

**DRAFT REPORT OF THE 11<sup>TH</sup> MEETING  
OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON THE  
CONSERVATION OF MIGRATORY SPECIES OF WILD ANIMALS**

Note: This draft report follows the sequence in which items were discussed. The final report will be restructured to follow Agenda items in numerical order.

**Day 1 – Tuesday 4 November 2014**

<b>Opening ceremony 10.00–12.00</b>
-------------------------------------

**OPENING OF THE MEETING (ITEM 1)**

1. The Opening Ceremony was held on Tuesday 4 November. The Ceremony was divided into informal and formal segments.

**INFORMAL OPENING CEREMONY**

2. The Informal Opening Ceremony was held between 10.00 and 11.30 and commenced with a short video welcoming participants to Ecuador, followed by inspiring and motivational presentations by three speakers. Ms Ashlan Gorse Cousteau acted as Master of Ceremonies.

3. Presentations were made by:

- Mr Achmat Hassiem (South Africa) – a shark attack survivor and Paralympian Bronze Medallist, who is now a shark conservationist and advocate;
- Mr Boyan Slat (Netherlands) – a campaigner and coordinator of an ambitious marine debris reduction programme;
- Mr Philippe Cousteau (USA) – a leader in the environmental movement, and award-winning communicator and philanthropist.

**FORMAL HIGH-LEVEL OPENING CEREMONY**

4. The High-Level Opening Ceremony was held from 11.30 to 12.00 and was presided over by Prof. Alfred Oteng-Yeboah, Chair of the CMS Standing Committee.

**WELCOMING ADDRESSES (ITEM 2)  
KEYNOTE ADDRESS (ITEM 3)**

5. Addresses were delivered by:

- H.E. Lorena Tapia, Minister of the Environment of Ecuador
- H.E. Tine Sundtoft, Minister of Climate and the Environment, Norway (by video)
- H.E. Noël Nelson Messone, Minister of the Environment, Gabon
- Ms Elizabeth Mrema, Director of the UNEP Division of Environmental Law and Conventions
- Mr Achim Steiner, Executive Director of UNEP (by video)

- Mr John Scanlon, Executive Secretary of CITES
- Mr Bradnee Chambers, Executive Secretary of CMS.

<b>Plenary session 12.00–13.00</b>
------------------------------------

#### **ADOPTION OF RULES OF PROCEDURE (ITEM 4)**

6. Items 4 and 5 of the Agenda were chaired by the Chair of the Standing Committee, Mr Alfred Oteng-Yeboah (Ghana). He introduced the Rules of Procedure for the 11<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Conference of the Parties (UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.4 *Rules of Procedure*) and invited the meeting to adopt them.

7. The representative of Uganda noted that there appeared to be a conflict between Rule 16 of the Rules of Procedure and Article 7.7 of the Convention text.

8. This observation was supported by the representatives of Israel, Egypt and Panama.

9. The representative of Uganda proposed that Rule 16 of the Rules of Procedure be amended to read: “Except where otherwise provided for under the provisions of the Convention, these Rules or the Terms of Reference for the Administration of the Trust Fund, all votes shall be decided by a two-thirds majority of votes cast.”

10. The Rules of Procedure were adopted, subject to inclusion of the amendment proposed by Uganda.

#### **ELECTION OF OFFICERS (ITEM 5)**

11. The Chair recalled that Rule 5 of the Rules of Procedure provided for the election of the Chair of the COP, the Chair of the Conference of the Whole (COW) who would also serve as Vice Chair of the COP, and the Vice Chair of the COW.

12. The Conference elected the following officers by acclamation:

**Conference of the Parties**

Chair: H.E. Lorena Tapia, Minister of Environment (Ecuador)

Vice Chair: Mr Øystein Størkensen (Norway)

**Committee of the Whole**

Chair: Mr Øystein Størkensen (Norway)

Vice Chair: Ms Ndeye Sene Epouse Thiam (Senegal)

13. Taking her place on the podium, the Chair of the COP pledged to do her utmost to guide the meeting in the best way possible in the pursuit of a successful outcome.

