLLOW  
UP TO THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR MIGRATORY SPECIES 2015-2023**

*(Prepared by the Secretariat)*

**Summary:**

This document complements document UNEP/CMS/StC53/Doc.12 and provides additional information on options for a follow up to the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023.

The Standing Committee is expected to consider this document, along with Document UNEP/CMS/StC53/Doc.11 and Document UNEP/CMS/StC53/Doc.12, and to take a decision on next steps regarding options for a follow up to the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023.

## **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO SUPPORT CONSIDERATION OF OPTIONS FOR FOLLOW UP TO THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR MIGRATORY SPECIES 2015-2023**

### Introduction

1. Document UNEP/CMS/StC53/Doc.12 suggests a number of options for a possible follow-up to the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023 (SPMS), drawing *inter alia* on the assessment of the implementation of the existing SPMS, lessons learned and examples of approaches in other biodiversity-related Conventions, that are presented in document UNEP/CMS/StC53/Doc.11.
2. The present Addendum provides additional information to support the Standing Committee's consideration of these options and to assist it in taking a decision on next steps, as requested by CMS COP Decision 13.5(b).

### Key considerations for developing a follow-up to the SPMS

3. Document UNEP/CMS/StC53/Doc.12 provides five options for a possible follow-up to the SPMS:
  - Option 1: No further strategic plan is adopted;
  - Option 2: End-date of existing SPMS is extended with minor editing;
  - Option 3: Maintain the approach of the existing SPMS (Mission, Vision, high-level goals and targets), while modifying the goals and targets so as to retain only those that continue to be relevant to CMS, and adding others as warranted;
  - Option 4: Develop a new Strategic Plan linked to the GBF, largely following the philosophy for the development of the existing SPMS;
  - Option 5: Develop a new Strategic Plan defined by the objectives and priorities of CMS.
4. The three greatest factors that will have a bearing on the utility, process and budgetary implications of the various Options are:
  - 1) the timeframe for any follow-up plan,
  - 2) the desired approach and elements of any follow-up plan, and
  - 3) whether all elements need to be delivered as a package, or if any elements of the plan can be developed over time (iterative approach).
5. The sections below discuss each of these factors. A summary of the projected requirements and costs for Options 1 – 5 is provided in Annex 1.

### Possible timeframe for any follow-up plan

6. A key consideration for any follow-up plan will be the timeframe that it covers. This will be important in particular for determining the scope and process for developing any follow-up to the SPMS.
7. The current SPMS was designed to last until the end of 2023, for two principal reasons: 1) to align the timeframe to the CMS COP cycle, and 2) to allow an assessment of how the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023 (SPMS) has supported the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 (SPfB) and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Commencing the start of the SPMS several years after the SPfB was adopted facilitated the shaping of the SPMS goals and targets to closely track the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, while extending it to 2023 provided a life span of nine years.

8. The draft post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF), expected to be finalized and adopted this December at the fifteenth Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD COP15), uses the date of 2030 for achieving its Targets, while its Vision and Goals extend to 2050. The UN Sustainable Development Goals also are set to conclude in 2030. The strategy of at least one other biodiversity-related convention (CITES) also uses the end date of 2030 for its Strategic Vision.
9. The two most plausible options for the timeframe of any follow-up to the SPMS would be either to commence in 2024 (such that it would need to be adopted at CMS COP14), or in 2027 (assuming it were to be adopted at CMS COP15). The end date could either be set at 2030, thus aligning with the GBF, SDGs, and other global strategies, or extended beyond 2030 to either 2032 or 2035 to remain aligned with the CMS COP cycle. Logically, having 2030 as the end date would only make sense if the start date were 2024 to allow a reasonable period (seven years) to be covered. If a start date of 2027 were agreed on, an end date of 2032 or 2035 would allow for the plan to cover six to nine years.
10. With CMS COP14 tentatively scheduled for October or early November 2023, any scenario of adopting a follow-up plan at the COP would require publication on the CMS website of a completed proposal by July 2023. If the Committee concludes that it is important to adopt a follow-on plan at COP14 that would commence in 2024 and run at least until 2030, then a more streamlined approach could be taken for the preferred option, with some elements potentially identified for further development.

#### Desired approach and elements of any follow-up plan

11. Leaving aside Option 1 (no further strategic plan), the various Options encompass different models for shaping a follow-up to the SPMS. They include different approaches (e.g., whether to be tied to an external set of goals and targets), variations in style and comprehensiveness (e.g., all elements of a traditional Strategic Plan versus a more streamlined approach), and differences in the nature of the goals and targets (e.g., high-level visionary goals and targets versus action-oriented language tied to CMS objectives and priorities). The different approaches and elements are briefly described below.

