

THE NATURAL AFFILIATION: DEVELOPING THE ROLE OF NGOs IN THE CMS FAMILY

PART ONE SUMMARY OF THE *REVIEW: DEFINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NGO COMMUNITY
AND CMS* FOR THE 40TH MEETING OF THE CMS STANDING COMMITTEE

Document author: Margi Prideaux - Migratory Wildlife Network

NGO Review Group: Claire Mirande - International Crane Foundation, Nicola Crockford - Birdlife
International Mamadou Diallo- WWF Senegal, Nicola Hodgins - Whale and Dolphin Conservation

*A project funded by the Secretariat to the Convention on Migratory Species, Whale and Dolphin Conservation,
and the Migratory Wildlife Network*

THE NATURAL AFFILIATION: SUMMARY FINDINGS

“The serious environmental, social and economic challenges faced by societies worldwide cannot be addressed by public authorities alone without the involvement and support of a wide range of stakeholders, including individual citizens and civil society organisations.”

Aarhus Convention, 1998

In the margins of the 10th Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) Conference of the Parties (CoP), the Migratory Wildlife Network & Friends of CMS convened a *Civil Society Dialogue* to begin a process of discussion among civil society (Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs), wildlife scientists and wildlife policy specialists) about the CMS agenda. The views expressed during the *Dialogue* indicated that a greater exploration of the relationship between NGOs and CMS would be beneficial, especially in light of the CMS Strategic Planning Process that was about to commence.

Comments by the *Dialogue* participants suggested that:

Often civil society – mostly in the form of NGOs – are the implementers and sometimes even the coordinators of work under the convention and its agreements. NGOs felt that this contribution could be better developed and deployed across all the CMS agreements.

Communities and NGOs can provide fuel for decision makers. However, NGO programmes are often, by necessity, localised. Efforts at this level can quickly become scattered. If facilitated properly, CMS could usefully pull these activities together.

NGOs also felt that most of the CMS agreements are poorly linked to other Multi-lateral Environment Agreements (MEAs), and consequently NGOs often find their agreement-focused work is not reflected in the policy developments of other fora – either by CMS or Governments.

They also commented that better use could be made of the extensive and important technical expertise, such as the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Specialist Groups and the IUCN Red List, and that exploring this should be an important priority for CMS going forward.

Achieving the targets set in the Nagoya Strategic Plan will require coordinated decision making. There are significant possibilities for CMS to function on that higher political level. Coordinated NGO support will be an important aspect of this.

CMS lacks direct leverage mechanisms like, for instance, the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) trade restrictions. Further thought should be applied to developing mechanisms to promote national implementation of decisions taken during CMS CoPs and agreement meetings.

There is no current mechanism for NGO involvement in CMS and CMS agreements to be formally and consistently reported to CMS Parties (as a measure of implementation, rather than simply support) in a structured and measurable way, while there is great potential for increasing these roles and for formalizing these technical and strategic relationships.

With the support of CMS and NGO project funders – Whale and Dolphin Conservation (WDC, *previously known as the Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society - WDCCS*), Migratory Wildlife Network funders – the Migratory Wildlife Network instigated a focused Review about NGO perspectives on CMS as a mechanism, CMS’s influence and implementation and NGO contributions to this influence and implementation. The Review: *Defining the Relationship Between the NGO Community and CMS* seeks to help better define the existing relationship between the NGO community and CMS in its present form and help to guide building that relationship into the future. Part One of the Review is offered as a contribution to the CMS Strategic Plan 2015–2023 Working Group process, and focuses on the relationship NGOs have with CMS as a whole. Part Two will focus on the relationship NGOs have with CMS Agreements, memorandum of understanding and concerted actions and will be completed in the coming months, at which time the detailed finding of the full Review will be presented to CMS.

An NGO Review Group has been established to provide project oversight and feedback as Part One and Part Two of the Review develops.

The NGOs that participated in Part One of the Review were drawn from direct approaches because of their organisational profile of working on species related work, or asked to be involved after reading the open invitation sent out on a number of e-lists. The aim was to include a spectrum of views ranging from those who worked closely with CMS and were highly invested in the Convention's work through to challenging critics. Almost all of the NGOs approached were pleased to hear that this process was underway. Some felt they had little to contribute at this stage, but wanted to be kept apprised of progress.

