



8th SESSION OF THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES
26 – 30 September 2022, Budapest, Hungary

“Strengthening Flyway Conservation in a Changing World”

PROGRESS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AEWA STRATEGIC PLAN 2019-2027
(Period 2019-2022)

Compiled by the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat for the AEWA Standing Committee

Summary

The AEWA Strategic Plan for the period 2019-2027 was adopted by MOP7 in 2018. This initial progress report (for the period 2019-2022) was compiled by the UNEP/AEWA Secretariat, consulted with the Technical Committee and approved by the Standing Committee for submission to MOP8.

The goal of the Strategic Plan reflects one of the fundamental principles of the Agreement and its time-bound purpose is to improve the status of AEWA populations by 2027. Five objectives have been set to achieve the purpose (four substantive conservation objectives and one enabling objective), with 27 associated targets (four to six targets per objective). The progress towards reaching the targets is measured by 66 indicators across all of them. Another six indicators have been designated to measure the progress towards the Strategic Plan purpose.

This report is based on the assessment framework built into the Strategic Plan and follows an approach that employs a measure of distance to target values for the purpose-level indicators and a scoring system for the target-level indicators. Scores were placed between brackets to indicate when they are based on incomplete quality and/or scope of the assessment or a partially missing assessment, and between square brackets to indicate that it is tentative since additional time-bound indicators will be included at a later stage of the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

The current average distance of all purpose-level indicators to their target values is 17% compared to 13% for the 2018 baseline which indicates an overall negative change, i.e. instead of moving towards attaining the purpose of this Strategic Plan and improving the status of AEWA populations an overall deterioration is recorded. Only one indicator (P3) shows a positive change and another indicator (P2) has no change compared to 2018, but half of the indicators (three out of six; P1, P5 and P6) have negative trend. The remaining indicator P4 was not assessed due to the lack of data.

The current overall mean objectives score based on all the five objectives (substantive and enabling) is [(2)], which indicates limited progress of implementation. The progress is limited also in the implementation of the four substantive conservation objectives with a slightly lower current mean score of [(1.9)]. The progress towards four out of the five objectives is assessed to be limited, while there is not any progress on the remaining fifth objective.

Of the 27 targets, the progress towards more than half (52%) of them is limited, with one target tentatively reached and another with no progress to date (4% each). Two targets fall into each of the three categories – significant progress, good progress and not assessed (7% each). 19% of the targets have been postponed since they relate to later stages of the Strategic Plan implementation.

At the level of the indicators the distribution per category has a different pattern. Out of the 66 indicators, the highest number - 22 or 33% - are postponed as they are relevant for later stage of the implementation of the Strategic Plan and will be assessed in the next cycles. The second highest number of indicators (17; 26%) has been scored as having limited progress followed by those demonstrating good progress (12; 18%). Data and information could not be sourced for 12% of the indicators (n=8) and they were not assessed. Three indicators

(5%) have been assessed as showing significant progress while only two have been achieved (3%). No progress has been recorded against one indicator and another one was excluded as it was not deemed to measuring progress towards the threshold of the respective target. Parties shall strive to perform against all indicators and reach all targets. Nevertheless, some specific priorities are recommendations for the next triennium that relate to the transposition of all the legal measures required in paragraphs 2.1 and 4.1 of the AEWA Action Plan into the domestic legislation; the completion of the review and confirmation their inventories of sites of international and national importance; the increase in the coverage of the flyway network sites national or international protected area designations, by actively implemented management plans, and the enhancement of the effectiveness of all conservation management measures at flyway network sites; the strengthening of implementation of species action plans; the financing of the joint AEWA-CMS-Raptors MoU project on the assessment of the status of principal bird habitats in the wider environment and the resulting action plan; and the mobilisation of the resources required for the international-level coordination and implementation of the Strategic Plan, including through the AEWA core budget, and the assessment by all Parties of the resource requirements at national level and effective implementation of resource mobilisation plans.

To improve the monitoring of implementation of the Strategic Plan and progress towards achieving its objectives and purpose some targets and indicators will still need to be assessed (one purpose-level indicators and six targets) or their assessment needs to be improved (four targets). Advance planning shall be undertaken for the assessment of the 22 postponed indicators.

The National Reports submitted to the MOP provide essential data and information for the monitoring of the implementation of the Strategic Plan. Their quantity and quality shall be increased, including through training of National Focal Points and Designated National Respondents.

Introduction

The AEWA Strategic Plan for 2019-2027 was adopted in 2018 by the 7th Session of the Meeting of the Parties (MOP) through resolution 7.1. The Strategic Plan provides the framework for implementation of the Agreement by the Contracting Parties (CPs), Standing Committee (StC), Technical Committee (TC), Secretariat and Partners by setting the overall goal, the objectives and targets for a period of nine years (three triennial MOP cycles). It is intended to provide coherent and strategic guidance to the Contracting Parties and other stakeholders in their endeavour to act effectively both nationally and regionally whilst cooperating internationally along the flyways.

Resolution 7.1, amongst others, requested the Standing Committee, in collaboration with the Technical Committee and the Secretariat, to monitor the implementation of the AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027 and to report progress to each ordinary session of the Meeting of the Parties.

This initial progress report on the implementation of the Strategic Plan 2019-2027 for the period 2019-2022 has been compiled by the Secretariat, consulted with the Technical Committee and approved by the Standing Committee for submission to MOP8.

Report structure and approach

This report is based on an assessment which follows the logical framework of the Strategic Plan 2019-2027.

The goal of the Strategic Plan is defined as follows, which reflects one of the fundamental principles of the Agreement:

To maintain migratory waterbird species and their populations in a favourable conservation status or to restore them to such a status throughout their flyways’.

The purpose of this Strategic Plan is **to improve the status of AEWA populations by 2027** and it sets five related objectives, four of which are substantive conservation objectives and one is an enabling objective, whose focus can be summarised as follows:

Substantive conservation objectives

1. Species conservation and recovery.
2. Sustainable use and management of waterbird populations.
3. Flyway site network protection, management, maintenance and restoration.
4. Habitat conservation in the wider environment.

Enabling objective

5. Securing and strengthening of knowledge, capacity, recognition, awareness and resources.

For each objective between four and six targets have been identified - altogether 27 - with every target incorporating as far as possible a tangible threshold against which delivery can be assessed.

Each target is accompanied by specific quantitative, qualitative or interim indicators with means of verification and corresponding actions. There are 66 target-level indicators across all targets.

Six quantitative indicators (P1-P6) have also been assigned to measure the progress towards achieving the purpose of the Strategic Plan. These indicators are based on the trends of various groupings of AEWA populations and set the aspired threshold for each of them which is measured against the baseline of 2018. The information for the purpose-level indicators is sourced through the AEWA Conservation Status Report (CSR) the 8th edition of which has been submitted to MOP8 (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.19). The detailed overview of the progress against each purpose-level indicator is presented in Annex 1 to this report.

A similar detailed overview of progress against each target and target-level indicator was compiled and is available in Annex 2 to this report. The information for this overview has been drawn from several MOP8 documents, such as:

- *Report of the Technical Committee to the 8th Session of the Meeting of the Parties* (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.7);
- *Report of the Depositary to the 8th Session of the Meeting of the Parties* (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.8);
- *Report of the Secretariat to the 8th Session of the Meeting of the Parties* (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.9);
- *Analysis of the AEWA National Reports for the triennium 2018-2020* (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.13);
- *Report on the Conservation Status of Migratory Waterbirds in the Agreement Area, 8th edition* (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.19);
- *Summary of the Current Status of Species Action and Management Plan Production and Coordination with recommendations to MOP for Extension, Revision or Retirement* (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.22);
- *Overview of knowledge gaps and needs relevant for AEWA implementation: priority needs in 2021* (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.30);
- *Resource needs for international coordination and delivery of the 2019–2027 AEWA Strategic Plan: assessment and resource mobilisation plan* (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.43);
- Information documents AEWA/MOP Inf. 8.14-8.18; and
- other external information sources.

To assess the overall progress towards achieving the purpose of the Strategic Plan, the distance (in percentages) of the value of each indicator to the aspired target value was calculated and compared to its respective baseline distance; the current distances of all indicators were averaged and compared to the average baseline distance.

In principle, the average distance of all indicators to their respective target values represents the overall assessment of the outcome of the Strategic Plan implementation. However, due to a time lag in data collation, the data on which this assessment is based (see CSR8; Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.19) precede the current Strategic Plan period which was adopted in the end of 2018. Thus, what the purpose-level indicators illustrate at present is the result of the implementation of the previous Strategic Plan 2019-2018 (see [Doc. AEWA/MOP 7.10](#) - final implementation report). Only at MOP10 the status of AEWA populations based on short-term trends will be assessed using data that would largely overlap with the period of the AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027.

For measuring the progress of implementation of the Strategic Plan, the target-level indicators received a score depending on the progress made towards the defined. The scores were assigned as per the assessment matrix in Table 1.

