

---

**MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING ON THE  
CONSERVATION OF SOUTHERN SOUTH AMERICAN  
MIGRATORY GRASSLAND BIRDS AND THEIR HABITATS**

**3<sup>rd</sup> meeting, Florianópolis (Brazil)**

*hybrid meeting format*

**2-3 December 2024**

---

UNEP/CMS/MOS3/Meeting Report

**Meeting Report**

*Document prepared by  
the Government of Brazil*

# Table of Contents

<b>1. Opening of the meeting and housekeeping remarks</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2. ELECTION OF OFFICERS: APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIR OF THE MEETING</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND MEETING SCHEDULE</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>4. REPORTS</b>	<b>8</b>
ARGENTINA	10
BOLIVIA	10
BRAZIL	10
PARAGUAY	11
URUGUAY	12
USA - USFWS	12
BIRDLIFE AMERICAS	13
ALIANZA DEL PASTIZAL IN ARGENTINA	14
ALIANZA DEL PASTIZAL IN URUGUAY	14
GUYRA PARAGUAY	14
ALIANZA DEL PASTIZAL IN BRAZIL	14
<b>5. REVIEW OF MOU ACTION PLAN IMPLEMENTATION – WORKSHOP FORMAT</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>6. FUTURE IMPLEMENTATION AND FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF THE MOU AND ACTION PLAN</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>OPENING OF SECOND DAY AND SETTING THE SCENE</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>POSSIBLE INCLUSION OF NEW SIGNATORIES TO THE MOU</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>7. COORDINATION OF THE MOU</b>	<b>27</b>
URUGUAY DESIGNATED THE NEXT MOU COORDINATOR	28
GROUP FOR UPDATING THE COORDINATION MECHANISM OF THE MOU	28
REVIEW AND RE-NOMINATION OF FOCAL POINTS	28
TRILATERAL NORTH AMERICAN GRASSLAND CONSERVATION INITIATIVES	28
<b>8. NEXT STEPS: FUNDRAISING; PLACE AND DATE OF THE NEXT MOU MEETING</b>	<b>29</b>
USFWS – FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES	30
BIRDLIFE – SOUTHERN CONE GRASSLANDS CONSERVATION INVESTMENT STRATEGY	30
<b>9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>10. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING</b>	<b>31</b>



## Goals of the meeting

1. The 3rd Meeting of the Signatories to the Memorandum of Understanding (MOS3) on the Conservation of Southern South American Migratory Grasslands Bird Species and their Habitats (MOU), hereafter Grasslands MOU, took place from 2 to 3 December 2024, in Florianópolis, Brazil, with both in-person and online participation. This meeting gathered representatives from the signatory countries, namely Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Paraguay, and Uruguay, as well as invited observers. The official languages of the meeting were Spanish and English.
2. The goals of the meeting were to report on the progress made in the implementation of the MOU by Signatories and Stakeholders, identify implementation gaps and threats to the species and habitats covered by the MOU, and discuss next steps to address these issues. Additionally, the meeting aimed to update the MOU Action Plan, explore fundraising opportunities to strengthen its implementation, and nominate the next MOU Coordinator.
3. This 3rd meeting builds upon the outcomes of the two previous MOU meetings, which were held in Asunción, Paraguay, in 2010, and Florianópolis, Brazil, in 2018. For details on the previous meetings, please check the [MOU website](#).

## **Day 1.**

### **Monday 02 December 2024**

#### **1. Opening of the meeting and housekeeping remarks**

4. The meeting was opened by Nadinni Oliveira de Matos Sousa (Coordinator at the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change of Brazil). She warmly welcomed all participants and expressed the country's excitement in hosting the meeting in Florianópolis. She highlighted that Brazil is thrilled to be the host of the 15th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS COP15), emphasizing the importance of this event in advancing discussions on key conservation topics, particularly the 3rd Meeting of the Grasslands MOU. Nadinni also mentioned that Brazil is home to grasslands across various biomes, with several endemic and endangered species that are under threat from multiple factors, including pollution, land conversion, and others. She stressed that conversations around the conservation of these species are crucial for raising awareness on these pressing environmental issues. She further emphasized that this meeting represents an opportunity to establish a roadmap leading up to COP15 to enhance the protection of these species. Nadinni concluded by thanking the CMS Secretariat for co-organizing the meeting with Brazil, as well as the Global Environment Facility (GEF), Manomet Conservation Sciences, the Chico Mendes Institute for Biodiversity Conservation (ICMBio), and her colleagues at the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change for their valuable contributions and support.
5. Iván Ramírez Paredes (Head of Avian Species Team, CMS Secretariat) welcomed the participants and expressed his gratitude to the Government of Brazil, particularly the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MMA) and ICMBio, for organizing and facilitating the meeting. He also extended his appreciation to Manomet Conservation Sciences and his colleagues at the CMS Secretariat for their contributions. He provided an overview of the Grasslands MOU, outlining its goals and history, and emphasized its role in guiding regional efforts for the conservation of migratory grasslands bird species and their habitats. He highlighted the importance of cooperation among countries to achieve the MOU's objectives and ensure effective conservation outcomes. Ramírez stated that the primary goal of the meeting was to update the MOU's work plan, ensuring that conservation actions remain relevant and aligned with current challenges. He also noted that, with the support of the Brazilian Government, the CMS Secretariat was hosting the meeting in a hybrid format, allowing some participants to attend online and ensuring broader participation. He formally opened the meeting and concluded his remarks by explaining the rules of participation.

#### **2. Election of officers: Appointment of the Chair of the meeting**

6. Mr. Iván Ramírez (CMS Secretariat) introduced this agenda and moderated the election of Chair for the meeting. He recalled that it was customary for the Chair to be nominated by the host country, with the Secretariats making a proposal accordingly. He then introduced Ms. Patrícia Pereira Serafini, who was elected by consensus as the Chair of the meeting. Ms. Serafini is an Environmental Analyst at the National Center for Research and Conservation of Wild Birds of Brazil (CEMAVE/ICMBio). She has extensive experience in the field and previously served as the coordinator of Brazil's action plan under the MOU for 10 years. The meeting elected by consensus Ms. Serafini to the position of Chair.
7. Ms. Patrícia Pereira Serafini (Environmental Analyst, CEMAVE/ICMBio), the newly elected Chair, extended a warm welcome to all participants. In her opening remarks, she underscored the importance of analyzing and evaluating the implementation of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and the ongoing efforts to protect migratory grasslands bird species and their habitats. She highlighted that the action plan adopted under the MOU served as a reference for the action plan developed in Brazil, whose creation began in 2011, also in Florianópolis. Ms. Serafini also stressed the importance of assessing the progress made in the implementation of the MOU and identifying ways to enhance the execution of the action plan moving forward.

### 3. Adoption of the agenda and meeting schedule

8. The Chair introduced the Provisional Agenda (UNEP/CMS/GRB/MOS3/Doc.3.a) and the Provisional Annotated Agenda and Meeting Schedule (UNEP/CMS/GRB/MOS3/Doc.3.b) noting it was a busy agenda. The meeting would be mostly conducted in plenary mode, but there would be breakout groups under Agenda item 5 on the review of the MOU Action Plan implementation.
9. The Annotated Agenda and Meeting Schedule were adopted without change.
10. All documents, including presentations, can be found on the [meeting's dedicated website](#). A list of the participants can be found in the Annex to this report.

### 4. Reports

#### 4.1 Report of the MOU Coordinator (Brazil)

11. The Chair introduced this agenda item.
12. Krishna Barros Bonavides (Environmental Analyst, Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change of Brazil), the MOU Coordinator, presented the Report of the MOU Coordinator (document UNEP/CMS/GRB/MOS3/Doc.4.1), providing an overview of the MOU's implementation and the key achievements made since the last meeting. Representing Brazil as the current Coordinating Signatory State, she emphasized the role of the Department of Conservation of Biodiversity (DCBio/MMA) in supporting the coordination efforts of the MOU.
13. In her presentation, Krishna reviewed significant meetings related to the MOU, starting with the First Meeting (MOS1), held in Asunción, Paraguay in 2010, where the International Action Plan was adopted. The Second Meeting (MOS2) took place in Florianópolis, Brazil, in 2018, where the status of the species covered by the MOU was reviewed, the MOU Action Plan was updated for the 2018-2023 cycle, and a coordination mechanism was established, along with a format for future national reports. This meeting also saw the inclusion of the Bobolink (*Dolichonyx oryzivorus*) and cooperation with organizations such as the Wetlands and Waterbird Species Network (WHSRN) and the Argentine Wildlife Foundation. Furthermore, a virtual meeting was held in 2020 to monitor the MOU Action Plan's progress.
14. Krishna highlighted the MOU's Action Plan, which focuses on the conservation of 11 priority bird species. The plan outlines 43 specific action points and five key objectives: habitat protection, grassland management, raising community awareness, developing public and private policies, and fostering international cooperation. The importance of these actions lies in the rich biodiversity of the region and the essential ecosystem services provided by the grasslands, which are under threat from habitat loss, invasive species, pollution, and unsustainable agricultural practices.
15. Among the achievements of the MOU, Krishna pointed to the expansion of protected areas, awareness campaigns on both illegal trade and the significance of the grasslands, an increase in research efforts, and strengthened collaboration among the signatory countries. Joint monitoring efforts, shared best practices, and the provision of financial and technical support were also significant milestones.
16. However, challenges remain, particularly in securing adequate funding and human resources, as well as coordination gaps between stakeholders. The impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic were also noted as a factor that affected the implementation of certain initiatives. Moving forward, Krishna stressed the need to strengthen action plans for the next MOU cycle, focusing on the sustainable management of grasslands and enhancing global partnerships to ensure long-term conservation of the species and their habitats.

