



Australian Government

Report

Outcomes of the trial of the consolidated reporting template for Pacific Island countries to the biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements

Supporting document for discussion under Agenda Item 8.1 of the 19th Meeting of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme.

August 2008

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Executive Summary | 3 |
| Introduction | 7 |
| About the consolidated reporting template | 8 |
| Overview of the trial of the consolidated reporting template..... | 11 |
| Benefits identified during the trial of the consolidated reporting template | 16 |
| Issues identified during the trial of the consolidated reporting template | 20 |
| Overall outcome of the trial of the consolidated reporting template | 22 |
| Areas identified during the trial that could be improved to facilitate national reporting..... | 22 |
| Recommendations and next steps..... | 26 |
| References | 28 |
| Attachment A - List of questions from current reporting formats for the biodiversity-related MEAs and the corresponding questions in the consolidated reporting template | 29 |
| Attachment B: List of persons consulted during the trial of the consolidated reporting template..... | 48 |

Executive Summary

1. This report has been prepared by the Australian Government Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts for Members of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) to support discussion on Agenda Item 8.1 ‘Streamlined reporting by Pacific Island countries (PICs) to the biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) – the development of a consolidated reporting template’ at the 19th SPREP Meeting in September 2008.
2. The report is an outcome of the 18th SPREP Meeting in September 2007, where Members endorsed an option under Agenda Item 6.2 ‘Options to streamline reporting by Pacific Island countries (PICs) to multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs)’ for the Australian Government, in collaboration with SPREP, to develop and trial a consolidated (single) reporting template for PICs to the five main biodiversity-related MEAs:
 - Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD);
 - Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) – Biennial report only;
 - Convention on Migratory Species (CMS);
 - Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar); and
 - World Heritage Convention (WHC).
3. The consolidated reporting template was drafted in early 2008 and was sent to all self-governing PICs for comment in June this year – the consolidated reporting template should be reviewed in conjunction with this report.
4. This report details outcomes of the trial of the consolidated reporting template which took place in four PICs (Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati and Samoa) in July 2008. Overall, feedback from the trial, and on this project more generally, has been positive.

Benefits to PICs

5. Focal Points and government officials who participated in the trial identified a broad range of benefits to using the consolidated reporting template. For example:
 - a) it could assist Governments who have constraints on resources (staffing and funding) by reducing the amount of time and funding required to undertake national reporting;
 - b) it is a flexible, tailor-made product for the Pacific that has been designed to meet the reporting capacity of PICs and reduce duplication in reporting;
 - c) direct assistance is provided to facilitate understanding of reporting and how to report using the consolidated reporting template;
 - d) it could provide incentive to undertake national reporting 'in-house' ;
 - e) it could facilitate and improve Focal Point engagement and consultation; and
 - f) it could provide an incentive for improved whole-of-government and private sector consultation.

Issues for consideration

6. Two main issues were raised during the trial of the template. These are:
 - a) the value of inclusion of the World Heritage Convention (WHC) in the template due to the biodiversity focus of the template; and
 - b) the length and complexity of the template.
7. Both of these issues are discussed in more detail in the body of this report. Members should take due consideration of these issues.

Outcome of the trial

8. Overall, the PICs consulted during the trial were supportive of the consolidated reporting template and the implementation of the consolidated reporting process in the Pacific.

Recommendations and next steps

9. During Agenda Item 8.1, Members are invited to review the report and to consider agreeing to the implementation of the consolidated reporting template for self-governing PICs in 2009.

10. Implementation of this project across the region could present a major step forward in improving biodiversity outcomes and reporting compliance in the Pacific. It could improve PICs' capacity to undertake reporting, improve national biodiversity knowledge and data management, and provide a mechanism to disseminate biodiversity information which could draw more attention to the Pacific and lead to an increase in support and funding for environmental governance activities in the region.

11. Pending agreement in this forum, the next stages for this project (proposed for 2008-2009) would involve:
 - further consultation with the MEA Secretariats on the content of the consolidated reporting template and proposed timeframe for reporting (i.e. use of a triennial reporting cycle);
 - commencing the process to have the consolidated reporting template endorsed through the formal decision-making processes at the respective Conferences of the Parties (COPs) for each of the MEAs. This process would be initiated by the Australian Government in consultation with SPREP. The active support by SPREP Members of the consolidated reporting process will be integral to gaining acceptance of this project by the COPs;
 - ensuring funding mechanisms would be available to PICs using the consolidated reporting template;
 - assisting all self-governing PICs with developing a national report using the consolidated reporting template. This will include assistance with interpreting reporting requirements, compiling responses to the questions in the template as well as compiling and managing biodiversity information.

12. It is important to note that in conjunction with any approach to streamline and harmonise national reporting that there is ongoing investment in improving capacity at the national level to undertake national reporting, for example in areas of knowledge management.

Introduction

13. The Australian Government's Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts (DEWHA), in consultation with the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), is currently undertaking a project to streamline reporting by Pacific Island countries (PICs) to the biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs). This project is funded under the Australian Agency for International Development's (AusAID) Pacific Governance Support Program.
14. At the 18th SPREP Meeting in September 2007, Members endorsed an option under Agenda Item 6.2 'Options to streamline reporting by Pacific Island countries (PICs) to multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs)' for the Australian Government, in collaboration with SPREP, to develop and trial a consolidated (single) reporting template (the reporting template) for PICs to the five main biodiversity-related MEAs:
- Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD);
 - Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) – Biennial report only;
 - Convention on Migratory Species (CMS);
 - Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar); and
 - World Heritage Convention (WHC).
15. The consolidated reporting template was drafted in early 2008 and was trialled in four PICs in July 2008 to determine its suitability for use in the Pacific. This report outlines the process used to develop the consolidated reporting template and the outcomes of the trial, with the aim to provide Members with sufficient supporting information to determine the suitability of the consolidated reporting template for wider implementation in the Pacific region in 2009.

About the consolidated reporting template

16. The development of the consolidated reporting template involved a number of steps. These were:

- seeking preliminary information on the reporting capacity of PICs via questionnaires and discussions;
- analysing questions and information requirements for past and current national reporting formats;
- analysing past national reports submitted by Contracting Parties, including PICs;
- analysing feedback and reports from MEA Secretariats on past submissions of national reports to the biodiversity-related MEAs;
- research and analysis into work by other agencies relating to MEA reporting, on both optimal content as well as best practice in formatting reports; and
- consultation and feedback on the consolidated reporting template with PICs, SPREP, the United Nations Environment Programme's World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), Australian Government MEA Focal Points, and the Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade

17. A key source of information for this project has come from studies completed by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) on the harmonisation of national reporting to the biodiversity-related MEAs. Their work has been used as a basis to determine the structure of the consolidated reporting template.

18. The consolidated reporting template is based on a concept proposed in 2002 by the UN Secretary-General for the harmonisation of the human rights treaty system, stating that 'each State should be allowed to produce a single report summarising its adherence to the full range of international human rights treaties

to which it is a party' (United Nations Secretary-General, 2002). The consolidated reporting template is an example of how this concept can be applied to the biodiversity-related MEAs.

19. The consolidated reporting template streamlines and simplifies the separate reporting requirements for the five biodiversity-related MEAs into one template. This means that each PIC would use the consolidated reporting template to develop one national report per reporting period (every 3 years) and this report would serve as the national report for any of the five biodiversity-related MEAs to which the PIC is party. The benefits of this to PICs are:

- a reduction in the amount of time and funding spent undertaking national reporting for the biodiversity-related MEAs;
- a simplified structure that reduces duplication yet still allows for tracking of progress and achievements in implementing the biodiversity-related MEAs; and
- a reporting template that is tailored to meet the reporting capacity of PICs.

20. The consolidated reporting template incorporates questions that meet the majority of the information requirements of all five of the biodiversity-related MEAs. A table has been prepared at Attachment A that compares the original questions from the five separate biodiversity-related MEAs with the questions that have been incorporated into the consolidated reporting template. This table shows that many of the questions in the consolidated reporting template are directly linked to questions from the original reporting formats for each of the five biodiversity-related MEAs. However, in order to streamline the number of questions in the consolidated reporting template, some questions have been reworded to be more generic whilst still requesting important information on MEA implementation. This also means that the questions in the consolidated reporting template are no longer specifically aligned to any of the MEAs strategic plans or biodiversity targets as was the case for a number of the original reporting formats

21. The questions in the consolidated reporting template are tailored to request responses that provide an overview of biodiversity in PICs to facilitate an understanding of the status, trends and threats to biodiversity in PICS, and to enable a comprehensive understanding of measures taken to implement the biodiversity-related MEAs.
22. The consolidated reporting template aims to provide a broad picture of national legislation, strategies, policies and activities undertaken to implement the biodiversity-related MEAs. It should be viewed as a beneficial tool for communicating and disseminating national biodiversity information between MEA Secretariats as well as more broadly across all sectors.
23. The template has a biodiversity focus, largely because all PICs are party to the CBD and therefore must undertake a level of specific biodiversity reporting. This has influenced the content of the template in some respects, however many measures undertaken to implement the CBD in the Pacific relate directly to the other biodiversity-related MEAs.
24. There is a 'core' component of the consolidated reporting template that contains seventeen generalised sections are designed to be completed by all reporting PICs. There are five 'Supplementary Information' sections in addition to the 'core' component – one section for each of the five biodiversity-related MEAs – that request information that is specific to each of the MEAs and could not be incorporated into the 'core' component. As not all PICs are Contracting Parties to each of the five MEAs, PICs are only required to complete the Supplementary Information for the MEA/s they are party to. For example, Samoa is party to all five of the biodiversity-related MEAs and would therefore fill in the entire template. The Cook Islands however are party to the CBD and CMS, so they would therefore complete the core components of the template, then the supplementary information for only the CBD and CMS.

Overview of the trial of the consolidated reporting template

25. The consolidated reporting template was trialled in four PICs (Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati and Samoa) in July 2008. The objective of the trial was to 'road-test' the consolidated reporting template to determine its suitability for use in the Pacific.

26. The Australian Government Project Officer, Ms Melissa Jaques, travelled to each of the trial countries to conduct workshops on the template with government officials and other stakeholders who work on the implementation of the biodiversity-related MEAs. A list of persons who attended workshops and/or were consulted during the trial is at Attachment B.

27. Government officials and stakeholders in the trial countries assisted by:

- advising on the history of and process used to undertake national reporting in their country;
- providing an understanding of how national environmental data is collated, managed and stored in their country;
- identifying gaps, overlaps and/or difficulties that exist in the collation, management and storage of environmental data and information in their country;
- providing an understanding of how a consolidated reporting process might be coordinated across government, non-government organisations and the private sector in their country;
- advising on style preference for reporting on biodiversity-related information in their country;
- providing feedback on the suitability of questions in the template;
- providing an assessment of whether the template captures the current achievements as well as obstacles faced relating to the implementation of the biodiversity-related MEAs in their country;

- providing advice on improvements that could be made to the template; and
- assisting with the development of a draft national report for their country using the consolidated reporting template.

