



Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals

Secretariat provided by the United Nations Environment Programme



45th Meeting of the Standing Committee

Bonn, Germany, 9 - 10 November 2016

UNEP/CMS/StC45/Doc.14

REVISION OF THE TEMPLATE FOR NATIONAL REPORTS

(prepared by the Secretariat)

Summary

The present document proposes an approach for the revision of the template for National Reports in the light of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023, and includes proposals for questions for each of the SPMS targets to be integrated in the National Report format.

Through [Res.11.2](#) Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023 COP11 requested the Secretariat to consider amendments to the format for National Reports in respect of assessing implementation of the Strategic Plan and those indicators for which such reports are identified as a potentially important source of information, and the scope for streamlining existing reporting processes to reduce reporting burdens, and to submit any proposed amendments to the Standing Committee for its consideration and transmission to the 12th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties”.

REVISION OF THE TEMPLATE FOR NATIONAL REPORTS

(prepared by the Secretariat)

1. Through [Resolution 11.2](#) the 11th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CMS (COP11) adopted the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023. In adopting the Strategic Plan, COP11 acknowledged the need for additional inter-sessional work to strengthen the suite of materials to support the Plan's implementation, including:

- a) indicators for the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species; and
- b) a Companion Volume on Implementation for the new Strategic Plan, to provide guidance on its implementation.

COP11 also decided to extend the mandate of the Strategic Plan Working Group (SPWG) to include the tasks of elaborating the indicators and Companion Volume during the triennium 2015-2017.

2. Resolution 11.2 also requested the Secretariat *“to consider amendments to the format for National Reports, where necessary, in respect of assessing implementation of the Strategic Plan and those indicators for which such reports are identified as a potentially important source of information, and the scope for streamlining existing reporting processes to reduce reporting burdens, and to submit any proposed amendments to the Standing Committee for its consideration and transmission to the 12th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties”*.

3. Based on this mandate, the overall aim of a revision of the format for National Reports is to generate information that will be useful for making assessments of CMS implementation experience and progress towards achieving the goals of the Strategic Plan, while also being as efficient as possible by ensuring that the reporting burden on Parties is limited to those items that are most meaningful.

4. In undertaking this task, the Secretariat has worked in close consultation with the SPWG, notably within the context of the work on indicators for the Strategic Plan. The fact that National Reports are expected to be submitted six months before the COP means that the final outcomes of the SPWG work on indicators (expected to be delivered in the run up to COP12 within the deadline for document submission) cannot be taken fully into account in the COP12 reporting cycle. However, in consultations between the Secretariat and the SPWG, it was considered desirable that at least some elements relevant to the assessment of Strategic Plan implementation already be included in the template for National Reports to be submitted to COP12.

5. Based on this rationale, it is proposed to undertake the revision of the template for National Reports in two steps. A first revision of the template, mainly consisting of integrating into the current template some questions for the assessment of progress towards the targets of the Strategic Plan, should be approved by the Standing Committee and finalized in time for the COP12 reporting cycle. This first revision will take into account progress on the identification of indicators for the Strategic Plan within the SPWG. A second revision, which will take into account the final outcomes of SPWG work on indicators and provide for a more in-depth revision of the format, including any appropriate streamlining, should be prepared in time for consideration and approval by COP12 for use at COP13 and in subsequent reporting cycles.

6. Annex 1 to this document includes proposals for questions for each of the SPMS targets to be integrated in the National Report format. The proposals take into account any possible National Report-based indicator suggested by the SPWG (as reflected in the draft indicator factsheets available

at <http://www.cms.int/en/document/indicator-factsheets-strategic-plan-migratory-species-first-draft-consultation>), relevant questions in the COP11 National Report format and relevant comments in a UNEP-WCMC report to the Secretariat on recommended improvements to the CMS National Report format from October 2014. They are submitted to the Standing Committee for its consideration and approval for integration in the National Report template for COP12 reporting cycle.

Action requested:

The Standing Committee is invited to:

- i.) Consider and approve the proposed two-step approach for the revision of the template for National Reports
- ii.) Review and approve for integration in the template for COP12 National Reports the Strategic Plan-related questions included in Annex 1

**PROPOSALS FOR SPMS-RELATED QUESTIONS TO BE INTEGRATED IN THE CMS
NATIONAL REPORT FORMAT**

This Annex includes proposals for questions to be integrated in the CMS National Report format for each of the SPMS targets.

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.

Note: “Awareness” here is intended to be more than passive, and to include positive support and engagement at political levels, as well as among the public. It includes awareness of the values represented by the phenomenon of migration itself. The values concerned may be socio-economic, including cultural, as well as ecological.

National Report-based indicator suggested in Indicator Factsheets?

Yes:

1.2 Simple qualitative assessment by CMS Parties in triennial national reports.

Parties could be asked to score the situation relating to this target in their country on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (very good). Guidance would need to be provided on how report compilers should interpret the question, eg in relation to who are the “people” and what are the “values” that are relevant. Scope should be provided for reference to be made to any specific studies which may have been undertaken and which help to inform the picture. Any report questions which address eg uptake of Convention guidance products (and perhaps also implementation of the Convention’s Communication, Information and Outreach Plan, Resolution 11.8) would also make a relevant contribution.

Relevant questions in COP11 National Report Format

VIII. Global and National Importance of CMS

1. Have actions been taken by your country to increase national, regional and/or global awareness of the relevance of CMS and its global importance in the context of biodiversity conservation?
If Yes, please provide details:
3. Results - please describe the positive outcomes of any actions taken

X. Implementation of COP Resolutions and Recommendations

Please provide information about measures undertaken by your country relating to recent Resolutions and Recommendations since the last Report.

Resolutions

- CMS Information Priorities (9.3) [*Also under Target 15*]
- Outreach and Communication Issues (9.5 / 10.7)

Related comments in UNEP-WCMC report on CMS NRF Oct 2014

[None].