#### 4.2 Reports from the Signatory States

17. The Chair introduced this topic, under which representatives from the Signatory States delivered presentations on the progress made in implementing the MOU, highlighting achievements, challenges, and opportunities to enhance regional cooperation. These presentations were based on their National Reports, which were submitted in accordance with the established guidelines outlined in document UNEP/CMS/GRB/MOS3/Doc.4.2, as well as any supporting information documents provided. Participants also discussed potential adjustments to the format and periodicity of the National Reports to improve consistency and the sharing of relevant information across Signatory States.
18. The Chair presented the Template for the Preparation of National Reports (UNEP/CMS/GRB/MOS3/Doc.4.2), which outlines the format and frequency of the national reports that signatory countries are expected to submit. She explained that the need to review this document arises from the fact that, during the first meeting of the Grasslands MOU, held in Asunción, Paraguay, in 2010, no standardized format was adopted for the preparation of national reports by signatory countries, nor was an agreed-upon submission frequency established. She noted that the document proposes that, moving forward, national reports should be prepared for each meeting of the signatory countries, following the format annexed to the document. The proposed format is based on the activities outlined in the Grasslands MOU Action Plan and its five objectives, ensuring that the reports can also serve as a tool to assess the level of implementation of the Action Plan. The document's recommended action requests that signatory countries review the reporting format, consider whether it is appropriate or requires modifications, and confirm the reporting frequency, with the proposal that national reports be submitted at each Meeting of Signatories. The Chair noted that the annexed format is straightforward and consists of 16 key points to be addressed in the national reports.
19. Iván Ramírez (CMS Secretariat) emphasized the importance of receiving feedback from countries, both signatories and observers, on how to improve the document UNEP/CMS/GRB/MOS3/Doc.4.2, given that the form was developed quite some time ago. He encouraged participants to share their input and suggestions on how the document could be enhanced to better support the national reporting process. He added that now is the time to adopt a more ambitious approach in compiling data and information.
20. Carmen Leizagoyen (Uruguay) noted that, perhaps due to the fact that four years have passed and many changes have occurred in the world during this period, she feels that an important aspect is missing from all these points: the "One Health" approach. She emphasized that this perspective is being overlooked and that its monitoring should be incorporated into the discussions. Paola Rossi (Chile) agreed with Carmen Leizagoyen (Uruguay) and mentioned that Chile has a One Health committee, which also incorporates an emergency response framework for wildfires. She expressed her support for this type of monitoring approach, emphasizing the importance of integrating it based on the One Health concept. Moreover, she suggested that a new section be included in the national report format to reflect the importance of the One Health approach. She emphasized that incorporating this aspect would enhance the monitoring process and provide a more comprehensive assessment of the health interconnections between humans, animals, and ecosystems.
21. Krishna Barros Bonavides (Brazil) mentioned that the national report format of the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP) includes a list of species, allowing countries to indicate their conservation status within their territories. She highlighted the importance of having a clear picture of the species' status in each report and suggested including the list of 11 species covered by the Grasslands MOU, along with their conservation status and data on the size of the monitored population, to track improvements over time.
22. Carla Fontana (Brazil) suggested simplifying the report by including a single section on "capacity building", encompassing training and educational activities for producers, researchers, the general society, and local communities.
23. Lúcia Rodríguez (BirdLife International) suggested adding a specific section on "Involvement of Civil Society and Local Populations" in the national reports. She noted that while many focus on capacity-building, it is also important to consider how different stakeholders can contribute to monitoring,

research, and managing various threats. She emphasized that this new section should address how civil society is being engaged across all aspects of the action plan in a cross-cutting manner, highlighting local knowledge and presence.

24. Natalie Dudinszky (BirdLife Americas) suggested adding a new section on invasive alien species in the national reports. She emphasized that these species pose a significant threat to migratory grassland birds and their habitats, and their impact should be systematically monitored and reported by the signatory countries.
25. The Chair stated that there were proposals for three new sections in the template for the preparation of national reports: one specifically on One Health, another on Involvement of Civil Society and Local Populations, and a third on Conversion and Invasion by Invasive Alien Species. Additionally, another suggestion was to merge points 8 and 14, both related to capacity building, into a single, general capacity-building section. The Chair informed that new suggestions would be accepted until 6:00 PM, and, the following day, the revised proposal incorporating the suggestions would be uploaded to the meeting website.

### ***Argentina***

26. Jorge Meriggi, from the National Directorate of Biodiversity in Argentina, presented the country's main achievements in various areas related to conservation, habitat management, research, education, and public engagement. He highlighted the establishment of critical conservation areas, including Cervo de los Pantanos National Park (2018), Ansenusa National Park (2022), and Campo San Juan Federal Park (2022).
27. Regarding habitat management outside protected areas, he emphasized the importance of public-private partnerships, such as the Grassland Beef Protocol and actions under Argentina's National Action Plan for Shorebird Conservation. The identification of Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) and Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas (IBAs) was also noted.
28. In research and monitoring, he highlighted the work of the Coastal Applied Ecology Center (CECOAL) on migratory movements and species demography, integrated into the National Action Plan for Shorebird Conservation. He also mentioned efforts to update online biodiversity information platforms like the Biodiversity Information System (BIS) and e-Bird.
29. Capacity-building initiatives have promoted sustainable grazing practices through collaborations with organizations like SSA, INTA, and Aves Argentinas. The Grassland Alliance Argentina now includes 180 cattle producers. Public outreach efforts include the Illegal Wildlife Trade Program and symposia on grassland birds and livestock management.
30. Meriggi also emphasized institutional strengthening through key projects like ARG/21/G28 and ARG/19/G24, focused on integrating biodiversity conservation into public policies and sustainable land management. Training activities for sustainable grazing and combating wildlife trafficking were also highlighted.
31. Finally, he outlined Argentina's international cooperation, including GEF-funded conservation projects, support from the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act (NMBCA), and partnerships within the Grassland Alliance Argentina, involving BirdLife International and organizations from Brazil, Paraguay, and Uruguay.

### ***Bolivia***

32. Bolivia did not present any information.

### ***Brazil***

33. Andrei Langeloh Roos, Environmental Analyst from the National Center for Wild Birds Conservation and Research (CEMAVE/ICMBIO), presented the action plan for the conservation of Southern Grassland Birds, which is part of the National Action Plans for the Conservation of Endangered Species in Brazil.
34. The first cycle, prepared in 2011 and effective in 2016, aimed at the conservation of 13 threatened species. However, the implementation of actions was low. The second cycle, prepared in 2017 and effective in 2022, expanded the focus to include 13 threatened species and 7 additional species, with a total of 51 action plans, 35% of which were completed, and 31% initiated. The final follow-up of the second cycle took place in December 2022.
35. The third cycle of the Southern Grassland Birds Action Plan was planned during a meeting held from November 6 to 19, 2023, in Florianópolis, Santa Catarina. The meeting involved 16 participants from 15 institutions, including researchers, technicians, civil society, public and private organizations. The plan includes 6 specific objectives and 34 conservation actions targeting 25 bird species, including three classified as Critically Endangered (CR), three as Endangered (EN), and 12 as Vulnerable (VU). Among these, four of these species are included in the SSAGB Memorandum of Understanding: Cock-tailed Tyrant (*Alectrurus tricolor*), Saffron-cowled Blackbird (*Xanthopsar flavus*), Dark-throated Seedeater (*Sporophila ruficollis*), and Marsh Seedeater (*Sporophila palustris*).

