

**Questionnaire to the attention of CMS and CMS agreement Parties/Signatories  
Phase 2 of the Intersessional Working Group on the Future Shape of the CMS**

---

*If you are a Party to CMS or to one or more of its Agreements or signatory to one or more of its Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) please provide your answers in relation to each where relevant.*

***CMS from a national perspective:***

*This series of questions aims to identify the factors that distinguish CMS and its Agreements and MOUs from other existing conservation mechanisms and to identify barriers to engagement and opportunities for improving them.*

**I. What do you consider to be the added value of being a Party to CMS?**

a) Please assess its added value from a 1 (no added value) to 10 scale (essential) in Annex I:

b) compared CMS added value to the species conservation mechanisms already existing

- at the regional level (EU, etc.) and
- in other multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs), CBD, CITES, etc.

**II. What do you consider to be the added value of the CMS Agreements to which your country is a Party (Please use as much space as necessary for your answer, according to the number of Agreements your country is a Party to)**

*For each instrument:*

a) Please assess the added value of each CMS Agreement to which your country is a Party from a 1 (no added value) to 10 scale (essential) in Annex I:

b) compared the CMS Agreement added value to the species conservation mechanisms already existing

- at the regional level (EU, etc.) and
- in other MEAs (CBD, CITES, Ramsar, etc).

**III. What do you consider to be the added value of the CMS MoU to which your country is a Signatory compared to the species conservation mechanisms already existing. (Please use as much space as necessary for your answer, according to the number of MoUs your country is a Party to)**

a) Please assess the added value of each CMS MoU to which your country is a Signatory from a 1 (no added value) to 10 scale (essential) in Annex I:

b) compared the CMS MoU added value to the species conservation mechanisms already existing

- at the regional level (EU, etc.) and
- in other MEAs (CBD, CITES, Ramsar, etc).

**IV.** Do you have sufficient human and financial resources and capacities in your country to fully implement CMS and/or its agreements?

Do resource limitations preclude you from becoming a Party/Signatory to CMS, Agreements and/or its MOUs and to adhere to newly created CMS instruments? If so, please provide examples.

What measures would be likely to improve your country's participation, implementation and overall satisfaction with the CMS, its Agreements and MOUs?

***Convention and agreement implementation:***

*This series of questions aims to assess the success of the CMS and its Agreements and MOUs in delivering their conservation objectives and identify options for improvement (see ERIC report § 4.2 pages 24 to 44)*

**V.** Please give your assessment<sup>1</sup> basing yourself on the list of advantages and disadvantages annexed to Eric report and adding any further elements as you judge necessary and appropriate

- a) the successes and failures of the CMS
- b) the successes and failures of the CMS Agreements in delivering their respective actions plans and coordinated actions. *(Please use as much space as necessary for your answer, according to the number of Agreements your country is a Party to)*
- c) the successes and failures of the CMS MOUs in delivering their respective actions plans and coordinated actions. *(Please use as much space as necessary for your answer, according to the number of MOUs your country is a Party to)*

For each of the above, where you consider action plans are not being satisfactorily implemented, please explain what you think should be done to improve the situation.

**VI.** Do you think the conservation measures adopted by the CMS and its instruments have proven effective in delivering their conservation objectives?

*Please, answer by using a 1 to 10 scale of effectiveness in Annex I.*

- a) Where they have been effective, please give examples and explain why you think so.
- b) Where they have not been effective, please give examples, explaining why this has been the case and how you think this should be addressed in future

**VII.** What do you think should be the strategic focus of CMS and its instruments in the short to medium term? For example:

- a) Maintain the current list of activities, but focussing on a short-list of priority objectives
- b) Reduce the current list of activities
- c) Establish new species programmes or Agreements/MOUs

---

<sup>1</sup> The performance to be assessed should refer to the holistic sense of CMS and Agreements, i.e. incl. Parties  
E.g. CMS and its instruments are treaties composed by individual Contracting Parties and institutional bodies while the Secretariat provides administrative support to them

- d) Increase engagement with other organisations to deliver shared conservation objectives

**VIII.** What opportunities do you think exist to develop synergies within the CMS between its existing Agreements and MOUs for the implementation of strategic/action plans and potentially to develop common plans (e.g. regional synergies, species overlap, etc.)?