28. A brief outline of how the trial was conducted in each of the four PICs is provided below:

| SAMOA | |
|--|--|
| Date of trial: | Wednesday 9 July to Friday 11 July 2008 |
| Consultation: | Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Environment & Conservation Division; ➤ Forestry Division; ➤ Legal Services; and ➤ Water Resources Division. |
| | Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme |
| MEAs: | CBD, CITES, CMS, Ramsar and WHC |
| <p>Process</p> <p>A working group of staff in the Samoan Government Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE) was established to assist the DEWHA Project Officer, Ms Jaques, with the trial of the template. This working group was comprised of technical officers and the Focal Points for the biodiversity-related MEAs. The working group met with Ms Jaques a number of times over three days to workshop the template.</p> <p>The first workshop session aimed to achieve an understanding of how a consolidated reporting process might be implemented and coordinated in Samoa, as well as the current processes in place to undertake national reporting.</p> <p>Following this, two focussed workshop sessions were held with the objective of using the template to draft a national report for Samoa. This meant that the suitability of every question in the template was assessed to determine:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) if it could be easily understood; b) if staff could generate a response to the question; | |

- c) if any questions resulted in a duplication of response;
- d) if any questions were not relevant; and
- e) if there were any other questions that should be included in the template to reflect activities and initiatives underway in Samoa.

| FIJI | |
|--|---|
| Date of trial: | Monday 14 July to Wednesday 16 July 2008 |
| Consultation: | Ministry of Local Government, Urban Development, Housing and Environment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Department of Environment |
| | National Trust of Fiji |
| | Ministry of Education, Culture, Natural Heritage and the Arts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Department of Culture and Heritage |
| | International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) |
| | World Wide Fund for Nature Fiji (WWF) |
| | Environment Consultant – Department of the Environment |
| MEAs: | CBD, CITES, Ramsar and WHC |
| <p>Process</p> <p>Ms Jaques met separately with government staff from the Fijian Government Department of Environment, the National Trust of Fiji, and the Department of Culture and Heritage to discuss the template. Ms Jaques also met with a consultant currently working on the Fijian National Capacity Self Assessment (NCSA) as well as staff from non-government organisations (NGOs).</p> <p>Due to the resource and time constraints on government staff working on the biodiversity-related MEAs, discussions on the template were kept at a conceptual level to ascertain how a consolidated reporting process might work in Fiji.</p> | |

| KIRIBATI | |
|--|--|
| Date of trial: | Thursday 17 July to Tuesday 22 July 2008 |
| Consultation: | Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agriculture Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Environment and Conservation Division ➤ Land Management Division ➤ Agriculture Division |
| | Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Fisheries Division |
| | Ministry of Internal and Social Affairs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Cultural Division ➤ Rural Development |
| | Ministry of Communications, Transport and Tourism Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Tourism Division |
| MEAs: | CBD and WHC (Ramsar – process underway to accede to Ramsar Convention) |
| <p>Process</p> <p>Ms Jaques met separately with government staff from a range of Ministries in the Kiribati Government. Most of these staff were part of the Kiribati Biodiversity Steering Committee. Consultation with the Biodiversity Steering Committee members was kept at a conceptual level.</p> <p>Ms Jaques also met with technical staff in the Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agriculture Development (MELAD) who are responsible for the implementation of the CBD and WHC, and coordinate national reporting to these MEAs. Focussed sessions were held with MELAD staff with the objective of using the template to draft a national report for Kiribati. The process for this was similar to that in Samoa, with the aim of determining the suitability of the questions in the template.</p> | |

| COOK ISLANDS | |
|--|---|
| Date of trial: | Thursday 24 July to Monday 28 July 2008 |
| Consultation: | National Environment Service |
| | Ministry of Marine Resources |
| | Ministry of Agriculture |
| | World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) Cook Islands |
| MEAs: | CBD and CMS |
| <p>Process</p> <p>Ms Jaques met with staff from a number of government agencies as well as a major NGO in the Cook Islands.</p> <p>Focussed sessions were held with staff in the National Environment Service with the objective of using the template to draft a national report for the Cook Islands. The process for this was similar to that in Samoa, with the aim of determining the suitability of the questions in the template.</p> <p>Consultation with the Ministry of Marine Resources, the Ministry of Agriculture and WWF was kept at a conceptual level.</p> | |

Benefits identified during the trial of the consolidated reporting template

29. The majority of the Focal Points who were involved in the trial were supportive of the consolidated reporting process for the biodiversity-related MEAs and were supportive of further implementation of this approach in the Pacific. Focal Points and government officials who participated in the trial identified a broad range of benefits of using the consolidated reporting template which are outlined below.

Assists Governments who have constraints on resources

30. For many PICs with small environment agencies, limited staff and funding, the implementation of a consolidated reporting process may be of significant benefit, as only one report would be required in a three-year reporting period instead of multiple reports during this time period. This may free up resources (staffing and funding) which will enable countries to focus on other tasks that may be of higher priority in achieving national environmental objectives.

Flexible, tailor-made product for the Pacific

31. A key benefit of the consolidated template is that it has been tailor-made for PICs and trialled through a consultative process in the Pacific. This is important as nearly all PICs are nation states comprising of multiple islands that are, in many cases, spread over hundreds or thousands of kilometres and feature unique ecosystems and species. Ensuring national reports depict the unique biodiversity, geography and topography as well as differing national circumstances of PICs is therefore highly important to ensure biodiversity status, trends and threats are viewed in the appropriate context. The consolidated reporting template aims to provide a simple framework to convey the complexities and obstacles faced by many PICs as well as their key outcomes and success with environmental management and governance.

32. The objective of the consolidated reporting template is to facilitate reporting by PICs – the template should be viewed as a flexible document that can be used to present an overall picture of national circumstances and measures taken to implement the MEAs in the Pacific, rather than a prescriptive or constraining document. This means that PICs should use the consolidated reporting template to present a frank and objective picture of the measures undertaken to implement the MEAs as well as key challenges and obstacles they may face.
33. The inclusion of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (a supplementary agreement to the CBD) into the template was suggested by a number of PICs involved in the trial. It is possible that elements of the reporting requirements for the Protocol can be added to the consolidated reporting template. An Annex featuring ‘Supplementary Information on the Cartagena Protocol’ can also be added to the template and this task will be undertaken if the template is endorsed for wider use in the Pacific.
34. The consolidated reporting template is designed to be completed on a triennial cycle (once every three years) due to the average reporting period for most MEAs. During the trial, PICs indicated a preference for the trial to cover a reporting period from January 2006 to December 2008, to enable information collated in the trial to be fed into national reports required in 2009.

Help tools provided in the consolidated reporting template

35. The consolidated reporting template incorporates a number of help tools to assist countries with understanding and interpreting the questions in the template. These tools will be developed further should the template be endorsed for broader implementation. Tools currently available include a glossary of terms that explain biodiversity terminology and concepts used in the template and a description at the start of each section explaining why the questions are being asked and what is expected in the responses. An example report will also be finalised in the coming months as a guide. General guidelines on how to use the template and undertake the reporting process will also be prepared.

Direct assistance to facilitate understanding of national reporting

36. The process undertaken during the trial of the consolidated reporting template provided a learning opportunity for many government officials and Focal Points who had previously had limited experience with national reporting. During the trial, assistance was provided to Focal Points and government officials to assist with their understanding of the questions, why certain information was being requested, and how they would formulate a response to each question. Broader implementation of the consolidated reporting process in the Pacific will ensure all PICs receive assistance with understanding and interpreting requirements in the consolidated reporting template.

Incentive to undertake national reporting 'in-house'

37. A number of PICs involved in the trial currently use or have previously used consultants to coordinate and draft national reports for the biodiversity-related MEAs. This could mean that some technical/operation Focal Points who are responsible for day-to-day implementation of the MEAs may not have had direct experience with national reporting. The use of a consolidated reporting process may improve the capacity of Focal Points and areas responsible for MEA implementation to undertake national reporting 'in-house' which will be of great benefit in ensuring technical officers are directly engaged in the stocktaking and assessment of national efforts for MEA implementation. This direct involvement may also help technical officers with future biodiversity planning at the national level. Some of the Focal Points involved in the trial stated that if a consolidated reporting template was implemented, they would have more incentive to consider undertaking reporting themselves rather than engage a consultant to undertake this work. This could be an important learning and self-assessment process for many PICs and could also free up financial resources normally allocated to consultants which could be redirected towards other on-ground environmental activities.

Facilitates Focal Point consultation

38. Depending on the government structure and resources available, some PICs have different technical/operational Focal Points or areas responsible for the day-to-day implementation of the biodiversity-related MEAs. The Focal Points and government officials who participated in the workshop stated that one of the benefits of using a consolidated reporting process was that it provided a mechanism and an opportunity to bring Focal Points and government officials together to discuss work that they are undertaking or have undertaken in relation to the biodiversity-related MEAs. It provided a transparent forum where Focal Points and government officials could hear first hand of activities, outcomes, obstacles and key issues faced by the various Focal Points in implementing their respective MEAs. This process can provide an important forum for Focal Points to learn from and communicate past experience. This process can also serve as a useful forum to identifying synergies in work programs undertaken to the implement the biodiversity-related MEAs.

Incentive for comprehensive whole-of-government and private sector consultation

39. A number of the environment Departments and Ministries in the trial PICs have established biodiversity taskforces or steering committees comprised of representatives from the public and private sector to mainstream and improve coordination on environment issues. This will be of great benefit to the consolidated reporting process as the development of any national report should be fully inclusive, including all agencies – governmental and/or non-governmental – who are involved in the implementation of the MEAs. For those PICs who are yet to establish a biodiversity steering committee or taskforce, the implementation of a consolidated reporting process could provide an incentive to establish such a group or network to facilitate the reporting process.

Issues identified during the trial of the consolidated reporting template

40. Feedback on the trial and initial consultation process has been mostly positive. However, a number of issues were raised by some of the Focal Points and these have been outlined below.

Value of including the World Heritage Convention (WHC)

41. An issue that was raised during the trial was the value of including the World Heritage Convention (WHC) in the consolidated reporting template. During the consultation process, it has been suggested by two Focal Points for the WHC that there is no real benefit from incorporating the reporting requirements for the WHC into the consolidated reporting template.

42. The WHC Focal Points recognised the value of a consolidated reporting process for the other biodiversity-related MEAs and stated they would be supportive and work to assist other Focal Points where required should the template be endorsed, however they were generally not supportive of the inclusion of the WHC into the template for two reasons. The first is that they considered the current reporting requirements for WHC not onerous or complex. The second is that the consolidated reporting template is biodiversity focussed and could therefore skew the reporting process for WHC to appear focussed towards natural heritage rather than cultural heritage.

43. Whilst these are valid points, for many Pacific islanders cultural heritage sites are intrinsically linked to the natural environment. Steps taken to implement the WHC in terms of the protection and conservation of cultural or natural heritage sites in the Pacific generally contribute, to some extent, to the conservation and protection of biodiversity values. In fact, nearly all properties submitted to the World Heritage Tentative List from PICs feature a blend of cultural and natural heritage values, and measures taken for the protection and management of these

sites are relevant to other biodiversity-related MEAs. For example, the Phoenix Islands Protected Area (PIPA) in Kiribati was declared a Protected Area in-line with the CBD's Programme of Work on Protected Areas. The PIPA has also been submitted to the World Heritage Tentative List as a potential World Heritage site. There is therefore benefit to having a consolidated reporting process for Kiribati as they are required to provide information to both the CBD and WHC on work undertaken to protect, conserve and manage the PIPA. Ultimately, for many PICs, there is significant value in having the WHC incorporated into the consolidated reporting template.