### Paraguay

36. Héctor Vera, Scientific Advisor from the National Museum of Natural History of Paraguay, presented the National Report on the progress of the implementation of the Grasslands MOU. Paraguay has protected 54,272 hectares across seven key sites, covering 8.5% of grasslands and 91.5% of complementary habitats. Incentives include 11,000 hectares of conservation areas via environmental services, carbon credits, private protected areas, and sustainable finance initiatives. Seven Protected Wilderness Areas have been consolidated with management plans and best practices.
37. He mentioned that research efforts include niche modeling for the Marsh Seedeater, carbon balance studies in grazing systems, and the establishment of a country advisory group. Paraguay has launched awareness campaigns, such as "Transchaco Rally" (2018–2023), "Cuidemos nuestro Chaco," and fishery bans, along with two fire prevention campaigns. A 2019 symposium focused on migratory species.
38. According to Vera, Public policies since 2013 have led to laws on conservation areas and environmental services, 11 grassland-related resolutions (2018–2023), and the Agroideal Project for sustainable beef production. Regulations address invasive species like wild boar and buffalo. A national strategy against illegal wildlife trade (2023–2033) and financial incentives for grassland certification have been implemented.
39. Internationally, as mentioned by Vera, Paraguay contributed 34 ISS and 302 eBird observations (2018–2023) and engaged in Mercosur's Working Subgroup No. 6 on invasive species, the environmental seal, and wildlife trafficking.
40. He also explained that challenges include poor habitat quality (64% of key sites), degradation from burning, agriculture, and overgrazing, and a lack of management plans for eight Protected Wilderness Areas. Scientific research is hindered by limited personnel, funding, and institutional collaboration. Awareness efforts need broader dissemination, and policies on invasive species require better prioritization and financial support. The illegal wildlife trade plan also needs funding for enforcement.
41. He further mentioned that monitoring faces difficulties due to insufficient data and funding. Paraguay's Fourth National Communication on Climate Change (2023) recognizes grasslands in its Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) commitments, but further efforts are needed

to strengthen conservation measures.

### *Uruguay*

42. Ms. Carmen Leizagoyen, Head of the Fauna Department at the Ministry of Environment of Uruguay, provided the national report on the implementation of the Grasslands MOU. The report highlights key conservation efforts, including the expansion of the National System of Protected Areas (SNAP), with 20 new or expanded areas since 2019, six of which host at least 10 migratory grassland bird species. A new regulation allows private properties meeting conservation criteria to be designated as Private Reserves.
43. She mentioned that Uruguay has implemented habitat management projects focused on sustainable land use and combating land degradation, including a 2017-2020 FAO-GEF initiative and the ongoing GEF URU/21/G31 project (2021-2026). The country also promotes ecotourism, such as avitourism in grasslands and restoration of natural fields using native forage species. Conservation efforts in livestock farming areas are being advanced through partnerships with local organizations.
44. According to her, Uruguay has conducted 16 research studies on migratory grassland birds and improved monitoring of wind farms' impact on wildlife. The country also monitors birds in SNAP's protected areas and collaborates with the Pastureland Alliance to integrate conservation with livestock farming. Training initiatives for producers and the public focus on biodiversity, sustainable livestock, and ecotourism.
45. She further explained that data management efforts include MAPBIOMAS Uruguay, which tracks land cover changes, and national biodiversity databases like SIBUy. The legal framework has been strengthened with new laws, including the 2020 establishment of the Ministry of Environment and recent regulations on invasive species, wildlife trafficking, and illegal hunting. Enforcement actions are carried out in collaboration with Interpol and local security forces. Institutional reforms have restructured the Ministry to enhance environmental governance, and training for law enforcement officials has been conducted to improve biodiversity protection.

### 4.3 Reports from Observer States

#### *USA - USFWS*

46. Dr. Eric Kershner, Chief of the Division of Bird Conservation, Permits, and Regulations at the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), highlights the agency's priorities in grassland conservation, with a focus on shared species conservation and collaborative efforts across the Americas. Grasslands have experienced the largest population declines of bird species in North America, underscoring the need for continental-scale habitat conservation strategies.
47. Two key shared species, the Bobolink (*Dolichonyx oryzivorus*) and the Buff-breasted Sandpiper (*Calidris subruficollis*), are central to these efforts. The Bobolink, listed as a species of concern by USFWS and other conservation groups such as Partners in Flight, is a critical focus due to its precarious status on the Road to Recovery Tipping Point. Conservation efforts for this species include significant work in the Central Grasslands, as well as expanding initiatives in the Midwest and eastern U.S.
48. The Buff-breasted Sandpiper is another priority species, with forthcoming research detailing its key stopover sites and movement patterns. Collaboration with the Southern Cone Grassland Alliance has been pivotal in developing successful grassland management practices. In Texas, efforts to promote "bird-friendly turf" are proving essential in preserving habitats within critical stopover areas.
49. Support under the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act has been instrumental in protecting these species. For the Bobolink, over 389,968 hectares have been conserved through projects spanning 28 countries, many in partnership with the Southern Cone Grasslands

Alliance. For the Buff-breasted Sandpiper, projects across 20 countries have safeguarded over 1.36 million hectares, including key sites like the Barba Azul Reserve in Bolivia. Support for the Asociación Armonía in Bolivia has enabled the management of 15,000 hectares of critical foraging habitat in the Beni plains. Additionally, initiatives like the Beni Eco-friendly Ranching Alliance educate local communities, including school children, and promote sustainable ranching practices that benefit both wildlife and livelihoods.

#### 4.3. Reports from Organizations

50. The chair opened the session by outlining its purpose: to provide a platform for representatives from key organizations to share updates on their efforts in grassland bird conservation across the Americas. The session aimed to highlight progress, challenges, and opportunities for collaboration among stakeholders committed to preserving grassland ecosystems and their avian species.
51. Representatives from Alianza Pastizal, in partnership with Aves Argentinas, Aves Uruguay, Guyra Paraguay, and SAVE Brasil, presented a comprehensive regional and national overview of their conservation initiatives. They detailed efforts to promote sustainable practices that support biodiversity while engaging local communities and landowners. Asociación Armonía shared updates on their work in the Llanos de Moxos region of Bolivia.

#### ***BirdLife Americas***

52. Dr. Natalie Dudinszky, Grasslands Program Manager for BirdLife Americas, emphasized the critical yet often overlooked role of grasslands in global conservation efforts. She highlighted major threats to Southern Hemisphere grasslands, including land-use changes from agriculture, afforestation, unsustainable grazing, urbanization, invasive species, poor fire management, and misconceptions about biodiversity and sustainability.
53. She identified key barriers to conservation, such as insufficient funding, weak public and governmental support, legal complexities, and a lack of coordination among NGOs and academia. Dr. Dudinszky presented the Regional Strategy, which promotes Nature-Based Solutions, sustainable grazing, stakeholder capacity building, habitat protection and restoration, and market incentives like certifications and carbon credits.
54. The Alianza Pastizal model, launched in 2006 by BirdLife and partners, was highlighted for its work in conserving grassland birds through biodiversity-friendly land management and long-term monitoring. South America's Pampas grasslands, covering 75 million hectares and home to over 550 bird species, have lost more than 60% of their original area, with less than 0.5% under protection.
55. Dr. Dudinszky showcased conservation efforts involving 814 producers managing 1.3 million hectares of privately owned grasslands, demonstrating the effectiveness of private landowner collaboration. She stressed the importance of regional cooperation, monitoring tools, and public policy development, citing initiatives like the Grassland Conservation Contribution Index and knowledge-sharing events with over 300 participants.
56. Market incentives, such as the Grassland Beef Certification Protocol and carbon projects utilizing AI and remote sensors, were also discussed. She concluded by underscoring the success of conservation efforts, with protected habitats for 290 bird species and long-term monitoring showing species-specific responses to grassland management, reinforcing the role of scientific research in ensuring ecosystem resilience.

***Alianza del Pastizal in Argentina***

57. The representative from Aves Argentinas highlighted the initiative's success, working with 208 producers managing 710,000 hectares, mostly privately owned natural grasslands. Well-managed livestock production was emphasized as crucial for conservation. The initiative has accessed premium markets, such as certified grassland beef and carbon credits, and integrates species-specific programs for ecosystem conservation. Aves Argentinas provides free technical materials to support producers and promote best practices. The initiative contributes to climate resilience and sustainability goals while engaging new generations in environmental stewardship.

***Alianza del Pastizal in Uruguay***

58. In her presentation, Daniela Schossler, Coordinator of the Alianza del Pastizal in Uruguay, highlighted the critical importance of Uruguay's 10 million hectares of grasslands, crucial for livestock and migratory birds but threatened by habitat loss, rural exodus, and lack of incentives. The Alianza del Pastizal initiative manages 160,000 hectares with 200 producers, though this remains less than 1% of the sector.
59. Between 2018 and 2024, the initiative expanded significantly, winning awards, exporting sustainable meat, and advancing conservation monitoring. Looking forward, Schossler emphasized the need for biodiversity credits, international funding, and producer support while addressing invasive species and improving infrastructure. She identified Basalto and central Uruguay as priority areas, aligning efforts with global conservation initiatives.