#### Linkages with external goals and targets

12. One of the key features of the SPMS is that it is closely aligned with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets which expired in 2020. Options 2 and 4 would follow a similar approach – with Option 2 extending the SPMS, and Option 4 developing a new strategic plan closely aligned with the GBF. Option 3 and Option 5, while taking the GBF or other global policy into account, would not mirror them, but rather show contributions to them.

#### Style and comprehensiveness

13. A follow-up to the SPMS could use a similar comprehensive approach as was used for the SPMS.
14. This scenario would allow greater contemplation of options that envisage adoption of a full “Strategic Plan” in the fairly typical sense, based on a more deeply researched appraisal of likely impact effectiveness, and production of a document containing an exposition of context, rationale, objectives, communication messages, an implementation road-map, linkages to other processes, references to source material, and a monitoring framework with performance indicators and defined means of verifying progress. It would require a greater engagement of an intersessional working group for consultation and shaping of the final strategy. This approach could only be delivered at COP15.

15. A streamlined, iterative approach with a view to adoption at COP14 might take the form of a brief “high-level” statement of mission, vision, “strategic intent” and a small number (less than 10) of “headline” goals. Elements would be identified that could be further developed in the intersessional period following COP14 and adopted at COP15.
16. These alternatives could be relevant to Options 3, 4 or 5.

#### Nature of the Goals and Targets

17. There are also differences in the nature of the goals and targets that could be included in any follow-up to the SPMS. The SPMS goals and targets are generally “high-level” aspirations (e.g., “*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*” (SPMS Target 7)). This approach would be continued by Option 2 and 3, and likely would be a model for Option 4.
18. An alternative approach could be more concretely tied to CMS objectives and priorities, defined by the Convention text, current resolutions and decisions, along with the most recent scientific evidence regarding priority areas for action. This would be particularly relevant to Option 5. This approach is more similar to that used by CITES.
19. Another key consideration for the nature of the goals and targets is the extent to which the approach is grounded on science. An opportunity could be taken in the SPMS follow-up to place significant emphasis on the science-based rationale for the priorities of CMS. The strategy would lead from the conservation needs of migratory species, beginning with the species listed in CMS Appendices I and II, the evidence for effective responses to the threats and pressures that affect them, and a scheme of action priorities based on this.
20. Elements of this would also likely capture some of the particular “niche strengths” of CMS compared to other MEAs and international processes, and set out the distinctive added contribution that CMS makes for example in taking a “migration systems” approach, championing ecological connectivity, and concerning for population distributions as a component of species conservation status. This approach would be particularly relevant to Option 5.

#### Delivery in a comprehensive vs. iterative approach

21. As already hinted in the previous section of this document, two main approaches can be envisaged as regards the timing for the delivery of the new plan.

#### Delivery of all the elements as a package

22. This approach foresees that all the elements of the new plan, including any mechanism aimed at supporting the implementation of the plan, as well as monitoring and assessment of its implementation are developed simultaneously and delivered as a package to the Conference of the Parties for consideration and adoption. This approach is applicable to all options, and would be ideal in many respects, as it would allow to define key elements of the plan such as goals and targets with a full perspective of the suite of tools supporting its implementation and assessment in its progress. In particular, definition of the targets would take into account what is available in terms of tools to assess progress towards their achievement, helping to design realistic ones.
23. However, this approach has implications on the timing for the delivery of the elements of the plan to the Conference of the Parties for consideration. With the possible exception of Option 2, expected to deliver only an extension of the existing plan, delivery of a full package in time for consideration by COP14 could be challenging for other Options 3-5, with a possible impact

on the comprehensiveness of the process and robustness of the product.

Development of different elements of the plan over time (iterative approach)

24. This approach foresees the development, delivery and adoption of different elements of the new plan in different phases. In particular, it would defer the development of the monitoring and evaluation elements (e.g. a set of indicators to assess progress towards the achievement of goals and targets) to the intersessional period, with a view to being submitted to the following meeting of the COP or to the Standing Committee for adoption. This approach has already been used for the SPMS 2015-2023, for which a set of instruments have been developed in the intersessional period between COP11 and COP12, to be adopted by COP12. While on one hand this approach could have some impact on the timing of implementation of the plan, on the other hand it would be more compatible with the adoption of a plan by COP14, and allow a more comprehensive, inclusive and robust process over time.