#### **ADOPTION OF AGENDA AND MEETING SCHEDULE (ITEM 6)**

14. The Chair referred the meeting to documents:

UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.6.1/Rev.2 *Provisional Agenda and Documents*

15. There being no proposals for amendments, both documents were adopted by consensus.

**ESTABLISHMENT OF CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE AND OTHER SESSIONAL COMMITTEES (ITEM 7)**

16. The Chair recalled that Rule 3 of the Rules of Procedure provided for the establishment of a Credentials Committee of five members. It had been common practice at CMS COPs for those five members to be drawn from each of the five regional groupings. She invited nominations accordingly.

17. The following Parties were elected to serve on the Credentials Committee:

**Africa:** Uganda

**Asia:** Pakistan

**Europe:** Italy

**Latin America & Caribbean:** Ecuador

**Oceania:** Philippines

18. The Chair recalled that the Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee of the Whole had been elected under item 5.

19. The COP approved establishment of a six-member Bureau, in conformity with Rule 7 of the Rules of Procedure.

20. At the invitation of the Chair, the COP appointed South Africa to Chair the COP Budget Committee. She noted that participation in the Budget Committee was open to all Parties.

**ADMISSION OF OBSERVERS (ITEM 8)**

21. The Chair referred the meeting to document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.8 *Admission of Observers*.

22. The COP approved admission to the meeting of all those Observers listed in COP11/Doc.8.

**REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODIES OF THE CONVENTION (ITEM 10)**

**(a) Standing Committee (Item 10.1)**

23. The Chair of the Standing Committee (StC), Prof. Alfred Oteng-Yeboah (Ghana) recalled that the present StC had met for the first time in Bergen, Norway, on 25 November 2011, immediately following the close of COP10. This meeting had a limited agenda confined to election of officers and agreement of the date and venue for the first full intersessional meeting. Ghana had been honoured to be elected to succeed Saudi Arabia as Chair of the StC. Prof. Oteng-Yeboah wished to place on record his appreciation of the work accomplished by his predecessor, Mr Mohammad Sulayem (Saudi Arabia), during the 2009-2011 triennium.

24. Three further meetings of the StC had taken place intersessionally:

- 40<sup>th</sup> meeting – November 2012, Bonn
- 41<sup>st</sup> meeting – November 2013, Bonn
- 42<sup>nd</sup> meeting – November 2014, Quito

25. The Committee had received regular reports from the Secretariat and Depositary. Building on the Future Shape process led by Olivier Biber, the StC had devoted significant attention to preparation of the draft Strategic Plan for Migratory Species to be considered by COP11. Particular thanks were due to Ines Verleye, Wendy Jackson and Dave Pritchard for all their work on the draft Plan. Among other activities, the Chair of the Scientific Council, Dr Fernando Spina, had actively represented the interests of CMS in IPBES. The Saker Falcon Task Force had tackled a very difficult issue under the skilful leadership of Prof. Colin Galbraith. The StC had also dealt with a broad range of implementation issues such as bird poisoning, illegal trapping, marine debris, illegal elephant hunting and management of flyways; much of this work carried out through the CMS Agreements, MOUs and Special Species Initiatives.

26. Prof. Oteng-Yeboah noted that Mr Bradnee Chambers had kept him apprised of a wide range of issues since being appointed to succeed Ms Elizabeth Mrema as CMS Executive Secretary. He wished to pay tribute to Ms Mrema for the tremendous support she had continued to give to the StC since she had left the CMS Secretariat. He also thanked the StC Vice Chair, Mr Øystein Størkersen, as well as the other members of the StC for their unstinting support. He wished his successor as StC Chair all the very best as he or she took up the important task of leading CMS on its mission to conserve the world's migratory species. We lived in changing times; the road ahead would be long and hard, but with determination and mutual support, success was within reach. Prof. Oteng-Yeboah's concluded by saying: "Roll up your sleeves, redouble your efforts, because it's time for action!"

#### **(b) Scientific Council (Item 10.2)**

27. The Chair of the CMS Scientific Council, Mr Fernando Spina (Italy) made a presentation summarizing the activities of the Scientific Council between 2011 and 2014.