***Guyra Paraguay***

60. In his presentation, Pier Cacciali, from the Guyra Paraguay Species Conservation Program, highlighted the Alianza del Pastizal's impact in the country, collaborating with 25 producers to conserve 53,000 hectares of natural grasslands, benefiting seven IUCN-listed and five CMS species. He emphasized livestock production as a key conservation ally but noted challenges, including misinterpretation of sustainable practices and lack of legal recognition. Cacciali underscored the potential of sustainable livestock farming as a low-cost, low-risk nature-based solution eligible for carbon and biodiversity credits, improving local livelihoods and strengthening community ties to the land.

***Alianza del Pastizal in Brazil***

61. In his presentation, Eduardo Chiarani, Coordinator of Biodiversity for the Alianza del Pastizal in Brazil, provided an overview of the organization's work and achievements. The initiative encompasses 355 properties across 44 municipalities, covering 242,875 hectares, of which 177,619 hectares are natural grasslands. Bird monitoring is a key component, with surveys conducted on 88 properties since 2014, spanning 72,000 hectares and documenting 288 bird species. Of these, 85 species are grassland-dependent, and 21 of the 29 threatened or near-threatened species in Brazil's Pampa rely on these open habitats. Some properties have recorded up to 57 grassland bird species, underscoring the ecological significance of these landscapes.
62. Chiarani also introduced the "Alianza Mais" project, which integrates financial instruments to support producers in adopting sustainable practices. The initiative is backed by the Fonds Français pour L'Environnement Mondial (FFEM), which offers up to 20% of investment costs as incentives, and the Banco Regional de Desenvolvimento do Extremo Sul (BRDE), which provides credit lines with lower interest rates and extended grace periods. Alianza del Pastizal plays a critical role in assisting producers with loan applications and ensuring the integrity of

the financial process.

63. Despite these advancements, Chiarani highlighted key challenges. Maintaining producer engagement remains an ongoing effort, particularly in the face of competition from more lucrative agricultural activities, such as soybean cultivation. He stressed the necessity of sufficient financial incentives to ensure livestock farming remains a viable and sustainable alternative on native grasslands. Additionally, he pointed to legislative challenges, which could threaten conservation efforts and requires close attention to safeguard the long-term sustainability of these initiatives.

## 5. Review of MOU Action Plan implementation – Workshop format

64. The Chair opened the session with a review of the MOU Action Plan implementation, aimed at assessing progress and identifying areas for improvement. The discussions were framed around two main objectives: the assessment of the MOU implementation status and the identification of gaps and emerging threats that need to be addressed moving forward.

### 5.1 Assessment of the implementation of the MOU

65. The session reviewed the implementation of the MOU, including a monitoring spreadsheet and an implementation report that detailed progress, completed activities, and ongoing challenges. The goal was to update participants on the current status and ensure a shared understanding of achievements and obstacles.
66. Krishna Barros Bonavides (Brazil) presented the implementation report of the Grasslands MOU for the period from 2018 to 2024. In her presentation, she outlined the activities carried out during Brazil's coordination period, highlighting the progress made, challenges encountered, and future prospects for the conservation of Southern South American migratory grassland bird species and their habitats. She explained that the Grasslands MOU focuses on the conservation of 11 species, including *Calidris subruficollis* and *Numenius borealis*, through various initiatives such as awareness campaigns, scientific research, conservation programs, and national action plans. Bonavides emphasized the importance of the national reports submitted to MOS2 and MOS3, which provided updates on the results achieved and were supported by detailed monitoring spreadsheets tracking the progress of the action plan. She noted that the submission of national reports serves as a key mechanism for the implementation of the Grasslands MOU. She highlighted the main results achieved between 2018 and 2024, which included updating and monitoring the action plan, improving the conservation status of species, reducing threats—particularly those linked to agricultural impacts—and developing new research and innovation projects to enhance conservation strategies. She further mentioned progress in population and habitat monitoring, the consolidation of information on habitats and threats, and the protection of critical grassland areas through nature reserves and protected areas. She also stressed the importance of strengthening national legislation and institutions, implementing sustainable pasture management practices that foster the integration of local communities, and promoting best practices and certified meat production through the Alianza del Pastizal. Additionally, she underscored the value of exchanging information between experts and institutions from the signatory countries, capacity-building efforts, control measures, awareness campaigns, and international cooperation as key components of the Grasslands MOU's strategy. Regarding the evaluation of the action plan, Bonavides reported that 51% of the actions were progressing as planned, 37% were underway but faced implementation challenges, and 12% had not yet been initiated. She acknowledged that despite some implementation difficulties, most activities were advancing. Bonavides pointed out that pressures from land-use changes and the impacts of climate change remain significant challenges. However, she highlighted the collective efforts of the signatory countries as evidence of a strong commitment to long-term conservation. She concluded by noting that the report can be further supplemented by the Report on MoU Coordination (UNEP/CMS/GRB-MOS3/Doc.4.1), the National Reports, and the monitoring spreadsheets detailing the action plan's progress from MOS2 and MOS3.

67. Héctor Vera (Paraguay) presented an analysis of the gaps in the implementation of the Grasslands MOU between 2018 and 2023. He began by addressing issues related to habitats and ecosystem services. Regarding action A8, he highlighted the scarcity and lack of regularity of national meetings focused on grassland culture. For actions A9 and A10, he mentioned challenges related to the management of native seeds and forage plants, emphasizing the need for seed banks and other types of reserves, best management practices, and the incorporation of these measures within producer communities and government structures. On species, habitats, and ecosystem research, Vera identified several critical gaps. In relation to action A1, he mentioned the need for improved information, maps, and key areas (KA). For action A2, he pointed to gaps in the network of protected areas (ASP). He also highlighted the need for more data on seasonal migration and habitat use (A4) and for better understanding of species biology and demography (A5). Regarding action A6, he noted that the management of productive habitats is limited by a reduced number of scientific institutions, lack of scientific personnel, and insufficient incentives, training, and funding. Vera then discussed the alignment of public and private policies with the productive and social sectors. For action A5, he pointed out the need for improved regulation and oversight of buffer zones. For action A6, he noted concerns about the volume and scale of illegal trade. Regarding action A9, he mentioned the role of civil society and the National Action Plan. For action A10, he highlighted the potential of habitats for tourism and other uses. He noted that these efforts are hindered by the limited number of scientific institutions and personnel in government agencies, as well as a lack of incentives, training, and funding. On international cooperation under the Grasslands MOU, Vera highlighted the need for a North-South agreement (A2). He also stressed the importance of organizing workshops to improve methodologies for censuses and monitoring (A4). Regarding action A6, he mentioned the need to strengthen actions and protocols for protected areas and the National System of Protected Natural Areas (SINASIP). Finally, for action A7, he emphasized the importance of ensuring the financial viability of the MOU through a long-term business plan. Vera concluded by noting that the limited number of scientific institutions, personnel, and technical staff in government agencies, along with inadequate incentives, training, and funding, continue to pose significant challenges to the effective implementation of the MOU.
68. Participants highlighted several key points during the discussion regarding the implementation of the MoU. One key area of focus was the importance of addressing species that are particularly vulnerable due to climate change. It was emphasized that advancing common methodologies for monitoring these species is essential, not only for tracking their populations but also for guiding future actions to protect them. The need for consistent and standardized approaches to monitoring was seen as critical for ensuring the effectiveness of conservation efforts.
69. A participant further raised concerns about the challenges associated with making accurate estimates of species populations. The difficulty lies in determining the exact number of animals and species present in the wild, as many are elusive or not adequately tracked. It was noted that while data is being collected, it is not yet being translated into actionable information that could guide decision-making. The importance of transforming raw data into usable insights was underscored as a necessary step for improving conservation strategies.
70. Another point of discussion involved the need for clearer and more specific objectives in the action plan. It was suggested that by making the goals more precise, it would be easier to assign responsibilities and identify who will implement each part of the plan. This level of specificity would provide governments with clearer guidance and improve the effectiveness of their implementation efforts. This approach was seen as essential for ensuring that the objectives are not only understood but actively pursued by those responsible for their achievement.

## 5.2 Identification of implementation gaps, threat analysis and conclusions regarding priorities and next steps in implementation

71. The second part of the discussion addressed the identification of implementation gaps, threat analysis, and conclusions regarding priorities and next steps in the implementation. Participants were encouraged to reflect on the threats that had emerged since the MOU's initiation and

consider which of these required further attention.

