

CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES  
OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA



Fifty-seventh meeting of the Standing Committee  
Geneva (Switzerland), 14-18 July 2008

Strategic and administrative matters

COOPERATION WITH THE CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF  
MIGRATORY SPECIES OF WILD ANIMALS (CMS)

1. This document has been prepared jointly by the CITES and CMS Secretariats.

Background information

2. At its 49th meeting (SC49, Geneva, April 2003), the CITES Standing Committee was provided with a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) concluded between the CITES and CMS Secretariats. It was also advised that the Secretariats had initiated discussion on the development of a detailed work programme (see document SC49 Doc. 6.2).
3. At its 13th meeting (Bangkok, 2004), the Conference of the Parties to CITES adopted Resolution Conf. 13.3 on Cooperation and synergy with the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals which directs the Standing Committee to keep that MoU under regular review.
4. At its 53rd meeting (SC53, Geneva, June – July 2005), the Standing Committee adopted a CITES/CMS list of joint activities for 2005-2007 on the basis of a proposal made in document SC53 Doc. 9. This adopted list is contained in Annex 1 to the present document, with a column reflecting the state of implementation at the time of writing (end of April 2008).
5. In November 2005, the Conference of the Parties to CMS adopted Resolution 8.11 which reiterated the importance of and need for enhanced collaboration among biodiversity-related conventions to coordinate actions to achieve the goal of significantly reducing biodiversity loss endorsed by the World Summit on Sustainable Development. Moreover, in Resolution Conf. 8.2, the Conference adopted the CMS *Strategic Plan* for 2006-2011.
6. In June 2007, at its 14th meeting, the Conference of the Parties to CITES adopted a *Strategic Vision* for 2008-2013 in Resolution Conf. 14.2. Goal 3 of that Strategic Vision states that:

*Parties and the Secretariat [should] cooperate with other relevant international organizations and agreements dealing with natural resources, as appropriate, in order to achieve a coherent and collaborative approach to species which can be endangered by unsustainable trade, including those which are commercially exploited.*

Planned joint activities for 2008-2010

7. At the end of 2007, pursuant to the provision of CITES Resolution Conf. 13.3 mentioned in paragraph 3 above, the CITES and CMS Secretariats agreed to prepare a draft list of joint activities for the period 2008-2010 (see Annex 2). This new list takes into account the state of implementation of the previous activities.

8. The joint activities envisaged for 2008-2010 take account of and contribute to the 2010 biodiversity target. The list gives priority to the species already identified as being of priority importance in Resolution Conf. 13.3. It has three principle themes:
  - a) harmonization of taxonomy and nomenclature;
  - b) joint actions for the conservation and sustainable use of shared species; and
  - c) administrative and fund-raising cooperation.
9. The CITES and CMS Secretariats have formed an informal partnership in the past to develop and implement joint activities on specific, shared species. This experience has proven to be positive, so the secretariats believe that it would be useful to continue establishing such teams and expand them to include other species and other individuals or institutions with useful expertise. Subject to external funding, joint working groups will be established for some priority species. The CITES and CMS Secretariats plan to invite relevant partners (e.g. international, regional, national public or private institutions, governmental agencies, scientific networks) to participate in or contribute to the joint working groups. The Committee should note the link between the proposals in the present document and the CITES contribution to this effort, noted in activity 12 of the proposed costed programme of work for the CITES Secretariat for 2009-2011 in document SC57 Doc. 13.3 A1.
10. The synergies resulting from the activities mentioned in Annex 2 to the present document would optimize not only the impact on species conservation, including the consideration of cross-cutting issues such as climate change, human livelihoods, poverty alleviation and invasive species, but also the use of financial resources. The Secretariats therefore intend to cooperate in raising funds for these activities.
11. The Secretariats also intend to ask their Parties whether they would be interested in secondment a person to support the implementation of these activities.

#### Recommendations

12. The CITES Standing Committee is invited to endorse the draft list of joint activities for 2008-2010 presented in Annex 2. The CMS Standing Committee will be invited to do the same at its 33rd meeting scheduled for 30 November 2008. Once a final list is agreed, both Secretariats will sign the new Annex to the MoU and proceed with its implementation.
13. The Secretariats will submit regular progress reports on the implementation of the activities to their respective Standing Committees and where appropriate, to the Biodiversity Liaison Group and to the meetings of the Chairs of the Scientific Advisory Bodies of Biodiversity-related Conventions.