A total of 141 individuals from 89 NGOs were contacted directly to seeking their input to Part One of the Review process. Although the northern summer holiday season and the very busy international meeting calendar stretching from the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) through the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Conference of the Parties quite possibly reduced the number of people who would have liked to have input, over 40 telephone interviews and written surveys were completed. The details of each will be annexed to the final Review. The cross section of regions, perspectives, organisational size, international/regional/national/local focus and taxonomic coverage was fairly balanced.

Close coordination was regularly maintained with Mr Dave Pritchard the independent consultant supporting the CMS Working Group

This document represents a brief summary of the results of Part One of the Review. Supporting material and analyses have been compiled in a separate archive. Part Two: *The Relationship NGOs have with CMS Agreements* will be completed in the coming months, and which point the Review will be presented in full.

CIVIL SOCIETY AND MEAS

"Civil society is the sphere of institutions, organisations and individuals located between the family, the state and the market in which people associate voluntarily to advance common interests"

Helmut K Anheier, 2004
'Civil Society: Measurement, Evaluation, Policy'
Earthscan, London, p 22

Discussion in the past decade surrounding the International Environmental Governance agenda highlighted the pressures on States to encompass and implement an expanding range of international enviro-political issues^[1]. Putting aside the financial constraints in implementing an expanding agenda, the sheer number of different instrument has created a complicated policy field. While some commentators have suggested that consolidation of instruments into a single governance system is an answer^[2], others have recognised that the sheer number of instruments directly reflects the breadth of detail that must be addressed. There is growing recognition of the complexity, pervasiveness, and mutual interdependence of environmental problems, which is reshaping environmental regulation and natural resource management both within the nation state and internationally^[3, 4]. An increasing density of intergovernmental interaction, interplay, overlap or co-governance has contributed to the rescaling of politics, illustrating the interdependence between institutional context and political action^[4]. Moving forward it seems prudent to consider carefully the deployment of governmental, inter-governmental and non-governmental resources to ensure the greatest gain.

Global civil society is a transnational domain in which people form relationships surrounding issues of mutual interests. It is a self-organising system that collects expertise and like its domestic counterpart, global civil society supports activities that shape widespread behaviour and influence the ways that public policy issues are addressed^[5-8]. NGOs operating within this global civil society adhere to norms, codes of conduct and forms of governance that are mutually understood, shared and evolving. Many of these NGOs are well known to the CMS family, and some already have a history of working closely with elements of the CMS family.

While NGO diplomacy is becoming more coordinated, effective and consistent^[9-12], a new form of 'collaborative governance' based around the interactions of the socio-political system involving the public, private and civil sectors is also developing in many international fora^[3, 13]. Historically, where conventional frameworks have been focused on compliance, the perceived muddiness in governance arrangements that seek to tie typically horizontal 'collaborative governance' efforts together with more conventional vertical arrangements pose a challenge in both measuring performance^[14] but also in the development of mutual trust.

To be successful ‘collaborative governance’ must construct an institutional framework that facilitates a complex mix of policy, discourse, negotiation and arbitration – with an eye to also considering variables such as prior history of conflict or cooperation, the incentives for stakeholders to participate, power and resources imbalances, leadership, and institutional design [13, 15-17]. ‘Collaborative governance’ arrangements can and do extend governmental resources, develop new solutions, and enable decisions that go beyond compliance [14, 18]. They tap a broad range of resources and discretionary authorities held by a variety of Government and non-government stakeholders to be applied to a problem. Coordination is achieved by the commitment of each to act in accordance with an agreed, though always evolving plan devised and periodically revised by all those involved [3].

It is also fair to say that already, most governmental departments responsible for environmental issues operate in a situation of devolution – either to their counterpart departments of justice for legal representation, departments for resource management for threat mitigation relating to resource extraction (be it mining, fisheries or agriculture), or through contracts engaging outside organisations in on-ground works – typically comparatively little of policy implementation is carried out by environment department staff [18, 19]. The CMS family is also growing accustomed to using the services of NGOs for certain activities, but these services have been offered or asked for on an adhoc basis. There has not yet been a systematic consideration of the gaps that exists in the CMS programme that might be more formally supported by the NGO community.