72. Patrícia Serafini, as the Chair, presented an overview of the review of the implementation of the Grasslands MOU Action Plan. She began by outlining the general objective of the Action Plan, which is to improve the conservation status of migratory grassland bird species and their habitats in southern South America, including breeding, migration, and congregation areas. She then described the specific objectives of the Action Plan. The first objective is to promote the protection and sustainable management of grasslands that are important for migratory species and the ecosystem services they provide. The second objective focuses on developing and coordinating monitoring and research programs on the species covered by the MOU, as well as their habitats and grassland ecosystems. The third objective aims to raise awareness about the importance of natural grasslands and the threatened species they support. The fourth objective seeks to develop and strengthen public and private policies for the conservation of natural grasslands and to promote collaboration with the productive sector and civil society. The fifth objective is to strengthen international cooperation for the implementation of the Memorandum of Understanding. For each specific objective, Serafini presented a detailed description of the progress made on the corresponding actions, including the products delivered, the problems encountered, recommendations and observations, and the consideration of whether the action should continue in the updated Action Plan for the MOU. She emphasized that this presentation was based on inputs received from the Parties to the MOU.
73. Following this, the Chair, Patrícia Pereira Serafini, introduced the topic of Threat Analysis. She raised key questions for consideration: What new threats have emerged or need to be addressed? What are the current threats affecting the conservation of threatened grassland bird species, and where are they located? She referred to previous cycles and asked what has changed since then. Serafini listed several specific threats currently affecting grassland bird conservation. These include the conversion of native grasslands for agriculture (such as soybean, onion, and rice production) and forestry; the spread of Pinus species, which rapidly alter native grasslands by modifying the ecosystem through seed dispersal; and poorly managed livestock grazing, which, despite being beneficial, requires better management practices. She also noted the expansion of transmission line projects in the region, which are fragmenting conservation units (UCs) and important bird areas, as well as the growth of wind farm projects in the region. Additional threats highlighted by Serafini included the low representation of protected areas within grassland and weak legislation for grassland protection, such as the requirement for licenses for land conversion. She also mentioned the use of fire for native grassland management, the lack of public awareness about grassland bird species and their ecological importance, and the illegal capture of *Sporophila* and other grassland birds for illegal trade. Other threats include the use of acaricides and insecticides in cattle farming, which affects birds that feed on bovine ectoparasites, and the nest predation by feral pigs (*Sus scrofa*), which particularly affects ground-nesting birds.
74. Serafini then outlined the structure for the upcoming working session, which would be divided into two parts: Memory and Leadership. For the Memory exercise, participants would be split into five groups, each linked to one of the specific objectives of the Action Plan. Serafini explained that she would call out the names and corresponding numbers, and participants would need to remember their assigned number to join the correct group. In the Leadership exercise, the challenge for each group would be to select a leader responsible for presenting the group's results during the plenary session and coordinating the report by completing the information on the slide. The working groups were organized according to the five specific objectives of the Action Plan: (I) promoting the protection and sustainable management of grasslands important for migratory species and ecosystem services; (II) developing and coordinating monitoring and research programs on the species, their habitats, and grassland ecosystems; (III) raising awareness about the importance of natural grasslands and threatened species; (IV) strengthening public and private policies for the conservation of grasslands and promoting collaboration with the productive sector and civil society; and (V) enhancing international cooperation for the implementation of the MOU.

## **6. Future implementation and further development of the MOU and Action Plan**

75. The Chair introduced this topic, highlighting the next steps in revising and improving the MoU's effectiveness.

### **6.1 Update of the MOU Action Plan (break-out groups)**

76. The session was structured around break-out groups, each tasked with addressing specific objectives outlined in the MoU.
77. Krishna Barros Bonavides (Environmental Analyst, Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change of Brazil), the MOU Coordinator, with support from CMS, led the update and revision process, facilitating the discussions within the groups. These groups were expected to analyze the existing action plan, propose necessary revisions, and suggest improvements based on their expertise and the needs of the species under the MoU.
78. Once the break-out sessions concluded, the groups were to report back to the plenary with their draft revisions. The expected outcome of this session was a draft revised Action Plan, incorporating the feedback and proposals from each group. This step was seen as crucial in refining the MoU's approach and ensuring its continued relevance and impact moving forward.

## Day 2. 03 December 2024

### Opening of second day and setting the scene

79. Ms. Patrícia Serafini (Chair) and Mr. Ramírez (CMS Secretariat) welcomed everyone to Day 2 of the meeting.

#### 6.1 Update of the MOU Action Plan (reporting in plenary)

80. During the plenary reporting session, a representative from each break-out group presented their group's findings, revisions, and proposed improvements to the existing MoU Action Plan. Each representative shared the group's analysis, highlighting the key changes or additions suggested based on their discussions and expertise related to the species under the MoU.

##### 6.1.1. Group 1 Presentation

81. Group 1 was tasked with discussing Specific Objective 1: "Promote the protection and sustainable management of grasslands of importance for migratory species and the ecosystem services they provide."
82. *Action 1.1 - Compile available information on priority areas for the conservation of MoU bird species, seeking regional representativeness and complementarity.*

The group indicated that this is an ongoing action and suggested revising the action to: "Compile, update, and centralize available information on priority areas for the conservation of MoU bird species, seeking regional representativeness and complementarity."

Planned Product: Inventory of key sites.

Main Points Discussed: The inventory is highly outdated in many countries. Existing technologies in South America, including databases, could be utilized. It is important to define who will centralize this information (suggestions included CMS or identifying institutions capable of managing this process, potentially forming a compilation committee). Proposal to create an avifauna portal to centralize and make the information accessible.

Indicator to Measure Success: The availability of comprehensive information on key sites.

83. *Action 1.2 - Identify conservation and management mechanisms, including appropriate incentives for the conservation of migratory grassland birds in each country, at the subnational and regional levels.*

The group noted the following: The action is not clearly defined. Suggested including measurable conservation and management indicators.

Revised Action: "Identify and define conservation and management strategies, including appropriate incentives for the conservation of migratory grassland birds in each country, at the subnational and regional levels, to identify the most suitable and effective tools."

Planned Product: Portfolio of conservation and management strategies, including a list of widely available incentives in each country.

Indicator to Measure Success: Number of incentives listed.

84. *Action 1.3 - Ensure the protection of priority areas under appropriate conservation mechanisms for migratory grassland birds.*

The group suggested revising the action to: "Identify priority grassland areas for the conservation of migratory birds."

Planned Product: List of priority areas identified for the conservation of migratory birds. Compilation of CMS data, which should be available on the MoU website.

Indicators to Measure Success: Number of mechanisms implemented. Number of identified areas.

85. *Action 1.4 - Identify protected areas that lack management plans addressing the needs of migratory grassland birds or that require updates to include those needs and the ecosystem services provided by the areas.*

The group recommended maintaining this action as part of the updated MoU Action Plan.

Planned Product: List of areas requiring management plans or updates, including the needs of migratory grassland birds. A CMS database containing protected areas and their management plans focused on migratory grassland bird species and ecosystem services.

Indicator to Measure Success: Number of protected areas with updated management plans addressing the needs of migratory species and ecosystem services.

86. *Action 1.5 - Develop and update the management plans of protected areas to include the needs of migratory grassland birds and the ecosystem services provided by those areas.*

The group proposed revising the action to: "Include the needs of migratory grassland birds in the management plans of protected areas in native grassland areas."

Planned Product: Database of countries with protected area management plans that have been developed or updated to address the needs of migratory grassland birds.

Indicator to Measure Success: Number of protected areas whose management plans reflect the needs of migratory grassland birds and ecosystem services. Use of a Grassland Conservation Index for protected areas.

87. *Action 1.6/1.7 - Promote, develop, and strengthen best management practices (BMP) for migratory grassland bird habitats.*

Planned Products: E-book on Best Practices for migratory grassland birds in the Southern Cone. Compilation, documentation, and publication of information by CMS for the COP. Training for technicians and communicators on BMP. Creation of a Committee for publication. Promotion of the sustainable production agenda.

Indicators to Measure Success: Number of BMPs documented and published. Number of technicians and communicators trained.

88. *Action 1.8 - Promotion of the typical grassland culture as a mechanism to support the conservation of migratory grassland birds.*

Revised Action: "Promote typical grassland cultures as a mechanism to support the conservation of migratory grassland birds."

Planned Products: Chapter in the e-book "Grassland Cultures" from Action 1.7, with an overlay map of migratory bird areas and associated cultures. Producer and rancher meetings at grassland cultural events (e.g., Alianza del Pastizal Meetings).

Indicator to Measure Success: Number of cultural events focused on migratory bird conservation.

89. *Action 1.9/1.10 - Promote the use of native seeds and forage plants in grazing systems.*

Revised Action: "Develop techniques for using native seeds and forage plants in grazing systems to restore degraded areas."

Planned Products: Compilation of information in the e-book (Action 1.7) on best management practices and the use of native seeds and forage plants. Creation of a network of native grassland seed banks.

Indicators to Measure Success: Number of grazing systems using native seeds and forage plants. Number of native seed banks established.

#### 6.1.2. Group 2 Presentation

90. Group 2 was tasked with discussing Specific Objective 2: "Develop and coordinate monitoring and research programs for the species covered by the MoU, their habitats, and grassland ecosystems."

91. Action 2.1 - Facilitate access to existing information and improve distribution maps and key areas for the species covered by the MoU in each Signatory State.

Planned Product: Distribution maps and key areas produced, and the existing information is widely available to the Signatory States.

92. Action 2.2 - Analysis of gaps in the representativeness (GAP) in the system of protected areas in the region.

Planned Product: A map of the representativeness gaps analysis produced.