Length and complexity of the template

44. A number of staff consulted during the trial commented on the length of the consolidated reporting template and stated that this may deter them from using it. This issue is currently being considered, however it is important to recognise that the consolidated reporting template combines reporting requirements for five MEAs into one. It is important that the template requests sufficient information to present an overview of national measures undertaken to implement the MEAs, whilst at the same time being of easy to use and of benefit to PICs.

45. The current consolidated reporting template has been created as a Form in a Microsoft Word document which has some limitations in terms of interactivity and presentation of data. A mechanism currently being considered which could improve the interactivity and make the length of the template more manageable is the use of Adobe LiveCycle Forms software for the consolidated reporting template. Use of Adobe LiveCycle Forms software would mean that the template would appear as a simple, interactive PDF form that is purpose designed to facilitate reporting. Provided PICs have the free Adobe Reader application (Acrobat/Adobe Reader 6.0.2 or above) they will be able to view and compile the report using this software. This software program is also purpose designed to improve the collation and management of data entered into the form which could be of benefit to end-users of the template, for example those who will be analysing and interpreting the reports submitted by PICs.

Overall outcome of the trial of the consolidated reporting template

46. Feedback in general on the consolidated reporting template has been favourable. The majority of the Focal Points and government officials involved in the trial were supportive of the consolidated reporting process and were supportive of further implementation of this approach in the Pacific.

Areas identified during the trial that could be improved to facilitate national reporting

47. During the trial, a number of areas were identified where improvements could be made to facilitate national reporting and MEA implementation more generally for PICs. These are outlined briefly below. It is important to note that in conjunction with any approach to streamline and harmonise reporting there is ongoing investment in improving capacity at the national level to undertake national reporting.

Knowledge management

48. Ensuring processes are in place to manage environmental information such as databases and reports is integral to achieve effective implementation of MEAs and support reporting processes. Ongoing investment in improving knowledge management, such as national capacity to collate, manage and store data, could be benefit to PICs to strengthen their capacity to meet reporting requirements, and aid their capacity to monitor the state of the environment.

Communication of information from MEA Secretariats

49. Difficulties due to changes or position of MEA Focal Point within Government

It became apparent during the trial that for some PICs, the position of the designated MEA Focal Point within government can affect the flow of communication of information from the MEA Secretariats to the technical officers

engaged in the day-to day implementation of the MEAs. For example, some PICs list a political Focal Point (such as an official in their Foreign Affairs Department, or the highest-level government official in a Ministry) rather than a technical or operational Focal Point that is involved in the day-to-day implementation of the MEAs. For governments with high-turnover or a level of instability this can mean that important information sent to the Focal Point may be delayed in getting to the technical officers or in some cases may not be passed on at all. For some PICs, changes to the contact details of the Focal Point occurs frequently, and this presents further difficulties in ensuring information is not lost during periods of transition. Overall, ensuring all technical officers who require information from the MEA Secretariats actually receive it is a key issue that needs to be addressed by both the MEA Secretariats and the Contracting Parties.

50. Difficulties due to technical issues

It became apparent during the trial that information that is important for PICs to successfully implement the MEAs and undertake reporting is not always reaching the appropriate staff in the environment Departments and Ministries in PICs due to technical issues with the internet and email systems. At this point in time, email is not always a reliable tool for communication in the Pacific, and important information that may be sent via email does not always get through to the appropriate officers. Difficulties with access to the internet also means that some PICs do not have the capacity to check the various MEA websites regularly and may not necessarily be aware of the availability of important documentation that could assist them with MEA implementation and reporting.

51. Difficulties with meeting timeframes set by MEA Secretariats

Some PICs advised that they required clearer guidance from the MEA Secretariats to ensure technical officers are aware of timeframes for reporting as well as the availability of mechanisms to assist with reporting such as funding and guidance material. A number of PICs involved in the trial suggested that a calendar be produced that details all major events for the MEAs including when

PICs should commence processes for national reporting, due dates for national reports, as well as dates for regional and international meetings.

Relationships with NGOS

52. For PICs with small environmental agencies and limited staff and funding, environmental NGOs working nationally and regionally can make an important contribution to MEA implementation due to their capacity to undertake on-ground environmental activities. Establishing and maintaining an active working relationship between NGOs and government that ensures work priorities and goals are communicated and aligned can be of great benefit in improving national environmental governance. This relationship is important to national reporting to MEAs as the process is intended to be transparent, fully inclusive and involve all agencies and institutions that assist with or have an interest in the implementation of MEAs. Ensuring NGOs are directly engaged in national reporting is important as their work can be of great value to achieving the objectives of the MEAs.

Managing and accessing CITES-specific data

53. Ensuring CITES-specific information that is held across more than one agency is managed and made available across government is highly important to facilitate reporting on the implementation of this MEA. Governments may have separate agencies responsible for various aspects of CITES, for example a Customs or Quarantine agency that is responsible for CITES enforcement and monitoring, or an environment agency that is responsible for permitting. In many PICs, more than one agency is responsible for collating and managing CITES-specific information, and ensuring a strong working arrangement and information management system is in place between all areas engaged in implementing and enforcing CITES is important to facilitate reporting for this MEA.

Use of indicators to ensuring national reporting is outcomes focussed

54. A number of PICs in the trial stated a preference for national reporting to be outcomes focussed. For example, some PICs would like national reporting to

show how the community has really benefited from activities and the implementation of the MEAs, and to provide an overview of how the MEAs are really addressing issues of concern such as logging, coral extraction and impacts from agricultural practices. However, for many PICs, identifying positive or negative environmental outcomes is difficult as countries require assistance to develop environmental indicators and/or their capacity to monitor and assess outcomes from environmental activities. Further consideration of this work in many PICs on developing indicators and capacity to monitor and assess projects and activities is required to enable reporting to be more outcomes focussed.

Recommendations and next steps

55. PICs are invited to consider agreeing to the implementation of the consolidated reporting template for self-governing PICs in 2009.

56. Implementation of this project across the region could present a major step forward in improving biodiversity outcomes and reporting compliance in the Pacific. It could improve PICs' capacity to undertake reporting, improve national biodiversity knowledge and data management, and provide a mechanism to disseminate biodiversity information which could draw more attention to the Pacific and lead to an increase in support and funding for environmental governance activities in the region.

57. It could also provide a practical case study of a streamlined reporting approach that will be a valuable model for the governing bodies of the MEAs, UNEP and UNEP-WCMC, and other regions with similar resource constraints to PICs, e.g. Africa.

58. Pending agreement in this forum, the next stages of this project would involve:

- further consultation with the MEA Secretariats on the content of the consolidated reporting template and proposed timeframe for reporting (i.e. use of a triennial reporting cycle);
- commencing the process to have the consolidated reporting template endorsed through the formal decision-making processes at the respective Conferences of the Parties (COPs) for each of the MEAs. This process would be initiated by the Australian Government in consultation with SPREP. The active support by SPREP Members of the consolidated reporting process will be integral to gaining acceptance of this project by the COPs;
- ensuring funding mechanisms would be available to countries using the consolidated reporting template; and
- assisting all self-governing PICs with developing a national report using the consolidated reporting template. This would include assistance with interpreting

reporting requirements, compiling responses, as well as compiling and managing biodiversity information.

59. It is proposed that the DEWHA Project Officer would brief SPREP Members on progress with the project at the 20th SPREP Meeting in 2009.

60. Progressing these next stages is dependant on securing funding for 2009. Possible sources include the Pacific Governance Support Programme (PGSP) managed by AusAID. Alternative sources will also be explored, such as the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the Asian Development Bank, UNEP and the World Bank.

References

United Nations Secretary-General (2002), *Strengthening the United Nations: an agenda for further change*, [http://www.undg.org/archive_docs/1848-Strengthening of the UN An agenda Exec Summary - Executive Summary.doc](http://www.undg.org/archive_docs/1848-Strengthening_of_the_UN_An_agenda_Exec_Summary_-_Executive_Summary.doc)

Attachment A - List of questions from current reporting formats for the biodiversity-related MEAs and the corresponding questions in the consolidated reporting template

| Table 1: List of questions from current reporting formats for the biodiversity-related MEAs and the corresponding questions in the consolidated reporting template | |
|--|--|
| ORIGINAL FORMATS - QUESTIONS | CONSOLIDATED REPORTING TEMPLATE |
| CBD | |
| Executive Summary | Section 2 |
| Chapter I - Overview of biodiversity status, trends and threats | |
| 2. (a) Overview of biodiversity and importance for human well-being. | Question 2.2 & 4.3 |
| (b) Status and trends of biodiversity, using any indicators. | Question 3 & 4. |
| (c) Main threats to biodiversity components and underlying drivers and causes. | Question 2.3. |
| (d) Implications of changes in status of biodiversity components for ecology, livelihood and social and economic development. | Question 3 & 4. |
| Chapter II - Current status of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans | |
| 2. (a) Brief description of the NBSAP, identifying main/priority activities. | Question 8.8/8.9. |
| (b) Indicate whether and where CBD targets and indicators (global and national) have been incorporated in NBSAPs. | Question 8.12. |
| (c) Contribution of activities under NBSAPs to implementation of CBD articles and thematic programmes and cross-cutting issues. | Not included |
| (d) Progress with implementation of priority activities, focusing on concrete results. | Question 8.10. |
| (e) Domestic and/or international funding for priority activities. | Question 8.11. |
| (f) Success and obstacles encountered in implementation and lessons learned. | Question 8.13 |
| (g) Analysis of effectiveness of NBSAPs: (i) are changes in status and trends in biodiversity the results of NBSAP and Convention implementation. | Difficult for many PICs to determine as yet but could include a question on this |
| (ii) Analysis of effectiveness of NBSAPs: Is the current NBSAP adequate to address threats to biodiversity. | Difficult for many PICs to determine as yet but could include a question on this |