However, moving to a situation where the NGO community is able to contribute more systematically and consistently to the work of CMS requires the right dynamic to be created. Success factors such as active dialogue, trust building (which includes mutual transparency and accountability) and the development of commitment and shared understanding becomes paramount [9, 16, 20-23]. It is also necessary to have an accessible and meaningful long-term forward plan.

While this review is specifically focused on the relationships that NGOs have now and wish to have with the CMS family in the future, it is worth noting that two seminal projects have recently been completed: *Transforming governance and institutions for global sustainability: key insights from the Earth System Governance Project* and *The Stakeholder Empowerment Project*. The messages and recommendations from these important studies are that a transformative structural change in global governance is required to address the environmental situation the world now faces.

These project findings include *inter alia* strengthening international environmental treaties, managing conflicts among international treaties, strengthening national governance and strengthening accountability and legitimacy [24].

The Stakeholder Empowerment Project specifically found that:

- One-off opportunities for Civil Society to interact with Member States in intergovernmental meetings do not provide an effective space for impacting policy decisions.
- Evidence shows that the earlier that Civil Society is involved in designing their participation in an intergovernmental meeting, the more likely they will impact the final outcome and cement their continued participation in the process.
- There is still a considerable gap between the language used by Civil Society and the language used by policy-makers and government delegations in intergovernmental meetings.
- Limited funds and a lack of understanding of intergovernmental processes remain key barriers to preventing effective Civil Society participation in international meetings.
- The most positive instances of Civil Society participation in intergovernmental meetings were ones in which the preparatory and follow-up stages were treated as multi-stakeholder processes in and of themselves.
- Civil Society cited ‘impacting the final outcome’ as only one of the many reasons why they choose to attend intergovernmental meetings.
- UN agencies, programmes and funds tend to compartmentalise all civil society relations to a single unit/department rather than adopting an institutional approach. [25]

HOW CMS IS PERCEIVED BY NGOS

NGOs agree that CMS’s role has been to champion international cooperation on species conservation and to lead strategic initiatives through the organization of range state meetings and development of conservation plans. A significant capacity has been developed in the impressive number of Agreements, memorandum of understanding and concerted actions.

Many governments, regional agreements and legal regimes address habitat and species protection and conservation. CMS could play a significant role in acting as 'bridge' between these national, regional and international commitments, enhancing Signatories ability to maximise the value of their individual efforts. CMS's focus on migratory species and populations puts CMS in unique position to enhance the delivery of these various mechanisms in a strategic and effective way.

Given the wide spectrum of NGOs who participated in Stage One of the Review there was a correspondingly wide spectrum of perceptions about how best to proceed next, but these can be summarised down to a few key points:

- CMS is valued by the NGO community and strengthening CMS capacity is important
- CMS has built an important architecture, but attention should now be turned to: placing CMS within the context of other MEAs, in particular as a driver of migratory species conservation strategy considerations into, and delivery point for CBD and CITES; and to demonstrating an implementation record
- NGOs wish to increase their involvement with CMS in a formalised and structured way that can recognise NGO contribution

CMS AMONGST OTHER MEAs

Using the metric of organisational staff/volunteer time that is allocated 'intentionally' on CMS related activities NGO responses to the survey were as follows:

As needs (defined as < 10% of conservation and policy staff/volunteer time): The vast majority of NGO respondents fell into this category, with a qualification that the time commitment increases when meetings are taking place. Most NGOs wished to be clear that they were forced to apply this metric across all of their work. What is important to note in this is that this group includes a number of NGOs that would be considered active in the CMS Family.

Part-time priority (defined as 10-25% of conservation and policy staff/volunteer time): The next highest reply was this category, with several NGOs indicating that specific agreements are major focuses for individual programmes

Medium priority (defined as 25-50% of conservation and policy staff/volunteer time): One organisation indicated that half of their time is spent implementing directly for (or on behalf of) CMS.

Significant priority (defined as 50-75% of conservation and policy staff/volunteer time): One organisation indicated CMS is a significant priority for them taking more than half of their time

Major focus (defined as 75-100% of conservation and policy staff/volunteer time): Two organisations indicated that CMS was the major focus of their work.