Proposed question(s) for future Report Format

1.1 Have actions been taken by your country to increase people’s awareness of the values of migratory species, their habitats and migration systems?

If yes,

- (a) Please give details.
- (b) Please indicate any specific elements of CMS COP Resolutions 11.8 (*Communication, Information and Outreach Plan*) and 11.9 (*World Migratory Bird Day*) which have been particularly taken forward by these actions.
- (c) How successful have these actions been in achieving their objectives?
(Tick one box). (1 = very unsuccessful, 5 = very successful).

1	2	3	4	5

(d) In what ways have these actions helped to raise people’s awareness about the steps they can take to conserve migratory species and to ensure the sustainability of any use of these species?

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.

Note: Actions towards this SPMS target may also contribute to SPMS target 13.

National Report-based indicator suggested in Indicator Factsheets?

Yes:

2.2 CMS National Report Format question.

The CMS National Report Format currently asks whether the conservation of migratory species features in national or regional policies/plans. Information provided in response to this could be analysed as it stands, for any light it might shed on progress with Target 2. A modified or additional question could ask specifically about incorporation of migratory species/habitats values into national accounting systems (as appropriate) and (other) national reporting systems. This may not show much change from triennium to triennium for any given Party, but it might for example show trends in uptake by increasing numbers of Parties. Reference to implementation of specific CMS COP decisions of relevance to “mainstreaming” might also provide a component of such a question.

Relevant questions in COP11 National Report Format

I(a) Involvement of other government departments/NGOs/private sector

1. Which other government departments are involved in activities/initiatives for the conservation of migratory species in your country? (Please list.)
2. If more than one government department is involved, describe the interaction/relationship between these government departments:
3. Has a national liaison system or committee been established in your country?

3. Listing of migratory species in Appendix II

IV. National and Regional Priorities

3. Does the conservation of migratory species currently feature in any other national or regional policies/plans (apart from CMS Agreements)
 - 3.1. If Yes, please provide details:
 - 3a. Do these policies/plans cover the following areas?
 - Economic development
 - If Yes, please provide details
4. Results - please describe the positive outcomes of any actions taken

Related comments in UNEP-WCMC report on CMS NRF Oct 2014

[None].

Proposed question(s) for future Report Format

- 2.1 Does the conservation of migratory species currently feature in any national or local strategies and planning processes in your country relating to development, poverty reduction and/or livelihoods?
If yes, please give details.
- 2.2 Do the values of migratory species and their habitats currently feature in national accounting processes in your country?
If yes, please give details.
- 2.3 Apart from national reporting processes associated with biodiversity conservation, do the values of migratory species and their habitats currently feature in any other national reporting processes in your country?
If yes, please give details.

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.

Note: Reference to governance “affecting” migratory species here indicates that this is not limited only to conservation governance, but extends to other levels/sectors that may also have an effect.

National Report-based indicator suggested in Indicator Factsheets?

Yes:

3.1 CMS National Report Format question.

As mentioned above, all that can realistically be expected for this target is a qualitative opinion by the Contracting Party government on the overall picture of progress towards achieving the target.

The target refers to regional and international arrangements and agreements as well as national ones: Parties will not be able to address these supra-national levels very fully, but they *will* be able to say something about the coherence, accountability, transparency, participation, equitability and inclusiveness of arrangements and agreements at those levels that are relevant to them, as perceived from their perspective as participants or stakeholders.

One potential element may lie with the pre-existing encouragement for CMS Parties to establish and operate national liaison systems or committees (target 4.5 in the 2006-2014 CMS Strategic Plan). The current National Report Format asks a question about this, but at present it is simply a yes/no question as to the existence of such a system or committee.

Relevant questions in COP11 National Report Format

I(a). General Information

Involvement of other government departments/NGOs/private sector

3. Has a national liaison system or committee been established in your country?
No Yes .

2. Questions on CMS Agreements

Questions on the development of new CMS Agreements relating to [Bird] Species [question repeated for each taxonomic group]

1. In the current reporting period, has your country initiated the development of any CMS Agreements, including Memoranda of Understanding, to address the needs of Appendix II [Bird] Species ?
[Relevant also to Target 9]
2. In the current reporting period, has your country participated in the development of any new CMS Agreements, including Memoranda of Understanding, which address the conservation needs of Appendix II [Bird] Species ? [Relevant also to Target 9]
4. Is the development of any CMS Agreement for [Bird] Species, including Memoranda of Understanding, planned by your country in the foreseeable future? [Relevant also to Target 9]

3. Listing of migratory species in Appendix II

IV. National and Regional Priorities

3. Does the conservation of migratory species currently feature in any other national or regional policies/plans (apart from CMS Agreements)
 - 3.1. If Yes, please provide details:

- 3a. Do these policies/plans cover the following areas?
 Land-use planning
 If Yes, please provide details
- 4. Results - please describe the positive outcomes of any actions taken

X. Implementation of COP Resolutions and Recommendations

Please provide information about measures undertaken by your country relating to recent Resolutions and Recommendations since the last Report. For your convenience please refer to the list of COP Resolutions and Recommendations listed below:

- Resolutions [*include*]:
- Modus Operandi for Conservation Emergencies (10.2)
 - Cooperation with Other Bodies and Processes (7.9)
 - Synergies and Partnerships / Cooperation with other Conventions (8.11 / 9.11 / 10.21)
 - Future strategies of the CMS Family / “Future Shape” (10.9)

Related comments in UNEP-WCMC report on CMS NRF Oct 2014

None in the WCMC report itself, but in response to it, CMS Secretariat comments (Abu Dhabi office 13/10/14) noted that perhaps there should be a specific section in the NRF seeking summary information from Parties relating to their implementation of each CMS instrument to which they are a Signatory; which would *inter alia* potentially reduce the need to report similar information separately for each instrument.

Proposed question(s) for future Report Format

- 3.1 Have any governance arrangements affecting migratory species and their migration systems in your country, or in which your country participates, improved?