***Structural organisation:***

*This series of questions aims to identify opportunities for restructuring of activities within the secretariats of CMS and its Agreements and MOUs and in the organisation of the Convention's activities. Please, base your answer on the assessment made by ERIC of the system in place (see ERIC report, pages 19 to 24) and add any further responses as judged necessary and appropriate.*

**IX.** What do you consider to be the advantages and disadvantages for the CMS and its MOUs, of the CMS Secretariat providing full secretariat services for its MOUs <sup>2</sup>?

What opportunities do you think exist for further amalgamation of the functions of the Secretariats of the CMS, its Agreements and MOUs?

**X.** What do you consider to be the advantages and disadvantages of co-locating Secretariats at a single site?

Can you suggest other more cost-effective alternatives to the current location arrangements?

What obstacles do you foresee to these alternative arrangements?

**XI.** What do you think are the advantages and disadvantages of restructuring the CMS Agreements and MOUs into the main migratory species groups, e.g. marine, avian, and terrestrial species?

What do you think will be the main barriers to such an approach and how do you think they might be overcome?

**XII.** What do you think are the advantages and disadvantages of restructuring the CMS Agreements and MOUs into clusters covering all the Agreements/MOUs in a specific region?

What do you think will be the main barriers to such an approach and how do you think they might be overcome?

**XIII.** Do you have any other thoughts on how the CMS and its Agreements and MOUs could more effectively deliver their conservation objectives?

***Financial aspects:***

*This series of questions aims to identify opportunities to address failures in delivering the objectives of the CMS and its Agreements and MOUs due to funding constraints (see ERIC Report §4.2.1 Financial perspective, pages 24 to 29)*

---

<sup>2</sup> Except for the IOSEA MoU (run by the office in Bangkok), the dugong and raptors MoUs (run by the Abu Dhabi coordination Unit)

**XIV.** What options do you consider are available to ensure that activities/projects agreed by Parties/Signatories to the CMS and its Agreements and MOUs are sufficiently resourced from the outset? *(please, insert as much space as necessary for your answer)*

**XV.** What are your views on the current arrangement whereby Parties' core financial contributions go mostly towards financing the institutional and operational organisation of CMS and its Agreements, whilst most of conservation activities are funded by voluntary contribution?

What alternative funding arrangements do you think could address this situation to ensure a balanced use of available resources?

**XVI.** What do you consider to be the advantages and disadvantages of the arrangement of 13% overhead charges applied by UNEP<sup>3</sup>?

What are your views on the application of this arrangement to Parties' voluntary contributions?

What alternatives to this arrangement do you think are available?

### ***Reporting and information management***

*This series of questions aims to identify opportunities to minimise the reporting burden faced by Parties and Signatories to the CMS and its Agreements and MOUs (see ERIC report §4.2.3, pages 32 to 35)*

**XVII.** What options do you think exist to minimise the reporting burden imposed by the CMS and its Agreements and MOUs both within your country and within the CMS Family?.

**XVIII.** What opportunities do you think exist for harmonising data collection, national reporting and information management within the CMS Family?

### ***Scientific resources and advice:***

*This series of questions aims to identify ways in which to provide the necessary scientific input to the CMS and its Agreements and MOUs in an efficient and cost-effective manner (see ERIC report §4.2.5, pages 37 to 43)*

**XIX.** What opportunities do you think exist for reducing the financial burden imposed by existing structures e.g Scientific Council and/ or Advisory Committees for providing scientific advice within the CMS Family and at the same time ensuring sound scientific basis for any decisions taken within the CMS Family?

What do you consider to be the advantages and disadvantages of outsourcing scientific advice to external bodies or organisations?

---

<sup>3</sup> UNEP charges 13% of the total income of the CMS, AEWA, ASCOBANS, EUROBATS and Gorillas Trust Funds as overhead costs. Part of this money is ploughed back into CMS to support functioning costs of CMS AEWA, ASCOBANS, EUROBATS and Gorillas.

Do you think that the existing scientific bodies e.g Scientific Councils and/ or Advisory Committees are fulfilling their mission and are delivering the appropriate scientific advice to the COP/MOP?

***Strengthening cooperation and synergies with MEAs, IGOs, and NGOs, the private sector and national programmes***

*This series of questions aims to identify opportunities for greater cooperation with other organisations, institutions or MEAs (see Eric report §4.3, pages 44 to 52)*

**XX.** What opportunities do you think exist to develop synergies between the CMS as well as its instruments and other MEAs for the implementation of the strategic/action plans and potentially to develop common strategic plans?