While many NGOs commented that it was important for them to work across all of the MEAs of relevance to their work, many also said that other MEAs currently offer more tangible outcomes for this work. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+) programme are 'fund generators' for conservation work. CITES delivers tangible and binding outcomes. Ramsar highlights conservation opportunity through declared Ramsar Sites and Important Bird Areas. CBD has become a coordination point for policy and draws together financing mechanisms. Organisations also invest a proportion of their time in The Protocol concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW) and Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR) because of the well integrated political and regional opportunities they offer.

IWC has historically been a long-standing commitment and the meeting frequency dictates a more significant time investment. The many RFMOs provide an immediate focus about the threats which forces NGO attention in their direction. The NGOs working on marine issues voiced that CMS, working with CITES, could add significant value to fisheries debates, bringing a species conservation voice into these fora.

Of those NGOs who work on other MEA or Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMOs), the majority committed a part-time priority (10-25%) to at least one of these MEAs, which is slightly higher than the commitment to CMS.

Resources are restricted within the NGO community and many organisations are choosing to prioritize their focus on tangible policy delivery, research or public awareness. Those NGOs who are prioritizing tangible policy delivery are regularly assessing what can be accomplished, what species are covered by different fora and if clear messages are being developed through the processes that the public understands.

For most NGOs the investment of time they commit to CMS is similar to what they committed 3 and 6 years ago. Most commented that they would be interested to increase their commitment of time if the conditions were right. **Almost all of the NGOs interviewed would have liked CMS to draw more heavily on their time. They would welcome CMS becoming a stronger delivery point that could not be ignored.**

INTEGRATION OF NGO EFFORTS INTO THE CMS PROGRAMME OF WORK

NGOs are often the implementers and sometimes even the coordinators of work under CMS and its agreements. Most NGOs felt that this contribution could be better developed and deployed. With a few notable exceptions within some CMS agreements and concerted actions, NGOs commented that while the CMS Secretariat draws upon the NGO expertise to a limited extent, there is very little in-country call for NGO advice and technical support, other than what is activated by NGOs themselves. Consequently, NGOs are not well integrated into strategic planning and thinking, especially where community environmental education is required. This is especially pertinent in regions where Government resources are stretched and capacity for on-the-ground action is low.

Communities and NGOs can provide fuel for decision makers. However, NGO programmes are often, by necessity, localised. Efforts at this level can quickly become scattered. If facilitated properly, CMS could usefully help map out and act as a focal point to pull these activities together. A number of NGOs highlighted that they could be drawn upon to strategically fill data gaps or research needs for CMS priority areas if there was a planned approach and strategically designed longer-term goals. In being able to coordinate their own strategic plans with that of CMS in advance, both NGOs and CMS could seek to ensure greater compatibility in delivery.

They also commented that better use could be made of the extensive and important technical expertise within the NGO and IGO community, such as the IUCN Specialist Groups and the IUCN Red List, and that exploring this should be an important priority for CMS going forward.

SUGGESTIONS MOVING FORWARD

MAKING THE MOST OF THE UNIQUE CMS ARCHITECTURE

Many of the NGOs felt a major focus for CMS should be making itself coherent with the CBD and CITES work plans. CMS has much to offer CBD and CITES by focusing on facilitating countries to focus on real deliverables and speed up implementation on the ground, especially in making better use of CMS's transboundary/inter-governmental negotiation abilities. CMS Agreements, memorandum of understanding and concerted actions can make use of regional 'edges', and can have great conservation impact. A number of NGOs commented that fulfilling such a role would gain CMS greater access to various funding arms.

This requires some additional in-house work on CMS's part. NGOs felt that there is a trend for CMS to negotiate agreements and then step-back waiting for them to gain momentum, without having established the infrastructure (finance and processes) for this momentum to build. All agreements need infrastructure to facilitate, monitor and report on progress, and for this progress to be recognised. Without these processes agreements can flounder.

INCREASING COOPERATION WITH NGOS

There is significant scope for NGOs and IGOs to provide specific types of implementation activity (scientific, technical, practical, local, popular, capacity-related, etc.) especially where a priority taxonomic or geographical gap is identified or capacity building with local NGOs in developing regions is needed. Advisory roles in the Scientific Council could be more explicitly codified, and formalised models such as the Ramsar Convention's "International Organisation Partners" construct may be worth exploring. NGOs would welcome a more structured and systematic long-term approach to joint planning (and evaluation) of their contribution to CMS implementation.