If yes,

- (a) Please give details.
- (b) To what extent have these improvements helped to achieve Target 3 of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species (“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”)?

(Tick one box). (1 = minimal contribution, 5 = very significant contribution).

1	2	3	4	5

- 3.2 Has a national liaison system or committee been established in your country to address migratory species conservation issues? Yes No .

- 3.3 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 24-26 of CMS COP Resolution 11.10 (*Synergies and partnerships*)?

If yes, please give details.

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.

Note: The precise approach to this will vary, in some cases sub-nationally, according to specific local circumstances.

National Report-based indicator suggested in Indicator Factsheets?

Yes:

4.1 CMS National Report Format question.

Indicators on the corresponding Aichi Target are proposed for assessment in the CBD context, but it is difficult to see how the data on those could be meaningfully disaggregated to tell a story that is specific to migratory species, hence a simpler approach is proposed here.

The National Report question should ask Parties whether negative and positive incentives of the kind described in the target have been identified (leaving up to them the decision about which individual instruments or interventions may qualify, in the given national context); and it should ask about instances of any of the four kinds of “events” described above, inviting a narrative to give key particulars. “Multiple choice” prompts on the types of incentives involved might allow some sort of stratified analysis at global level, perhaps in a similar way to those used in the question on this issue in the national report format for CITES.

Relevant questions in COP11 National Report Format

[None specifically].

Related comments in UNEP-WCMC report on CMS NRF Oct 2014

[None].

Proposed question(s) for future Report Format

4.1 Have any of the following measures been implemented in your country in ways which benefit migratory species?

- Elimination/phasing out of harmful incentives;
- Reform of harmful incentives to minimise or avoid negative impacts;
- Development of positive incentives;
- Application of positive incentives.

If yes,

- (a) Please give details of the measures implemented.
- (b) Please describe the specific ways in which migratory species have benefited.

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.

Note: Where there is uncertainty about what constitutes a “safe ecological limit” in a given case, a precautionary approach should be taken.

National Report-based indicator suggested in Indicator Factsheets?

Yes:

5.3 CMS National Report Format question.

Perhaps the most useful indicator for this target would be one which simply asks CMS Party Governments to report on any steps taken or plans implemented (by them or by others) of the kind described (and with the objectives described) in the target.

Relevant questions in COP11 National Report Format

[None specifically].

Related comments in UNEP-WCMC report on CMS NRF Oct 2014

[None].

Proposed question(s) for future Report Format

5.1 Have you implemented plans or taken other steps concerning sustainable production and consumption which are achieving the results defined in Target 5 of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species (“*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*”)?

If yes,

(a) Please give details of the measures implemented.

(b) Please describe what evidence exists to show that the intended results are being achieved.

If no, what is preventing progress?

Target 6

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.

Note: Achievement of this target will require that migratory species are managed and harvested sustainably, legally and through the use of ecosystem-based approaches. Overexploitation of migratory species must be avoided, and recovery plans and measures should be in place for all depleted species. Where there is uncertainty about what constitutes a “safe ecological limit” in a given case, a precautionary approach should be taken.

National Report-based indicator suggested in Indicator Factsheets?

[None].

Relevant questions in COP11 National Report Format

3. Listing of migratory species in Appendix II

IV. National and Regional Priorities

3. Does the conservation of migratory species currently feature in any other national or regional policies/plans (apart from CMS Agreements)
 - 3a. Do these policies/plans cover the following areas?
 - Exploitation of natural resources (e.g. fisheries, hunting, etc.)
 - If Yes, please provide details.
4. Results - please describe the positive outcomes of any actions taken.

X. Implementation of COP Resolutions and Recommendations

Please provide information about measures undertaken by your country relating to recent Resolutions and Recommendations since the last Report. For your convenience please refer to the list of COP Resolutions and Recommendations listed below:

Resolutions [*include*]:

Bycatch (incl. Recommendation) (6.2 / 7.2 / 8.14 / 9.18 / 10.14).

Related comments in UNEP-WCMC report on CMS NRF Oct 2014

[None].

Proposed question(s) for future Report Format

[Integrated into questions for Target 7].

Target 7

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.

Note: The pressures concerned may include those relating to climate change, renewable energy developments, power lines, by-catch, underwater noise, ship strikes, poisoning, pollution, disease, invasive species, illegal and unsustainable take and marine debris.

National Report-based indicator suggested in Indicator Factsheets?

[None].

Relevant questions in COP11 National Report Format

II. Appendix I species

1. General questions on Appendix I species [*this group of questions repeated for each taxonomic group*]
2. Identify any obstacles to migration that exist in relation to Appendix I [bird etc] species:
 - By-catch
 - Habitat destruction
 - Wind turbines
 - Pollution
- 2a. What actions are being undertaken to overcome these obstacles?
- 2b. Please report on the progress / success of the actions taken.
3. What are the major pressures to Appendix I [bird etc] species (transcending mere obstacles to migration)?
[*List provided*]
- 3a. What actions have been taken to prevent, reduce or control factors that are endangering or are likely to further endanger [bird etc] species beyond actions to prevent disruption to migrating behaviour?
- 3b. Please report on the progress / success of the actions taken.
- 3c. Describe any factors that may limit action being taken in this regard:

3. Listing of migratory species in Appendix II

IV. National and Regional Priorities

3. Does the conservation of migratory species currently feature in any other national or regional policies/plans (apart from CMS Agreements)
 - 3.1. If Yes, please provide details:
 - 3a. Do these policies/plans cover the following areas?
 - Pollution control
 - If Yes, please provide details
 - Planning of power lines
 - If Yes, please provide details
 - Planning of fences
 - If Yes, please provide details
 - Planning of dams
 - If Yes, please provide details
 - Other
 - If Yes, please provide details
4. Results - please describe the positive outcomes of any actions taken.