93. Action 2.3 - Conduct niche modeling studies in important areas for the conservation of the species under the MoU.

Planned Product: Scientific articles published.

94. Action 2.4 - Increase knowledge about seasonal movements and habitat needs of the species.

Planned Product: Scientific articles published.

95. Action 2.5 - Improve knowledge of the biology and demography of the species covered by the MoU.

Planned Product: Scientific articles published.

96. Action 2.6 - Conduct studies on the effectiveness of different management techniques (fire, rest, livestock load, afforestation, agriculture) for the conservation of species under the MoU and increased production.

Planned Product: Scientific articles published.

97. Action 2.7 Disseminate existing information and promote new studies on the carbon balance in natural grasslands under livestock management systems.

Planned Product: Studies implemented and information disseminated.

98. Action 2.8 - Create a group of scientists to advise on decisions under the MoU (Grassland Birds Study Group).

Planned Product: The group is established.

99. Action 2.9 - Develop studies on the control of the invasive exotic grass species *Eragrostis plana*.

Planned Product: Studies conducted.

100. Action 2.10 - Investigate the importance of roadside verges along highways and rural roads for the conservation of native grasslands.

Planned Product: A package of information on best management practices for roadside verges, rural roads, and transmission lines for the conservation of grassland migratory birds and the implementation of native grassland conservation measures in roadside verges.

### 6.1.3. Group 3 Presentation

101. Group 3 was responsible for discussing Specific Objective 3: “Raise awareness about the importance of natural grasslands and threatened species.”

102. Action 3.1 - Develop educational campaigns to discourage the illegal trade of bird species covered by the MoU.

The group suggested revising the action to: “Develop and implement communication strategies for grassland conservation (with clear definition of objectives) targeting the landowners and managers, decision-makers, businesses, financial institutions, local communities and general public.”

Planned Product: Educational campaigns developed.

103. Action 3.2 - Implement educational campaigns to discourage the illegal trade of species covered by the MoU.

The group suggested revising the action to: “Disseminate guidance on evidence-based interventions for sustainable (bird-friendly) grassland management to practitioners, including through and agricultural sector meetings.”

Planned Product: Educational campaigns implemented.

104. Action 3.3 - Develop a communication strategy for the conservation of grasslands aimed at the general public, decision-makers, markets, and financial institutions.

The group suggested revising the action to: “Promote the connectivity of grasslands through migratory species during the International Year of Rangelands in 2026.”

Planned Product: Strategy developed.

105. Action 3.4 - Implement a communication strategy for the conservation of grasslands aimed at the general public, decision-makers, markets, and financial institutions.

The group suggested revising the action to: “Develop and implement educational campaigns to discourage the illegal trade in grassland songbirds species.”

Planned Product: Strategy implemented.

106. Action 3.5 - Promote the organization of symposia on grassland birds at national and international ornithology meetings and agricultural sector gatherings.

Planned Product: Events promoted.

107. Group 3 was also responsible for discussing Specific Objective 5: “Strengthen international cooperation for the implementation of the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU).”

108. Action 5.1 - Promote the use of interactive systems to share and systematize monitoring information on migratory grassland species.

The group suggested revising the action to: “Promote the coordinated use of a standard grassland health index, such as the Grassland Conservation Index (ICP) for monitoring and evaluation of actions under the MoU across all signatories.”

Planned Product: Data entered into the ISS (International Shorebird Survey) system and eBird.

109. *Action 5.2 - Strengthen the implementation of north-south conservation agreements for the conservation of grassland birds.*

The group suggested revising the action to: “Strengthen cooperation and the exchange of experiences between regional bird initiatives (such as Trilateral Loi) and the MoU.”

Planned Product: Implemented agreements.

110. *Action 5.3 - Promote the interface between the MoU and the Mercosur SGT6 group for issues related to the conservation of grassland birds.*

The group suggested revising the action to: “Develop tools and instruments to facilitate implementation of coordinated north-south actions.”

Planned Product: MoU incorporated into the SGT6 meeting agenda.

111. *Action 5.4 - Organize a technical-scientific workshop to develop a methodology for the census and monitoring of MoU birds at the international level.*

Planned Product: Technical-scientific workshop organized.

112. *Action 5.5 - Explore the potential of grasslands in the context of Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs).*

The group suggested revising the action to: “Explore the potential of rangelands to Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs), National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) and Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN).”

Planned Product: Contributions explored in NDCs.

113. *Action 5.6 - Coordinate common actions and management protocols for protected areas through the Red Parques network.*

The group suggested revising the action to: “Coordinate common actions and management protocols for protected areas through national focal points for Red Parques.”

Planned Product: Meetings held.

114. *Action 5.7 - Ensure the long-term financial viability of the MoU through the development of a business plan.*

The group suggested revising the action to: “Support the long-term financial viability of the MoU by adopting a business plan approach.”

Planned Product: Business plan developed.

115. Mr. Iván Ramírez (CMS Secretariat) emphasized that while it is important for the MoU Action Plan to contribute to the objectives of other conventions, it is crucial not to overlook the Samarkand Strategic Plan for Migratory Species (2024–2032), which was adopted in February 2024 as the strategic framework of CMS. He highlighted that aligning the MoU with the objectives of the Samarkand Strategic Plan is beneficial for avoiding double-reporting and unnecessary overlaps in conservation efforts. If the species covered by the MoU contribute to the targets of the Samarkand

Strategic Plan, governments can justify that swift action under the MoU will also advance the achievement of the strategic plan's indicators. Therefore, it is important to explicitly reference the Samarkand Strategic Plan when designing and implementing the MoU Action Plan, ensuring that both frameworks reinforce each other and contribute to more efficient and coordinated conservation outcomes.

#### 6.1.4. Group 4 Presentation

116. Group 4 focused on Specific Objective 4: "Develop and strengthen public and private policies for the conservation of natural grasslands and promote collaboration with the productive sector and civil society."

117. *Action 4.1 - Develop and apply legislative measures for the conservation of grasslands in unprotected areas.*

Planned Product: Developed regulations.

118. *Action 4.2 - Develop, update, and apply planning instruments in grassland regions.*

Planned Product: Developed or updated maps.

119. *Action 4.3 - Develop and apply regulations on invasive species in grassland regions (wild boar, pine, eucalyptus, forages, etc.).*

The group suggested revising the action to: "Develop and apply regulations on invasive species in grassland regions (wild boar, pine, eucalyptus, forages, etc), including road and pathway edges (shoulders, right-of-way strips)."

Planned Product: Established regulations for countries.

120. *Action 4.4 - Develop and apply enforcement programs to prevent the illegal capture and trade of species covered by the MoU.*

The group suggested revising the action to: "Increase surveillance through the development and implementation of enforcement and monitoring programs for the capture and illegal trade of species covered by the MoU."

Planned Product: Developed and implemented enforcement programs.

121. *Action 4.5 - Promote, regulate, and oversee the use of road and trail edges (road verges, right-of-way) to maintain natural grasslands in areas important for species under the MoU.*

Planned Product: Monitored road verges.

122. *Action 4.6 - Increase surveillance and monitor the scale and geographical extent of the illegal capture and trade of grassland species.*

Planned Product: Surveillance and monitoring reports.

123. *Action 4.7 - Build dialogue and collaborate with the productive sector for grassland conservation.*

The group suggested revising the action to: "Develop and implement Communication Plans based on social diagnosis, analysis, and stakeholder mapping (productive sector, civil society, among others)."

Planned Product: Workshops and meetings with the productive sector for discussion at working tables.

124. *Action 4.8 - Develop and implement financial incentives for grassland conservation, such as credit lines for good practices, environmental services, ecological products, and environmental certification.*

Planned Product: Developed and implemented financial incentive models.

125. *Action 4.9 - Promote collaboration with civil society through the joint implementation of national action plans.*

The group suggested revising the action to: “Promote the integration of the MoU into National Action Plans, involving civil society and other stakeholders in their implementation.”

Planned Product: Developed action plans.

126. *Action 4.10 - Explore the potential of grasslands for tourism, ornamental plants, and other uses.*

The group suggested revising the action to: “Explore the potential of grasslands for tourism, ornamental plants, and other uses for grassland conservation.”

Planned Product: Diagnostic for the MoU region.