Possible Standing Committee decision on next steps

25. CMS Decision 13.5(b) requested the Standing Committee to take a decision on next steps regarding follow up to the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023. In the event that the Standing Committee decides that some form of strategic plan should be prepared for consideration of the CMS COP, draft elements of a possible decision are provided below:

[“The Standing Committee

1. *Agrees* to establish an Intersessional Working Group (IWG) tasked with developing a proposal to COP14 on a follow-up to the SPMS 2015-2023. The IWG will meet at least once prior to COP14, in person or virtually. The Terms of Reference of the IWG are detailed in the attachment to this decision;
2. *Requests* the CMS Secretariat, under the guidance of the IWG, to develop a draft proposal to COP14 on a follow-up to the SPMS 2015-2023. In developing the proposal, the Secretariat shall, *inter alia*:
  - a. Review the existing SPMS for elements that continue to be relevant to CMS implementation, considering *inter alia* the analysis of implementation of the SPMS 2015-2023, as set forth in document UNEP/CMS/StC53/Doc.11;
  - b. Review current CMS decisions and resolutions, including the CMS Programme of Work and status of its implementation, to identify key priorities and cross-cutting policy issues for achieving CMS objectives;
  - c. Consider interim results of recent global scientific assessments relevant for CMS, including the IPBES Global Assessment on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, the IPBES Assessment on the Sustainable Use of Wild Species, the IPBES Assessment of the Diverse Values and Valuation of Nature, the 5<sup>th</sup> edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook, the draft CMS report on the conservation status of migratory species;
  - d. Review the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, outcomes of other relevant global agreements including UNFCCC, UNCCD, the Sustainable Development Goals, other global initiatives such as the Decade on Ecosystem Restoration, and map how CMS priorities contribute to their achievement; and
  - e. Take into account strategic planning approaches used by other biodiversity-related conventions.]

Recommended Actions

26. The Standing Committee is recommended to:

- a) Consider this document, along with Document UNEP/CMS/StC53/Doc.11 and Document UNEP/CMS/StC53/Doc.12,
- b) Take a decision on next steps regarding options for a follow up to the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023, and
- c) Encourage Parties and stakeholders to provide financial and technical support to support implementation of its decision regarding next steps.

**ANNEX**

**COST ESTIMATES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF OPTIONS FOR FOLLOW UP TO THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR MIGRATORY SPECIES 2015-2023**

	COSTS FOR DELIVERY (USD)	
	Scenario for delivery by COP14 (2023)	Scenario for delivery by COP15 (2026)
<b>Option 1</b>	/	/
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Option 2</b>	<u>Consultant</u> <u>Translation of document</u>	
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>4,000</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Option 3</b>	<u>Consultant</u> <u>*1 StC or WG meeting</u> <u>Translation of 1 draft and final versions of the document and accompanying materials</u>	<u>Consultant</u> <u>*2 StC or WG meetings</u> <u>Translation of 2 draft and final versions of the document and accompanying materials</u>
<b>TOTAL:</b> <i>with online meeting</i> <i>with in person meeting</i>	<b>12,000</b> <b>32,000</b>	<b>18,000</b> <b>58,000</b>
<b>Option 4</b>	<u>Consultant</u> <u>*1 StC or WG meeting</u> <u>Translation of 1 draft and final versions of the document and accompanying materials</u>	<u>Consultant</u> <u>*3 StC or WG meetings</u> <u>Translation of 3 drafts and final versions of the document and accompanying materials</u>
<b>TOTAL:</b> <i>with online meeting</i> <i>with in person meeting</i>	<b>20,500</b> <b>40,500</b>	<b>53,000</b> <b>113,000</b>
<b>Option 5</b>	<u>Consultant</u> <u>*1 StC or WG meeting</u> <u>Translation of 1 draft and final versions of the document and accompanying materials</u>	<u>Consultant</u> <u>*3 StC or WG meetings</u> <u>Translation of 3 drafts and final versions of the document and accompanying materials</u>
<b>TOTAL:</b> <i>with online meeting</i> <i>with in person meeting</i>	<b>20,500</b> <b>40,500</b>	<b>53,000</b> <b>113,000</b>

\* Meetings of the Standing Committee (StC) or of a dedicated Working Group (WG) with a similar composition. Meeting costs cover travel, DSA for 6 participants eligible for funding and services including security and catering for a two-day meeting held in Bonn at the Secretariat’s premises.

Alternatively, the meeting could be held online. In this case, there would be no financial implications with the exception of interpretation, if needed and not covered by other budgets.