X. Implementation of COP Resolutions and Recommendations

Please provide information about measures undertaken by your country relating to recent Resolutions and Recommendations since the last Report. For your convenience please refer to the list of COP Resolutions and Recommendations listed below:

Resolutions [*include*]:

- Electrocution of Migratory Birds (7.4 / 10.11)
- Marine Debris (10.4)
- Poisoning Migratory Birds (10.26)
- Adverse Anthropogenic Impacts on Cetaceans and other Biota (8.22 / 9.19 / 10.24)

Related comments in UNEP-WCMC report on CMS NRF Oct 2014

UNEP-WCMC recommended combining questions on “obstacles to migration” and “major threats” within each taxonomic group (questions II.1.2 and II.1.3 - II.5.2 and II.5.3), since within these general sections for each taxonomic group, there is a large amount of repetition between the questions covering “obstacles to migration” and “major threats/pressures” (questions 2 and 3), particularly regarding actions being taken (2a, 3a) and successes (2b, 3b). Combining the questions would remove questions 3, 3a and 3b, which would then be covered by questions 2, 2a and 2b. The existing multiple-choice options for questions 2 and 3 should therefore be combined (e.g. for birds, “Poaching” and “Illegal trade” should be added to the existing options under question 2). Question 3d (on assistance required) could be combined with 2c (or both could be removed if WCMC’s separate recommendation on having a dedicated section on ‘assistance required’ is followed). Question 3c (on limiting factors) is also recommended for removal as it is implicit under question 2c covering assistance required.

UNEP-WCMC also recommended using multiple-choice response options for question 2a regarding actions undertaken, to help standardise Party responses, since the majority of actions reported fell into a number of distinct categories.

Revised questions would be as follows (using birds as an example):

Q2: Indicate whether the pressures below are considered obstacles to migration and/or major threats to Appendix I migratory bird species within your country:

- By-catch
- Electrocution
- Habitat destruction
- Illegal trade
- Poaching
- Pollution
- Wind turbines
- Other (please provide details):

Q2a: What actions are being undertaken to overcome these pressures?

- Creation of new protected areas
- Expansion of existing protected areas
- Implementation of new legislation
- Law enforcement
- Development of management plans
- Use of Environmental Impact Assessments
- Monitoring and/or research
- Education and awareness-raising
- Measures to reduce by-catch
- Other (please provide details):
- No action has been taken

Q2b: Please report on the progress/success of the actions taken.

CMS Secretariat comments on these recommendations (Abu Dhabi office 13/10/14) suggested that “Illegal trade” might be better listed as “Illegal taking, trapping and trade”; and also queried why only by-catch from Q2 was specifically echoed in Q2a, since it would be useful to know similar information about measures taken for all the listed threat types.

[NB by-catch may be better considered in relation to SPMS Target 6].

Proposed question(s) for future Report Format

7.1 Which of the following pressures on migratory species or their habitats are important in your country? (Tick/comment on all those that apply):

	Annex I species	Other migratory species
By-catch*		
Poaching and other illegal taking, trapping or trade*		
Over-exploitation*		
Other fisheries impacts*		
Other hunting impacts*		
Electrocution		
Obstruction of migration (other than by collision - see next category) by physical barriers	<i>(Specify type(s) of barrier)</i>	<i>(Specify type(s) of barrier)</i>
Collisions	<i>(Indicate separately for): Fences Power lines Wind turbines Other infrastructure (specify)</i>	<i>(Indicate separately for): Fences Power lines Wind turbines Other infrastructure (specify)</i>
Pollution		
Other habitat damage, fragmentation or destruction	<i>(Specify habitat and damage type)</i>	<i>(Specify habitat and damage type)</i>
Disturbance		
Other pressures	<i>(Specify type)</i>	<i>(Specify type)</i>

* (Linked also to Target 6)

7.2 What actions are being taken to overcome these pressures? (Describe in relation to each element of your answer to question [7.1] where possible).

7.3 Please report on the progress of the actions taken, and the success or otherwise of the outcomes.

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

- Resolutions 6.2, 8.14, 9.18 and 10.24 and Recommendation 7.2 on by-catch.
- Resolutions 9.19 and 10.24 on underwater noise.
- Resolutions 10.4 and 11.30 on marine debris.
- Resolution 11.22 on live captures of cetaceans.
- Resolution 8.22 on adverse human induced impacts on cetaceans.
- Resolutions 7.5 and 11.27 on renewable energy.
- Resolutions 7.4 and 10.11 on power lines and migratory birds.
- Resolution 11.15 on poisoning of migratory birds.

- Resolution 11.16 on illegal killing, taking and trade of migratory birds.
- Resolution 11.31 on wildlife crime.
- Resolution 11.26 on climate change.
- Resolution 11.28 on invasive alien species.

Target 8

The conservation status of all migratory species, especially threatened species, has considerably improved throughout their range.

Note: Actions towards this SPMS target may also contribute to SPMS target 11.

National Report-based indicator suggested in Indicator Factsheets?

[None].

Relevant questions in COP11 National Report Format

II. Appendix I species

1. General questions on Appendix I species [*this group of questions repeated for each taxonomic group*]

1. Is the taking of all Appendix I [bird etc] species prohibited by the national implementing legislation cited in Table I(a) (General Information)?

If other legislation is relevant, please provide details:

1a. If the taking of Appendix I [bird etc] species is prohibited by law, have any exceptions been granted to the prohibition?

If Yes, please provide details (Include the date on which the exception was notified to the CMS Secretariat pursuant to CMS Article III(7):

1.2 Questions on specific Appendix I species [*this group of questions repeated for each taxonomic group*]

3. Indicate and briefly describe any activities that have been carried out in favour of this species in the reporting period. (Please provide the title of the project and contact details, where available): [*List of types provided*]

5. Describe any future activities that are planned for this species.

3. Listing of migratory species in Appendix II

1. Is your country a Range State for any migratory species that has an unfavourable conservation status, but is not currently listed in Appendix II and could benefit from the conclusion of an Agreement for its conservation?

If Yes, please provide details.