**XXI.** For each of the following areas please describe what opportunities you think exist for improved cooperation or coordination with other organisations and MEAs (*please identify*) and what the barriers to delivery might be:

- The provision of scientific advice
- Data exchange between organisations
- Fundraising and funding opportunities
- Development of common reporting requirements
- Capacity building
- The development of new species Agreement
- Joint projects and programmes
- Joint and/or back-to-back meetings including COPs/ MOPs
- Policy and Strategic plan definition
- Awareness raising

What opportunities do you think exist for sharing common services and developing partnerships with other organisations and MEAs, taking into account their own mandates and objectives?

Are there other areas where you think the effective delivery of CMS and its Agreements and MOUs could be improved by greater cooperation?

**XXII.** What are national programmes and public and/or private entities that could be taken into account for such a cooperation?

**Questionnaire to the attention of CMS and CMS agreement Parties/Signatories – Phase 2 of the  
Intersessional Working Group on the Future Shape of the CMS**

**ANNEX I**

CMS INSTRUMENTS	QUESTIONS			
	I	II	III	VI
<b>ACAP</b>				
<b>AEWA</b>				
<b>ACCOBAMS</b>				
<b>ASCOBANS</b>				
<b>EUROBATS</b>				
<b>GORILLAS</b>				
<b>WADDEN SEA SEALS</b>				
<b>Aquatic Warbler MoU</b>				
<b>Bukhara Deer MoU</b>				
<b>Dugong MoU</b>				
<b>Grassland Birds of South America MoU</b>				
<b>Great Bustard MoU</b>				
<b>High Andean Flamingos MoU</b>				
<b>Marine Turtles Africa MoU</b>				
<b>Marine Turtles IOSEA MoU</b>				
<b>Mediterranean Monk Seal MoU</b>				
<b>Pacific Islands Cetaceans MoU</b>				
<b>Raptors (Birds of Prey) MoU</b>				
<b>Ruddy-headed Goose MoU</b>				
<b>Saiga Antelope MoU</b>				
<b>Siberian Crane MoU</b>				
<b>Slender-billed Curlew MoU</b>				
<b>Western African Aquatic Mammals MoU</b>				
<b>West African Elephants MoU</b>				

**Questionnaire to the attention of Multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) – Phase 2 of  
the Intersessional Working Group on the Future Shape of the CMS**

---

***I. Existing partnership and collaboration arrangements with CMS and/or CMS agreements:***

*This series of questions aims to identify the current extent of cooperation and collaboration with the CMS, its Agreements and Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs)*

**1.** What, if any, partnerships or collaborative arrangements have your MEA developed with the CMS, its Agreements and MOUs? Please outline the purpose of these arrangements.

What do you consider to be the benefits derived from any such arrangements?

Did you encounter any problems with the implementation of these arrangements?

**2.** Which, if any species or groups of species does your MEA have in common with CMS, its Agreements and MOUs? What is in your view the added value of CMS and/ or its Agreements in this respect?

Please outline the key differences and similarities in the conservation activities of your MEA for these species and species groups as compared to CMS activities for the same ones

Has your institution developed common species conservation programmes with CMS? If so, please describe their key objectives.

What do you consider to be the benefits derived from these arrangements?

**3.** Has your MEA developed any shared work programmes or other collaborative arrangements with the CMS, its Agreements or MOUs on issues of common interest such as:

- capacity building
- information management
- climate change
- invasive alien species
- avian influenza
- outreach and public awareness
- Convention implementation

If so, please describe the arrangement and outline what you consider to be the advantages and disadvantages of them?

***II. Strengthening cooperation and synergies with CMS and/or CMS agreements***

*This series of questions aims to identify opportunities for strengthening cooperative and collaborative arrangements between your MEA and the CMS, its Agreements and MOUs*

*Recognising that you cannot necessarily speak on behalf of the Parties to your MEA and any views expressed will only represent the views of the Secretariat we would nonetheless be grateful to hear your views on the following issues.*

1) *MEA implementation:*

4. Do you envisage any opportunities in your current strategic/action plan to develop synergies with CMS, its agreements or MOUs?