CITES/CMS LIST OF JOINT ACTIVITIES 2005-2007

State of implementation as of the end of April 2008

Activity	Priority <sup>1</sup>	Main actors	Indicative tasks (numbered) and status/comments (lettered) 2005-2007 from SC53	Summary of activities undertaken
Generate and verify concordance list of species shared on CITES/CMS Appendices.	M	CITES and CMS bodies (UNEP – WCMC – IUCN – ELC)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Generate a basic list using the CMS information Management System, contact UNEP-WCMC and IUCN-ELC to address feasibility of improving basic list and develop list format.</li> <li>2. Identify and clarify taxonomic and species listing issues in collaboration with relevant experts or the CITES Nomenclature Committee.</li> <li>3. Consider ways to better link CITES and CMS information on shared species.</li> <li>4. Make concordance list available on the websites of CITES and CMS Secretariats before CITES CoP14 (2007) and CMS CoP9 (2008).</li> </ol> <p>A. A concordance list between CITES and CMS Appendices can be generated from the CMS Information Management System, but the resulting list would benefit from review by UNEP-WCMC and/or other experts and tested against the CMS Global Register of Migratory Species (GROMS).</p> <p>B. The list should address inconsistencies in</p>	<p>UNEP-WCMC prepared a concordance list in 2005, but this has subsequently become out of date due to changes to the CITES and CMS appendices and to the nomenclatural references adopted by the Conventions. CMS Secretariat have prepared a revised version which, after checking will be completed in mid 2008. The main differences between the nomenclature and taxonomy used by the two Conventions cetaceans.</p> <p>Following the adoption of Decision 14.18 on Harmonization of nomenclature and taxonomy with other Multilateral Environmental Agreements a joint approach will be made to the 2nd meeting of the Chairmen of the scientific advisory bodies of biodiversity-related conventions (25 May 2008, Bonn) and the Biodiversity Liaison Group (31 May 2008, Bonn) with a view to seeking wider support for better harmonization of nomenclature and taxonomy.</p>

<sup>1</sup> H: High priority (immediate); M: Medium priority (by the end of 2006); Ong: Ongoing.

Activity	Priority <sup>1</sup>	Main actors	Indicative tasks (numbered) and status/comments (lettered) 2005-2007 from SC53	Summary of activities undertaken
			<p>taxonomy or nomenclature, if necessary. Discrepancies can be expected for marine mammals, because taxonomic reference lists of CITES and CMS differ.</p> <p>C. CMS is reviewing taxonomic issues as part of another internal project and CITES has ongoing nomenclature work under the Nomenclature Committee. Taxonomy has been identified in the Vilm report as an area for better cooperation and synergy between CITES and CBD.</p>	
Exchange experience on administrative matters and enhance mutual representation.	M and ONG	CITES and CMS bodies (CBD)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify ways for the Biodiversity Liaison Group to enhance synergy between CITES and CMS as well as other MEAs.</li> <li>2. Set priorities for cooperation on administrative matters and mutual representation</li> <li>3. Compare operation and structure of technical committees.</li> <li>4. Consult with each other when the CITES or CMS strategic plan is being reviewed. [see CITES Decision 13.11].</li> </ol> <p>A. The Secretariats already share experiences on host State arrangements and strategic plans, but CITES could benefit from input on how CMS develops and implements GEF projects and otherwise finances conservation. When attending meetings, one Secretariat may be keeping an eye out for issues of interest to the other.</p> <p>B. The CMS Secretariat attended the 53rd meeting of the CITES Standing Committee (Geneva, June 2005). The CITES</p>	<p>The Biodiversity Liaison Group has met twice since SC53 and is meeting again on 31 May 2008 in Bonn. The minutes of these meetings are available on <a href="http://www.cbd.int/cooperation/related-conventions/blg.shtml">http://www.cbd.int/cooperation/related-conventions/blg.shtml</a>.</p> <p>Cooperation has occurred in other specialized fora such as those related to knowledge management, online reporting and the harmonisation of national reporting see <a href="http://www.inforMEA.org">www.inforMEA.org</a> and <a href="http://www.unep-wcmc.org/conventions/default.aspx">www.unep-wcmc.org/conventions/default.aspx</a>.</p> <p>A comparison of the operation and structure of the scientific committees was undertaken (see Table 1 in document SC54 Inf. 4) and there was frequent participation by representatives of the respective Secretariats at meetings (Scientific, Standing committees and Conferences of the Parties) organized by their counterparts.</p> <p>The Secretariats exchanged drafts during the preparation phases for their respective Strategic Plans/Visions.</p>