1a. Is your country taking any steps to propose the listing of this/these species in Appendix II?

X. Implementation of COP Resolutions and Recommendations

Please provide information about measures undertaken by your country relating to recent Resolutions and Recommendations since the last Report. For your convenience please refer to the list of COP Resolutions and Recommendations listed below:

Resolutions [*include*]:

Migratory Species and Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza (8.27 / 10.22)

Southern Hemisphere Albatross Conservation (6.3)

Antarctic Minke, Bryde's and Pygmy Right Whales (7.15)

Concerted Actions for Appendix I Species (8.29) [*Also under Target 9*]

Concerted and Cooperative Actions (9.1 / 10.23) [*Also under Target 9*]

Migratory Marine Species (9.9 / 10.15)

Saker Falcon (9.20 / 10.28)

Global Flyway Conservation (10.10) [*Also under Target 9*]

Migratory Freshwater Fish (10.12)

Contribution of CMS in Achieving the 2010 Biodiversity Target (8.7).

Recommendations [*include*]

Recommendation 7.6 - Improving the Conservation Status of the Leatherback Turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*)

Recommendation 8.17 - Marine Turtles

Recommendation 9.1 - Central Eurasian Aridland Mammals [*Also under Target 9*]

Recommendation 9.2 - Sahelo-Saharan Megafauna
 Recommendation 9.3 - Tigers and other Asian Big Cats
 Recommendation 9.5 - Cooperative Action for the Elephant (*Loxodonta africana*) in Central Africa
 [Also under Target 9].

Related comments in UNEP-WCMC report on CMS NRF Oct 2014

[None].

Proposed question(s) for future Report Format

8.1 What changes in migratory species conservation status have been recorded in your country in the current reporting period?

	Species/other taxon <i>(indicate CMS Appendix where applicable)</i>	Change in status	Source reference	Comments
FISH				
REPTILES				
BIRDS				
AQUATIC MAMMALS				
TERRISTRIAL MAMMALS				
BATS				

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.

Note: The Convention on Migratory Species, being “concerned particularly with those species of wild animals that migrate across or outside national jurisdictional boundaries”, emphasizes that “conservation and effective management of migratory species of wild animals require the concerted action of all States within the national jurisdictional boundaries of which such species spend any part of their life cycle”. This would include the necessary capacity building as a key component of trans-boundary cooperation. Target 9 seeks more complete engagement by all of the States who share joint responsibility in such circumstances.

National Report-based indicator suggested in Indicator Factsheets?

Yes:

9.2 CMS National Report Format question.

The other most realistic way of monitoring this target is probably to ask CMS Party Governments to report on steps they may have taken (or activities in which they have participated) which in their opinion represent meaningful progress in the desired direction.

Relevant questions in COP11 National Report Format

2. Questions on CMS Agreements

Questions on the development of new CMS Agreements relating to [Bird] Species [*this group of questions repeated for each taxonomic group*].

1. In the current reporting period, has your country initiated the development of any CMS Agreements, including Memoranda of Understanding, to address the needs of Appendix II [Bird] Species ? [*Relevant also to Target 3*].
2. In the current reporting period, has your country participated in the development of any new CMS Agreements, including Memoranda of Understanding, which address the conservation needs of Appendix II [Bird] Species ? [*Relevant also to Target 3*].
4. Is the development of any CMS Agreement for [Bird] Species, including Memoranda of Understanding, planned by your country in the foreseeable future? [*Relevant also to Target 3*].

VII. Membership

1. Have actions been taken by your country to encourage non- Parties to join CMS and its related Agreements?

X. Implementation of COP Resolutions and Recommendations

Please provide information about measures undertaken by your country relating to recent Resolutions and Recommendations since the last Report. For your convenience please refer to the list of COP Resolutions and Recommendations listed below:

Resolutions [*include*]:

- Implementation of Existing Agreements and Development of Future Agreements (8.5)
- Concerted Actions for Appendix I Species (8.29) [*Also under Target 8*]
- Concerted and Cooperative Actions (9.1 / 10.23) [*Also under Target 8*]
- Priorities for CMS Agreements (9.2 / 10.16)
- Global Flyway Conservation (10.10) [*Also under Target 8*]
- Migratory Landbirds in the African Eurasian Region (10.27) [*Also under Target 8*]

Recommendations [*include*]:

- Recommendation 9.5 - Cooperative Action for the Elephant (*Loxodonta africana*) in Central Africa [*Also under Target 8*].

Related comments in UNEP-WCMC report on CMS NRF Oct 2014

[None].

Proposed question(s) for future Report Format

- 9.1 In the current reporting period, has your country initiated or participated in the development of any CMS Agreements, including Memoranda of Understanding, to address the needs of Appendix II species?
If yes, please give details.
- 9.2 In the current reporting period, have actions been taken by your country to encourage non-Parties to join CMS and its related Agreements?
If yes, please give details.
- 9.3 In the current reporting period, has your country participated in the development or implementation of concerted actions or cooperative actions under CMS (as detailed in COP Resolution 11.13) to address the needs of relevant migratory species?
If yes,
 - (a) please give details.
 - (b) describe the results achieved so far.
- 9.4 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*)?

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.

National Report-based indicator suggested in Indicator Factsheets?

[None].

Relevant questions in COP11 National Report Format

3. Listing of migratory species in Appendix II

IV. National and Regional Priorities

3. Does the conservation of migratory species currently feature in any other national or regional policies/plans (apart from CMS Agreements)
 - 3.1. If Yes, please provide details:
 - 3a. Do these policies/plans cover the following areas?
 - Designation and development of protected areas
 - If Yes, please provide details
 - Development of ecological networks
 - If Yes, please provide details
4. Results - please describe the positive outcomes of any actions taken.