Do you think that improved efficiencies can be achieved for your MEA by developing such synergies with CMS, its agreements or MOUs? Please describe.

5. Do you envisage any opportunities to develop joint programmes or activities (or further extending existing ones) on species or group of species also covered by CMS its agreements or MOUs?

What benefits do you think could be realised by the establishment of such joint programmes?

Do you consider there to be opportunities to develop joint programmes or activities (or further extending existing ones) on issues of common interest such as climate change, capacity building, information management, etc.?

What benefits to you think could be realised by the establishment of such joint programmes?

What opportunities do you consider might be available to ensure greater coherence between the programmes and activities of MEAs in the future?

2) *Scientific resources and advice:*

*This series of questions aims to identify ways in which to provide scientific input in an efficient and cost-effective manner*

6. What opportunities do you think exist to share scientific resources between your MEA and the CMS and its agreements and MOUs?

What obstacles to utilise shared scientific resources do you think exist and how do you think they might be overcome?

What alternative structures - to the existing ones - do you think are available for providing efficient and cost-effective scientific advice to MEAs?

3) *Strategic plan development*

7. Do you envisage any opportunities to develop common strategic plans with CMS Family instruments in the future?

Do you think this arrangement would improve effectiveness?

4) *Reporting and information management:*

*This series of questions aims to identify opportunities for minimising reporting burdens.*

**8.** What options do you think exist to minimise the reporting burden imposed by the biodiversity MEAs.

**9.** What opportunities do you think exist for harmonising data collection and management across the biodiversity MEAs and what benefits can be derived?

5) *Administrative integration/co-location with CMS and CMS Family:*

*This series of questions aims to identify opportunities for reducing administrative costs.*

**10.** Do you think any opportunities exist to develop cooperative working arrangements with the Secretariats of the CMS, its agreements and MOUs, such as in the provision of IT support services or other office functions?

**11.** Do you think that opportunities exist to co-locate your offices with the CMS, its Agreements or MOUs, in particular where common activities exist in different regions of the world?

What do you think would be the limitations of co-location?

**12.** Would you ever envisage opportunities for back-to-back or combined meetings with the CMS, its Agreements or MOUs (Conference of the Parties, Technical Committee, Standing Committee, Species related meeting and/or working group meetings) and under what conditions?

\*\*\*\*\*

**Questionnaire to the attention of IGOs, NGOs and research institutions**  
**Phase 2 of the Intersessional Working Group on the Future Shape of the CMS**

---

***Summary of NGO relationship with the CMS, its Agreements or its Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs)***

**I.** Please provide a brief summary of the mission, the geographical and species scope and the objectives of your organisation in relation to CMS's (CMS and CMS Family)

**II.** Are you a signatory to one of the CMS MOUs?

**III.** Do you have an official role in one of the bodies of CMS and/ or agreements/MOUs

**IV.** Did your organisation conclude a Memorandum of Cooperation and/ or a Joint Work Plan with CMS and/ or its agreements?

**V.** Provide details of your cooperation and support to CMS and CMS agreements (institutional, technical and/or financial support).

***Convention and agreement implementation:***

*This series of questions aims to assess the success of the CMS and its Agreements and MOUs in delivering their conservation objectives and identify options for improvement (see ERIC report § 4.2 pages 24 to 44)*

**VI.** Please give your assessment<sup>4</sup> basing yourself on the list of advantages and disadvantages annexed to Eric report and adding any further elements as you judge necessary and appropriate

d) the successes and failures of CMS

e) the successes and failures of the CMS Agreements in delivering their respective actions plans and coordinated actions. *(Please use as much space as necessary for your answer, according to the number of Agreements)*

f) the successes and failures of the CMS MOUs in delivering their respective actions plans and coordinated actions. *(Please use as much space as necessary for your answer, according to the number of MOUs)*

For each of the above, where you consider action plans are not being satisfactorily implemented, please explain what you think should be done to improve the situation.

**VII.** Do you think the conservation measures adopted by the CMS and its instruments have proven effective in delivering their conservation objectives?