Table 1. Assessment matrix for target-level indicators, targets and objectives.

Indicator score	Not assessed	Not achieved / not reached / no progress	Limited progress	Good progress	Significant progress	Achieved / reached	Mean target / objective score
0							0
1							0.1 – 1.0
2							1.1 – 2.9
3							3.0 – 3.9
4							4.0 - 4.9
5							5

To facilitate scoring of quantitative indicators, the scale in Table 2 was used to match the progress towards the aspired target threshold with the specific score.

Table 2. Scale for assigning scores to quantitative target-level indicators.

Progress towards the aspired target threshold	Assigned score
0%	1
1-33%	2
34-66%	3
67-99%	4
100%	5

For qualitative indicators, the highest level of the assessment scale (e.g. “green” in traffic light assessments or “very high / high” when categories were used) was taken as the desired state with respect to the target threshold and then the reported proportion of that was matched against the scale in Table 2 to define the score.

The indicator score was placed between brackets to indicate that it is based on incomplete quality and/or scope of the assessment.

Interim indicators are based on the approval or establishment of certain documents or processes and they were assigned either score 1 or 5.

Some indicators are linked to actions to be undertaken or results to be delivered at a later stage of the implementation of the Strategic Plan, therefore they were postponed to later assessments after MOP8 and not included in the present assessment.

One indicator to Target 5.2 was excluded as it was not deemed to be measuring progress towards the threshold of that target.

For each target an arithmetic mean score was then calculated based on the individual indicator scores (where >1 indicator). Similarly, an arithmetic mean score was calculated for each of the five objectives based on the scores of all mean target scores under the respective objective. Finally, based on the mean objective scores, overall mean scores for the four substantive conservation objectives and for the five objectives altogether were derived too as a measurement of the overall implementation progress of the Strategic Plan.

Based on the mean scores, the progress towards achieving each target, each objective and all objectives together was defined and placed under the following categories: **Not assessed** (mean score 0), **Not achieved / not reached / no progress** (mean score 0.1-1.0), **Limited progress** (mean score 1.1-2.9), **Good progress** (mean score 3.0-3.9), **Significant progress** (mean score 4.0-4.9), **Achieved / reached** (mean score 5).

Mean target score were placed between brackets to indicate that they are based on incomplete quality and/or scope of the assessment or a missing assessment of at least one of the target-level indicators, and between square brackets to indicate that it is tentative since additional time-bound indicators will be included at a later stage of the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

The mean objective score was placed between brackets to indicate that it is derived from mean target scores where at least one of them is based on incomplete quality and/or scope of the assessment or a missing assessment of at least one of the target-level indicators, and between square brackets to indicate that is derived from mean target scores where at least one of them is tentative since additional time-bound indicators will be included at a later stage of the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

On the basis of these accounts, an overall assessment was made of the progress towards achieving the Strategic Plan purpose, the objectives as a whole and each objective separately. The major achievements have been acknowledged and the significant gaps have been pointed out. Recommendations for further actions have also

been suggested and shall be addressed by the Parties, the Agreement’s governing bodies, the Secretariat and all other involved stakeholders and partners.

Progress towards achieving the Strategic Plan purpose

The Strategic Plan purpose contributes to the overall goal based on the Agreement’s fundamental principles (Article II) of *maintaining or restoring migratory waterbird species and their populations at a favourable conservation status throughout their flyways*, and aims at **improving the status of AEWA populations by 2027**. The progress towards the attainment of the purpose is measured through six indicators (P1-P6), which also incorporate the aspired threshold to be reached by 2027. Figure 1 presents the current progress of these six indicators towards the aspired target level in relation to the baseline values of 2018.




Figure 1. Current values of the Strategic Plan purpose-level indicators in relation to the set targets and the baseline of 2018.

Figure 2 presents the distance of the baseline and the current values to the set target value as well as the average distance for all indicators.

The average distance of the values of all indicators to the set target values has increased to 17% from 13% of the 2018 baseline, which indicates an overall negative change, i.e. instead of moving towards attaining the purpose of this Strategic Plan and improving the status of AEWA populations an overall deterioration is recorded. Only one indicator (P3) shows a positive change (see Figure 1), with the distance to the target reduced from 15% in 2018 to 12% now (see Figure 2). Another indicator (P2) shows no change compared to 2018, but half of the indicators (three out of six; P1, P5 and P6) show negative trend, i.e. increasing distance from the set target level. The remaining indicator P4 was not assessed due to the lack of data. This indicator also lacks a baseline, which will need to be established retrospectively, thus the overall average baseline distance and current average distance are based on five out of the six indicators.

The indicators which are showing negative change relate to proportion of AEWA populations with known trends that show a stable or increasing trend (P1) – distance increased from 13% to 20%, the proportion of AEWA populations highly dependent on site networks with known trends that show a stable or increasing

trend (P5) – distance increased from 10% to 16%, and proportion of dispersed AEWA populations with known trends that show a stable or increasing trend (P6) – distance increased from 10% to 17%.




Figure 2. Distance in percentages of the baseline and the current values to the set target value as well as the average distance for all indicators. The shorter the bar, the closer it is to the target; currently all values are negative, i.e. below the target; if the target is reached, the current value will be zero and no bar will appear on the graph; if the target is surpassed, the bar will extend in the opposite direction.

No change has been recorded for indicator P4 on the proportion of ‘priority’ populations (as identified in 2018) that show a stable or increasing trend. Priority populations in this context are defined as those belonging to Globally Threatened or Near Threatened species and population in categories 2 and 3 of Column A of AEWA Table 1 and marked with an asterisk.

The only positive change was detected in indicator P3 on the proportion of populations with unfavourable conservation status in 2018 that show a stable or increasing trend, but this improvement is modest as pointed above and will require further work to maintain and improve the direction. No data has been available for indicator P4 on the proportion of harvested AEWA populations with known trends that show a stable or increasing trend, for which the baselines will also need to be defined retrospectively.

This assessment suggests that the targeted species conservation work through action and management plans which aims at the recovery of populations in unfavourable conservation status, in particular Globally Threatened and Near Threatened species, delivers some good results, but would benefit from strengthening. On the other hand, the conservation of the flyway site network and waterbird habitats within the wider landscape is lacking behind and will need to receive stronger attention and investment.

Overall progress towards achieving the Strategic Plan objectives

Five objectives have been set towards achieving the Strategic Plan goal each aiming at (1) species conservation and recovery, (2) sustainable use and management of waterbird populations, (3) flyway site network protection, management, maintenance and restoration, (4) habitat conservation in the wider environment, and (5) securing and strengthening of knowledge, capacity, recognition, awareness and resources. The first four objectives are substantive conservation objectives while the last one is an enabling objective.

Table 3. Placement of the Strategic plan objectives according to their current category of progress with their respective scores.

	Objective 1	Objective 2	Objective 3	Objective 4	Objective 5
Achieved / reached					
Significant progress					
Good progress					
Limited progress	[(2)]	[(1.8)]	[(2.6)]		[(2.8)]
Not achieved / not reached / no progress				[1]	
Not assessed					
Mean substantive objectives score: [(1.9)]					
Overall mean objectives score: [(2)]					

The current overall mean objectives score based on all the five objectives (substantive and enabling) is [(2)], which indicates limited progress of implementation. The progress is limited also in the implementation of the four substantive conservation objectives with a slightly lower current mean score of [(1.9)].

The progress towards four out of the five objectives is assessed to be limited, while there is not any progress on the remaining fifth objective.

The highest relative score of [(2.8)] is achieved in the implementation towards the enabling objective (Objective 5), closely followed by Objective 3 on flyway site network protection, management, maintenance and restoration with score [(2.6)]. Objective 1 on species conservation and recovery and Objective 2 on sustainable use and management of waterbird populations are both having lower scores of [(2)] and [(1.8)] respectively. The lowest score of [1], indicating lack of any progress of implementation, is assigned to Objective 4 on habitat conservation in the wider environment.

All scores of four of the objectives and the mean objective scores are placed between brackets and square brackets indicating that (i) the scores are derived from mean target scores where at least one of them is based

on incomplete quality and/or scope of the assessment or missing assessment of at least one of the target-level indicators and (ii) the scores are derived from mean target scores where at least one of them is tentative since additional time-bound indicators will be included at a later stage of the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

Altogether 27 targets have been set – six for Objectives 1, 2 and 5, five for Objective 3, and four for Objective 4. Through the indicators associated with each of these targets, the progress towards the achievement of the objectives is measured. Figure 3 presents the distribution of these 27 targets across the respective categories of progress.




Figure 3. Proportion of the targets associated with the Strategic Plan objectives per category of progress.