| | |
|--|--|
| (iii) Analysis of effectiveness of NBSAPs: How can implementation of NBSAP be improved, including overcoming obstacles. | Difficult for many PICs to determine as yet but could include a question on this |
| (h) Specific information from COP 8 decisions: | Related to Question 9.4 |
| (3) Parties not having completed their NBSAP to report on relevant activities as above. | Question 8.8 |
| (a) Parties not having completed their NBSAP: Status of development of NBSAP or related strategies and plans. | Question 8.8 |
| (b) Parties not having completed their NBSAP: Obstacles to completing NBSAPs and ways to overcome them. | Related to 8.8 |
| Chapter III - Sectoral and cross-sectoral integration or mainstreaming of biodiversity considerations | |
| 3. (a) Extent to which biodiversity has been integrated into sectoral and cross-sectoral strategies and plans, providing concrete examples. | Question 8.6 |
| (b) Processes by which biodiversity has been integrated into sectoral and cross-sectoral strategies and plans, including: (i) mechanisms put in place to ensure that implementation of these strategies and plans will avoid or minimize adverse impacts on biodiversity or contribute to the objectives of the Convention. | Question 8.6 |
| (ii) the use of positive incentives and removal of perverse incentives. | Not included |
| (c) Describe whether and how the ecosystem approach has been adopted and employed in mainstreaming biodiversity. | Question 8.1 |
| (d) Extent to which biodiversity is included in environmental impact assessments and strategic environmental assessments. | Question 8.7 |
| (e) Analysis of the outcomes achieved through implementation of these measures and extent to which these measures contribute to implementation of NBSAPs. | check |
| 4. Donor countries: Information on how biodiversity has been taken into account in programmes of overseas development assistance, scientific and technical cooperation, and technology transfer, including south-south cooperation. | N/A |
| Chapter IV – Conclusions: Progress towards the 2010 target and implementation of the Strategic Plan | |
| A. Progress Towards the 2010 Target | Question 18.2 |
| B. Progress towards the goals and objectives of the Strategic Plan of the Convention | Question 18.3 |
| C. Conclusions | |
| 6. (a) Overall assessment of whether the implementation of the Convention has had an impact on improving conservation, sustainable use, and benefit-sharing. If yes, how so? If not, why not? | Question 9.2 |
| (b) Analysis of lessons learned regarding implementation, highlighting examples of successful and less successful actions. | Question 9.2/9.3 |
| (c) Summary of future priorities and capacity-building needs for implementation of the Convention. | Question 17.1 |
| (d) Suggested actions to be taken at regional and global levels to enhance national implementation of the Convention, including: refining existing and developing new work programmes; goals and objectives to be included in future Strategic Plans; mechanisms to be established at various levels. | Question 17.1 |
| Appendix I A. National Focal Point contact information. | Section 1 |
| Contact officer for national report. | Section 1 |
| Submission signature and date. | Section 1 |
| Ramsar Convention on Wetlands | |

| | |
|---|-------------------------|
| Section 1: Institutional information. | |
| Administrative Authority – contact details. | Section 1 |
| National Focal Point – contact details. | Section 1 |
| National Focal Point for STRP – contact details. | Section 1 |
| National Government Focal Point for CEPA – contact details. | Section 1 |
| National NGO Focal Point for CEPA – contact details. | Section 1 |
| Section 2: General Summary of national Implementation Progress and Challenges | |
| A. What new steps have been taken to implement the Convention? | Question 9.1 |
| B. What have been the most successful aspects of implementation of the Convention? | Question 9.2 |
| C. What have been the greatest difficulties in implementing the Convention? | Question 9.3 |
| D. What proposals and priorities are there for future implementation of the Convention? | Question 9.5 |
| E. Does the Contracting Party have any recommendations concerning implementation assistance from the Ramsar Secretariat? | Question 9.6 |
| F. Does the Contracting Party have any recommendations concerning implementation assistance from the Convention's International Organisation Partners (IOPs)? | Question 9.7 |
| G. How can national implementation of the Ramsar Convention be better linked with implementation of other multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs), especially those in the "Biodiversity cluster" (Ramsar, Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), Convention on Migratory Species (CMS), CITES, and the World Heritage Convention), and UNCCD and UNFCCC? | Question 15.1 |
| H. How can Ramsar Convention implementation be better linked with the implementation of water policy/strategy and other strategies in the country (e.g. sustainable development, energy, extractive industry, poverty reduction, sanitation, food security, biodiversity)? | Related to Question 8.6 |
| I. Does the Contracting Party have any other general comments on the implementation of the Convention? | Additional comments |
| Goal 1: The wise use of wetlands | |
| <i>Strategy 1.1: Describe, assess and monitor the extent and condition of wetland resources</i> | |
| 1.1.1. Do you have a comprehensive National Wetland Inventory? | Question 12.1 |
| 1.1.2. Is the wetland inventory data and information maintained and made accessible to all stakeholders? | Question 12.2 |
| 1.1.3. Does your country have information about the status and trends of the ecological character of wetlands (Ramsar sites and/or wetlands generally)? | Question 21.3 |
| 1.1.4. If the answer is 'Yes' in 1.1.3., does this information indicate that the need to address adverse change in the ecological character of wetlands is now greater, the same, or less than in the previous triennium, for: a) Ramsar sites b) wetlands generally | Question 21.4 |
| <i>Strategy 1.2: Develop, review and implement national or supranational policies, legislation, institutions and practices, including impact assessment and valuation</i> | |
| 1.2.1 Is a National Wetland Policy (or equivalent) in place? | Table 8.2 |
| 1.2.2. Does the National Wetland Policy (or equivalent) incorporate any World Summit on Sustainable Development targets and actions? | Table 8.2 |
| 1.2.3. Have wetlands issues been incorporated in to national strategies for sustainable development (including National Poverty Reduction Plans called for by the WSSD and water resources management and water efficiency plans)? | Question 8.6 |

| | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| 1.2.4. Has the quality and quantity of water available to, and required by, wetlands been assessed? | Question 21.7 |
| 1.2.5. Are Strategic Environmental Assessment practices applied when reviewing policies, programmes and plans that may impact upon wetlands? | Question 8.7 |
| <i>Strategy 1.3: Increase recognition of the significance of wetlands for reasons of water supply, coastal protection, flood defence, climate change mitigation, food security, poverty reduction, cultural heritage, and scientific research, with a focus on under-represented ecosystem types</i> | |
| 1.3.1. Has an assessment been conducted of the ecosystem benefits/services provided from Ramsar sites? | Question 5.3 |
| 1.3.2. Have wise use wetland programmes and/or projects that contribute to poverty alleviation objectives and food and water security plans been developed? | Related to Question 7.1 |
| 1.3.3. Has national action been taken to implement the Guidelines for Global Action on Peatlands? | Question 21.8 |
| 1.3.4. Has national action been taken to apply the guiding principles on cultural values of wetlands (Resolutions VIII.19 and IX.21)? | Related to Question 5.2 |
| <i>Strategy 1.4: Integrate policies on the conservation and wise use of wetlands in the planning activities and in decision-making processes at national, regional, provincial and local levels, particularly concerning territorial management, groundwater management, catchment / river basin management, coastal and marine zone planning and responses to climate change</i> | |
| 1.4.1. Has the Convention's water related guidance been used / applied in decision-making related to waste resource planning and management? | Question 12.6 |
| 1.4.2. Have CEPA expertise and tools been incorporated into catchment / river basin planning and management? | Related to Section 10 |
| 1.4.3. Has the Convention's guidance on wetlands and coastal zone management been used/applied in Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) planning and decision-making? | Question 12.6 |
| 1.4.4. Have the implications for wetland conservation and wise use of national of the Kyoto Protocol been assessed? | Related to Question 8.3 |
| <i>Strategy 1.5: Identify priority wetlands where restoration or rehabilitation would be beneficial and yield long-term environmental, social or economic benefits, and implement the necessary measures to recover these sites</i> | |
| 1.5.1. Have wetland restoration / rehabilitation programmes or projects been implemented? | Question 6.1 |
| 1.5.2. Has the Convention's guidance on wetland restoration been used/applied in designing and implementing wetland restoration/rehabilitation programmes or projects? | Question 12.6 |
| <i>Strategy 1.6: Develop guidance and promote protocols and actions to prevent, control or eradicate invasive alien species in wetland systems</i> | |
| 1.6.1. Have national policies, strategies and management responses to threats from invasive species, particularly in wetlands, developed and implemented? | Question 2.3 |
| 1.6.2. Have such policies, strategies and management responses been carried out in cooperation with the focal points of other conventions and international organizations/processes? | Section 15 |
| Goal 2: Wetlands of International Importance | |
| <i>Strategy 2.1: Apply the Strategic Framework and guidelines for the future development of the List of Wetlands of International Importance</i> | |
| 2.1.1. Has a strategy and priorities been established for further designation of Ramsar sites, using the Strategic Framework for the Ramsar List? | Related to Section 21/Table 8.2 |
| <i>Strategy 2.2: Maintain the Ramsar Site Information Service and constantly update it with the best available information, and use the Ramsar Sites Database as a tool for guiding the further designation of wetlands for the List of Wetlands of International Importance</i> | |
| 2.2.1. Have all required updates of the Information Sheet on Ramsar Wetlands been submitted to the Ramsar Secretariat? | Question 21.3 |
| 2.2.2. Are the Ramsar Sites Information Service and its database used in national implementation of the Convention concerning Ramsar site issues? | Question 12.6 |
| <i>Strategy 2.3: Maintain the ecological character of all Ramsar sites</i> | |
| 2.3.1. Have the measures required to maintain the ecological character of Ramsar sites been defined and applied? | Question 21.5 |

| | |
|---|-------------------------|
| 2.3.2. Have management plans/strategies been developed and implemented at all Ramsar sites? | Question 12.1 |
| 2.3.3. Have cross-sectoral site management committees been established at Ramsar sites? | Question 15.2 |
| 2.3.4. Has any assessment of Ramsar site management effectiveness been carried out? | Relates to Question 8.2 |
| <i>Strategy 2.4: Monitor the condition of Ramsar sites, notify the Ramsar Secretariat without delay of changes affecting Ramsar sites, and apply the Montreux Record and Ramsar Advisory Mission as tools to address problems</i> | |
| 2.4.1. Are arrangements in place for the Administrative Authority to be informed of changes or likely changes in ecological character of Ramsar sites? | Question 21.4 |
| 2.4.2. Have all cases of change or likely change in the ecological character of Ramsar sites been reported to the Ramsar Secretariat, pursuant to Article 3.2? | Question 21.5 |
| 2.4.3. Is the Montreux Record being used as part of the Convention's governance process, in parallel with nomination and management planning of sites? | Question 21.6 |
| <i>Strategy 2.5: Promote inventory and integrated management of shared wetlands and hydrological basins, including cooperative monitoring and management of shared wetland-dependent species</i> | |
| 2.5.1. Have all transboundary/shared wetland systems been identified? | Not included |
| 2.5.2. Is effective cooperative management in place for shared wetland systems, including regional site and waterbird flyway networks? | Table 8.2 |
| <i>Strategy 2.6: Support existing regional agreements under the Convention and promote additional agreements</i> | |
| 2.6.1. Has the Contracting Party been involved in the development of a regional initiative under the framework of the Convention? | Question 14.6 |
| Goal 3: International cooperation | |
| <i>Strategy 3.1: Work as partners with international and regional MEAs and other agencies</i> | |
| 3.1.1. Are mechanisms in place at the national level for collaboration between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the focal points of other MEAs? | Question 15.2 |
| 3.1.2. Are the national focal points of other MEAs invited to participate in the National Ramsar/Wetland Committee? | Question 15.2 |
| 3.1.3. For African parties: Has the Contracting Party participated in the implementation of the wetland programme under NEPAD? | N/A |
| <i>Strategy 3.2: Promote the sharing of expertise and information</i> | |
| 3.2.1. Have networks, including twinning arrangements, been established, nationally or inter among wetlands sharing common features been established, either nationally or internationally, for knowledge sharing and training for wetlands that share common features? | Section 15 |
| 3.2.2. Has information about the country's wetlands and/or Ramsar sites and their status been made publicly available (e.g. through publications or a Web site)? | Section 10 |
| Goal 4: Implementation capacity | |
| <i>Strategy 4.1: Encourage active and informed participation of local communities and indigenous people, including women and youth, in the conservation and wise use of wetlands, including in relation to understanding the dynamics of cultural values</i> | |
| 4.1.1. Has resource information been compiled on local communities and indigenous people's participation in wetland management? | Question 11.1 |
| 4.1.2. Have traditional knowledge and management practices in relation to wetlands been documented and their application encouraged? | Question 11.2 |
| 4.1.3. Does the Contracting Party promote public participation in decision-making (with respect to wetlands), especially with local stakeholder involvement in the selection of new Ramsar sites and in site management? | Question 11.2 |
| 4.1.4. Have educational and training activities been developed concerning cultural aspects of wetlands? | Section 10 |
| 4.1.5. Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning of Ramsar sites and other wetlands? | Question 5.2 |
| <i>Strategy 4.2: Promote the involvement of the private sector in the conservation and wise use of wetlands</i> | |