V. Protected Areas

1. Are migratory species taken into account in the selection, establishment and management of protected areas in your country?
 - If Yes, please provide details:
 - 1a. Please identify the most important national sites for migratory species and their protection status:
 - 1b. Do these protected areas cover the following areas?
 - Terrestrial
 - If Yes, please provide details and include the amount of protected areas coverage and the number of protected areas
 - Aquatic
 - If Yes, please provide details and include the amount of protected areas coverage and the number of protected areas
 - Marine
 - If Yes, please provide details and include the amount of protected areas coverage and the number of protected areas
2. Results - please describe the positive outcomes of any actions taken

Related comments in UNEP-WCMC report on CMS NRF Oct 2014

UNEP-WCMC recommended ensuring that the questions here request the information that is most needed. Parties had found it difficult to provide a comprehensive response to questions in this section, probably due partly to lack of clarity in the questions and partly to the reporting effort required. The Secretariat were advised to consider what information regarding protected areas is most needed, whether it could be gathered through other means (e.g. the World Database on Protected Areas) and, if not, to ensure that it is explicitly requested in this section. More specific questions could include “Are there populations of migratory species/sites of importance to migratory species in your country that would benefit from increased protection?” and “What are the pressures on protected areas in your country and how are they being addressed, if at all?”

It was further recommended to provide clarifying criteria on how Parties should select the “most important sites”, in order to help standardise responses to question V.1.a regarding identification of “the most important national sites for migratory species”. Parties responded very differently to this question (e.g. with some Parties providing details of one site and others providing details of many).

A third recommendation was to add clarity to question V.1.b regarding protected area coverage. The question states “Do *these* protected areas cover the following areas?”; and if the intention is for Parties to report only on the “most important national sites” from the previous question, this should be made explicit. Parties are also asked to categorise the information according to area type (terrestrial/aquatic/ marine), and given that many protected areas encompass more than one such type, it was not clear whether they should report only on the area covered by each type or on the total area of any protected site that encompassed that area type. Parties therefore responded in different ways, with the latter approach resulting in double-counting of sites. Thirdly, Parties reported a mixture of numbers and areas of sites, with areas reported in a variety of different units, complicating analysis of the responses. If this level of detail is useful, WCMC suggested wording the question more clearly as follows:

- (a) Please provide details on the number and extent of protected areas that are important for migratory species in your country:
 Total number of protected areas:
 Total area protected (km²):
- (b) Do the protected areas that are important for migratory species in your country cover the following areas (If yes, please specify the number of protected areas and the area covered in square kilometres):
 Terrestrial: Yes No
 If yes, Number of protected areas that are mainly terrestrial:
 Terrestrial area protected (sq km):
- Aquatic: Yes No
 If yes, Number of protected areas that are mainly aquatic:
 Aquatic area protected (sq km):
- Marine: Yes No
 If yes, Number of protected areas that are mainly marine:
 Marine area protected (sq km).

CMS Secretariat comments on these recommendations (Abu Dhabi office 13/10/14) noted that for the 132 Range States and Territories covered by the CMS Raptors MoU, the most important national sites for migratory birds of prey are already detailed in the Action Plan annexed to the MoU, hence criteria etc have already been addressed for this group of migratory birds; and the information will be kept updated through the MoU. The Critical Site Network under AEWA may address the issue for waterbirds in that Agreement’s area too.

Proposed question(s) for future Report Format

- 10.1 Have all critical habitats and sites for migratory species been identified in your country?
 If not, which are the ecosystem types, taxonomic groups and/or geographical areas for which critical habitats and sites are:
 (a) most well documented;
 (b) least well documented?
- 10.2 Please provide details of the number and extent of protected areas that are judged to be important for migratory species in your country:
 (a) Total number of relevant protected areas.
 (b) Total area of relevant protected areas (sq km).
 (c) Comments on how “importance for migratory species” has been interpreted in answering this question.

- 10.3 In respect of protected areas in your country that are important for migratory species, are any assessments of management effectiveness undertaken?
If yes, please give details.
- 10.4 Are other area-based conservation measures (apart from protected areas) implemented in your country in ways which benefit migratory species?
If yes, please give details.
- 10.5 Have actions been undertaken in your country to implement specific provisions in CMS COP Resolutions 10.3 and/or 11.25 on ecological networks for migratory species?
If yes, please give details.

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.

Note: The services concerned may include water supply, quality and regulation; disaster risk reduction; climate regulation; cultural services; food and other socio-economic benefits, all contributing to people's health, livelihoods and well-being. Actions towards this SPMS target may also contribute to SPMS target 8.

Note added subsequent to SPMS adoption: The phrase "indigenous and local communities" follows the terminology in the text of the Convention on Biological Diversity. At around the same time as the SPMS was being adopted by CMS, CBD COP Decision XII/12 (2014) confirmed that although the CBD was deciding to use the phrase "indigenous peoples and local communities" in future decisions and secondary documents, this would not act to interpret or change the legal meaning of the original phrase in the Convention text.

National Report-based indicator suggested in Indicator Factsheets?

[None].

Relevant questions in COP11 National Report Format

[None specifically].

Related comments in UNEP-WCMC report on CMS NRF Oct 2014

[None].

Proposed question(s) for future Report Format

- 11.1 Has any assessment of ecosystem services associated with migratory species been undertaken in your country?
If yes, please give details (including source references where applicable).

Target 12

The genetic diversity of wild populations of migratory species is safeguarded, and strategies have been developed and implemented for minimizing genetic erosion.

Note: Safeguarding actions may include maintenance of the original gene pool for migratory species that are managed under human care for re-introduction into the wild and other purposes, or are otherwise of socio-economic as well as cultural value.

National Report-based indicator suggested in Indicator Factsheets?

12.1 CMS National Report Format question, in two parts.

Existing indicators are not well suited to addressing genetic erosion in wild animals. The most feasible course is probably to ask CMS Parties to report on *activities* that relate to this target, in response to two questions.

The first question would ask about the development of strategies for minimizing genetic erosion that are relevant to migratory species. (Limiting this to strategies addressing only migratory species might narrow the scope too strictly; hence the reference to strategies that are “of relevance” to migratory species).