One target (4%) has been assessed as achieved, however this is a tentative assessment based on one of the three associated indicators since two were postponed to a later stage of the implementation of the Strategic Plan. Implementation and results against two targets (7%) have recorded significant progress and good progress is considered to have been achieved against another two targets. Majority of the targets however – 14 or 52% - have seen limited progress to date, while there has not been any progress against the target on prioritising and implementing habitat conservation and management measures in the wider environment. The latter is also tentative as it is based on one out of three indicators since two were postponed to a later stage of the implementation of the Strategic Plan. Of the remaining seven targets, two (7%) were not assessed due to the lack of availability of data and information while five (19%) are relevant for later stages of the implementation of the Strategic Plan and were postponed for the next assessment cycles.

Figure 4 provides a summary of the distribution of the targets per objective according to their category of progress.

Other than six targets (one in Objective 1, three in Objective 2 and two in Objective 3), the scores for all other remaining targets which were assessed in this cycle (14 targets or 52%) were placed between brackets or square brackets, or both in one case, indicating that (i) the mean target score is based on incomplete quality and/or scope of the assessment or missing assessment of at least one of the target-level indicators or that (ii) the mean target score is tentative since additional time-bound indicators will be included at a later stage of the implementation of the Strategic Plan, or both (see Annex 2).




Figure 4. Proportion of the targets of each Strategic Plan objective per category of progress.

At the level of the indicators the distribution per category shows a different pattern, as presented on Figure 5.




Figure 5. Proportion of the indicators across all targets per category of progress.

Out of the 66 indicators, the highest number - 22 or 33% - are postponed as they are relevant for later stage of the implementation of the Strategic Plan and will be assessed in the next cycles. The second highest number of indicators (17; 26%) has been scored as having limited progress followed by those demonstrating good progress (12; 18%). Data and information could not be sources for 12% of the indicators (n=8) and they were not assessed. Three indicators (5%) have been assessed as showing significant progress while only two have been achieved (3%). No progress has been recorded against one indicator and another one was excluded as it was not deemed to measure progress towards the threshold of the respective target.

Figure 6 presents the distribution of the indicators per objective according to their category of progress. Three indicators in Objective 3 were jointly scored under category “good progress”.




Figure 6. Proportion of the indicators of each Strategic Plan objective per category of progress.

The scores of only six indicators (two in Objective 1, three in Objective 3 and one in Objective 5) or 17% of all indicators which were assessed in this cycle were placed between brackets indicating that the score is based on incomplete assessment due to the quality and/or scope of the assessment (see Annex 2).

Progress towards achieving Objective 1

Objective 1 aims to **strengthen species conservation and recovery and reduce causes of unnecessary mortality**. Six targets have been set to achieve this objective. Four targets for Objective 1 (66%) are showing limited progress with only one target demonstrating significant progress and one remaining not assessed at present (see Figure 4). A detailed account is presented in Annex 2. The overall implementation score against this objective is [(2)] (see Table 3), qualifying the progress of implementation as limited.

Significant progress has been achieved only against Target 1.4 where for 54% of the populations, both the population size and (short-term) trend estimates are based on survey and monitoring data (against an aspired threshold of 66%). This indicator is however only partially assessed since information on drivers of population trends has not been yet systematically collated and made available.

The overall progress against Target 1.2 is limited. While there is a good progress in developing flyway-level species action plans for priority species/populations, the implementation of these plans at national level, according to the National Reports submitted to MOP8, has been very limited. A better assessment of the implementation of the AEWA species action plans shall be undertaken in a coordinated manner for each specific plan.

The extremely low compliance with basic AEWA provisions which is measured through the progress achieved against Target 1.1 requires serious attention and action. Only very few Parties have reported that the legal measures required by paragraph 2.1 of the AEWA Action Plan are transposed into their respective domestic legislation (10%) and are enforced effectively (8%).

Target 1.3 has been tentatively assessed as having limited progress since only a limited number of conservation and management guidance has been compiled for populations in unfavourable conservation status other than those prioritised for action planning, and the implementation of action to reduce threats to relevant populations will be assessed at a later stage.

The level of progress towards Target 1.5 is tentatively assessed as limited despite the good progress reported by Parties the use of International Waterbird Census (IWC) data and/or other relevant monitoring data to inform national-level implementation of the Agreement; the number/percentage of AEWA populations with

flyway-level conservation measures in place that are regularly reviewed on the basis of updated IWC and other relevant monitoring data needs yet to be assessed.

The progress towards the last target to this objective, Target 1.6 which aims at integrating AEWA priorities relating to four causes of unnecessary additional mortality and other key threats to migratory waterbirds and their habitats in key multilateral processes was not assessed in this first cycle of the Strategic Plan as no information could be collated.

Progress towards achieving Objective 2

Objective 2 aims to **ensure that any use and management of migratory waterbird populations is sustainable across their flyways**. This objective is to be achieved through six targets. Four targets for Objective 2 (66%) are showing limited progress with one target not being assessed at present and the last remaining target postponed to the next assessment cycles (see Figure 4). A detailed account is presented in Annex 2. The overall implementation score against this objective is [(1.8)] (see Table 3), qualifying the progress of implementation as limited.

Similarly to Target 1.1 above, through Target 2.2 is measured the compliance with AEWA legal provisions and again the results indicate a very low level of compliance. Only 11% of the Parties have reported that the legal measures required by paragraph 4.1 of the AEWA Action Plan are transposed into their respective domestic legislation and are enforced effectively.

While good progress has been achieved with 33% of the Parties reported that they have national coverage of best-practice codes or standards for waterbird hunting, only 18% of the Parties reported very high or high extent to which best-practice codes or standards for waterbird hunting are applied and only 15% reported high extent to which best-practice codes or standards for waterbird hunting are effective. Thus, the progress towards Target 2.3 has been assessed on average as limited.

Limited progress towards Target 2.6 on the integration of consideration of the ecosystem services derived from migratory waterbirds into policy and decision-making processes that affect waterbird habitats has been recorded with only 14% of the Parties reporting that.

Significant progress has been reported towards Target 2.5 with 35% of the Parties reporting the existence of ecotourism initiatives specifically based on migratory waterbirds and their habitats, but only limited progress has been achieved with designing such initiatives to deliver both conservation and community benefits (13% of Parties reporting that). As the third indicator associated with this target was postponed to the next assessment cycles, the overall progress has been scored as limited.

No assessment has been undertaken on the progress towards Target 2.1 on the monitoring of harvest levels and harvest data availability at flyway level to support sustainable harvest of all prioritised quarry species due to the lack of systematically collated information. As this is one of the critical data sets underpinning the direction towards sustainable harvest, it will be essential to assess the status quo in the next cycle.

The assessment of the last target under this objective was postponed. The progress towards Target 2.4 on establishing adaptive harvest management regimes for priority species will be assessed in the next cycles after the rapid assessment of the sustainability of harvest has delivered a priority list of species/populations for this adaptive harvest management.

Progress towards achieving Objective 3

Objective 3 aims to **establish and sustain a coherent and comprehensive flyway network of protected areas and other sites, managed to maintain – and where necessary restore – their national and international importance for migratory waterbird populations**. Five targets have been set to achieve this objective. Two targets for Objective 3 (40%) are assessed as having good progress with the same proportion having limited progress and the one remaining (20%) postponed to the next cycles (see Figure 4). A detailed

account is presented in Annex 2. The overall implementation score against this objective is [(2.6)] (see Table 3), qualifying the progress of implementation as limited.

Tentatively the progress towards Target 3.1 has been assessed as good based on the advancement in submission of reviewed and confirmed inventories of sites of international and national importance for migratory waterbirds with 40% of the Parties having submitted their inventories at the time of writing. The other indicator associated with this target concerns gap-filling of the identified site network and was postponed to MOP10 as the activities are yet to take place.

The progress towards Target 3.5 on legal or administrative measures to avoid, mitigate and compensate for adverse impacts of development activities and other pressures, including the impacts of climate change, on sites of national and international importance for migratory waterbirds also was identified as being good. 61% of the Parties reported that they have adopted relevant legal or administrative measures. The other three indicators associate with this target measure the effectiveness of implementation of such measures and they relate to number of flyway network sites that are threatened with adverse impacts from development, number of sites where specific threats have been effectively avoided, mitigated or compensated and number of sites with known specific threats where no effective avoidance, mitigation or compensation measures have been implemented. These three indicators have scored jointly and the progress is considered to be good, but information needs to be collated more systematically and comprehensively for a better assessment.

The overall progress towards Target 3.3. is scored as limited despite Parties reporting that 42% of flyway network sites are covered by national or international protected area designations. The other two indicators under this target point at a rather limited progress with respect to coverage of flyway network sites by actively implemented management plans and the effectiveness across all conservation management measures at flyway network sites.

With only 20% of the Parties reporting that the importance of AEWA flyway network sites is explicitly taken into account in water- and land-use planning and decision-making, the progress toward Target 3.4 is rendered limited.

The progress towards Target 3.2 on the assessment at flyway level of the status of, the threats to, and the effectiveness of conservation measures implemented at flyway network sites will be evaluated at MOP10 when the first formalised edition of the Site Network Report as per paragraph 7.4(c) of the Agreement's Action Plan is planned to be delivered.