28. A number of Working Groups had been very active during the triennium and their work had been facilitated by promotion of the new online Scientific Council workspace. Much work had been done on development of the *modus operandi* of the Scientific Council. Mr Spina drew attention to the work of the Saker Falcon Task Force, the Landbirds Action Plan, the Working Group on Minimizing Poisoning, and work on the conservation implications of cetaceans culture. Contacts with other MEAs had been maintained and he, in his role as Chair of the Scientific Council, had represented CMS at meetings of IPBES and the Bern Convention. Mr Spina had secured funding from the Po Delta Regional Park for a restricted Scientific Council Meeting to be held in Venice, in February/March 2015. The 18<sup>th</sup> Scientific Council meeting, held in Bonn from 1-3 July 2014, had been supported by the Government of Germany and outputs of that meeting would provide key contributions to COP11.

**REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT (ITEM 12)**

**(a) Overview of Secretariat activities (Item 12.1)**

29. The Executive Secretary made a presentation on Secretariat activities between 2011 and 2014. He reported that Zimbabwe, Swaziland, Fiji and Kyrgyzstan had joined CMS since the COP10 and even more countries were taking the last steps to ratify the Convention. CMS had been strengthened by the Future Shape process which was now being implemented. Communication and outreach were becoming core activities and the new multi-instrument website and use of social media were raising the Convention's public profile. Capacity building and implementation support were high priorities. The proposed restructuring of the Scientific Council had strengthened the scientific basis of the Convention, and voluntary contributions from the UK, Germany and Switzerland had allowed new resolutions on the development of a programme of work on Climate Change, Preventing the Risk of Poisoning to Migratory Birds, an Action Plan for Migratory African-Eurasian Landbirds and a Global Flyways Programme of Work. Further contributions from Australia, Norway and Italy had supported work on Marine Debris, Invasive Species and Ecological Networks. The MOUs continue to grow and attract more Parties and the support of the Environment Agency – Abu Dhabi has been crucial to this. The Central Asian Mammals Initiative was an example of a successful regional approach, and this approach might provide a way forward for revitalizing instruments in Africa. Nearly half of the income for CMS now came from voluntary contributions from Parties, the Private Sector and public organizations. Threats to biodiversity had never been greater and the Convention's budget should reflect an urgent need to maintain momentum.

30. The Conference took note of the activities of the Secretariat and invited comments from the floor. There being no such comments, the Chair drew the Plenary session to a close at 15.54 hrs.

**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

31. Mr Øystein Størkersen (Norway) took up his position as the Chair of the COW. He thanked the meeting for electing him and invited their guidance in the days ahead. He reminded delegates of time pressure and called for efficiency. He suggested that a number of Working Groups would be necessary but that the number of groups and the topics to be covered would be up to delegates to decide.

32. The Drafting Group, to be chaired by Alfred Oteng-Yeboah, would be open-ended; all delegates would be eligible to participate in this group.

33. On Thursday, 6 November, a number of marine and avian issues would be considered by the COW. He asked whether delegates preferred to establish Working Groups immediately, stressing that he was not precluding debate in the COW, but that he wished to maximize opportunities for timely discussion.

34. The representative of Brazil announced that Brazil has finalized the most important steps for ratifying CMS and the relevant documentation had been submitted to the Presidency for signature. This statement was greeted with a round of applause. Brazil was now actively

participating, as it had for some years, in several CMS Instruments. Brazil wished to propose the establishment of Working Groups to discuss two resolutions that Brazil considered required amendment: item 21.3 on relations between CMS & Civil Society, which was due for consideration by COW on Friday, 7 November, and item 23.4.7 concerning Fighting Wildlife Crime Within and Beyond Borders which was scheduled for COW consideration on Wednesday, 5 November.

35. The representative of Argentina, on behalf of the Latin America & Caribbean region, requested clarification concerning the scope of the Drafting Group.

36. The Executive Secretary stated that the Drafting Group that would work in parallel to the COW. The documents envisaged for consideration by the DG all related to governance issues, notably those concerning Rules of Procedure; Synergies between CMS instruments and other MEAs; Restructuring of the Scientific Council; Arrangements for Meetings of the COP; Repeal of resolutions and the Review Process (i.e. COP11 document numbers 4, 16.2, 17.1, 18.1, 18.2 and 18.3 respectively). Relations between Civil Society and the CMS could also be included to address the proposal of Brazil. The DG would take forward discussions only after they had first been raised in the COW, and would then report back to the COW, prior to final decision by the Plenary. The Budget Committee and other Working/Contact Groups would meet outside of the COW sessions (not in parallel with the COW).