#### 6.1.5. Group 5 Presentation

127. The group presenting online shared a series of recommendations and proposed updates to improve the action plan under the Grasslands MOU. The presentation focused on enhancing the plan's clarity, effectiveness, and implementation through more specific and measurable actions.
128. First, it was recommended to define the objectives more clearly and transform them into SMART objectives — specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound. Objectives should clearly define what is to be achieved, include indicators to measure progress, ensure they are realistic within available resources, align with overall priorities and context, and set deadlines for completion. The group stressed that the proposed actions need more specificity and concrete steps, with a clear assignment of responsibility to ensure accountability and avoid vague goals. It was highlighted that specifying which entity or government body will carry out each action is essential to increase commitment to implementation.
129. The expected results should also include deadlines and measurable indicators. For example, instead of stating "Published regulations," a more concrete target would be "At least one law regulating the sustainable management of grasslands in each country by 2029." Additionally, the group suggested appointing more than one focal point per country to improve coordination and implementation. Establishing a working group per country would help map key stakeholders and facilitate implementation, with at least one annual meeting — even if virtual — to monitor progress and improve coordination.
130. Given the importance of a five-year action plan, it was recommended to establish these working groups and organize virtual workshops to define more concrete and SMART actions. A virtual pre-CMS meeting was also suggested to allow better preparation for the official meeting and ensure alignment on key priorities. The group emphasized the need for governments to engage with BirdLife partners to facilitate the implementation of actions and proposed the creation of a BirdLife action plan monitoring committee to strengthen coordination with governments.
131. Since the MoU is not legally binding, the group raised concerns about how to increase government commitment to implementation. They suggested strategies to align the MoU with national legislation and explore options to make it more binding, similar to the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP). It was also recommended to include the socioeconomic factor in the sustainability framework to align conservation efforts with the interests of governments. A lack of public incentives was identified as a limiting factor, and it was suggested that governments should work to address this gap through policy adjustments and financial incentives.
132. Regarding the specific objectives, the group proposed that by 2029, the signatory countries should recognize the value of grasslands in terms of biodiversity, ecosystem services, and climate resilience. They should commit to developing at least one mechanism to promote the protection and sustainable management of grasslands of importance to migratory species and the ecosystem services they provide. For research and monitoring, they proposed that by 2029, the signatory countries should

- include in their national plans the prioritization, facilitation, and financing of state institutions and research programs focused on monitoring species under the MoU, their habitats, and grassland ecosystems. Suggested actions included the development of harmonized bird monitoring programs to contribute to an international grassland bird index and conducting studies to evaluate the effectiveness of different management practices.
133. On education and communication, the group proposed that by 2029, the signatory countries should commit to facilitating communication efforts aligned with the messages of the MoU regarding the value and need for the conservation of South American grasslands. They suggested new activities focused on raising awareness, particularly at primary and elementary school levels.
134. For public and private policies, the group suggested that by 2029, the signatory countries should commit to outlining an incentive plan and reviewing existing legislation to facilitate good management practices and conservation of natural grasslands while promoting collaboration with the productive sector and civil society. Finally, regarding sustainability and international cooperation, the group proposed that by 2029, the signatory countries should commit to allocating resources to strengthen international cooperation for the implementation of the MoU, including through financial support from institutions such as the CAF, GEF, and IDB. They also suggested identifying international funding sources and incentives to support the implementation of the MoU, creating a platform or database to centralize scientific data and policy instruments related to the action plan, and facilitating the sharing of key information with governments to support the development of legislation and public policies.
135. **ACTION AGREED:**
- Brazil proposed holding a virtual meeting at a later date to finalize the conversations and complete the review process. While the review had begun during the session, it was clear that further discussions were necessary to refine and finalize the Action Plan.
  - Participants emphasized the importance of organizing an "intersectional" monitoring meeting before the five-year mark (for the 2025-2030 plan). Regarding the order of implementation, it was suggested that research should take priority, followed by monitoring activities.
  - To ensure timely progress, specific deadlines were set: the deadline for submitting final revisions was set for January 15, and the deadline for comments was set for February 15.
  - These deadlines aimed to keep the process on track and ensure that the revisions were comprehensive and reflective of all participants' input.

## 6.2 Potential extension of the MOU

136. The Chair introduced the next topic, 6.2, which focused on the potential extension of the MoU.
137. Dr. Rob P. Clay, the COP-appointed Councillor for Birds, presented a document that addresses the potential species for inclusion under the MoU. Dr. Clay outlined the context and recommendations based on various resolutions and analyses of migratory bird species.
138. The discussion focused on two main aspects: the inclusion of new species under the MoU and the potential expansion of the MoU to include additional countries that host grassland habitats and migratory birds associated with these ecosystems. Dr. Clay explained the feasibility of adding new species to the MoU, considering the evolving conservation needs and the importance of addressing threats to migratory grassland bird species that may not yet be covered under the current framework.
139. Dr. Clay also highlighted that Appendix II of CMS includes families and genera of birds that have been aggregated for listing purposes. A significant analysis was conducted to determine which species within these families have a considerable proportion of individuals that cyclically and predictably cross national boundaries and have an unfavorable conservation status. Resolution 14.19 provides guidance on the treatment of species within these aggregated families listed under Appendix II, requesting that the Scientific Council maintain a list of such species and provide advice to Parties. Parties are encouraged to consider this list when preparing National Reports. Resolution 14.20, on the other hand, identifies additional species that cross national boundaries and have an unfavorable conservation status but are not yet included in the CMS appendices. Dr. Clay noted that the COP had invited stakeholders to collaborate on developing listing proposals, Concerted Actions, and other conservation efforts for these species.
140. Dr. Clay also mentioned that the document takes into account the most recent update to the IUCN Global Red List, published in October 2024, when analyzing potential species for inclusion under the MoU. Shorebird species that have an unfavorable conservation status but are not yet globally threatened or Near Threatened according to the IUCN Global Red List have also been included in the analysis.

141. **ACTION AGREED:**
- Creating a working group for reviewing the species lists presented in the tables of the document. These lists are divided into two categories: Table 1 includes species already listed in CMS Appendix II, which could be directly included in the MoU. Table 2 includes species that are not listed and would require the development of proposals to amend the CMS Appendices. These proposals would be reviewed by the CMS Scientific Council and potentially submitted to CMS COP15 for consideration.
  - A Group for the Inclusion of New Species was created to focus on the potential inclusion of new species under the MoU. The group consists of the following participants: Andrei Ross (Brazil), Carla Fontana (UFSM), Héctor Vera (Paraguay), Jorge Meriggi (Argentina), Krishna Bonavides (Brazil), Laura Dodyk (Aves Argentinas), Paola Rossi (Chile), Rob Clay (Manomet), and Tjalle Boorsma (Director of Conservation Programs, Armonía). The group's objective is to review and evaluate potential species for inclusion in the MoU, with the aim of having a first draft completed by March 2025.
142. Iván Ramírez (CMS Secretariat) informed that the deadline for submitting documents with scientific components for the COP will be around the end of October 2025, precisely because they will need to be reviewed by the Scientific Council, which is expected to meet around that time. He noted that it would be ideal for the documents to be submitted around the summer period in the Northern Hemisphere, considering the need for translation. On the other hand, documents related to the Grasslands MoU have more flexibility, as the MoU follows its own schedule of activities.

#### *Possible inclusion of new signatories to the MoU*

143. The strategy for the inclusion of new signatories was discussed during the session. Dr. Clay explored the possibility of extending the MoU to other countries that share these vital habitats, recognizing that grassland ecosystems often span multiple national borders and require coordinated international efforts for effective conservation. He also recommended exploring the possibility of involving Colombia and Venezuela in the MoU.
144. Chile expressed interest in exploring the possibility of joining the MoU, highlighting that there are bird species in the Andes and Patagonia that are among the most threatened. They view this as an essential step.
145. Iván Ramírez (CMS Secretariat) acknowledged Chile's interest and indicated that, from the Secretariat's perspective, this would be a welcome development. He suggested that a formal presentation could take place at the next COP, where a simple process would be followed. This would involve sending an official letter to the Secretariat, outlining the benefits of joining and the issues that the country believes the MoU could address. He also mentioned the potential for including a species in the MoU.
146. Paraguay emphasized the importance of considering the scope of the MoU and noted that they had identified species not currently covered by the MoU, suggesting it would be worthwhile to include these.
147. Iván Ramírez (CMS Secretariat) also clarified that it is not necessary to be a member of CMS to join the MoU.

#### **7. Coordination of the MOU**

148. The Chair introduced the topic of coordination for the MOU, focusing on the nomination or update of MOU focal points in each signatory state and opportunities for cooperation in the conservation of grassland birds. The discussion also highlighted links with other grassland bird initiatives across the Americas.
149. Iván Ramírez (CMS Secretariat) presented a document addressing the Coordination Mechanism of the Grassland Birds MoU. He recalled that the first Meeting of the Signatories (MoS) of the MoU took place in Asunción, Paraguay, on 14 December 2010. During that meeting, it was agreed that Guyra Paraguay and BirdLife International would provide interim coordination services for the MoU until the next MoS, within the framework of the Grassland Alliance Program. This coordination was intended to support the Secretariat and the Signatory States in matters related to the implementation of the MoU. However, this coordination mechanism was never fully operational due to a lack of financial resources. He also highlighted that the second MoS of the MoU was held in Florianópolis,

Brazil, on 24–25 July 2018. During that meeting, it was agreed that the host country of the MoS would assume the role of coordinator until the next meeting. However, due to unforeseen circumstances, the proposed timeline outlined in that document has not been followed. Therefore, a revised version of the coordination mechanism may be necessary to ensure the MoU's effective implementation going forward. He concluded by presenting the recommended action outlined in the document, which called on the Signatory States of the MoU to review and approve an updated version of the Coordination Mechanism, as detailed in the annex to the document.