Progress towards achieving Objective 4

Objective 4 aims **ensure that there is sufficient quantity and quality of habitat in the wider environment for achieving and maintaining favourable conservation status for migratory waterbird populations**. Four targets have been set to achieve this objective. One target for Objective 1 (25%) is assessed to have no progress with and the remaining three target (75%) were postponed to the next cycles (see Figure 4). A detailed account is presented in Annex 2. The overall implementation score against this objective is [1] (see Table 3), which is the lowest score amongst all objectives and is pointing at the lack of progress to date.

The only assessed target under Objective 4 is Target 4.1 on identifying priorities for habitat conservation and management in the wider environment at Agreement level and implementing corresponding actions. There is no progress on the interim indicator on agreeing the habitat conservation priorities at MOP8 since the Agreement-wide assessment of the status of principal waterbird habitats in the wider environment and the resulting action plan have not been compiled yet. A joint costed project brief together with CMS and the Raptors MoU covering all bird taxa (apart from pelagic) in the African-Eurasian flyways was compiled in this triennium, but the implementation will require over 1 million Euros and at least 2 years. The remaining two indicators under this target were postponed since they concern the implementation of the resulting action plan in the following triennia, thus the overall Target 4.1. is considered as having no progress to date.

The assessment of progress towards the other three targets associated with Objective 4 was postponed as the related activities are to be implemented after MOP8 and are dependent on the assessment and action plan to be delivered under Target 4.1.

Considering the dependence of the achievement of the entire Objective 4 on the delivery of the assessment and action plan under Target 4.1, the costed project brief developed in this triennium should be considered as one of the highest priorities for funding as early as possible in the next triennium.

Progress towards achieving Objective 5

Objective 5 is an enabling objective and aims **to ensure and strengthen the knowledge, capacity, recognition, awareness and resources required for the Agreement to achieve its conservation objectives**. Six targets have been set to achieve this objective. Four targets for Objective 5 (66%) are showing limited progress with one target demonstrating significant progress and the last one tentatively achieved (see Figure 4). A detailed account is presented in Annex 2. The overall implementation score against this objective is [(2.8)] (see Table 3), which is the highest across all objectives, but is still qualifying the progress of implementation as limited.

Under Target 5.1, the interim indicator on establishing a prioritised list of key information gaps was achieved through the work of the Technical Committee which compiled an overview of knowledge gaps and needs relevant for AEWA implementation with commentary on priority gaps and AEWA's role in filling those gaps. Since the other two associated indicators are linked to activities to be implemented after MOP8, the assessment was postponed and the overall the target is tentatively considered achieved.

With 54% of the Parties reporting that migratory waterbird conservation priorities are explicitly addressed in NBSAPs and/or similar national plans/policies, the progress towards Target 5.5 is assessed as significant. However, the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework is not yet agreed and adopted, hence the new generation of NBSAPs is not yet available – this assessment reflects integration into the pre-2020 NBSAPs and will need to be redone for MOP9 and MOP10.

Since MOP7 five new Contracting Parties acceded to the Agreement to reach a total of 82 Parties at present, which is a significant progress towards Target 5.2 which aiming at 90 Contracting Parties by 2027. One of the indicators under this target was excluded since it represents a regional pattern rather than measurement of the (progress towards reaching the targeted) global number of Parties. The degree of progress made towards recruiting potential Parties that have still not yet joined was not assessed, thus rendering the overall progress towards Target 5.2 limited.

The progress of identifying and prioritizing at national level capacity gaps for implementation of the Agreement is very limited with only 4% of Parties that reported having completed this action. Good progress has been reported on establishing national AEWA implementation coordination mechanisms (35% of the Parties), but their effectiveness is rather limited (only 13% of the Parties reporting high effectiveness). With the assessment of implementation capacity postponed to MOP10, the overall rating of progress towards Target 5.3 is limited.

The overall progress towards Target 5.4 on integration of AEWA waterbird conservation priorities into national implementation policies and plans related to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), Aichi Targets / Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species (SPMS) and the Ramsar Strategic Plan is limited. 38% of Parties reported inclusion of AEWA focal points in national processes relating to SDGs, Aichi Targets/Post 2020 biodiversity framework and SPMS, which is considered a good progress, but the other indicator under this target was not assessed.

The last Target 5.6 relates to the assessment of resources required for coordination and delivery of the Strategic Plan at international and national levels the implementation of corresponding resource mobilisation plans. The progress so far has been limited. While the interim indicator on assessing international-level resource requirements and producing a corresponding resource mobilisation plan is scored as achieved, at national level only 9% of the Parties reported that they have assessed resource requirements at national level for the implementation of the Strategic Plan and 4% reported that they are implementing a resource mobilisation plan. The other two indicators have been either postponed (percentage of international-level resource requirement that has been successfully mobilized) or not assessed (traffic-light assessment of progress made with resource mobilisation at national level).

Recommendations on advancing the implementation of the Strategic Plan

With 1/3 of the Strategic Plan time span behind us and the overall progress of implementation assessed as limited as well as an overall negative change in the purpose-level indicators compared to the baseline of 2018, it is necessary to significantly step up efforts and allocate increased funding and other resources if the Strategic Plan objectives were to be achieved and the purpose attained.

The assessment of the purpose-level indicators suggests that the targeted species conservation work through action and management plans which aims at the recovery of populations in unfavourable conservation status, in particular Globally Threatened and Near Threatened species, delivers some good results.

However, negative change is detected in (i) the proportion of all AEWA populations with known trends that show a stable or increasing trend, (ii) the proportion of AEWA populations highly dependent on site networks with known trends that show a stable or increasing trend and (iii) the proportion of dispersed AEWA populations with known trends that show a stable or increasing trend. The overall mean score of implementation against the four substantive conservation objectives is limited, which is also the case for Objective 3 on the conservation of the flyway site network while there has been no progress reported on Objective 4 which largely addresses the conservation of dispersed species. The enabling Objective 5 has the highest relative implementation score, but it is still limited.

The only target assessed as achieved is under the enabling objective and is based on an interim indicator. This tentative score will decline if in the next cycles no action takes place against the other two postponed indicators. Significant progress has been achieved towards two targets, but both assessments are incomplete either in terms of scope and/or quality and may change in future assessments.

While Parties shall strive to perform against all indicators and reach all targets, some specific recommendations on priorities, to be addressed during the next triennium, can be made to this end:

Target 1.1: All Parties shall, as a matter of priority and urgency, transpose all the legal measures required in Paragraph 2.1 of the AEWA Action Plan into their domestic legislation and adjust it as necessary after each session of the Meeting of the Parties;

Target 1.2: The implementation of species action plans shall be strengthened at national and international levels;

Target 2.2: All Parties shall, as a matter of priority and urgency, transpose all the legal measures required in Paragraph 4.1 of the AEWA Action Plan into their domestic legislation;

Target 3.1: All Parties shall complete the process of review and confirmation of their inventories of sites of international and national importance for migratory waterbirds and submit them to the Secretariat as early as possible after MOP8;

Target 3.3: Parties shall increase the coverage of the flyway network sites national or international protected area designations, by actively implemented management plans, and enhance the effectiveness of all conservation management measures at flyway network sites;

Target 4.1: As a matter of priority and urgency, finance the joint AEWA-CMS-Raptors MoU project on the assessment of the status of principal bird habitats in the wider environment and the resulting action plan;

Target 5.6: As a matter of critical importance, mobilise majority of the resources required for the international-level coordination and implementation of the Strategic Plan, including through the AEWA core budget, and all Parties assess the resource requirements at national level and effectively implemented resource mobilisation plans.

To improve the monitoring of implementation of the Strategic Plan and progress towards achieving its objectives and purpose some targets and indicators will still need to be assessed or their assessment needs to be improved:

Purpose-level indicator P4: undertake an assessment of this indicator for MOP9, all CPs shall report to the Secretariat early in the next triennium on the list of their huntable species;

Targets 1.5, 1.6, 2.1, 5.2, 5.4 and 5.6: either one or all (targets 1.6 and 2.1) indicators associated with these targets have not been assessed in the current cycle and efforts shall be made to collate the information required to provide an assessment for MOP9;

Targets 1.2, 1.4, 3.5 and 5.5: additional and improved data for the assessment of these targets or individual indicators associated with them will be necessary for enhancing the overall assessment of the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

Advance planning shall be undertaken for the assessment of the **22 postponed indicators** to minimize the chances that the assessment cannot be delivered when it is due.

The **National Reports** submitted to the MOP **provide essential data and information** for the monitoring of the implementation of the Strategic Plan. The number of National Reports submitted and especially their quality needs to be improved (see Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.13). Considering that the submission of comprehensive reports to each session of the MOP is a basic obligation of each Contracting Party, efforts shall be made for a better planning for the compilation of such reports and their timely submission to the Secretariat. The issue of insufficient quantity and quality of National Reports has a certain geographical bias which can be addressed through training of National Focal Points and Designated National Respondents. Donor Parties are encouraged to provide to the Secretariat resources for such training.