A number of NGOs suggested that increasing NGO involvement could be facilitated by making processes, meetings and information more accessible through better use of web and communication technologies (ie cloud sharing, online information management systems and web conferencing).

CMS might also be able to engage more strategically with the CMS agreement Partners if the agreements were used more actively as an informal surrogate for regional representation on CMS issues.

MEASURING PROGRESS

Many of the NGOs highlighted that CMS needs a monitoring and evaluation process that defines the main benchmarks for the convention's work. Some organisations suggested that robustness and quality in this area could be a way of providing some of the strength the CMS lacks through not having a legally enforceable compliance regime.

The absence of a formal mechanism for NGO involvement in CMS and CMS agreements to be regularly and consistently reported to CMS Parties (as a measure of implementation, rather than simply support) is an impediment to increasing NGO involvement and formalizing technical and strategic relationships. If it were possible to develop such a mechanism that could more transparently recognise the benefit of commitment the task of finding core funds would be easier to fulfil and NGO commitment would increase.

DEVELOPING PRIORITY AREAS

A number of NGOs felt that a strategic appraisal of where CMS can make the most difference is needed to identify and highlight priority work areas.

NGOs and research institutions are interested in doing research that it is relevant to CMS and agreements. Having CMS identify the list of areas that need research for institutes and researchers to draw upon for setting their priorities would help generate this type of support. Similarly, if short, medium and long term policy priorities were set and NGOs were invited into the planning for how to take issues forward, it would increase the NGO buy-in to CMS and CMS processes.

A number of NGOs commented that they would like to see the CMS messaging more overtly encompass habitat, as this is equally a part of the work CMS does and would help to separate out CMS's role from other Conventions such as CITES and the various RFMOs. A more specific focus on the development and management of marine and terrestrial wildlife corridors (including the High Seas), particularly transnational corridors was something that was urged by a few NGOs.

THE FORMAL HISTORY OF CMS AND NGOS

In 1994 the CMS Conference of the Parties (CMS CoP) adopted Recommendation 4.6: *The Role of non-Governmental Organizations in the Convention on Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals* which recognised that “*non-governmental organizations can represent influential movements in society and that - through their expertise - they can play an active role in the conservation of migratory species of wild animals*”^[26]. During that same CMS CoP4 they also encouraged “*Specialized non-governmental ... to play a more active role in the Convention, particularly by providing scientific advice, assisting in promotional activities and implementing projects for migratory species*” in Resolution 4.4: *Strategy for the Future Development of the Convention*^[27].

Subsequent CoPs maintained this level of recognition. In 1997 Resolution 5.4: *Strategy for the Future Development of the Convention* encouraged “*non-governmental organisations to target their project work, inter alia, towards the implementation of CMS and Agreements*”^[28] and once again specialized non-governmental organizations were “*...encouraged to play a more active role in the Convention, particularly by providing scientific advice, assisting in promotional activities and implementing projects for migratory species.*”

During CMS CoP6 in 1999 NGOs were recognized through the Djerba Declaration annexed to Recommendation 6.3: *Further Action for Sahelo-Saharan Antelopes*^[29]. Resolution 6.7: *Institutional Arrangements: Scientific Council*^[30] that invited six IGOs and four NGOs to participate as observers in the meetings of the Scientific Council and to “*consider establishing close working cooperative arrangements on matters of common interest*” and Resolution 6.4: *Strategic Plan For The Convention On Migratory Species*^[31] mentions the need to increasing attention “*... to coordinat[e] action, creating synergies and avoiding duplication among the respective treaty bodies and other concerned partners within the non-governmental*

community.” And Partner NGOs appears overtly in the Annex - Implementation of CMS Information Management Plan to Resolution 6.5: *Information Management Plan and National Reporting* [32].

In 2002 during CMS CoP7 the Secretariat was urged to “... *partnerships with interested organizations specialized in the conservation and management of migratory species for the provision of secretariat services for selected MoUs*” in Resolution 7.7: *Implementation of Existing Agreements* [33].