| | |
|---|--------------------------|
| 4.2.1. Is the private sector encouraged to apply the wise use principle in activities and investments concerning wetlands? | Question 7.1 |
| 4.2.2. Have private-sector 'Friends of Wetlands' fora or similar mechanisms been established? | Not included |
| <i>Strategy 4.3: Promote measures which encourage the application of the wise use principle</i> | |
| 4.3.1. Have actions been taken to promote incentive measures which encourage conservation and wise use of wetlands? | Question 11.1 |
| 4.3.2. Have actions been taken to remove perverse incentive measures which discourage conservation and wise use of wetlands? | Not included |
| <i>Strategy 4.4: Support, and assist in implementation at all levels, the Convention's CEPA programme for promoting conservation and wise use of wetlands through public participation and CEPA</i> | |
| 4.4.1. Has a mechanism for planning and implementing wetland CEPA (National Ramsar/Wetland Committee or other mechanism) been established with both CEPA Government and NGO National Focal Point (NFP) involvement? | Section 10 |
| 4.4.2. Has a National Action Plan (or plans at the subnational, catchment or local level) for wetland CEPA been developed? | Question 10.1 |
| 4.4.3. Have actions been taken to communicate and share information cross-sectorally on wetland issues amongst relevant ministries, departments and agencies? | Question 10.3 |
| 4.4.4. Have national campaigns, programmes and projects been carried out to raise community awareness of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by wetlands? | Section 10 |
| 4.4.5. Have World Wetlands Day activities in the country, either government and NGO-led or both, been carried out? | Section 10 |
| 4.4.6. Have education centres been established at the Ramsar sites and other wetlands? | Section 10 |
| <i>Strategy 4.5: Promote international assistance to support the conservation and wise use of wetlands, while ensuring that environmental safeguards and assessments are an integral component of all development projects that affect wetlands</i> | |
| 4.5.1. For Contracting Parties with development assistance agencies: Has funding support been provided from development assistance agencies for wetland conservation and management issues in other countries? | N/A |
| 4.5.2. For Contracting Parties in receipt of development assistance: Has funding support been mobilized from development assistance agencies for in-country wetland conservation and management? | Section 16 |
| <i>Strategy 4.6: Provide the financial resources required for the Convention's governance mechanisms and programmes</i> | |
| 4.6.1. For the last triennium have Ramsar contributions been paid in full and in a timely manner (by 31 March of the calendar year)? If no, clarify if there is a plan in place to ensure prompt payment. | Not included. |
| 4.6.2. Has any additional financial support been provided through voluntary contributions to the Ramsar Small Grants Fund, or other non-core funded Convention activity (if yes, state amounts)? | Section 16 |
| <i>Strategy 4.7: Ensure that the COP, Standing Committee, STRP and Secretariat are operating at a high level of efficiency and effectiveness to support implementation of this Framework</i> | |
| 4.7.1. Has the Contracting Party used its previous Ramsar National Reports in monitoring its implementation of the Convention? | Question 1.3 |
| <i>Strategy 4.8: Develop the capacity within, and promote cooperation among, institutions in Contracting Parties to achieve conservation and wise use of wetlands</i> | |
| 4.8.1. Has a review of national institutions responsible for the conservation and wise use of wetlands been completed? | Not included |
| 4.8.2. Is a National Ramsar/Wetlands cross-sectoral Committee (or equivalent body) in place and operational? | Question 15.2 |
| <i>Strategy 4.9: Maximise the benefits of working with the Convention's International Organization Partners (IOPs) and others</i> | |
| 4.9.1. Has your country received assistance from one or more of the Convention's IOPs in its implementation of the Convention? | Question 9.7 |
| 4.9.2. Has your country provided assistance to one or more of the Convention's IOPs? | Not included. |
| <i>Strategy 4.10: Identify the training needs of institutions and individuals concerned with the conservation and wise use of wetlands, particularly in developing countries and countries in transition, and implement appropriate responses</i> | |
| 4.10.1. Has your country provided support to, or participated in, the development of regional (i.e. covering more than one country) wetland training and research centres? | Related to Question 10.5 |

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| 4.10.2. Has an assessment of national and local training been completed of national and local training needs in the implementation of the Convention, including the use of the Wise Use Handbooks? | Question 14.5 |
| 4.10.3. Have opportunities for wetland site manager training in the country been provided? | Question 14.4 |
| CITES BIENNIAL REPORT FORMAT | |
| A. GENERAL INFORMATION | Section 1 |
| Party | Section 1 |
| Period covering this report. | Section 1 |
| Details of agency preparing report. | Section 1 |
| Contributing agencies, organisations, individuals. | Section 1 |
| B. LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY MEASURES | |
| 1. Has information on CITES-relevant legislation already been provided under the CITES National Legislation Project? | Table 8.1 |
| 2. If any CITES-relevant legislation has been planned, drafted or enacted, please provide details. | Table 8.1 |
| 3. Is enacting legislation available in one of the working languages of the Convention? | Table 8.1 |
| 4. If yes, please attach a copy of the full legislative text or key legislative provisions that were gazetted. | Table 8.1 |
| 5. Which issues are addressed by any stricter domestic measures adopted for CITES-listed species? | Not included |
| 6. What were the results of any review or assessment of the effectiveness of CITES legislation? | Question 8.2 |
| 7. If no review or assessment has taken place, is one planned for the next reporting period? | Question 8.2 |
| 8. Has there been any review of legislation on the following subjects in relation to implementation of the Convention? (Access or ownership of natural resources; Harvesting; Transporting of live animals; Handling and housing of live specimens). | Broadly 8.2 (may not be relevant) |
| 9. Please provide details of any additional measures taken. | Additional comments |
| C. COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT MEASURES | |
| 1. Have any of the following compliance monitoring operations been undertaken? (Review of reports and other information provided by traders and producers; Inspections of traders, producers, markets; Border controls; Other) | Question 19.4 |
| 2. Have any administrative measures (e.g., fines, bans, suspensions) been imposed for CITES-related violations? | Question 19.5 |
| 3. If yes, please indicate how many and for what type of violations. | Question 19.5 |
| 4. Have any seizures, confiscations and forfeitures of CITES specimens been made? | Question 19.6 |
| 5. If information available: Number of significant/total seizures/confiscations. | Question 19.6 |
| 6. Have there been any criminal prosecutions of significant CITES-related violations? | Question 19.7 |
| 7. If yes, how many and for what type of violations? | Question 19.7 |
| 8. Have there been any other court actions of CITES-related violations? | Question 19.8 |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| 9. If yes, what were the violations involved and what were the results? | Question 19.8 |
| 10. How were the confiscated specimens usually disposed of? (Return to country of export; Public zoos or botanical gardens; Designated rescue centres; Approved, private facilities; Euthanasia; Other) | Question 19.9 |
| 11. Has detailed information been provided to the Secretariat on significant cases of illegal trade (e.g. through an ECOMESSAGE or other means), or information on convicted illegal traders and persistent offenders? | Question 19.10 |
| 12. Have there been any cooperative enforcement activities with other countries (e.g., exchange of intelligence, technical support, investigative assistance, joint operation, etc.)? | Question 19.11 |
| 13. If yes, please give a brief description. | Question 19.11 |
| 14. Have any incentives been offered to local communities to assist in the enforcement of CITES legislation (e.g. leading to the arrest and conviction of offenders)? | Question 19.12 |
| 15. If yes, please describe. | Question 19.12 |
| 16. Has there been any review or assessments of CITES-related enforcement? | Question 19.13 |
| 17. Please provide details of any additional measures taken. | Additional comments |
| D. ADMINISTRATIVE MEASURES | |
| D1. Management Authority | |
| 1. Have there been any changes in the designation of or contact information for the Management Authority(ies) which are not yet reflected in the CITES Directory? | Section 19 |
| 2. If yes, please use the opportunity to provide those changes here. | Section 19 |
| 3. If there is more than one Management Authority in your country, has a lead Management Authority been designated? | Section 19 |
| 4. If yes, please name that Management Authority and indicate whether it is identified as the lead Management Authority in the CITES Directory. | Section 19 |
| 5. How many staff work in each Management Authority? | Section 19 |
| 6. Can you estimate the percentage of time they spend on CITES-related matters? If yes, please give estimation. | Section 19 |
| 7. What are the skills/expertise of staff within the Management Authority(ies)? (Administration; Biology; Economics/trade; Law/policy; Other; No information) | Perhaps consider including. |
| 8. Have the Management Authority(ies) undertaken or supported any research activities in relation to CITES species or technical issues (e.g., labelling, tagging, species identification) not covered in D2(8) and D2(9)? | Question 12.7 |
| 9. If yes, please give the species name and provide details of the kind of research involved. | Question 12.7 |
| 10. Please provide details of any additional measures taken. | Additional comments |
| D2. Scientific Authority | |
| 1. Have there been any changes in the designation of or contact information for the Scientific Authority(ies) which are not yet reflected in the CITES Directory? | Section 19 |
| 2. If yes, please use the opportunity to provide those changes here. | Section 19 |
| 3. Is the designated Scientific Authority independent from the Management Authority? | Section 19 |
| 4. What is the structure of the Scientific Authority(ies)? (Government institution; Academic or research institution; Permanent committee; Pools of individuals with certain expertise; Other) | Section 19 |
| 5. How many staff work in each Scientific Authority on CITES issues? | Section 19 |
| 6. Can you estimate the percentage of time they spend on CITES-related matters? If yes, please give estimation. | Section 19 |

| | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| 7. What are the skills/expertise of staff within the Scientific Authority(ies)? (Botany; Ecology; Fisheries; Forestry; Welfare; Zoology; Other; No information) | Perhaps consider including. |
| 8. Have any research activities been undertaken by the Scientific Authority(ies) in relation to CITES species? | Perhaps consider including. |
| 9. If yes, please give the species name and provide details of the kind of research involved (Species name; Populations; Distribution; Off take; Legal trade; Illegal trade; Other) | Perhaps consider including. |
| 10. Have any project proposals for scientific research been submitted to the Secretariat under Resolution Conf. 12.2? | Perhaps consider including. |
| 11. Please provide details of any additional measures taken. | Perhaps consider including. |
| D3. Enforcement Authority | |
| 1. Has the Secretariat been informed of any enforcement authorities that have been designated for the receipt of confidential information relating to CITES? | Question 19.1 |
| 2. If no, please designate them here (including contact details). | Question 19.1 |
| 3. Is there a specialized unit responsible for CITES-related enforcement (e.g., within the wildlife department, Customs, the police, public prosecutor's office)? | Question 19.2 |
| 4. If yes, please state which is the lead agency for enforcement. | Question 19.2 |
| 5. Please provide details of any additional measures taken. | Question 19.2 |
| D4. Communication, information management and exchange | |
| 1. To what extent is CITES information computerized? (Monitoring and reporting of data on legal trade; Monitoring and reporting of data on illegal trade; Permit issuance; Not at all; Other) | Question 12.3 |
| 2. Do the following authorities have access to the Internet? (Management Authority; Scientific Authority; Enforcement Agency) | Question 12.4 |
| 3. Is there an electronic information system providing information on CITES species? | Question 12.1 |
| 4. If yes, does it provide information on: Legislation (national, regional or international); Conservation status (national; regional or international); Other | Question 12.1 |
| 5. Is it available through the Internet? | Question 12.1 |
| 6. Do the authorities indicated have access to the following publications? (<i>2003 Checklist of CITES Species</i> [book]; <i>2003 Checklist of CITES Species and Annotated Appendices</i> [CD-ROM]; <i>Identification Manual</i> ; <i>CITES Handbook</i>) | Question 12.6 |
| 7. If not, what problems have been encountered to access this information? | Question 12.6 |
| 8. Have enforcement authorities reported to the Management Authority on: Mortality in transport; Seizures and confiscations; Discrepancies in number of items in permits and number of items actually traded? | Question 19.3 |
| 9. Is there a government website with information on CITES and its requirements? | Question 12.5 |
| 10. Have CITES authorities been involved in any of the following activities to bring about better accessibility to and understanding of the Convention's requirements to the wider public? (Press releases/conferences; Newspaper article, radio/television appearances; Brochures, leaflets; Presentations; Displays; Information at border crossing points; Telephone hotline; Other) | Section 10 |
| 11. Please provide details of any additional measures taken. | Additional comments |
| D5. Permitting and registration procedures | |
| 1. Have any changes in permit format or the designation and signatures of officials empowered to sign CITES permits/certificates been reported previously to the Secretariat? If no, please provide details of any: Changes in permit format; Changes in designation or signatures of relevant officials. | Question 19.14 |
| 2. To date, has your country developed written permit procedures for any of the following: permit issuance/acceptance; registration of traders; registration of producers? | Question 19.15 |

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| 3. Please indicate how many CITES documents were issued and denied in the two-year period? (Year 1 and Year 2; No. issued and No. denied; Import or introduction from the sea, Export, Import, Other) | Question 19.16 |
| 4. Were any CITES documents that were issued later cancelled and replaced because of serious omissions or misinformation? | Question 19.17 |
| 5. If yes, please give the reasons for this. | Question 19.17 |
| 6. Please give the reasons for rejection of CITES documents from other countries (Technical violations; Suspected fraud; Insufficient basis for finding of non-detriment; Insufficient basis for finding of legal acquisition). | Not included |
| 7. Are harvest and/or export quotas used as a management tool in the procedure for issuance of permits? | Question 19.18 |
| 8. How many times has the Scientific Authority been requested to provide opinions? | Question 19.9 |
| 9. Has the Management Authority charged fees for permit issuance, registration or related CITES activities? (Issuance of CITES documents; Licensing or registration of operations that produce CITES species; Harvesting of CITES-listed species; Use of CITES-listed species; Assignment of quotas for CITES-listed species; Importing of CITES-listed species; Other). | Question 19.20 |
| 10. If yes, please provide the amounts of such fees. | Question 19.20 |
| 11. Have revenues from fees been used for the implementation of CITES or wildlife conservation? (Entirely; Partly; Not at all; Not relevant). | Question 19.21 |
| 12. Please provide details of any additional measures taken. | Additional comments |
| D6. Capacity building | |
| 1. Have any of the following activities been undertaken to enhance effectiveness of CITES implementation at the national level? (Increased budget for activities; Hiring of more staff; Development of implementation tools; Improvement of national networks; Purchase of technical equipment for monitoring/enforcement; Computerization). | Question 14.2 |
| 2. Have the CITES authorities received or benefited from any of the following capacity building activities provided by external sources? (Staff of Management Authority; Staff of Scientific Authority; Staff of enforcement authorities; Traders; NGOs; Public; Other) (Oral or written advice/guidance; Technical assistance; Financial assistance; Training; Other). | Not included |
| 3. Have the CITES authorities been the providers of any of the following capacity building activities? (Staff of Management Authority; Staff of Scientific Authority; Staff of enforcement authorities; Traders; NGOs; Public; Other parties/International meetings; Other) (Oral or written advice/guidance; Technical assistance; Financial assistance; Training; Other). | Not included |
| 4. Please provide details of any additional measures taken. | Additional comments |
| D7. Collaboration/co-operative initiatives | |
| 1. Is there an inter-agency or inter-sectoral committee on CITES? | Question 15.2 |
| 2. If yes, which are represented and how often does it meet? | Question 15.2 |
| 3. If no, please indicate the frequency of meetings or consultancies used by the Management Authority to ensure co-ordination among CITES authorities (e.g., other Management Authorities, Scientific Authorities, Customs, police, others) | Question 15.2 |
| 4. At the national level, have there been any efforts to collaborate with: Agencies for development and trade; Provincial, state or territorial authorities; Local authorities or communities; Indigenous people; Trade or other private sector associations; NGOs; Other. | Question 15.3 |
| 5. To date, have any Memoranda of Understandings or other formal arrangements for institutional cooperation related to CITES been agreed between the Management Authority and the following agencies? (Scientific Authority; Customs; Police; Other border authorities; Other government agencies; Private sector bodies; NGOs; Other) | Table 8.3 |
| 6. Have government staff participated in any regional activities related to CITES? (Workshops; Meetings; Other) | Question 15.5 |
| 7. Has there been any effort to encourage any non-Party to accede to the Convention? | Question 15.4 |

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| 8. If yes, which one(s) and in what way? | Question 15.4 |
| 9. Has technical or financial assistance been provided to another country in relation in CITES? | Question 19.11 |
| 10. If yes, which country(ies) and what kind of assistance was provided? | Question 19.11 |
| 11. Has any data been provided for inclusion in the CITES Identification Manual? | Not included |
| 12. If yes, please give a brief description. | Not included |
| 13. Have measures been taken to achieve co-ordination and reduce duplication of activities between the national authorities for CITES and other multilateral environmental agreements (e.g., the biodiversity-related Conventions)? | Section 15 |
| 14. If yes, please give a brief description. | Section 15 |
| 15. Please provide details of any additional measures taken. | Additional comments |
| D8. Areas of future work | |
| 1. Are any of the following activities needed to enhance the effectiveness of CITES implementation at the national level and what is the respective level of priority? (Increased budget for activities; Hiring of more staff; Development of implementation tools; Improvement of national networks; Purchase of new technical equipment for monitoring and enforcement; Computerization; Other) | Question 14.2 |
| 2. Were any difficulties encountered in implementing specific Resolutions or Decisions adopted by the Conference of Parties? | Question 9.4 |
| 3. If yes, which one(s) and what is the main difficulty? | Question 9.4 |
| 4. Have any constraints to implementation of the Convention arisen in your country requiring attention or assistance? | Question 9.3 |
| 5. If yes, please describe the constraint and the type of attention or assistance that is required. | Question 9.3 |
| 6. Have any measures, procedures or mechanisms been identified within the Convention that would benefit from review and/or simplification. | Question 9.6 |
| 7. If yes, please give a brief description. | Question 9.6 |
| 8. Please provide details of any additional measures taken. | Additional comments |
| E. GENERAL FEEDBACK | |
| Please provide any additional comments you would like to make, including comments on this format. | Section 17 |
| CMS | |
| Primary agency responsible. | Section 1 |
| Other agencies. | Section 1 |
| I (A) GENERAL INFORMATION | |
| Date of entry into force of the Convention in <i>country name</i> . | Section 1 |
| Period covered. | Section 1 |
| Territory to which the Convention applies: | Section 1 |
| DESIGNATED NATIONAL FOCAL POINT | Section 1 |

| | |
|---|---------------|
| APPOINTMENT TO THE SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL | Section 1 |
| SUBMISSION | Section 1 |
| Membership of the Standing Committee (if applicable). | Section 1 |
| Competent Authority. | Section 1 |
| Implementing legislation. | Table 8.1 |
| Other relevant conventions/agreements (apart from CMS) to which <i>country name</i> is a Party. | Table 8.2 |
| National policy instruments (e.g. national biodiversity conservation strategy, etc.) | Table 8.2 |
| Wadden Sea Seals (Party; Signed but not yet entered force; Non-party). | N/A |
| Siberian Crane MoU (Signatory; Non-signatory) | N/A |
| EUROBATS (Party; Signed but not yet entered force; Non-party) | N/A |
| ASCOBANS (Party; Signed but not yet entered force; Non-party) | N/A |
| Slender-billed Curlew MoU (Signatory; Non-signatory) | N/A |
| Marine Turtle – Africa MoU (Signatory; Non-signatory) | N/A |
| AEWA (Party; Signed but not yet entered force; Non-party) | N/A |
| ACCOBAMS (Party; Signed but not yet entered force; Non-party) | N/A |
| Great Bustard MoU (Signatory; Non-signatory) | N/A |
| Marine Turtle MoU - Indian Ocean/South-East Asia (Party; Signed but not yet entered force; Non-party) Competent national authority | Section 20 |
| Albatrosses and Petrels (Party; Signed but not yet entered force; Non-party) | N/A |
| Bukhara Deer MoU (Signatory; Non-signatory) | N/A |
| Aquatic Warbler MoU (Signatory; Non-signatory) | N/A |
| I (B) ADDITIONAL GENERAL INFORMATION | |
| 1. Which other government departments are involved in activities/initiatives for the conservation of migratory species in your country? (Please list) | Section 1 |
| 2. If more than one government department is involved, describe the interaction/relationship between these government departments. | Not included |
| 3. Has a national liaison system or committee been established in your country? | Question 15.2 |
| 4. List the main non-governmental organizations actively involved in initiatives for the conservation of migratory species in your country, and describe their involvement. | Question 15.3 |
| 4a. Please provide details on any devolved government/territories involved. | Question 15.3 |
| 5. Describe any involvement of the private sector in the conservation of migratory species in your country. | Question 15.3 |