37. The representative of Brazil responded that the only concern was that dealing with Draft Resolutions only after they had been considered in the COW would not allow much time for some issues. One of the items of interest to Brazil was only scheduled for the COW on Friday 7 November, which would not allow enough time for Working Group discussion.

38. The Chair instructed the Secretariat to bring forward COW consideration of Agenda item 21.3 on Relations between CMS and Civil Society, and to inform the COW accordingly when this had been done.

39. The representative of Chile supported the proposal of the Chair to establish Working Groups on specific issues.

40. The Chair concluded that there was support from the COW to establish two Working Groups covering marine issues and avian issues respectively.

### **CMS STRATEGIC PLAN (ITEM 15)**

#### **Assessment of the Implementation of the Strategic Plan 2006-2014 (Item 15.1), and Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023 (Item 15.2)**

41. The Executive Secretary briefly introduced documents UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.15.1 *Assessment of Implementation of the Strategic Plan 2006-2014*, and UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.15.2 *Final Draft Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023*.

42. Ms Ines Verleye (Belgium), Chair of the Strategic Plan Working Group said that it had been a privilege to present the outcome of this fruitful process in the form of the Draft Strategic Plan and the corresponding Draft Resolution. The draft Strategic Plan had been developed with financial contributions from Germany, South Africa, Switzerland and UNEP. An extensive consultation process had generated strong support for building the draft

Strategic Plan around the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and for broadened applicability to the whole international community. The draft Strategic Plan included five Strategic Goals and 16 Targets, which were more specific than the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and had an end date consistent with the CMS COP cycle. How to implement the plan had not been part of the current Working Group mandate, so it was proposed that a Companion Volume should be produced detailing delivery mechanisms and associated activities. The content of such a Companion Volume was scoped in Annex III to COP11/Doc 15.2.

43. The Chair invited comments from the floor.

44. The representative of Chile congratulated the Working Group Chair on an extraordinary job. She noted that the Latin America & Caribbean region had contributed through the participation of two Scientific Councillors in the Working Group. The Region supported continuation of the Working Group for the reasons specified in the Draft Resolution.

45. The representative of New Zealand, speaking in her role as Vice-Chair of the Working Group, thanked all who had contributed to the work of the Group, and especially the Chair of the Group, and the Secretariat. Extensive consultation had led to development of an extremely useful and robust plan, which would also be useful at national level. She hoped the COP would adopt the Draft Resolution and New Zealand looked forward to contributing further to the process.

46. The representative of the EU and its Member States endorsed the usefulness of the report of the Secretariat and agreed with general recommendations delivered by the reviewer which should be considered in drafting the new Strategic Plan. He then made the following statement:

“The EU and its Member States would like to acknowledge the hard work and commitment of the Strategic Plan Working Group members, and other contributors, whose expertise has produced a clear and comprehensive document. The EU and its Member States wholeheartedly welcome the financial contributions given so far by different Parties to support the drafting of the Strategic Plan. We believe that the Strategic Plan is an important document for providing a coherent direction for the CMS, aiming to ensure that all parts of the CMS Family make a coherent and effective contribution to the delivery of the CBD Aichi targets. The EU and its Member States endorse the adoption of the draft resolution (Doc. 15.2 Annex I) subject to some amendments. The EU and its Member States also acknowledge the need for additional inter-sessional work to strengthen the suite of materials to support implementation of the Strategic Plan, including an open-ended register of Plan sub-targets and a Companion Volume on Implementation, and consider that the CMS Family Secretariats should be involved in the Working Group. We expect that the development of sub-targets, where agreed by the appropriate decision-making body, will ensure that matters of particular relevance to specific instruments are recognised. In developing sub-targets we consider it is important to be able to demonstrate how they contribute to the delivery of the broader goals in the Strategic Plan. We note that budgetary pressures may limit the degree to which these activities could be progressed but consider this an important activity that should be given priority. The EU and its Member States fully endorse the vision and mission of the Strategic Plan and agree with the goals and targets identified by the Working Group in the final draft of the Plan. We note that goals and targets are ambitious and recognize that they could be