The Meeting of the Parties is invited to note this report and take its conclusions and recommendations into account in the decision-making process. The recommendations will require to be addressed through joint planning and action by the Parties, the Agreement's governing bodies, the Secretariat and all other involved stakeholders and partners. Increased cooperation, resources and capacity will be essential in order to make necessary progress on the implementation of the AEWA Strategic Plan and towards achieving the conservation objectives of the Agreement.

Annex 1. Assessment of attainment of the AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027 purpose.

Key to colour code:

	Threshold reached
	Positive change
	No change
	Negative change
	Not assessed

Indicator description	Direction of change	Data & information summary	Means of verification and reference (the latter if available)
Indicator P1: At least 75% of AEWA populations with known trends show a stable or increasing trend.	Negative	60% of the 480 AEWA populations with known short-term trend show a stable or increasing trend. The baseline calculated based on CSR7 was 65% (N = 432 populations). The target is not met, and the indicator shows a negative change.	Report on the Conservation Status of Migratory Waterbirds in the Agreement Area, 8 th edition (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.19)
Indicator P2: At least 55% of ‘priority’ populations (as established in 2018) show a stable or increasing trend.	No change	According to the AEWA Strategic Plan for 2019–2027, ‘priority’ populations are those listed in Table 1 of the AEWA Action Plan and classified as Globally Threatened species (i.e. Critically Endangered, Endangered and Vulnerable) or Near Threatened species on the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species as reported in the most recent summary by BirdLife International, as well as those listed in Table 1, Column A, Categories 2 and 3 that are marked with an asterisk. A baseline was established in 2018. In total, the pool consisted of 98 populations including two additional populations, the Mediterranean/N & W coasts of Africa population of Audouin’s Gull (<i>Larus audouinii</i>) and the Europe & Western Asia (bre) of Great White Pelican (<i>Pelecanus onocrotalus</i>) which were also included because they are listed on Appendix 1 of the CMS. From these 98 populations, 18 populations were excluded because of unknown or uncertain trends and the baseline of 45% of the populations increasing or stable was established based on 80 populations. Based on the data	Report on the Conservation Status of Migratory Waterbirds in the Agreement Area, 8 th edition (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.19)

		for CSR8, 86 populations fulfil the selection criteria (i.e. has other than uncertain or unknown short-term trend) and 45% of the populations are stable or increasing. Hence, no improvement, but also no negative change.	
Indicator P3: At least 60% of populations with unfavourable conservation status in 2018 show a stable or increasing trend.	Positive	According to the AEWA Strategic Plan for 2019–2027, populations with unfavourable conservation status include those listed in Column A, Categories 1(c), 2 & 3 and Column B, Category 2, in Table 1 of the AEWA Action Plan. The baseline was 51% based on 155 populations with known trend (out of 204 population that meets the criteria above). Based on the data for CSR8, 169 populations fulfil the selection criteria (i.e. has other than uncertain or unknown short-term trend) and 53% of the populations are stable or increasing. This represents a slight improvement, but the target is not reached yet.	Report on the Conservation Status of Migratory Waterbirds in the Agreement Area, 8 th edition (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.19)
Indicator P4: Percentage of harvested AEWA populations with known trends that show a stable or increasing trend.	Not assessed	According to the AEWA Strategic Plan for 2019–2027, a harvested population is a population that is legally harvested in at least one country within its range. The target threshold for this indicator is to be defined on the basis of the most up-to-date information available after the baseline has been identified. Current baseline: to be identified once the list of harvested populations has been determined based on information to be collated from Parties in 2022 ¹ . The 2018 baseline will be then also calculated retrospectively.	Report on the Conservation Status of Migratory Waterbirds in the Agreement Area, 8 th edition (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.19)
Indicator P5: At least 70% of AEWA populations highly dependent on-site networks with known trends show a stable or increasing trend.	Negative	According to the AEWA Strategic Plan for 2019–2027, populations highly dependent on-site networks are those for which 25% or more of the population occurs at relatively few key sites during at least one season of its annual cycle. The 2018 baseline was 63% based on 355 populations with known trend (out 429 populations that meet the criteria above). Based on the data for CSR8, 380 populations fulfil the selection criteria (i.e. has other than uncertain or unknown short-term trend) and 59% of the populations are stable or increasing. Hence, the indicator suggests some deterioration instead of progress towards the target.	Report on the Conservation Status of Migratory Waterbirds in the Agreement Area, 8 th edition (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.19)

¹ Due to the postponement of MOP8 from 2021 to 2022, this will also postpone to 2023 the collation of information from Contracting Parties on the populations harvested in each of them.

<p>Indicator P6: At least 70% of dispersed AEWA populations with known trends show a stable or increasing trend.</p>	<p>Negative</p>	<p>According to the AEWA Strategic Plan for 2019–2027, a dispersed population is one where at least 75% of the population is ‘dispersed’ during at least one season of its annual cycle, with relatively small numbers occurring at multiple sites. The 2018 baseline was 63% based on 320 populations with known trend (out of 416 populations that meet the criteria above). Based on the data for CSR8, 365 populations fulfil the selection criteria (i.e. has other than uncertain or unknown short-term trend) and 58% of the populations are stable or increasing. Hence, the indicator suggests some deterioration instead of progress towards the target.</p>	<p>Report on the Conservation Status of Migratory Waterbirds in the Agreement Area, 8th edition (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.19)</p>
---	-----------------	--	---

Annex 2. Assessment of attainment of the AEWA Strategic Plan 2019-2027 targets and objectives.

Key to colour code:

	Achieved / reached
	Significant progress
	Good progress
	Limited progress
	Not achieved / not reached / no progress
	Not assessed
	Postponed assessment
	Excluded

Objective 1: To strengthen species conservation and recovery and reduce causes of unnecessary mortality					
Target description	Mean target score	Indicator description	Indicator score	Data & information summary	Means of verification and reference (the latter if available)
Target 1.1: The legal measures required by the AEWA Action Plan are transposed into all Parties' domestic legislation and enforced effectively.	2	Indicator (quantitative): Percentage of Parties that have transposed all of the legal measures required in Paragraph 2.1 of the AEWA Action Plan into domestic legislation.	2	10% of Parties have reported that they have transposed all of the legal measures required in Paragraph 2.1 of the AEWA Action Plan into domestic legislation.	Analysis of the AEWA National Reports for the triennium 2018-2020 (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.13)
		Indicator (qualitative): Degree of enforcement of	2	8% of Parties have reported very high or high degree of	Analysis of the AEWA National Reports for the triennium 2018-2020 (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.13)

		legislation as assessed by each Party.		enforcement of legislation.	
<p>Target 1.2: All priority species/populations are covered by effectively implemented Species Action Plans at flyway level.</p>	(2.5) ²	<p>Indicator (quantitative): Percentage of relevant species/populations covered by flyway-level Species Action Plans.</p>	3	<p>51% of the priority species/populations (30 out of 59) are covered by flyway-level Species Action Plans. In the absence of full species action plans, conservation guidance was compiled for another two globally threatened species under target 1.3 below, but these are not included in the calculation above.</p>	<p>The assessment is based on the IUCN Red Listed as of January 2021 as a reference for Globally Threatened and Near Threatened species (Report on the Conservation Status of Migratory Waterbirds in the Agreement Area, 8th edition; Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.19) and the overview of current status of preparation of AEWA International Species Action Plans (Summary of the Current Status of Species Action and Management Plan Production and Coordination with recommendations to MOP for Extension, Revision or Retirement; Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.22). AEWA Annex 3, Table 1 as amended by MOP7 was used as a reference for the asterisk-marked populations; CMS Appendix I (effective 22 May 2020) was used as a reference for Column A, category 1(a) populations. The assessment also includes two Critically Endangered species which are subject of stand-alone CMS MoUs with their own specific action plans - Slender-billed Curlew (<i>Numenius tenuirostris</i>) and Siberian Crane (<i>Leucogeranus leucogeranus</i>). There have not been confirmed sightings of the Slender-billed Curlew for extended time. There is a single individual Siberian Crane left in the wild in the Agreement area.</p>
		<p>Indicator (qualitative):</p>		(2) ³	<p>The implementation of 5% of all</p>

² Brackets indicate a mean target score based on incomplete quality and/or scope of the assessment or missing assessment of at least one of the target level indicators.

³ Brackets indicate a score based on incomplete assessment due to the quality and/or scope of the assessment.