*Please, answer by using a 1 to 10 scale of effectiveness in Annex I.*

---

<sup>4</sup> The performance to be assessed should refer to the holistic sense of CMS and Agreements, i.e. incl. Parties  
E.g. CMS and its instruments are treaties composed by individual Contracting Parties and institutional bodies while the Secretariat provides administrative support to them

- c) Where they have been effective, please give examples and explain why you think so.
- d) Where they have not been effective, please give examples, explaining why this has been the case and how you think this should be addressed in future

**VIII.** What do you think should be the strategic focus of CMS and its instruments in the short to medium term? For example:

- e) Maintain the current list of activities, but focussing on a short-list of priority objectives
- f) Reduce the current list of activities
- g) Establish new species programmes or Agreements/MOUs
- h) Increase engagement with other organisations to deliver shared conservation objectives

**IX.** What opportunities do you think exist to develop synergies within the CMS between its existing Agreements and MOUs for the implementation of strategic/action plans and potentially to develop common plans (e.g. regional synergies, species overlap, etc.)?

***Structural organisation:***

*This series of questions aims to identify opportunities for restructuring of activities within the secretariats of CMS and its Agreements and MOUs and in the organisation of the Convention's activities. Please, base your answer on the assessment made by ERIC of the system in place (see ERIC report, pages 19 to 24) and add any further responses as judged necessary and appropriate.*

**XII.** What do you consider to be the advantages and disadvantages for the CMS and its MOUs, of the CMS Secretariat providing full secretariat services for its MOUs<sup>5</sup>?

What opportunities do you think exist for further amalgamation of the functions of the Secretariats of the CMS, its Agreements and MOUs?

**XIII.** What do you consider to be the advantages and disadvantages of co-locating Secretariats at a single site?

Can you suggest other more cost-effective alternatives to the current location arrangements?

What obstacles do you foresee to these alternative arrangements?

**XIV.** What do you think are the advantages and disadvantages of restructuring the CMS Agreements and MOUs into the main migratory species groups, e.g. aquatic, avian, and terrestrial species?

What do you think will be the main barriers to such an approach and how do you think they might be overcome?

---

<sup>5</sup> Except for the IOSEA MoU (run by the office in Bangkok), the dugong and raptors MoUs (run by the Abu Dhabi coordination Unit)

**XV.** What do you think are the advantages and disadvantages of restructuring the CMS Agreements and MOUs into clusters covering all the Agreements/MOUs in a specific region?

What do you think will be the main barriers to such an approach and how do you think they might be overcome?

**XVI.** Do you have any other thoughts on how the CMS and its Agreements and MOUs could more effectively deliver their conservation objectives?

***Scientific resources and advice:***

*This series of questions aims to identify ways in which to provide the necessary scientific input to the CMS and its Agreements and MOUs in an efficient and cost-effective manner (see ERIC report §4.2.5, pages 37 to 43)*

**XVII.** What opportunities do you think exist for reducing the financial burden imposed by existing structures e.g. Scientific Councils and/ or Advisory Committees for providing scientific advice within the CMS Family and at the same time ensuring sound scientific basis for any decisions taken within the CMS Family?

What do you consider to be the advantages and disadvantages of outsourcing scientific advice to external bodies or organisations?

Do you think that the existing scientific bodies e.g Scientific Councils and/ or Advisory Committees are fulfilling their mission and are delivering the appropriate scientific advice to the COP/MOP?

***Strengthening cooperation and synergies with MEAs, IGOs, and NGOs, the private sector and national programmes***

*This series of questions aims to identify opportunities for greater cooperation with other organisations, institutions or MEAs (see Eric report §4.3, pages 44 to 52)*

**XVIII.** What opportunities do you think exist to develop synergies between the CMS as well as its instruments and other MEAs for the implementation of the strategic/action plans and potentially to develop common strategic plans?

**XIX.** For each of the following areas please describe what opportunities you think exist for improved cooperation or coordination with other organisations and MEAs (*please identify*) and what the barriers to delivery might be:

- The provision of scientific advice
- Data exchange between organisations
- Fundraising and funding opportunities
- Development of common reporting requirements
- Capacity building
- The development of new species Agreement
- Joint projects and programmes
- Joint and/or back-to-back meetings including COPs/ MOPs
- Policy and Strategic plan definition
- Awareness raising

What opportunities do you think exist for sharing common services and developing partnerships with other organisations and MEAs, taking into account their own mandates and objectives?

Are there other areas where you think the effective delivery of CMS and its Agreements and MOUs could be improved by greater cooperation?

**XX.** What are national programmes and public and/or private entities that could be taken into account for such a cooperation?