difficult to achieve. We welcome that the Strategic Plan builds on the Aichi targets and that indicators in the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity provide much of its basis. We also note that the Programmes of Work and Action Plans of the CMS family instruments have their own indicators and that the decision-making bodies of those instruments will want to consider linking those to the Plan. We agree that efforts should be put in developing clear and effective Indicators to track progress towards the achievement of goals and targets over different timeframes, and at various geographical and territorial scales. However, whilst we recognize that some work will be necessary to ensure that indicators are useful in measuring the achievement of the targets, we are conscious that developing new suites of indicators has potential resource implications, risks increasing the reporting burden on Parties, and potentially diverts effort from implementation to monitoring activity. We therefore believe it is important that wherever possible existing indicators should be used, such as those linked to the Aichi targets, or that indicators should be formulated around information that can currently be drawn from national reports. We also believe that this presents a valuable opportunity to review the current reporting process and to consider opportunities for reducing the current reporting burden on Parties by linking the information requested in National reports directly to the indicators developed for the Strategic Plan. Finally, we recognize the need for this work to receive the necessary resources and look forward to having a discussion on this in the budget group. However, we are aware of the overall budget restraints and the need to make the most effective use of available resources. Given the central character of the Strategic Plan, we believe that its follow-up development could equally support the necessary activities regarding other strategic activities for the next period. This will need a coherent approach during the budget discussions to support the development of a Companion Volume that addresses the key elements.”

47. The Executive Secretary of EUROBATS, Mr Andreas Streit thanked the Strategic Plan Working Group for their hard work over many years. He reiterated the Chair’s observation that for the first time there was a Strategic Plan covering the entire CMS family. He observed that this would benefit the conservation of all the species that the CMS family is working for.

48. The representative of Brazil supported Chile on behalf of the Latin America & Caribbean regional group. He thanked the Working Group and considered it relevant to extend its mandate into the future. Regarding the Companion Volume, the fourth Global Biodiversity Outlook report demonstrated in 2013 that the world was on track to achieve only five out of 53 indicators of the 20 Aichi Targets. These disappointing outcomes made it important for CMS to prioritize the implementation of the Strategic Plan to increase the success of implementation of the Convention.

49. The representative of South Africa, supported by Uganda, thanked the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Strategic Plan Working Group. She thanked the Secretariat for their support of the process of preparing the Plan, and urged Parties in a position to do so to provide resources for its implementation.

50. The representative of IFAW congratulated the Chair and members of the Working Group, and observed that implementation of the Strategic Plan would help lift CMS to the next level. He offered assistance with implementation.

51. The representative of the EU and its Member States requested a little more time to submit its amendments to the Draft Resolution, which had been delayed by a technical problem.

52. The Chair agreed to postpone completion of discussion of this issue until the EU's proposed amendments became available.

## **FUTURE SHAPE AND STRATEGIES OF CMS AND THE CMS FAMILY (ITEM 16)**

### **Short- and Medium-Term Activities under Resolution 10.9 (Item 16.1)**

53. The Executive Secretary made a presentation introducing document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.16.1 *Future Structure and Strategies of CMS: Short- and Medium-Term Activities under Resolution 10.9*.

54. He recalled that COP10 had adopted a set of activities listed in Resolution 10.9 based on options for the future organization and strategic development of the CMS Family. Activities in Resolution 10.9 were divided into those for implementation in the short term (2012-2014), medium term (2015-2017) and long term (2018-2020), to be used in the development of the CMS Strategic Plan 2015-2023. The activities for implementation in 2012-2014 were to be carried out with means provided by the core budget (including staff time) and voluntary contributions.

55. Document COP11/Doc. 16.1 reported on progress made since November 2012 regarding the short-term activities (as at July 2014) and followed the structure of Resolution 10.9 Annex I. As many activities concerned the CMS Family, decision-making meetings of CMS instruments were invited to become involved with the implementation of those activities, as appropriate.