In 2005, during CMS CoP8, NGOs were encouraged to share information on relevant studies on the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines in Resolution 8.1: *Sustainable Use* [34]. NGOs were also recognised in several information documents developed by the CMS Secretariat, including Resolution 8.5: *Implementation of Existing Agreements and Development of Future Agreements* [35] where, once again, the Secretariat was encouraged to continue “*exploring partnerships with interested organizations specialised in the conservation and management of migratory species for the provision of developmental support and coordination services for selected MoUs*”. Resolution 8.5 also asked NGOs to provide appropriate assistance towards the conclusion and subsequent implementation of the Dugong MoU. NGOs featured in the support document annexed to Resolution 8.2: *CMS Strategic Plan 2006–2011* and Resolution 8.8: *Outreach and Communications* [36, 37]. NGOs were also acknowledged as playing important roles in the co-operative conservation of migratory raptors and owls in the African-Eurasian Region, and their involvement was encouraged in the development of the migratory sharks agreement [38, 39]. During CoP8, the Secretariat also signed a number of Partnership Agreements with NGOs in a public signing ceremony, signalling that the relationship between CMS and the NGO community was being treated seriously.

In 2008, Resolution 9.2: *Priorities for CMS Agreements* and Resolution 9.5: *Outreach and Communication Issues* each recognised the ongoing support of a number of NGOs and Resolution 9.2 repeated the request to the Secretariat to explore “*partnerships with interested organisations specialised in the conservation and management of migratory species for the provision of developmental support and coordination services for MoUs concluded under CMS auspices*” [40, 41]. The impetus increased in Resolution 9.6: *Cooperation with Other Bodies* [42] began with the statement:

Acknowledging the importance of cooperation and synergies with other bodies, including MEAs, other inter-governmental bodies and non-governmental organisations, as well as the private sector;

Recognising the instrumental role of partner organisations in the development and implementation of CMS and its related initiatives and outreach campaigns, including the negotiation of the Convention itself;

Appreciating the value of such partnerships in reaching a wider audience and raising public awareness of the Convention and the importance of conserving migratory species on a global scale;

In the operative section, Parties:

1. *[Expressed]* gratitude to the many partner organisations that have assisted in promoting CMS and its mandate, for example, by facilitating the negotiation and implementation of species agreements under the Convention

4. *Further encourage[d]* the Secretariat to continue to foster such partnerships in order to further the effective delivery of conservation action and awareness-raising, subject to available human and financial resources;

5. *Recognise[d]* that preferred instruments for such cooperation are renewable joint work plans with agreed and attainable targets included in clear timetable, drawn up by CMS and partner bodies and the necessity to report on progress and to assess effectiveness of results regularly;

13. *Request[ed]* the CMS Secretariat and partners to develop additional processes to streamline and coordinate their relationship, such as:

(i) Agreed work programmes between CMS and partner organisations that align closely with the CMS Strategic Plan and that are regularly reviewed; and

(ii) Joint or consolidated reporting of partner contributions (monetary, in-kind and professional) to CMS for formal submission into CMS processes;

14. *Request[ed]* CMS partner organisations to promote and publicise the benefits to them, to CMS and to conservation arising from effective collaboration;

Resolution 9.13: *Intersessional Process Regarding the Future Shape of CMS* also recognised the growing relationship between CMS and NGOs.

In 2011, Resolution 10.2: *Modus Operandi for Conservation Emergencies* requested that the Secretariat identify UN agencies, IGOs, NGOs, industry and other relevant agencies that may be able to respond to emergencies affecting migratory species and their habitats, and to include NGOs in an emergency response group^[43]. Ongoing NGO support was acknowledged in Resolution 10.3: *The Role of Ecological Networks in the Conservation of Migratory Species*^[44], Resolution 10.7: *Outreach and Communication Issues*^[45], Resolution 10.10: *Guidance on Global Flyway Conservation and Options for Policy Arrangements*^[46]. NGO support was sought in Resolution 10.22: *Wildlife Disease and Migratory Species*^[47] and in Resolution 10.15: *Global Programme of Work for Cetaceans*^[48] and interest in increasing NGO contribution to the work of the convention was further acknowledged in Resolution 10.9: *Future Structure and Strategies of the CMS and CMS Family*^[49], Resolution 10.21: *Synergies and Partnerships*^[50] and in the Annexes to Resolution 10.5: *CMS Strategic Plan 2015–2023*^[51].