Activity	Priority <sup>1</sup>	Main actors	Indicative tasks (numbered) and status/comments (lettered) 2005-2007 from SC53	Summary of activities undertaken
			<p>Secretariat attended the 13<sup>th</sup> and the 15<sup>th</sup> meeting of the CMS scientific Council (November 2005 and October 2007) to share with the CMS Secretariat the CITES experience with technical committees.</p>	
<p>Share species and other substantive information that may be of mutual interest (e.g. on projects, activities, data, documents, reviews, etc.) and identify priority issues for both Secretariats.</p> <p>Ensure close cooperation and coordination on actions concerning priority species and issues. In particular, ensure that CITES and CMS initiatives regarding the following species and taxonomic groups complement, reinforce and benefit from each other: saiga antelope, snow leopard, African elephant, marine turtle, whale shark, sturgeons, great apes, Houbara bustard (see CITES).</p>	H and ONG	CITES and CMS bodies (CBD, IUCN)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Exchange information on CITES and CMS work related to falcons (e.g. CITES workshop on falcons. Review of significant trade under CITES), houbara bustard and great apes and determine opportunities for undertaking joint activities.</li> <li>2. Ensure that CMS and CITES work related to the saiga antelope is mutually supportive (e.g. collaborate on implementation of the scientific and management aspects of the CMS Saiga Action plan; promote ratification and entry into effect of Saiga MoU; organize a first meeting of the signatories; develop a joint work plan on saiga) [See CITES decisions 13.27, 13.31, 13.33 and 13.35].</li> <li>3. Exchange experiences if CITES and CMS on <i>ex situ</i> production and <i>in situ</i> conservation as well as area versus species-based conservation. [see CITES decision 13.78 and Vilm report].</li> <li>4. Arrange a visit by CITES Secretariat to CMS Secretariat and participation of CITES Secretariat in meeting of CMS scientific Council.</li> <li>5. Determine whether CMS might contribute to species identification work required in CITES.</li> </ol>	<p>An African-Eurasian migratory raptors agreement is under development at CMS which may lead to improved possibilities for cooperation on <u>falcon</u> species. No specific action has taken place regarding <u>houbara bustards</u>. On <u>great apes</u>, CMS has developed an Agreement on the Conservation of Gorillas and their Habitats the text of which provides for regular consultation with CITES. The CITES Secretariat continues to represent all the biodiversity-related MEAs on the Executive Committee of the Great Apes Survival Partnership Project (GRASP).</p> <p>The two Secretariats worked very closely at an event (Almaty 23-26 September 2006) which culminated in the signature of a CMS, MoU concerning Conservation, Restoration and Sustainable Use of the <u>Saiga Antelope</u> (<i>Saiga tatarica tatarica</i>). Full details of this joint action can be found in document CoP14 Doc. 56.</p> <p><u>Africa elephants</u>. Little joint work has occurred on African elephants, although the adoption of Decision 14.75 could provide scope for synergy between the envisaged overall <i>African elephant action plan</i> and the CMS MoU concerning Conservation Measures for the West African Populations</p>

Activity	Priority <sup>1</sup>	Main actors	Indicative tasks (numbered) and status/comments (lettered) 2005-2007 from SC53	Summary of activities undertaken
			<p>A. Initial information had been exchanged in relation to falcons and houbara.</p> <p>B. The CITES and CMS Secretariats have done cooperative work on the <u>saiga</u> antelope in the past (e.g. the Elista workshop where the Saiga Action Plan was developed) and agreed to act in parallel to encourage adoption of the saiga MoU and Action Plan. The CITES Secretariat shared information with the CMS Secretariat on a project to implement CITES Decision 13.35. An informal meeting with the pertinent actors was held on the sidelines of the 53rd meeting of the CITES Standing Committee (Geneva, June 2005), which resulted in SC53 Inf. 8 (Rev.1).</p> <p>C. In the past, the CITES and CMS Secretariats had discussions about possible cooperation in relation to the sturgeons.</p> <p>D. CMS and/or its agreements have provided input to proposals to list species in CITES Appendices.</p> <p>E. The Secretariats have considered in general the complementary nature of the CITES and CMS mandates and data.</p> <p>F. The CITES Secretariat included targeted actions to collaborate with CMS in its new work programme 2005-07, identifying time-frames, responsibilities and expected outputs.</p>	<p>of the African Elephant which was signed on 23 November, 2005.</p> <p><u>Sturgeons</u>. Work on these species has been divided geographically: CMS has focussed on western European sturgeon species in cooperation with Berne Convention. CITES on populations in the Black Sea, Caspian Sea and Amur/Heilongjiang River.</p> <p>No specific joint activities have been undertaken on <u>Whale sharks</u>, <u>Snow leopard</u> or <u>Marine turtles</u>.</p>