The second question would ask about implementation actions, including implementation of relevant strategies where these have been mentioned in response to the first question, and including other projects or initiatives which may be contributing to the achievement of the target.

Relevant questions in COP11 National Report Format

[None specifically].

Related comments in UNEP-WCMC report on CMS NRF Oct 2014

[None].

Proposed question(s) for future Report Format

- 12.1 Are strategies of relevance to migratory species being developed or implemented to minimise genetic erosion of biodiversity in your country?
 If yes:
 (a) please give details;
 (b) describe the relevance to migratory species.
- 12.2 Are any other steps being taken in your country to safeguard the genetic diversity of wild populations of migratory species?
 If yes,
 (a) please give details.
 (b) describe the results achieved so far.

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.

Note: Other types of national plans and strategies, such as those for the implementation of other Multilateral Environmental Agreements or national development plans, may also be highly relevant. Even if they are not designed overtly to have biodiversity-related purposes, plans for issues such as land use, resource use, public health, disaster risk reduction, infrastructure distribution and economic development can include provisions that make an important difference to migratory species conservation. Actions towards this SPMS target may also contribute to SPMS target 2.

National Report-based indicator suggested in Indicator Factsheets?

[None].

Relevant questions in COP11 National Report Format

3. Listing of migratory species in Appendix II

IV. National and Regional Priorities

2. Are migratory species and their habitats addressed by your country's national biodiversity strategy or action plan?
 - 2.1. If Yes, please indicate and briefly describe the extent to which it addresses the following issues:
 - Minimizing or eliminating barriers or obstacles to migration [*Also relevant to Target 7*]
 - Transboundary co-operation [*Also relevant to Target 9*]
 - Conservation, sustainable use and/or restoration of the habitats of migratory species, including protected areas [*Also relevant to Target 10*]
 - Conservation, sustainable use and/or restoration of migratory species [*Also relevant to Target 8*]
 - Research and monitoring of migratory species [*Also relevant to Target 15*]
 - Actions to prevent, reduce or control factors that are endangering or are likely to further endanger migratory species (e.g. alien invasive species or by-catch) [*Also relevant to Target 7*].

Related comments in UNEP-WCMC report on CMS NRF Oct 2014

[None].

Proposed question(s) for future Report Format

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

If yes:

 - (a) please give details of the elements in the plan/strategy that are particularly relevant;
 - (b) please highlight any specific references to CMS and/or its agreements and action plans;
 - (c) please add comments on the implementation of the strategy or action plan concerned.

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.

Note: This target reflects international thinking on the subject in other fora.

National Report-based indicator suggested in Indicator Factsheets?

Yes:

14.1 CMS National Report Format question.

Parties would be invited to provide a narrative comment on the extent to which they have achieved this target, in their own context. They would need to respond to each of the two distinct parts of the expectation, namely (i) respect and (ii) participation, and in addition to a comment, they could be asked to score their own assessment of achievement on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (good).

The extent to which Target 14 is relevant will vary from country to country (some will have more indigenous and local communities, and/or more traditional knowledge, innovations and practices, and/or more customary sustainable uses, than others) - but it is likely that in nearly every case a country should be able to report at least something in relation to these issues. This can of course include information on how they have contributed to the achievement of the target elsewhere, in a context of international cooperation.

In answering this question Parties will be able to draw on information relating to implementation of Aichi Target 18 and the associated Programme of Work, Plan of Action and Guidance on relevant provisions in the CBD (Articles 8(j), 10(c) and related provisions), provided they give specific consideration to the migratory species aspects of this.

Relevant questions in COP11 National Report Format

X. Implementation of COP Resolutions and Recommendations

Please provide information about measures undertaken by your country relating to recent Resolutions and Recommendations since the last Report. For your convenience please refer to the list of COP Resolutions and Recommendations listed below:

Resolutions [*include*]:

Capacity Building Strategy (9.12 / 10.6) [*Also under Targets 15 and 16*].

Related comments in UNEP-WCMC report on CMS NRF Oct 2014

[None].

Proposed question(s) for future Report Format

- 14.1 Have actions been taken by your country to foster respect 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?
If yes, please give details.

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

If yes, please give details.

14.3 To what extent overall have any actions in your country of the kind described in questions [14.1] and [14.2] above helped to achieve Target 14 of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species (“*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*”)?

(Tick one box). (1 = minimal contribution, 5 = very significant contribution).

1	2	3	4	5	(Not applicable)

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.

Note: The “science base” here does not relate only to new research and monitoring, but also to making better use of existing datasets (including improving their public availability), and improving the standardization of data collection protocols. In addition to investigation and understanding of specific events, phenomena, patterns and consequences, greater efforts may also be required to improve data on baseline conditions, so that meaningful assessments of significance, and assessments of change, can be made.

National Report-based indicator suggested in Indicator Factsheets?

[None].

Relevant questions in COP11 National Report Format

VI. Policies on Satellite Telemetry

1. In the current reporting period, has your country undertaken conservation/research projects that use satellite telemetry?
If yes what is the state of those projects?
Please provide details.
2. Are any future conservation/research projects planned that will use satellite telemetry?
If Yes, please provide details (including the expected timeframe for these projects):
3. Results - please describe the positive outcomes of any actions taken.

IX. Mobilization of Resources

4. Has your country provided technical and/or scientific assistance to developing countries to facilitate initiatives for the benefit of migratory species?
If Yes, please provide details (Indicate the migratory species that have benefited from these activities).

X. Implementation of COP Resolutions and Recommendations

Please provide information about measures undertaken by your country relating to recent Resolutions and Recommendations since the last Report. For your convenience please refer to the list of COP Resolutions and Recommendations listed below:

Resolutions [*include*]:

CMS Information Priorities (9.3) [*Also under Target 1*].

Capacity Building Strategy (9.12 / 10.6) [*Also under Targets 14 and 16*].