Throughout the ten CMS CoPs NGOs have been consistently included in the call for contributions to the CMS Trust Fund.

DOCUMENT REFERENCES

1. Biermann, F., et al., *The Fragmentation of Global Governance Architectures: A Framework for Analysis*. Global Environmental Politics, 2009. **9**(4): p. 14-40.
2. Biermann, F., *The Emerging Debate on the Need for a World Environment Organization: A Commentary*. Global Environmental Politics, 2001. **1**(1): p. 45-55.
3. Karkkainen, B., *Post-Sovereign Environmental Governance*. Global Environmental Politics, 2004. **4**(1): p. 72-96.
4. Andonova, L. and R. Mitchell, *The Rescaling of Global Environmental Politics*. Annual Review of Environment and Resources, 2010. **35**(1): p. 255-282.
5. Wapner, P., *The Normative Promise of Non-State Actors: A Theoretical Account of Global Civil Society*, in *Principled World Politics: The Challenges of Normative International Relations*, P. Wapner and L.E.J. Ruiz, Editors. 2000, Rowman and Littlefield: New York. p. 261-274.
6. Ruiz, L.E.J., *Culture, Politics, and the Sense of the Ethical: Challengers for Normative International Relations*, in *Principled World Politics: The Challenges of Normative International Relations*, P. Wapner and L.E.J. Ruiz, Editors. 2000, Rowman and Littlefield: New York. p. 322-348.
7. Anheier, H., *Civil Society: Measurement, Evaluation, Policy*. 2004, London: Earthscan.
8. Anheier, H., *What Kind of Nonprofit Sector, What Kind of Society?* American Behavioral Scientist, 2009. **52**(7): p. 1082-1094.
9. Betsill, M., *Reflections on the Analytical Framework and NGO Diplomacy*, in *NGO Diplomacy: The Influence of Nongovernmental Organisations in International Environmental Negotiations*, M. Betsill and E. Corell, Editors. 2008, MIT Press: Cambridge. p. 177-206.
10. Karns, M. and K. Mingst, *International Organisations: The Politics and Processes of Global Governance*. 2004, London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
11. Reimann, K., *A View from the Top: International Politics, Norms and the Worldwide Growth of NGOs*. International Studies Quarterly, 2006. **50**(1): p. 45-68.
12. Schlosberg, D. and J.S. Dryzek, *Political Strategies of American Environmentalism: Inclusion and Beyond*. Society & Natural Resources, 2002. **15**(9): p. 787-804.
13. Reddel, T., *Third Way Social Governance: Where is the State?* Australian Journal of Social Issues, 2004. **39**(2): p. 129-142.
14. Rogers, E. and E. Weber, *Thinking Harder About Outcomes for Collaborative Governance Arrangements*. The American Review of Public Administration, 2010. **40**(5): p. 546-567.
15. Fung, A. and E. Wright, *Deepening Democracy: Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance*. Politics and Society, 2001. **29**(1): p. 5-41.
16. Ansell, C. and A. Gash, *Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice*. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 2008. **18**(4): p. 543-571.
17. Emerson, K., T. Nabatchi, and S. Balogh, *An Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance*. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 2012. **22**(1): p. 1-29.
18. Kettl, D., *Conclusion: The Next Generation*, in *Environmental Governance: A Report on The Next Generation of Environmental Policy*, D. Kettl, Editor. 2002, Brookings Institution Press: Washington DC. p. 177-190.
19. Wilson, G., *Regulatory Reform on the World Stage*, in *Environmental Governance: A Report on The Next Generation of Environmental Policy*, Kettl, D.F., Editor. 2002, Brookings Institution Press: Washington DC. p. 118-145.
20. Benner, T., W. Reinicke, and J. Witte, *Multisectoral Networks in Global Governance: Towards a Pluralistic System of Accountability*. Government and Opposition, 2004. **39**(2): p. 191-210.
21. Bernauer, T. and C. Betzold, *Civil Society in Global Environmental Governance*. The Journal of Environment & Development, 2012. **21**(1): p. 62-66.
22. Newell, P., *Civil Society, Corporate Accountability and the Politics of Climate Change*. Global Environmental Politics, 2008. **8**(3): p. 122-153.
23. Scholte, J., *Civil Society and Democratically Accountable Global Governance*. Government and Opposition, 2004. **39**(2): p. 211-233.
24. Biermann, F., et al., *Transforming governance and institutions for global sustainability: key insights from the Earth System Governance Project*. Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 2012. **5**: p. 51-60.
25. Benson, E., *The Stakeholder Empowerment Project*, S.F.a.S. Future, Editor. 2009, UNEP: Nairobi.
26. Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals, *Recommendation 4.6: The Role of non-Governmental Organizations in the Convention on Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals*. 1994, 4th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals: Nairobi, Kenya.
27. Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals, *Resolution 4.4: Strategy for the Future Development of the Convention*. 1994, 4th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals.: Nairobi, Kenya.
28. Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals, *Resolution 5.4: Strategy for the Future Development of the Convention* 1997, 5th Conference of the Parties to the

- Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals.: Geneva, Switzerland.
29. Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals, *Recommendation 6.3: Further Action for Sahelo-Saharan Antelopes* 1999, 6th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals: Cape Town, South Africa.
 30. Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals, *Resolution 6.7: Institutional Arrangements: Scientific Council* 1999, 6th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals: Cape Town, South Africa.
 31. Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals, *Resolution 6.4: Strategic Plan For The Convention On Migratory Species* 1999, 6th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals: Cape Town, South Africa.
 32. Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals, *Resolution 6.5: Information Management Plan And National Reporting*. 1999, 6th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals.: Cape Town, South Africa.
 33. Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals, *Resolution 7.7: Implementation of Existing Agreements*. 2002, 7th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals: Bonn, Germany.
 34. Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals, *Resolution 8.1: Sustainable Use* 2005, 8th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals: Nairobi, Kenya.
 35. Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals, *Resolution 8.5: Implementation of Existing Agreements and Development of Future Agreements* 2005, 8th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals.: Nairobi, Kenya.
 36. Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals, *Resolution 8.2: CMS Strategic Plan 2006–2011*. 2005, 8th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals: Nairobi, Kenya.
 37. Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals, *Resolution 8.8: Outreach and Communications*. 2005, 8th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals: Nairobi, Kenya.
 38. Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals, *Resolution 8.12: Improving the Conservation Status of Raptors and Owls in the African-Eurasian Region*. 2005, 8th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals: Nairobi, Kenya.
 39. Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals, *Recommendation 8.16: Migratory Sharks*. 2005, 8th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals.: Nairobi, Kenya.
 40. Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals, *Resolution 9.2 - Priorities for CMS Agreements*. 2008, 9th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals: Rome, Italy.
 41. Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals, *Resolution 9.5: Outreach and Communication Issues* 2008, 9th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals.: Rome, Italy.
 42. Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals, *Resolution 9.6: Cooperation with Other Bodies* 2008, 9th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals: Rome, Italy.
 43. Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals., *Resolution 10.2: Modus Operandi for Conservation Emergencies* 2011, 10th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals: Bergen, Norway.
 44. Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals., *Resolution 10.3: The Role of Ecological Networks in the Conservation of Migratory Species* 2011, 10th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals: Bergen, Norway.
 45. Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals., *Resolution 10.7: Outreach and Communication Issues* 2011, 10th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals: Bergen, Norway.
 46. Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals., *Resolution 10.10: Guidance on Global Flyway Conservation and Options for Policy Arrangements*. 2011, 10th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals: Bergen, Norway.
 47. Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals., *Resolution 10.22: Wildlife Disease and Migratory Species* 2011, 10th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals: Bergen, Norway.
 48. Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals., *Resolution 10.15: Global Programme of Work for Cetaceans* 2011, 10th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals: Bergen, Norway.
 49. Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals., *Resolution 10.9: Future Structure and Strategies of the CMS and CMS Family* 2011, 10th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals: Bergen, Norway.
 50. Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals., *Resolution 10.21: Synergies and Partnerships* 2011, 10th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals: Bergen, Norway.
 51. Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals., *Resolution 10.5: CMS Strategic Plan 2015–2023* 2011, 10th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals: Bergen, Norway.