		Traffic-light assessment of implementation status.		national Species Action Plans for all species/populations for which an ISSAP/IMSAP is in place has been assessed by the Parties as fully implemented or advanced.	This reference provides a proxy assessment which shall be improved by a coordinated assessment of the state of implementation of each individual international species action plan.
Target 1.3: For all other populations in unfavourable conservation status, science-based conservation and management guidance is made available by AEWA and/or its Partners and is applied by Parties and other stakeholders.	[2] ⁴	Indicator (quantitative): (a) Number/percentage of all relevant populations for which conservation and management advice is available to Parties.	2	Conservation or management guidance notes have been compiled for 4 populations of 2 species (different from target 1.2 above). Another 12 populations of 8 species are already covered by action or management plans. This represents an 8% coverage of 194 populations in unfavourable conservation status.	Report of the Technical Committee to the 8th Session of the Meeting of the Parties (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.7); AEWA MOP8 information documents AEWA/MOP Inf. 8.14-8.18.
		Indicator (quantitative): (b) Number/percentage	--	<i>The first conservation and management</i>	N/A

⁴ Square brackets indicate a tentative mean target score since additional time-bound indicators will be included at a later stage of the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

		of Parties reporting action to reduce threats to relevant populations where they support more than 1% of the biogeographic population.		<i>guidance notes were produced after the closure of the National Reporting cycle to MOP8. First assessment to be based on reporting against this indicator to MOP9.</i>	
Target 1.4: The quality of waterbird population status assessments, including information on drivers of population trends, is improved so that at least two-thirds of all AEWA populations are being assessed on the basis of the most complete and up-to-date monitoring information available.	(4) ⁵	Indicator (quantitative): Percentage of populations for which good quality size and trend data as well as information on drivers of trends, is available and regularly updated.	(4) ⁶	For 54% of the populations, both the population size and (short-term) trend estimates are based on survey and monitoring data (categories “census based” and “expert opinion” for population size and categories “good” and “reasonable” for population trend).	Report on the Conservation Status of Migratory Waterbirds in the Agreement Area, 8th edition (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.19). This indicator has been assessed partially since no data on drivers of trend is systematically collated and presented for any population yet.

⁵ Brackets indicate a mean target score based on incomplete quality and/or scope of the assessment or missing assessment of at least one of the target level indicators.

⁶ Brackets indicate a score based on incomplete assessment due to the quality and/or scope of the assessment.

Target 1.5: Decision-making for national and flyway-level conservation and management of waterbird populations is based on the best-available monitoring data.	(1.5) ⁷	Indicator (quantitative): Number/percentage of Parties confirming their use of IWC and/or other relevant monitoring data to inform national-level implementation.	3	51% of Parties reported using data collected through the International Waterbird Census (IWC) or other relevant monitoring schemes to inform national-level implementation of AEWA.	Analysis of the AEWA National Reports for the triennium 2018-2020 (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.13)
		Indicator (quantitative): Number/percentage of AEWA populations with flyway-level conservation measures in place that are regularly reviewed on the basis of updated IWC and other relevant monitoring data.	0	Not assessed	N/A
1.6 AEWA priorities relating to four causes of unnecessary	(0) ⁸	Indicator (quantitative): (a) Number of issues for which AEWA	0	Not assessed	N/A

⁷ Brackets indicate a mean target score based on incomplete quality and/or scope of the assessment or missing assessment of at least one of the target level indicators.

⁸ Brackets indicate a mean target score based on incomplete quality and/or scope of the assessment or missing assessment of at least one of the target level indicators.

additional mortality and other key threats to migratory waterbirds and their habitats are integrated in key multilateral processes.		priorities have been formally communicated to the most relevant multilateral process(es).			
		Indicator (quantitative): (b) Number of relevant decisions, actions, recommendations and guidance under these processes that incorporate AEWA priorities.	0	Not assessed	N/A

Objective 1 mean score: [(2)⁹]¹⁰

⁹ Brackets indicate that the objective mean score is derived from mean target scores where at least one of them is based on incomplete quality and/or scope of the assessment or missing assessment of at least one of the target level indicators.

¹⁰ Square brackets indicate the objective mean score is derived from mean target scores where at least one of them is tentative since additional time-bound indicators will be included at a later stage of the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

Objective 2: To ensure that any use and management of migratory waterbird populations is sustainable across their flyways					
Target description	Mean target score	Indicator description	Indicator score	Data & information summary	Means of verification and reference (the latter if available)
Target 2.1: Harvest levels are monitored and readily available at flyway level to support sustainable harvest of all prioritised quarry species.	(0) ¹¹	Indicator (quantitative): (a) Number/percentage of Parties making harvest data for the prioritised quarry species available	0	Not assessed	N/A
		Indicator (quantitative): (b) Number/percentage of prioritised quarry species with sufficient harvest data at flyway level.	0	Not assessed	N/A
Target 2.2: The provisions of the AEWA Action Plan that relate to the use and management of migratory waterbirds, including harvesting, are transposed into	2	Indicator (quantitative): Percentage of Parties that have transposed all the legal measures required in Paragraph 4.1 of the AEWA Action Plan into domestic legislation.	2	11% of Parties have reported that they have transposed all of the legal measures required in Paragraph 4.1 of the AEWA Action Plan into domestic legislation.	Analysis of the AEWA National Reports for the triennium 2018-2020 (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.13)

¹¹ Brackets indicate a mean target score based on incomplete quality and/or scope of the assessment or missing assessment of at least one of the target level indicators.

all Parties' domestic legislation and enforced effectively. ...		Indicator (qualitative): Degree of enforcement of legislation as assessed by each Party	2	11% of Parties have reported high degree of effectiveness and enforcement of legislation.	Analysis of the AEWA National Reports for the triennium 2018-2020 (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.13)
Target 2.3: Best-practice codes and standards for waterbird hunting are in place and applied to support enforcement of hunting laws and regulations, including customary law where appropriate and consistent with AEWA objectives, in ensuring sustainable use of migratory waterbirds in at least three-quarters of Contracting Parties.	2.3	Indicator (quantitative): Number/percentage of Parties for which there is national coverage of best-practice codes or standards for waterbird hunting (recognising that such codes and standards may be developed and applied regionally).	3	33% of Parties reported that they have national coverage of best-practice codes or standards for waterbird hunting.	Analysis of the AEWA National Reports for the triennium 2018-2020 (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.13)
		Indicator (qualitative): Traffic-light assessment of extent to which codes/standards are applied.	2	18% of Parties reported very high or high extent to which best-practice codes or standards for waterbird hunting are applied.	Analysis of the AEWA National Reports for the triennium 2018-2020 (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.13)
		Indicator (qualitative): Traffic-light assessment of extent to which codes/standards are	2	15% of Parties reported high extent to which best-practice codes or standards for	Analysis of the AEWA National Reports for the triennium 2018-2020 (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.13)

		effective in supporting enforcement of hunting laws and regulations.		waterbird hunting are effective.	
Target 2.4: Adaptive harvest management regimes are in place and being effectively implemented at flyway level in the framework of Species Action or Management Plans* for all prioritised declining quarry populations and ‘conflict’ species	--	Indicator (quantitative): Number/percentage of priority species/populations for which flyway-level adaptive harvest management plans have been agreed.	--	<i>Although adaptive harvest management programmes are in place for several species, the list of priority species/populations is to be identified following a rapid assessment of sustainability of harvest of declining quarry populations by MOP9.</i>	N/A
		Indicator (quantitative): Number/percentage of such adaptive harvest management plans that are being implemented.	--	<i>To follow from MOP9 onwards.</i>	N/A
		Indicator (qualitative): Traffic-light assessment of effectiveness of implementation.	--	<i>To follow from MOP9 onwards.</i>	N/A
Target 2.5: Waterbird-related		Indicator (interim): Number of	--	<i>Pilot waterbird-related ecotourism</i>	N/A

<p>ecotourism is promoted in at least half of the Contracting Parties following the model/example of at least three ecotourism pilots focusing on migratory waterbirds that exemplify benefits to local communities as well as for the conservation status of AEWA populations and their habitats.</p>	<p>[2.7]¹²</p>	<p>waterbird-related ecotourism pilot initiatives launched and implemented.</p>		<p><i>pilot initiatives to be launched by MOP9.</i></p>	
		<p>Indicator (quantitative): Number/percentage of Parties reporting the existence of ecotourism initiatives specifically based on migratory waterbirds and their habitats.</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>35% of Parties reported the existence of ecotourism initiatives specifically based on migratory waterbirds and their habitats.</p>	<p>Analysis of the AEWA National Reports for the triennium 2018-2020 (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.13)</p>
		<p>Indicator (qualitative): Traffic-light assessment of extent to which these initiatives are designed to deliver both conservation and community benefits.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>13% of Parties reported high extent to which these initiatives are designed to deliver both conservation and community benefits.</p>	<p>Analysis of the AEWA National Reports for the triennium 2018-2020 (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.13)</p>
		<p>Indicator (qualitative): Traffic-light assessment of extent to which these dual benefits are being</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>9% of Parties reported high extent to which these dual benefits are being delivered in practice.</p>	<p>Analysis of the AEWA National Reports for the triennium 2018-2020 (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.13)</p>

¹² Square brackets indicate a tentative mean target score since additional time-bound indicators will be included at a later stage of the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

		delivered in practice.			
Target 2.6: Consideration of the ecosystem services derived from migratory waterbirds is integrated into policy and decision-making processes that affect waterbird habitats in at least two-thirds of AEWAs Parties.	2	Indicator (quantitative): Number/percentage of Parties reporting specific measures to integrate cultural/provisioning services of migratory waterbirds in decisions affecting waterbird habitats.	2	14% of Parties reported specific measures to integrate cultural/provisioning services of migratory waterbirds in decisions affecting waterbird habitats.	Analysis of the AEWAs National Reports for the triennium 2018-2020 (Doc. AEWAs/MOP 8.13)

Objective 2 mean score: [(1.8)¹³]¹⁴

¹³ Brackets indicate that the objective mean score is derived from mean target scores where at least one of them is based on incomplete quality and/or scope of the assessment or missing assessment of at least one of the target level indicators.