56. COP11/Doc. 16.1 also indicated the Secretariat's plan for carrying out medium-term activities.

57. Key Achievements to date included the following:

- Production of CMS Family website in three languages;
- Development of the Migratory Species Strategic Plan 2015-2023 an overarching framework for the entire CMS Family (Draft Resolution COP11/Doc.15.2);
- Restructuring of Scientific Council to maximize capacity of expertise and knowledge (Draft Resolution in COP11/Doc.17.1);
- Enhancement and use of existing Online Reporting System by CMS Family and promotion of its use by other biodiversity-related MEAs;
- Development of criteria for assessing new potential agreements (Draft Resolution in COP11/Doc.22.2);
- Coordination of capacity efforts within the CMS Family through development of the National Focal Points Manual and related training sessions in the regions; and
- Coordination of fundraising activities through development of the Migratory Species Champion Programme to ensure sustainable and long-term voluntary funding income for the CMS Family.

58. Among highlights for future work were:

- Coordination of scientific research programmes based on identification of common issues/threats shared across the CMS Family (e.g. (Draft Resolutions in COP11/Docs. 23.1.1 on Flyways; 23.4.6 on Marine Debris; 23.4.3 on Renewable Energy);
- Development of a resource assessment for the Convention (CMS Secretariat and MoUs) if funding becomes available; and
- Collaboration and cooperation on sharing of common services and synergies among the CMS Family (Draft Resolution in COP11/Doc.16.2).

59. The Executive Secretary ended his presentation by inviting Parties to take note of the efforts made to date to implement the short-term activities during 2012-2014 and to provide comments that would further guide the Secretariat in the implementation of medium-term activities during the 2015-2017 triennium.

60. The Chair opened the floor to comments.

61. The representative of Brazil suggested including a line in the matrix of activities for 2015-2017 to extend efforts to maximise synergies and avoid duplication beyond the CMS Family, to include cooperation with all relevant MEA Secretariats.

62. The representative of Chile, supported by the representative of Costa Rica, underlined the importance of CMS training workshops for the Latin America & Caribbean region, citing the example of the pre-COP workshop held in Santiago, and called for the medium-term work plan to include such activities.

63. The representative of the EU and its Member States welcomed the positive progress made on several fronts. This work cut across the activities of the whole CMS family, seeking to ensure that it was fit for purpose and could make an effective contribution to the conservation of the species listed on its Appendices. It was therefore important that all parts of the CMS family were fully engaged in the process.

64. The EU noted that much positive collaborative work with the AEWA secretariat had taken place and would encourage the decision-making bodies of the CMS family Agreements to engage proactively in the Future Shape work, and to explore opportunities for greater coordination and collaboration, delivering benefits across the whole CMS family.

65. The EU noted that the Annex to COP11/Doc.16.1 referred to the resources that would be required to continue taking this work forward in the next triennium. Given pressures on resources it was understood that external funding would be key to making good progress. Next steps on the activities proposed would therefore need to be considered in the context of the budget negotiations. However, it was difficult from the information provided to assess the likely budgetary pressures arising from this work with the limited detail provided about medium-term activities that would be undertaken or the expected costs.

66. The EU urged the Secretariat to provide more detail on the activities planned for the coming intersessional period and to provide information on the expected costs to enable the CMS Parties to make an effective evaluation of the Secretariat's budget proposals as a whole and the likely need for additional resources from either the core budget or external sources.

67. In terms of medium-term activities, the EU had a number of detailed comments and suggested that a Working Group might be a helpful means of considering in more detail how these could be taken forward.

68. The representative of South Africa congratulated the Secretariat on the work done to implement the Future Shape decisions taken at COP10. Within the Africa region there were constraints on regional coordination for CMS implementation, especially with regard to partnership building and resource mobilization. Among the short-term activities that had been due for completion by 2014 was an activity to “Regionalize conservation efforts by having local coordinators, with assistance from UNEP, NGOs, Parties and MEAs, leading to greater presence in each of the regions if appropriate.” However, there was no reported progress in this regard. The Secretariat was requested to deal with this issue proactively; support for enhanced regional coordination was really needed.