Related comments in UNEP-WCMC report on CMS NRF Oct 2014

In relation to Section VI (Policies on satellite telemetry) UNEP-WCMC recommended consideration of whether Parties need to provide details on all projects, or only those of particular interest (eg the three whose results are most interesting). If the latter approach is taken, the question could be restructured according to a list of specific questions for each project, depending on what information that is most needed - e.g. species involved, timeframe, phase of development (planned/ongoing/completed) and positive outcomes. They also recommended consideration of which details are needed (which should then be explicitly requested).

Another WCMC recommendation on this issue was to combine the questions concerning past and planned projects (VI.1 and VI.2), since several Parties reported details of the same projects in answer to both.

A reformulation of the two questions (combined into one) was proposed as follows [*paraphrased here for present purposes*]:

- Q: In the current reporting period, has your country undertaken or planned conservation/ research projects that use satellite telemetry?
- If projects are planned/in preparation, please provide details of the expected timeframe and species involved in these.
 - If projects are ongoing, please provide details of the timeframe and species involved in these.
 - If projects were completed, please provide details of the timeframe and species involved in these.
 - If no projects have been undertaken/planned, please provide details of the reasons why not.

Proposed question(s) for future Report Format

- 15.1 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 (*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*)?
- (a) Please give details.
- (b) Please comment in particular (where applicable) on aspects relating to:
- Training;
 - Sharing and transfer of information and technologies;
 - Improving the science base;
 - Effective application of improved understanding.

Target 16

The mobilization of adequate resources from all sources to implement the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species effectively has increased substantially.

Note: This target refers to resource mobilization in the broad sense including international and domestic funding from public, private and other sources. It however also implies policy choices that reduce the costs of improving the status of migratory species and thus also benefits from the correct implementation of Goals 1 and 2. Developing countries, least developed countries, small island developing states and countries with economies in transition have particularly acute needs in this regard. Resource flows to as well as within these countries need to increase, both through "north-south" and "south-south" cooperation.

National Report-based indicator suggested in Indicator Factsheets?

[None].

Relevant questions in COP11 National Report Format

II. Appendix I species

1. General questions on Appendix I species [*this group of questions repeated for each taxonomic group*]
- 2c. What assistance, if any, does your country require in order to overcome [obstacles to migration that exist in relation to Appendix I species]?
- 3d. What assistance, if any, does your country require to overcome [factors that are endangering or are likely to further endanger [bird etc] species beyond actions to prevent disruption to migrating behaviour]?

2. Questions on CMS Agreements

Questions on the development of new CMS Agreements relating to [Bird] Species [*this question repeated for each taxonomic group*]

3. If your country has initiated or is participating in the development of a new Agreement or Memorandum of Understanding, what assistance, if any, does your country require in order to initiate or participate in the instrument's development?

IX. Mobilization of Resources

1. Has your country made financial resources available for conservation activities having direct benefits for migratory species in your country?
If Yes, please provide details (Indicate the migratory species that have benefited from these activities):
2. Has your country made voluntary contributions to the CMS Trust Fund to support requests from developing countries and countries with economies in transition?
3. Has your country made other voluntary financial contributions to support conservation activities having direct benefits for migratory species in other countries (particularly developing countries)?
5. Has your country received financial assistance/support from the CMS Trust Fund, via the CMS Secretariat, for national conservation activities having direct benefits for migratory species in your country?
6. Has your country received financial assistance/support from sources other than the CMS Secretariat for conservation activities having direct benefit for migratory species in your country?

X. Implementation of COP Resolutions and Recommendations

Please provide information about measures undertaken by your country relating to recent Resolutions and Recommendations since the last Report. For your convenience please refer to the list of COP Resolutions and Recommendations listed below:

Resolutions [*include*]:

Capacity Building Strategy (9.12 / 10.6) [*Also under Targets 14 and 15*].

Related comments in UNEP-WCMC report on CMS NRF Oct 2014

Questions asking “What assistance, if any, does your country require...” arise frequently in different sections of the report format. Since there has been considerable repetition in the responses to this question by individual Parties, UNEP-WCMC recommended combining all these questions into one section. They also recommended constructing them in a closed way with multiple-choice options. In the suggestion they put forward (below), the options offered are based on needs commonly cited by Parties, and the areas of work are those for which questions on assistance are included in the current (COP11) report format. It was also suggested that further questions requesting additional information could also be added if the extra detail of this was thought to be useful.

Suggested question: What assistance, if any, does your country require in order to implement the Convention, and for what specific activities?

	Action against threats	Development of species listing proposals	Development of new Agreements	Satellite telemetry studies	Other
Financial support					
Technical/material/logistical support					
Training/human resources					
Scientific support					
Regional/international cooperation					
Other					
No assistance required					

CMS Secretariat comments on these recommendations (Abu Dhabi office 13/10/14) suggested that that the table could include an additional column relating to assistance required to implement existing CMS Agreements/MoUs/Action Plans. The singling out of satellite telemetry studies was also questioned, and it was suggested that the column concerned could be re-titled “Studies and projects (including satellite telemetry)” or similar.

UNEP-WCMC further queried whether the question in Section IX on mobilization of resources concerning contributions to the CMS Trust Fund (IX.2) is needed (or whether the information can be gathered from elsewhere), and suggested clarifying the information required. Party responses indicated some confusion as to whether the question referred to contributions beyond the normal contributions to CMS.

Proposed question(s) for future Report Format

- 16.1 Has your country made financial or other resources available for conservation activities specifically benefiting migratory species in your country?
If yes, please provide details (including details of the migratory species that have benefited).
- 16.2 Has your country made financial or other resources available for conservation activities specifically benefiting migratory species in other countries?
If yes, please provide details (including details of the countries concerned).
- 16.3 Has your country received financial or other resources for conservation activities specifically benefiting migratory species?
If yes, please provide details (including details of the source(s) of support).
- 16.4 Have steps been taken in your country to implement the CMS Capacity Building Strategy 2015-2017 (UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.20.2)?
If yes, please provide details.