¹⁴ Square brackets indicate the objective mean score is derived from mean target scores where at least one of them is tentative since additional time-bound indicators will be included at a later stage of the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

Objective 3: To establish and sustain a coherent and comprehensive flyway network of protected areas and other sites, managed to maintain – and where necessary restore – their national and international importance for migratory waterbird populations

Target description	Mean target score	Indicator description	Indicator score	Data & information summary	Means of verification and reference (the latter if available)
Target 3.1: Known sites of national or international importance for populations listed in Table 1 of the AEWA Action Plan have been reviewed and confirmed (in conformity with Paragraph 3.1.2 of the Action Plan) and at least three-quarters of the priority site gaps are filled in the case of Contracting Parties.	[3] ¹⁵	Indicator (quantitative): Number/percentage of Parties that have reviewed and confirmed the known internationally and nationally important sites for migratory waterbirds in their territory.	3	At the time of writing, 41% of Parties had submitted reviewed and confirmed inventories of sites of international and national importance for migratory waterbirds.	Report of the Technical Committee to the 8th Session of the Meeting of the Parties and Report of the Secretariat to the 8th Session of the Meeting of the Parties (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.7; Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.9)
		Indicator (quantitative): Number/percentage of Parties that have conducted gap-filling assessments at national level.	--	<i>To be assessed at MOP10</i>	N/A
Target 3.2: The status of, the threats to, and the effectiveness of	--	Indicator (qualitative): Traffic-light assessment of	--	<i>To be assessed at MOP10</i>	N/A

¹⁵ Square brackets indicate a tentative mean target score since additional time-bound indicators will be included at a later stage of the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

conservation measures implemented at flyway network sites are being assessed at flyway scale, using data provided by at least three-quarters of Contracting Parties.		protection and management status of network sites at individual site level and grouped by flyway and species (or species assemblage), where data permit.			
		Indicator (quantitative): Number/ percentage of Contracting Parties providing national-level data on site threats and effectiveness of conservation measures.	--	<i>To be assessed as of MOP9</i>	N/A
Target 3.3: At least two-thirds of all flyway network sites are actively protected and actively managed, focusing in particular on internationally important sites and those in transboundary areas.	2.3	Indicator (quantitative): The number/percentage of flyway network sites covered by national or international protected area designations.	3	Parties reported that 42% of flyway network sites are covered by national or international protected area designations.	Analysis of the AEWA National Reports for the triennium 2018-2020 (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.13)
		Indicator (quantitative): The number/percentage of flyway network sites for which actively	2	Parties reported that 20% of flyway network sites have actively implemented	Analysis of the AEWA National Reports for the triennium 2018-2020 (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.13)

		implemented management plans are in place.		management plans are in place.	
		Indicator (qualitative): Traffic-light assessment of effectiveness of conservation management measures.	2	8% of Parties reported high effectiveness across all conservation management measures at flyway network sites.	Analysis of the AEWA National Reports for the triennium 2018-2020 (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.13)
Target 3.4: The need to maintain the importance and integrity of AEWA flyway network sites is taken into account in planning and decision-making processes in all Contracting Parties.	2	Indicator (quantitative): Number/percentage of Parties confirming that the importance of AEWA flyway network sites is explicitly taken into account in water- and land-use planning and decision making.	2	20% of Parties reported that the importance of AEWA flyway network sites is explicitly taken into account in water- and land-use planning and decision-making.	Analysis of the AEWA National Reports for the triennium 2018-2020 (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.13)
Target 3.5: Legal or administrative measures are in place at national level – and being implemented effectively – to	(3) ¹⁶	Indicator (quantitative): Number of Parties that have adopted legal or administrative measures to avoid,	3	61% of Parties reported that they have adopted legal or administrative measures to avoid, mitigate and compensate for	Analysis of the AEWA National Reports for the triennium 2018-2020 (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.13)

¹⁶ Brackets indicate a mean target score based on incomplete quality and/or scope of the assessment or missing assessment of at least one of the target level indicators.

avoid, mitigate and compensate for adverse impacts of development activities and other pressures, including the impacts of climate change, on sites of national and international importance for migratory waterbirds in all Contracting Parties.	mitigate and compensate for adverse impact of development and other pressures on flyway network sites in general.		adverse impact of development and other pressures on flyway network sites.	
	Indicator (quantitative): Number of flyway network sites in the territory of each Party that are threatened with adverse impacts from development.	(3 ¹⁷) ¹⁸	Parties reported 35 flyway network sites that are threatened with adverse impacts from development.	Analysis of the AEWA National Reports for the triennium 2018-2020 (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.13); National reporting format should be strengthened with respect to sites under threat in order to collate information more systematically.
	Indicator (quantitative): Number of flyway sites where specific threats have been effectively avoided, mitigated or compensated.		Parties reported 46 flyway sites where specific threats have been effectively avoided, mitigated or compensated.	Analysis of the AEWA National Reports for the triennium 2018-2020 (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.13)
	Indicator (quantitative): Number of sites with known specific threats where no		Parties reported 16 sites with known specific threats where no effective avoidance,	Analysis of the AEWA National Reports for the triennium 2018-2020 (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.13)

¹⁷ These three indicators have been scored jointly. Of the reported 97 sites, in 47% (46 sites) specific threats have been effectively avoided, mitigated or compensated, while 36% (35 sites) are currently threatened with adverse impacts from development and 17% (16 sites) have not received effective avoidance, mitigation or compensation measures.

¹⁸ Brackets indicate a score based on incomplete assessment due to the quality and/or scope of the assessment.

		effective avoidance, mitigation or compensation measures have been implemented.		mitigation or compensation measures have been implemented.	
--	--	---	--	--	--

Objective 3 mean score: [(2.6)¹⁹]²⁰

¹⁹ Brackets indicate that the objective mean score is derived from mean target scores where at least one of them is based on incomplete quality and/or scope of the assessment or missing assessment of at least one of the target level indicators.

²⁰ Square brackets indicate the objective mean score is derived from mean target scores where at least one of them is tentative since additional time-bound indicators will be included at a later stage of the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

Objective 4: To ensure there is sufficient quantity and quality of habitat in the wider environment for achieving and maintaining favourable conservation status for migratory waterbird populations

Target description	Mean target score	Indicator description	Indicator score	Data & information summary	Means of verification and reference (the latter if available)
Target 4.1: Priorities for habitat conservation and management in the wider environment (as defined at the Objective level) are identified at Agreement level and corresponding actions are being implemented in at least half of Contracting Parties.	[1] ²¹	Indicator (interim): AEWA habitat conservation priorities agreed by MOP8.	1	The Agreement-level assessment of the status of principal waterbird habitats in the wider environment and the resulting action plan have not been compiled yet.	Report of the Technical Committee to the 8 th Session of the Meeting of the Parties (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.7). A joint costed project brief together with CMS and the Raptors MoU covering all bird taxa (apart from pelagic) in the African-Eurasian flyways was compiled in this triennium, but the implementation will require over 1 million Euros and at least 2 years.
		Indicator (quantitative): Number of Contracting Parties implementing the agreed action plan.	--	<i>To be assessed as of MOP9</i>	N/A
		Indicator (qualitative): Traffic-light assessment of level of implementation.	--	<i>To be assessed as of MOP9</i>	N/A
Target 4.2: At least half of the key international policy	--	Indicator (interim): Table indicating the key international	--	<i>To be assessed at MOP9</i>	N/A