CITES/CMS DRAFT LIST OF JOINT ACTIVITIES 2008-2010

Activity	Indicative common tasks	Comments	Time-frame and cost
Harmonization of taxonomy and nomenclature	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Finalize an updated concordance list of species in the Appendices of the two Conventions.</li> <li>2. Identify differences in nomenclature/taxonomy in the respective Appendices.</li> <li>3. Strive to eliminate these through the scientific subsidiary bodies and CoPs.</li> <li>4. Establish a common database for species covered by the two Conventions.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.-4. This activity will facilitate the practical cooperation between the Conventions and assist the understanding of our shared activities by partner organizations, other stakeholders and the general public.</li> <li>4. UNEP-WCMC would appear a natural partner in such an exercise.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. By October 2008. Staff time (CMS).</li> <li>2. By end of 2008. Staff time (CMS and CITES).</li> <li>3. 2009-10. Staff and Committee/CoP time (CMS and CITES).</li> <li>4. Mid-2009. Externally funded.</li> </ol>
Joint actions for the conservation and sustainable use of shared species.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Using the updated concordance list and focussing initially on: saiga antelope (<i>Saiga tatarica</i>), snow leopard (<i>Uncia uncia</i>); west and central African populations of the African elephant (<i>Loxodonta africana</i>); marine turtles of the Atlantic coast of Africa, the Indian Ocean, Southeast Asia and the Pacific Ocean; whale shark (<i>Rhincodon typus</i>) of south and Southeast Asia; great white shark (<i>Carcharodon carcharias</i>) and sturgeons (<i>Acipenseriformes</i>), identify regional stakeholders and relevant national, regional and interregional agencies or NGOs that could collaborate or support regional programmes on joint management aims and activities.</li> <li>2. Working with these stakeholders, develop joint programmes for the conservation and/or sustainable use of these species. Each Secretariat taking the lead where appropriate with CITES focussing on sustainable use and CMS on recovery of species. Establish joint</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.-2. In the interests of efficiency and cost-effectiveness, joint actions on shared species need to be undertaken wherever possible. The different focuses of the Convention are often complementary. Acting together, the Secretariats can provide the leadership required to stimulate action to improve the conservation and sustainable use of shared species.  In the absence of the external funding required, the Secretariats will continue routine exchange of information on shared species and engage in limited joint actions where time and funding permit.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Roll-out according to available funding. Externally funded. Staff project management time (CMS and CITES).</li> <li>2. Roll-out according to available funding. Externally funded. Staff project management time (CMS and CITES).</li> </ol>

Activity	Indicative common tasks	Comments	Time-frame and cost
	<p>working groups as appropriate to guide and oversee the implementation of these activities.</p> <p>3. Together, identify indicators for these shared species, which demonstrate the effectiveness of the programmes, fit with existing Convention indicators and monitor progress towards the 2010 target and beyond.</p> <p>4. Identifying relevant decisions proposed or taken by the governing bodies of CITES and CMS in order to encourage Parties to ensure policy coherence across the two conventions and coherent implementation of the conventions at national level.</p>		<p>3. Prior to roll-out of programme. Staff time (CMS and CITES) plus external funding.</p>
Administrative and fund-raising cooperation	<p>1. Undertake annual meetings of Secretariats to review the MoU, work plan and matters of mutual interest.</p> <p>2. Exchange experience with using and ideas for expanding the Knowledge Management portal for biodiversity-related MEAs (<a href="http://www.inforMEA.org">www.inforMEA.org</a>), calendars of meetings, meeting invitations, lists of administrative and scientific focal points in Parties, pertinent draft documents in advance of Convention meetings including strategic plans, details of procedural and administrative developments and guidelines whose joint adoption might be mutually supportive.</p> <p>3. Promote joint fund-raising for projects on shared species.</p>	<p>1.-2. Represents a formalization of tasks which already occur on a more informal and <i>ad hoc</i> basis.</p>	<p>1. Staff time. Travel costs every other year (unless this task can be accomplished by combining it with a visit for other purposes).</p> <p>2.-3. Staff time.</p>
Outreach and capacity building	<p>1. Explore possibilities for coordinated outreach and capacity building activities and representation of one Convention Secretariat by another at events of mutual interest to save participation costs and promote synergy.</p>		<p>1. Staff time cooperating on outreach and capacity building activities. A more extensive approach may be considered if external funding can be</p>

Activity	Indicative common tasks	Comments	Time-frame and cost
			found. Possible cost savings and increased visibility and engagement will occur through cooperation on representation at meetings and events.