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| 6. Note any interactions between these sectors in the conservation of migratory species in your country. | Question 15.3 |
| APPENDIX I SPECIES | |
| 1. Birds | |
| <i>1.1. General questions on Appendix I bird species</i> | N/A for PICs |
| <i>1.2. Questions on specific Appendix I bird species</i> | N/A for PICs |
| 2. Marine Mammals | |
| <i>2.1. General questions on Appendix I marine mammals</i> | |
| Identify the Ministry, agency/department, or organisation responsible for leading actions relating to Appendix I marine mammal species: | Question 20.1 |
| 1. Is the taking of all Appendix I marine mammal species prohibited by the national implementing legislation cited in Table I(a) (General Information)? If <i>other</i> legislation is relevant, please provide details: | Question 20.2 |
| 1a. If the taking of Appendix I marine mammal species is prohibited by law, have any exceptions been granted to the prohibition? If Yes, please provide details (Include the date on which the exception was notified to the CMS Secretariat pursuant to CMS Article III(7)): | Question 20.3 |
| 2. Identify any obstacles to migration that exist in relation to Appendix I marine mammal species. | Question 20.3 |
| 2a. What actions are being undertaken to overcome these obstacles? | Question 20.5 |
| 2b. Please report on the progress/success of the actions taken. | Question 20.5 |
| 2c. What assistance, if any, does your country require in order to overcome these obstacles? | Question 20.8 |
| 3. What are the major pressure on Appendix I marine mammal species (transcending mere obstacles to migration)? | Question 20.5 |
| 3a. What actions have been taken to prevent, reduce or control factors that are endangering or are likely to further endanger marine mammal species, beyond actions to prevent disruption to migrating behaviour? | Question 20.6 |
| 3b. Please report on the progress/success of the actions taken. | Question 20.6 |
| 3c. Describe any factors that may limit action being taken in this regard: | Additional comments |
| 3d. What assistance, if any, does your country require to overcome these factors? | Question 20.8 |
| <i>2.2. Questions on specific Appendix I marine mammal species</i> | |
| <i>Listed species: Species xxxx – Common name(s)</i> | Question 20.11 |
| 1. Is your country a Range State for this species? | Question 20.11 |
| 2. Please provide published distribution reference. | Question 20.11 |
| 3a,b,c. Summarise information on population size, trends and distribution (if known). | Question 20.11 |
| 4. Indicate (with an 'X') and briefly describe any activities that have been carried out in favour of this species in the reporting period. (Please provide the title of the project and contact details, where available) (Research; Monitoring; Species protection; Species restoration; Habitat protection; Habitat restoration, Other) | Question 20.11 |
| 5. If no activities have been carried out for this species in the reporting period, what has prevented such action being taken? | Question 20.11 |
| 6. Describe any future activities that are planned for this species. | Question 20.11 |

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| <i>Non-listed species: Species name, Common Name(s)</i> | Question 20.9 |
| 1. Please provide published distribution reference. | (Question 20.9 |
| 2a,b,c. Summarise information on population size, trends and distribution (if known). | Question 20.9 |
| 3. Indicate (with an 'X') and briefly describe any activities that have been carried out in favour of this species in the reporting period. (Please provide the title of the project and contact details, where available) (Research; Monitoring; Species protection; Species restoration; Habitat protection; Habitat restoration, Other) | Question 20.9 |
| 4. If no activities have been carried out for this species in the reporting period, what has prevented such action being taken? | (Question 20.9 |
| 5. Describe any future activities that are planned for this species. | Question 20.9 |
| Miscellaneous information or comments on Appendix I marine mammals in general. | Additional comments |
| 3. Marine turtles | |
| 3.1. General questions on Appendix I marine turtles | |
| Identify the Ministry, agency/department, or organisation responsible for leading actions relating to Appendix I marine turtle species: | Section 20 |
| 1. Is the taking of all Appendix I marine turtle species prohibited by the national implementing legislation cited in Table I(a) (General Information)? If <i>other</i> legislation is relevant, please provide details: | Section 20 |
| 1a. If the taking of Appendix I marine turtle species is prohibited by law, have any exceptions been granted to the prohibition? If Yes, please provide details (Include the date on which the exception was notified to the CMS Secretariat pursuant to CMS Article III(7)): | Section 20 |
| 2. Identify any obstacles to migration that exist in relation to Appendix I marine turtle species. | Section 20 |
| 2a. What actions are being undertaken to overcome these obstacles? | Section 20 |
| 2b. Please report on the progress /success of the actions taken. | Section 20 |
| 2c. What assistance, if any, does your country require in order to overcome these obstacles? | Section 20 |
| 3. What are the major pressures on Appendix I marine turtles (transcending mere obstacles to migration)? | Section 20 |
| 3a. What actions have been taken to prevent, reduce or control factors that are endangering or are likely to further endanger marine turtle species beyond actions to prevent disruption to migrating behaviour? | Section 20 |
| 3b. Please report on the progress/success of actions taken. | Section 20 |
| 3c. Describe any factors that may limit action being taken in this regard: | Section 20 |
| 3d. What assistance, if any, does your country require to overcome these factors? | Section 20 |
| 3.2. Questions on specific Appendix I marine turtles species | |
| <i>Listed species: Species xxxx – Common name(s)</i> | Question 20.11 |
| 1. Is your country a Range State for this species? | Question 20.11 |
| 2. Please provide published distribution reference. | Question 20.11 |
| 3a,b,c. Summarise information on population size, trends and distribution (if known). | Question 20.11 |

| | |
|--|----------------|
| 4. Indicate (with an 'X') and briefly describe any activities that have been carried out in favour of this species in the reporting period. (Please provide the title of the project and contact details, where available) (Research; Monitoring; Species protection; Species restoration; Habitat protection; Habitat restoration, Other) | Question 20.11 |
| 5. If no activities have been carried out for this species in the reporting period, what has prevented such action being taken? | Question 20.11 |
| 6. Describe any future activities that are planned for this species. | Question 20.11 |
| <i>Non-listed species: Species name, Common Name(s)</i> | Question 20.11 |
| 1. Please provide published distribution reference. | Question 20.11 |
| 2a,b,c. Summarise information on population size, trends and distribution (if known). | Question 20.11 |
| 3. Indicate (with an 'X') and briefly describe any activities that have been carried out in favour of this species in the reporting period. (Please provide the title of the project and contact details, where available) (Research; Monitoring; Species protection; Species restoration; Habitat protection; Habitat restoration, Other) | Question 20.11 |
| 4. If no activities have been carried out for this species in the reporting period, what has prevented such action being taken? | Question 20.11 |
| 5. Describe any future activities that are planned for this species. | Question 20.11 |
| Miscellaneous information or comments on Appendix I marine turtles in general. | Question 20.11 |
| 4. Terrestrial mammals (other than bats) | |
| <i>4.1. General questions on Appendix I terrestrial mammals (other than bats)</i> | N/A |
| <i>4.2. Questions on specific Appendix I terrestrial mammals (other than bats)</i> | N/A |
| 5. Bats | |
| <i>5.1. General questions on Appendix I bats</i> | N/A |
| <i>5.2. Questions on specific Appendix I bat species</i> | N/A |
| 6. Other taxa | |
| <i>6.1. General questions on Appendix I species belonging to other taxa</i> | N/A |
| <i>6.2. Questions on specific Appendix I species belonging to other taxa</i> | N/A |
| 7. Listing of other endangered migratory species in Appendix I | |
| III. APPENDIX II SPECIES | |
| 1. Information on Appendix II Species | N/A |
| 2. QUESTIONS ON CMS AGREEMENTS | |
| 2.1. Questions on the development of new CMS Agreements relating to birds | N/A |
| <i>1. In the current reporting period, has your country initiated the development of any new CMS Agreements, including Memoranda of Understanding, to address the conservation needs of Appendix II bird species? If Yes, what is the current state of development?</i> | Table 8.3 |
| <i>2. In the current reporting period, has your country participated in the development of any new CMS Agreements, including Memoranda of Understanding, which address the conservation needs of Appendix II bird species? If Yes, please provide details.</i> | Table 8.3 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 3. If your country has initiated or is participating in the development of a new Agreement or Memorandum of Understanding, what assistance, if any, does your country require in order to initiate or participate in the instrument's development? | Table 8.3 |
| 4. Is the development of any CMS Agreement for birds, including Memoranda of Understanding, planned by your country in the foreseeable future? If Yes, please provide details. | Table 8.3 |
| 2.2. Questions on the development of new CMS Agreements relating to marine mammals | |
| 1. In the current reporting period, has your country initiated the development of any new CMS Agreements, including Memoranda of Understanding, to address the conservation needs of Appendix II marine mammal species? If Yes, what is the current state of development? | Table 8.3 |
| 2. In the current reporting period, has your country participated in the development of any new CMS Agreements, including Memoranda of Understanding, which address the conservation needs of Appendix II marine mammal species? If Yes, please provide details. | Table 8.3 |
| 3. If your country has initiated or is participating in the development of a new Agreement or Memorandum of Understanding, what assistance, if any, does your country require in order to initiate or participate in the instrument's development? | Table 8.3 |
| 4. Is the development of any CMS Agreement for marine mammals, including Memoranda of Understanding, planned by your country in the foreseeable future? If Yes, please provide details. | Table 8.3 |
| 2.3. Questions on the development of new CMS Agreements relating to marine turtles | |
| 1. In the current reporting period, has your country initiated the development of any new CMS Agreements, including Memoranda of Understanding, to address the conservation needs of Appendix II marine turtle species? If Yes, what is the current state of development? | Table 8.3 |
| 2. In the current reporting period, has your country participated in the development of any new CMS Agreements, including Memoranda of Understanding, which address the conservation needs of Appendix II marine turtle species? If Yes, please provide details. | Table 8.3 |
| 3. If your country has initiated or is participating in the development of a new Agreement or Memorandum of Understanding, what assistance, if any, does your country require in order to initiate or participate in the instrument's development? | Table 8.3 |
| 4. Is the development of any CMS Agreement for marine turtle, including Memoranda of Understanding, planned by your country in the foreseeable future? If Yes, please provide details. | Table 8.3 |
| 2.4. Questions on the development of new CMS Agreements relating to terrestrial mammals (other than bats) | |
| 1. In the current reporting period, has your country initiated the development of any new CMS Agreements, including Memoranda of Understanding, to address the conservation needs of Appendix II terrestrial mammal (other than bats) species? If Yes, what is the current state of development? | Table 8.3 |
| 2. In the current reporting period, has your country participated in the development of any new CMS Agreements, including Memoranda of Understanding, which address the conservation needs of Appendix II terrestrial mammal (other than bats) species? If Yes, please provide details. | Table 8.3 |
| 3. If your country has initiated or is participating in the development of a new Agreement or Memorandum of Understanding, what assistance, if any, does your country require in order to initiate or participate in the instrument's development? | Table 8.3 |
| 4. Is the development of any CMS Agreement for terrestrial mammals (other than bats), including Memoranda of Understanding, planned by your country in the foreseeable future? If Yes, please provide details. | Table 8.3 |
| 2.5. Questions on the development of new CMS Agreements relating to bats | |
| 1. In the current reporting period, has your country initiated the development of any new CMS Agreements, including Memoranda of Understanding, to address the conservation needs of Appendix II bat species? If Yes, what is the current state of development? | Table 8.3 |
| 2. In the current reporting period, has your country participated in the development of any new CMS Agreements, including Memoranda of Understanding, which address the conservation needs of Appendix II bat species? If Yes, please provide details. | Table 8.3 |
| 3. If your country has initiated or is participating in the development of a new Agreement or Memorandum of Understanding, what assistance, if any, does your country require in order to initiate or participate in the instrument's development? | Table 8.3 |