²¹ Square brackets indicate a tentative mean target score since additional time-bound indicators will be included at a later stage of the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

mechanisms identified have made tangible progress towards integrating the waterbird habitat priorities and prescriptions of AEWA as they relate to the wider environment.		policy mechanism(s) to be targeted and the priorities to be promoted with each mechanism is established.			
		Indicator (qualitative): Traffic-light assessment, by MOP10, of progress made for each cell of the table.	--	<i>To be assessed at MOP10</i>	N/A
Target 4.3: National habitat conservation and management priorities have been identified and integrated into relevant sectoral policies of at least two-thirds of Contracting Parties.		Indicator (quantitative): Number of Parties reporting that national habitat conservation and management priorities have been identified.	--	<i>To be assessed as of MOP9</i>	N/A
	--	Indicator (quantitative): Number of Parties reporting that the identified national habitat conservation and management priorities have been integrated	--	<i>To be assessed at MOP10</i>	N/A

		across the relevant sectoral policies.			
		Indicator (quantitative): Number of Parties reporting significant measures to improve extent and quality of waterbird habitats in the wider environment.	--	<i>To be assessed at MOP10</i>	N/A
		Indicator (qualitative): traffic-light assessment, perhaps sub-regional, of progress made MOP8–MOP10.	--	<i>To be assessed at MOP10</i>	N/A
Target 4.4: At least three of the innovative, international multi-stakeholder partnerships result in the improved management, creation and/or restoration of waterbird habitats	--	Indicator (quantitative): Number of specific projects being implemented and/or have been completed.	--	<i>To be assessed as of MOP9</i>	N/A
		Indicator (qualitative): Traffic-light assessment of the impact of these projects on	--	<i>To be assessed at MOP9</i>	N/A

in the wider environment.		management, creation and/or restoration of waterbird habitats in the wider environment.			
---------------------------	--	---	--	--	--

Objective 4 mean score: [1]²²

²² Square brackets indicate the objective mean score is derived from mean target scores where at least one of them is tentative since additional time-bound indicators will be included at a later stage of the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

Objective 5: To ensure and strengthen the knowledge, capacity, recognition, awareness and resources required for the Agreement to achieve its conservation objectives

Target description	Mean target score	Indicator description	Indicator score	Data & information summary	Means of verification and reference (the latter if available)
Target 5.1: Key gaps in scientific and technical information, including population monitoring data, required for implementation of the Agreement have been identified and assessed and initiatives to fill all priority gaps have been completed or are in progress.	[5] ²³	Indicator (interim): Prioritised list of key information gaps established.	5	The Technical Committee compiled an overview of knowledge gaps and needs relevant for AEWA implementation with commentary on priority gaps and AEWA's role in filling those gaps.	Report of the Technical Committee to the 8 th Session of the Meeting of the Parties (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.7); Overview of knowledge gaps and needs relevant for AEWA implementation: priority needs in 2021 (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.30)
		Indicator (quantitative): Number of initiatives underway to fill priority gaps (per priority gap).	--	<i>To be assessed as of MOP9</i>	N/A
		Indicator (qualitative): Progress of initiatives tracked via traffic-light	--	<i>To be assessed as of MOP9</i>	N/A

²³ Square brackets indicate a tentative mean target score since additional time-bound indicators will be included at a later stage of the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

		assessment in relation to specified deliverables and timeframe.			
Target 5.2: The number of Contracting Parties has increased to at least 90.	(1.5) ²⁴	Indicator (quantitative): (a) Number of new Parties during period of Strategic Plan.	3	Since MOP7 five new Contracting Parties acceded to the Agreement to reach a total of 82 Parties at present.	Report of the Depository to the 8 th Session of the Meeting of the Parties (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.8)
		Indicator (quantitative): (b) Number of Parties per region/sub-region and percentage of theoretical total.	{*} ²⁵	Excluded	N/A
		Indicator (qualitative): Sub-regional traffic-light assessment of degree of progress made towards recruiting potential Parties that have still not yet joined.	0	Not assessed	N/A
Target 5.3: Initiatives are in place to address	[2.3] ²⁶	Indicator (quantitative): Number of	2	4% of Parties reported that they have identified and	Analysis of the AEWA National Reports for the triennium 2018-2020 (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.13)

²⁴ Brackets indicate a mean target score based on incomplete quality and/or scope of the assessment or missing assessment of at least one of the target level indicators.

²⁵ This indicator is not applied in assessing the progress towards reaching target 5.2 as it represents a regional pattern rather than measurement of the (progress towards reaching the targeted) global number of Parties.

²⁶ Square brackets indicate a tentative mean target score since additional time-bound indicators will be included at a later stage of the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

at least two-thirds of the priority capacity gaps restricting implementation of AEWA.		Contracting Parties that have identified and prioritised capacity gaps for implementation of the Agreement.		prioritised capacity gaps for implementation of the Agreement.	
		Indicator (quantitative): Number of Contracting Parties that have established national AEWA implementation coordination mechanisms.	3	35% of Parties reported that they have established national AEWA implementation coordination mechanisms.	Analysis of the AEWA National Reports for the triennium 2018-2020 (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.13)
		Indicator (qualitative): Traffic-light assessment, based on Parties' own review, of effectiveness of national AEWA implementation coordination mechanisms.	2	13% of Parties reported high effectiveness of their national AEWA implementation coordination mechanisms.	Analysis of the AEWA National Reports for the triennium 2018-2020 (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.13)
		Indicator (qualitative): Sub-regional traffic-light assessment of implementation capacity.	--	<i>To be assessed at MOP10</i>	N/A

<p>Target 5.4: Conservation of migratory waterbirds is integrated into national implementation policies and plans related to the SDGs, Aichi Targets / Post-2020 biodiversity framework, the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species and the Ramsar Strategic Plan in at least two-thirds of Contracting Parties and the contribution of AEWA to these global frameworks is recognised and supported.</p>	(1.5) ²⁷	<p>Indicator (quantitative): Number/percentage of Contracting Parties reporting inclusion of AEWA focal points in national processes relating to SDGs, Aichi Targets/Post 2020 biodiversity framework, SPMS and the Ramsar Strategic Plan.</p>	3	38% of Parties reported inclusion of AEWA focal points in national processes relating to SDGs, Aichi Targets/Post 2020 biodiversity framework and SPMS.	Analysis of the AEWA National Reports for the triennium 2018-2020 (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.13)
		<p>Indicator (qualitative): Traffic-light indicator of progress assessed by each Party.</p>	0	Not assessed	N/A
<p>Target 5.5: Conservation of migratory waterbirds is</p>	(4) ²⁸	<p>Indicator (quantitative): Number/percentage of Parties reporting</p>	(4) ²⁹	54% of Parties reported that migratory waterbird	Analysis of the AEWA National Reports for the triennium 2018-2020 (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.13); The post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework is not yet agreed and adopted,

²⁷ Brackets indicate a mean target score based on incomplete quality and/or scope of the assessment or missing assessment of at least one of the target level indicators.

²⁸ Brackets indicate a mean target score based on incomplete quality and/or scope of the assessment or missing assessment of at least one of the target level indicators.

²⁹ Brackets indicate a score based on incomplete assessment due to the quality and/or scope of the assessment.

integrated into the new generation of NBSAPs and/or similar national plans/policies by at least three-quarters of Contracting Parties.		that migratory waterbird conservation priorities are explicitly addressed in NBSAPs (or similar).		conservation priorities are explicitly addressed in NBSAPs and/or similar national plans/policies.	hence the new generation of NBSAPs is not yet available – this assessment reflects integration into the pre-2020 NBSAPs.
Target 5.6: The resources required for coordination and delivery of the Strategic Plan at international and national levels have been assessed as realistically as possible and corresponding resource mobilisation plans implemented.	[(2.3) ³⁰] ³¹	Indicator (interim): International-level resource requirements assessed and corresponding resource mobilisation plan produced.	5	The assessment of international-level resource requirements and corresponding resource mobilisation plan have been compiled by the Secretariat in consultation with the Standing and Technical Committees.	Resource needs for international coordination and delivery of the 2019–2027 AEWA Strategic Plan: assessment and resource mobilisation plan (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.43)
		Indicator (quantitative): Percentage of international-level resource requirement that has been	--	<i>To be assessed as of MOP9</i>	N/A

³⁰ Brackets indicate a mean target score based on incomplete quality and/or scope of the assessment or missing assessment of at least one of the target level indicators.

³¹ Square brackets indicate a tentative mean target score since additional time-bound indicators will be included at a later stage of the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

		successfully mobilised.			
		Indicator (quantitative): Number of Contracting Parties that have (i) assessed resource requirements at national level; and (ii) implemented resource mobilisation plans.	2	9% of Parties reported that they have assessed resource requirements at national level for the implementation of the Strategic Plan and 4% reported that they are implementing a resource mobilisation plan.	Analysis of the AEWA National Reports for the triennium 2018-2020 (Doc. AEWA/MOP 8.13)
		Indicator (qualitative): Traffic-light assessment (grouped regionally or sub-regionally) of progress made with resource mobilisation at national level.	0	Not assessed	N/A
Objective 5 mean score: [(2.8)³²]³³					

³² Brackets indicate that the objective mean score is derived from mean target scores where at least one of them is based on incomplete quality and/or scope of the assessment or missing assessment of at least one of the target level indicators.

³³ Square brackets indicate the objective mean score is derived from mean target scores where at least one of them is tentative since additional time-bound indicators will be included at a later stage of the implementation of the Strategic Plan.