69. The meeting took note of the Executive Secretary’s presentation and of the comments made by Parties.

## **OTHER STRATEGIC AND INSTITUTIONAL MATTERS (ITEM 17)**

### **Gap Analysis of the Convention on Migratory Species (Item 17.3)**

70. Mr Marco Barbieri (Secretariat) introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.17.3 *Draft Global Gap Analysis of the Convention on Migratory Species*. He recalled that Resolution 10.9 had requested a global gap analysis at Convention level and that COP11/Doc.17.3 had been prepared accordingly. An initial draft had been prepared by the Secretariat and further developed at the Strategic and Planning Meeting of the Scientific Council in October 2013 and at the 18<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Scientific Council in July 2014. The COP was asked to consider whether any further development of this activity was needed or feasible, in the absence of additional voluntary resources to support it.

71. The Chair felt it fair to say that those who had followed the development of the document would know it had been a difficult task. He invited comments from Parties.

72. The representative of Switzerland was of the view that a gap analysis should be a regular agenda item for the Scientific Council, but was not in favour of it being a special activity needing additional financial support.

73. The representative of the EU and its Member States was grateful to the Secretariat for preparing the document. The analysis showed that the potential for further work was enormous. The EU proposed taking the current gap analysis into account when developing the Companion Volume for the Strategic Plan and recommended that all further work on gap analysis should be done in framework of the Companion Volume.

74. The Chair invited the EU to participate in the proposed intersessional Working Group on the Companion Volume.

75. The meeting took note of document COP11/Doc.17.3 and of the comments made by Switzerland and the EU.

## FUTURE SHAPE AND STRATEGIES OF CMS AND THE CMS FAMILY

### (ITEM 16 continued)

#### **Synergies with the wider CMS Family: Analysis for Shared Common Services (Item 16.2)**

76. The Executive Secretary made a detailed presentation of document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.16.2 *Analysis of Shared Common Services between CMS Family Instruments*. He recalled that discussions on synergies had been taking place for several years and noted a number of the meetings and processes that had stimulated the current debate. The CMS was a complex system of MoUs and Agreements and Parties had long remarked on the need to bring increased coherence to the CMS Family. The Future Shape process was key response to such concerns.

77. The CMS had proposed to the 9<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the AEWA Standing Committee that CMS and AEWA should establish common services and a shared Executive Secretary. The AEWA Standing Committee mandated the sharing of services and referred the matter of a shared Executive Secretary to its next Meeting of Parties in November 2015. This decision had been communicated to CMS StC41, which had agreed to pilot the sharing of common services by AEWA and CMS. Following further consultations a pilot common Communications and Outreach Unit had been established and an interim report on the outcomes presented to the CMS Standing Committee.

78. The Executive Secretary outlined the benefits to be gained from increased synergies within the CMS Family and possible means of achieving these. He concluded by summarizing the provisions of the Draft Resolution contained in document COP11/Doc.16.2.

79. Mr Jacques Trouvilliez, Executive Secretary of AEWA, confirmed that the 9<sup>th</sup> meeting of the AEWA Standing Committee had decided to enhance synergies with CMS to strengthen the efficacy of both instruments. A joint pilot unit had been created at the end of January 2014. The Parties to AEWA would make a final decision on this matter at the 2015 Meeting of Parties.

80. The representatives of a number of Parties, including Uganda, the EU and its Member States, Chile, Switzerland, Kenya, Egypt, Monaco, Argentina, and Georgia, as well as the Observer from the United States, endorsed in principle the desirability of increased synergies and appreciated the opportunity to discuss the issues raised. However they also expressed concern that much more in-depth analysis would be required before any fundamental decisions could be taken. In particular, several Parties wished to see greater consideration of the potential costs and risks of merging the AEWA and CMS Secretariats; currently the document appeared to highlight mainly the potential benefits. The implications for other CMS daughter instruments also required further consideration.

81. The representative of Uganda was unable to support the Draft Resolution in its present form, while the representative of the EU and its Member States announced that the EU would table a number of proposed amendments to the Draft Resolution. The representative of Switzerland commented that the synergies exercise should not focus primarily on cost-savings, but rather it should prioritize improved implementation. Switzerland would be bringing forward amendments to the Draft Resolution in this regard.