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| 4. Is the development of any CMS Agreement for bats, including Memoranda of Understanding, planned by your country in the foreseeable future? If Yes, please provide details. | Table 8.3 |
| 2.6. Questions on the development of new CMS Agreements relating to other species | |
| 1. In the current reporting period, has your country initiated the development of any new CMS Agreements, including Memoranda of Understanding, to address the conservation needs of Appendix II species of other taxa? If Yes, what is the current state of development? | Table 8.3 |
| 2. In the current reporting period, has your country participated in the development of any new CMS Agreements, including Memoranda of Understanding, which address the conservation needs of Appendix II species of other taxa? If Yes, please provide details. | Table 8.3 |
| 3. If your country has initiated or is participating in the development of a new Agreement or Memorandum of Understanding, what assistance, if any, does your country require in order to initiate or participate in the instrument's development? | Table 8.3 |
| 4. Is the development of any CMS Agreement for species of other taxa, including Memoranda of Understanding, planned by your country in the foreseeable future? If Yes, please provide details. | Table 8.3 |
| 3. LISTING OF MIGRATORY SPECIES IN APPENDIX II | |
| 1. Is your country a Range State for any migratory species that has an unfavourable conservation status, but is <u>not</u> currently listed in Appendix II and could benefit from the conclusion of an Agreement for its conservation? If Yes, please provide details. | Question 20.9 |
| 1a. Is your country taking any steps to propose the listing of this/these species in Appendix II? If Yes, please provide details. | Question 20.9 |
| 1b. What assistance, if any, does your country require to initiate the listing of this/these species? | Question 20.9 |
| IV. NATIONAL AND REGIONAL PRIORITIES | |
| 1. What priority does your country assign to the conservation and where applicable, sustainable use of migratory species in comparison to other biodiversity-related issues? (Low; Medium; High) | Not included |
| 2. Are migratory species and their habitats addressed by your country's national biodiversity strategy or action plan? | Table 8.2 |
| 3. Does the conservation of migratory species currently feature in any other national or regional policies/plans (apart from CMS Agreements) If Yes, please provide details. | Table 8.2 |
| 3a. Do these policies/plans cover the following areas (if Yes, please provide details): (Exploitation of natural resources (e.g. fisheries, hunting, etc.); Economic development; Land-use planning; Pollution control; designation and development of protected areas; Development of ecological networks; Planning of powerlines; Planning of fences; Planning of dams; Other) | Table 8.2 |
| V. PROTECTED AREAS | |
| 1. Are migratory species taken into account in the selection, establishment and management of protected areas in your country? If Yes, please provide details: | Relates to Table 5.1 |
| 2. Do these protected areas cover the following areas? (If Yes, please provide details and include the amount of protected areas coverage and the number of protected areas): (Terrestrial; Aquatic; Marine) | Table 5.1 |
| 3. Identify the agency, department or organization responsible for leading on this action in your country: | Table 5.1 |
| VI. POLICIES ON SATELLITE TELEMETRY | |
| 1. In the current reporting period, has your country conservation/research projects that use satellite telemetry? If Yes, please provide details | Question 12.7 |
| 2. Are any future conservation/research projects planned that will use satellite telemetry? If Yes, please provide details | Question 12.7 |
| MEMBERSHIP | |
| 1. Have actions been taken by your country to encourage non-Parties to join CMS and its related Agreements? | Question 15.4 |

| | |
|---|---------------|
| 1a. Identify the agency, department or organization responsible for leading on this action in your country: | Question 15.4 |
| VIII. GLOBAL AND NATIONAL IMPORTANCE OF CMS | |
| 1. Have actions been taken by your country to increase national, and/or global awareness of the relevance of CMS and its global importance in the context of biodiversity conservation? If Yes, please provide details. | Section 10 |
| 2. Identify the agency, department or organization responsible for leading on this action in your country: | Section 10 |
| IX. MOBILISATION OF RESOURCES | |
| 1. Has your country made financial resources available for conservation activities having direct benefits for migratory species in your country? | Question 16.1 |
| 2. Has your country made voluntary contributions to the CMS Trust Fund to support requests from developing countries and countries with economies in transition? | N/A |
| 3. Has your country made other voluntary financial contributions to support conservation activities having direct benefits for migratory species in other countries (particularly developing countries)? | N/A |
| 4. Has your country provided technical and/or scientific assistance to developing countries to facilitate initiatives for the benefit of migratory species? | N/A |
| 5. Has your country received financial assistance/support from the CMS Trust Fund, via the CMS Secretariat, for national conservation activities having direct benefits for migratory species in your country? | Section 16 |
| 6. Has your country received financial assistance/support from sources other than the CMS Secretariat for conservation activities having direct benefit for migratory species in your country? | Section 16 |
| QUESTIONS ON SPECIFIC APPENDIX II SPECIES | Not included |
| WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION | |
| SECTION I: APPLICATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION BY THE STATE PARTY | |
| I.1. INTRODUCTION | |
| (i) State Party | Section 1 |
| (ii) Year of ratification or acceptance of the Convention | Section 1 |
| (iii) Organisation (s) or entity (ies) responsible for the preparation of the report | Section 1 |
| (iv) Date of report | Section 1 |
| (v) Signature on behalf of the State Party | Section 1 |
| I.2. IDENTIFICATION OF CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE PROPERTIES | |
| (i) National inventories | Section 22 |
| (ii) Tentative list | Section 22 |
| (iii) Nominations | Section 22 |
| I.3. PROTECTION, CONSERVATION AND PRESENTATION OF THE CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE | |
| (i) General policy development | Table 8.2 |
| (ii) Status of services for protection, conservation and presentation | Section 6 |
| (iii) Scientific and technical studies and research | Section 13 |

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| (iv) Measures for identification, protection, conservation presentation, and rehabilitation | Section 6 |
| (v) Training | Section 14 |
| I.4. INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION AND FUNDRAISING | Section 15 & 16 |
| I.5. EDUCATION, INFORMATION AND AWARENESS BUILDING | Section 10 |
| I.6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDED ACTION | Section 17 |
| SECTION II: STATE OF CONSERVATION OF SPECIFIC WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES | |
| II.1. INTRODUCTION | |
| (i) State Party | Section 22 |
| (ii) Name of World Heritage Property | Section 22 |
| (iii) Geographical coordinates to the nearest second | Section 22 |
| (iv) Date of inscription on the World Heritage List | Section 22 |
| (v) Date of report | Section 1 |
| (vi) Signature on behalf of State Party | Section 1 |
| II.2. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE | Section 22 |
| II.3. STATEMENT OF AUTHENTICITY | Section 22 |
| II.4. MANAGEMENT | Section 22 |
| II.5. FACTORS AFFECTING THE PROPERTY | Section 22 |
| II.6. MONITORING | Section 22 |
| II.7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDED ACTION | |
| (i) Main conclusion regarding the state of the World Heritage Values of the property | Section 22 |
| (ii) Main conclusion regarding the management and factors affecting the property | Section 22 |
| (iii) Proposed future action/actions | Section 22 |
| (iv) Responsible implementing agency/agencies | Section 22 |
| (v) Timeframe for implementation | Section 22 |
| (vi) Needs for international assistance | Section 22 |

Attachment B: List of persons consulted during the trial of the consolidated reporting template

| Table 2: List of persons consulted during trial of consolidated reporting template | | |
|--|--|--|
| Name | Ministry | Area |
| SAMOA | | |
| Tu'u'u | Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment | Chief Executive Officer |
| Toni Tipama'a | Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment | Division of Environment and Conservation, National Parks and Reserves |
| Tuiolo Schuster | Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment | Corporate Services Division (World Heritage) |
| Malama Momoemausu | Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment | Division of Environment and Conservation (CBD, CMS, CITES) |
| Susau Siolo | Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment | |
| Juney Ward | Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment | Division of Environment and Conservation (CBD, CMS, CITES) |
| Natasha Doherty | Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment | Division of Environment and Conservation, National Parks and Reserves (Ramsar) |
| Moeumu Uili | Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment | Division of Environment and Conservation |
| Faainoino Laulala | Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment | Division of Land Management (UNCCD) |
| Tolusina Pouli | Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment | Forestry Division |
| Lesaisaea Niualuga | Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment | Forestry Division |
| Steve Brown | Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment | Legal Services |
| Eti Malolo | Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment | Water Resources Division |
| Malaki Iakopo | Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment | Water Resources Division |
| Tepa Suaesi | Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme | |
| Peter Murgatroyd | Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme | |
| Ana Tiraa | Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme | |
| Kate Brown-Vitolio | Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme | |
| FIJI | | |
| Epeli Nasome | Ministry of Local Government, Urban Development, Housing and Environment | Director of Environment, Department of Environment |
| Eleni Tokadua | Ministry of Local Government, Urban Development, Housing and Environment | Department of Environment |

| | | |
|--------------------------|--|---|
| Senivasa Waqairamasi | Ministry of Local Government, Urban Development, Housing and Environment | Department of Environment (National Capacity Self Assessment) |
| Patricia Kailola | Consultant | Department of Environment (National Capacity Self Assessment) |
| Elizabeth Erasito | National Trust of Fiji | |
| Derek Cleland | Ministry of Education, Culture, Natural Heritage and Arts | Department of Culture and Heritage (WHC) |
| Helen Pippard | IUCN | (CITES) |
| KIRIBATI | | |
| Tukabu Teroroko | Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agriculture Development | Permanent Secretary |
| Utinia Anruti | Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agriculture Development | Assistant Secretary |
| Tererei Abete-Reema | Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agriculture Development | Director, Environment and Conservation Division |
| Nenenteiti Teariki-Ruatu | Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agriculture Development | Deputy Director, Environment and Conservation Division |
| Ratita Bebe | Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agriculture Development | Environment and Conservation Division |
| Reei Tioti | Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agriculture Development | Chief Land Management Officer, Land Management Division |
| Taere Ratieta | Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agriculture Development | Director, Agriculture Division |
| Rateiti Vaimalie | Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources Development | Fisheries Division |
| Tonana George | Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources Development | Fisheries Division |
| Natan Itonga | Ministry of Internal and Social Affairs | Cultural Division |
| Tarataake Teannaki | Ministry of Communications, Transport and Tourism Development | Director, Tourism Division |
| Kaotitaake Kokoria | Ministry of Internal and Social Affairs | Assistant Rural Development Officer |
| COOK ISLANDS | | |
| Tania Temata | National Environment Service | Manager, Islands Futures Division |
| Elizabeth Munro | National Environment Service | Biodiversity Officer, Islands Futures Division |
| Keri Herman | National Environment Service | Education Officer |
| Ian Bertram | Ministry of Marine Resources | Secretary |
| Nga Mataio | Ministry of Agriculture | Secretary |
| Mona Matepi | World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) Cook Islands | |