82. The Chair concluded that a Working Group would be established to take forward the debate on this topic.

## **BUDGET AND ADMINISTRATION (ITEM 14)**

### **Execution of CMS Budget 2012-2014 (Item 14.1)**

83. Mr Bruce Noronha (Secretariat) introduced document UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.14.1 *Execution of the CMS Budget during the 2012-2014 Triennium*. This represented the situation as of 31 July 2014. It contained three elements:

- Status of the Trust Fund for Assessed Contributions as at 31 December 2013
- Status of Contributions (income)
- Status of budget implementation for staff and operations (expenditure)

84. As of 31 December 2013, the balance of the Trust Fund was €867,393. Of that amount, approximately €650,000 was committed for the 2014 budget. Therefore the uncommitted Fund balance was €217,685. It was important to consider that the Fund balance contained unpaid pledges – an amount that had been rising, as shown in Table 3 of the document, standing at €345,981 as of 31 December 2013. Liquidity of the Fund therefore relied on unspent carry-overs and operating reserves. To address this trend the Secretariat has redoubled its efforts to urge Parties to pay their outstanding contributions for 2013 and prior years, and all corresponding invoices had been reissued. In response to these measures the balance of unpaid pledges for 2013 and prior years had fallen to €204,964 by 31 July 2014, and to €174,236 by 31 October 2014. Annex I provided an overview of the contributions status for each Party.

85. With regard to the 2014 budget, the total of unpaid contributions stood at €578,425 on 31 July 2014. However, as of 31 October 2014, this had fallen to approximately €550,000, of which €425,000 was at an advanced stage of processing. The 2014 year-end balance of unpaid pledges was expected to be slightly lower than for 2013.

86. With regard to expenditures, all the resources allocated for staff and operations costs in 2014 would be fully allocated. The information presented in the document had been reviewed in the light of expenditure during the period August to October 2014 and projections remained effectively unchanged.

87. Referring to the last two tables presented in Annex II, it was important to take into account that most activities with no or low expenditure when the document was compiled related to COP activities. It was expected that all such funds would be fully allocated.

88. The COW took note of the Secretariat's presentation.

### **Draft Costed Programme of Work 2015-2017 (Item 14.2)**

### **Draft Budget for 2015-2017 (Item 14.3)**

89. Taking Agenda items 14.2 and 14.3 together, the Executive Secretary made a presentation summarizing introducing documents UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.14.2/Rev.1 *Draft Costed*

*Programme of Work 2015-2017 and UNEP/CMS/COP11/Doc.14.3 Proposed Budget for the Triennium 2015-2017.*

90. He noted that the draft Programme of Work 2015-2017 was a response to the Parties' call for greater clarity, accountability and transparency. A key feature was its prioritization of tasks. The Programme of Work was closely linked to the draft Budget for 2015-2017 and the two documents should therefore be considered together.

91. Recognizing the prevailing global economic climate, the draft budget included three modest scenarios: zero real growth; status quo +3%; and status quo +5%. All three scenarios incorporated a 2% year-on-year inflation rate. The Executive Secretary briefly outlined how each of the three scenarios would translate into delivery of the Programme of Work.

92. The Chair recalled that the issues raised in the Executive Secretary's presentation would be discussed in depth by the Budget Committee and encouraged Parties to convey their detailed remarks to that forum.

93. The representative of France called on the Secretariat to provide a fourth scenario based on the principle of zero nominal growth, i.e. minus the 2% inflation adjustment included in the three existing scenarios.

94. The representative of Chile requested a number of adjustments to the Programme of Work to better reflect the priorities of the Latin America & Caribbean region, including the raising of certain activities to the High priority category and a greater emphasis on training.

95. The representative of Fiji called for the CMS Pacific Officer position based with SPREP to be maintained beyond 2014.

96. The representative of the EU and its Member States welcomed the draft Costed Programme of Work, which enabled Parties to have clearer overview. The EU noted in particular the priority rank assigned to various issues.

97. The Chair referred further discussion of Agenda items 14.1, 14.2 and 14.3 to the Budget Committee and closed the session of the COW so that participants could make their way to a reception being hosted by the Government of Ecuador.