### *Uruguay Designated the next MOU Coordinator*

150. Uruguay accepted the proposal to take on the role of coordinator for the next period, noting that it would need support from Brazil for the coordination handover and suggested that this could be done between January and February. Brazil expressed gratitude and assured Uruguay that it would be available for any assistance needed during the transition process.
151. Iván Ramírez (CMS Secretariat) thanked Brazil for its work and emphasized the importance of creating working groups to update the Coordination Mechanism. He mentioned that there are many examples of other mechanisms available on the CMS website, which could serve as guidance in updating the MOU's coordination structure. For instance, it would be important to define roles and responsibilities within the mechanism, as well as decide on the frequency of annual meetings. He proposed creating a document with track changes and setting a deadline for completing the update.

### *Group for Updating the Coordination Mechanism of the MoU*

#### 152. ACTION AGREED:

- The "Group for Updating the Coordination Mechanism of the MoU" was created with the following members from the respective countries and institutions: Carmen Leizagoyen (Uruguay), Daniela Schossler (Aves Uruguay), Iván Ramírez (CMS Secretariat), Krishna Bonavides (Brazil), Natalie Dudinszky (BirdLife International), Patrícia Serafini (Brazil), and Paola Rossi (Chile).

### *Review and re-nomination of focal points*

#### 153. ACTION AGREED:

- It was agreed that the review and re-nomination of focal points by the signatory states would proceed as follows: Argentina: Jorge Meriggi; Brazil: Krishna Bonavides (Focal Point) and Andrei Ross (Alternate); Bolivia: no participants yet, and the country will confirm its nominations; Paraguay: Dario Mandelburger (Focal Point) and Héctor Vera (Scientific Advisor); Uruguay: the Focal Point is under review, and consultations with authorities are ongoing.

### *Trilateral North American Grassland Conservation Initiatives*

154. The Chair opened the floor for the next presentation. The Trilateral North American Grassland Conservation Initiatives were presented by Jo Anna Lutmerding, a biologist from the Branch of Bird Conservation at the US Fish and Wildlife Service. These initiatives, which focus on grassland conservation across the United States, Mexico, and Canada, are part of the Migratory Bird Joint Ventures (JVs). The JVs were established under the North American Waterfowl Management Plan in 1986 and aim to conserve habitat for birds, wildlife, and people. The JVs have expanded to include 23 habitat-based JVs and 3 species-based JVs, covering nearly all of the U.S. and Canada, and much of Mexico. These collaborative, regional partnerships have been successful for over 30 years, leveraging both public and private resources to address conservation needs and achieve national and international goals.
155. Key partnerships within the Trilateral framework include the Central Grasslands Roadmap, which brought together over 600 people through virtual and in-person summits to develop a roadmap for grassland conservation (<https://grasslandsroadmap.org>). Another significant partnership is the JV8 Grassland Initiative, which unites eight joint ventures from southern Canada to northern Mexico in developing a strategy to improve grassland conservation (<https://jv8.org>). The North America Intergovernmental Committee on Cooperation for Wilderness and Protected Areas Conservation (NAWPA) also plays a vital role in fostering cross-border conservation efforts

- (<https://nawpaccommittee.org>).
156. Additionally, the CEC Grasslands Initiative (2022–2024) aims to improve the standardization of grassland inventories, measure grassland loss, integrate social science into conservation efforts, and increase the participation of underrepresented groups (<http://cec.org/grasslands-conservation-and-migratory-birds>). The Buffalo Treaty has seen forty First Nations signatories commit to rematriating bison to the Great Plains and beyond, emphasizing the importance of this keystone species in grassland ecosystems (<https://buffalotreaty.com>).
  157. Trilateral Grassland Conservation emphasizes engagement with sovereign tribes and Indigenous peoples, fostering collaboration and investments in initiatives such as the Sustainable Grazing Network, Conservation Investment Strategy for the Chihuahuan Desert Grasslands, and the Buffalo Nations Grasslands Alliance. These initiatives aim to promote co-stewardship with Indigenous peoples and integrate their knowledge into conservation practices.
  158. In 2024, an Implementation Plan will be developed, with a focus on grassland conservation, co-stewardship, and climate change adaptation. This plan, which will be discussed at the 2025 Trilateral plenary, will ensure that data sharing fully incorporates Indigenous concerns and policies. These efforts aim to enhance long-term sustainability and strengthen collaborative conservation practices for grassland ecosystems.

## 8. Next steps: Fundraising; place and date of the next MOU meeting

159. The next topic introduced by the Chair was 8.0 Next steps: Fundraising; place and date of the next MOU meeting. This item covered the next steps for the MoU, including fundraising efforts and determining the location and date of the next MoU meeting.

### 8.1 Fundraising opportunities

160. Discussions were held on recommendations and future steps for securing funding for grassland bird conservation initiatives. Key points included exploring funding opportunities in the context of regional (trade) agreements, with a particular focus on certification initiatives.
161. Presentations included: USFWS (United States Fish and Wildlife Service) provided an overview of various funding opportunities for supporting grassland conservation, highlighting both governmental and private sector sources; BirdLife presented on the Southern Cone Grasslands Conservation Investment Strategy, outlining opportunities for funding regional conservation initiatives, including collaboration with local and international partners, and integrating conservation efforts with regional economic and trade agreements.
162. The session emphasized the need to leverage existing regional agreements to promote conservation funding, as well as the importance of building strategic partnerships to ensure the long-term sustainability of conservation efforts for grassland birds.
163. The representatives made remarks on fundraising efforts, sharing their experiences and discussing ongoing projects in their respective countries. They also provided insights into the support they have received from other governments and institutions dedicated to conservation, action plans, and more.
164. During the session, the Investment Plan for Conservation was presented, outlining financial strategies aimed at supporting grassland conservation initiatives in the region. The plan emphasized the importance of aligning conservation efforts with investment to ensure sustainability.
165. Iván Ramírez (CMS Secretariat) raised several questions about the ongoing initiatives, seeking further clarification on the implementation and scaling of the Conservation Investment Plan. Daniela Schossler (Aves Uruguay) shared her insights on the development of grassroots initiatives for grassland conservation, emphasizing the need for collaborative efforts across borders. Nadinni Sousa (Brazil) contributed by discussing the challenges and opportunities for securing sustainable funding in the region. Jorge Meriggi (Argentina) elaborated on the specifics of local conservation strategies in Argentina and how they align with international funding frameworks. Joaquín Aldabe (MANOMET Uruguay) provided perspectives on how local communities could benefit from broader regional conservation efforts. Pierre highlighted

- the importance of linking conservation efforts to broader environmental sustainability goals. Patrícia Serafini (Chair) offered comments on the presentation, suggesting ways to improve alignment between funding sources and local priorities.
166. Iván Ramírez (CMS Secretariat) also spoke about ongoing negotiations with the Global Environment Facility (GEF) to secure funding for a project focused on improving connectivity with grassland ecosystems, explaining how such funding could contribute to the long-term conservation of these critical habitats.
167. Lastly, Humberto Berlanga (Mexico) shared his country's ongoing efforts to secure funding for grassland conservation and emphasized Mexico's commitment to working alongside other nations to address common challenges in the region.

### ***USFWS – Funding Opportunities***

168. Jo Anna Lutmerding, representing the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, presented information on the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act (NMBCA) Grants Program. He highlighted that the recent re-authorization of the NMBCA legislation reduced the mandatory cost-sharing requirement from 3-to-1 to 2-to-1, meaning that with \$200,000 in matching contributions, applicants can request \$100,000 in grant funds.
169. The NMBCA is particularly interested in supporting priority conservation interventions identified in Conservation Investment Strategies (CIS), such as the three shorebird flyway CISs: PASCA, MCSI, and AFSI.
170. Additionally, Guy mentioned that the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) directs some funds to USFWS to support shorebird projects in two major shorebird flyways (Atlantic and Pacific). There will likely be a call for proposals in January 2025, with an estimated \$1.5–\$2 million available. It remains uncertain whether the Midcontinent Shorebird Flyway can be integrated into this opportunity, though the earliest possibility for this would be in 2026.

### ***BirdLife – Southern Cone Grasslands Conservation Investment Strategy***

171. A representative from BirdLife presented the Southern Cone Grasslands Conservation Investment Plan, highlighting the importance of the grasslands in South America's Pampas region. These grasslands cover 75 million hectares and host high biodiversity, including over 550 bird species and 96 Important and Key Biodiversity Areas (IBAs/KBAs). They provide crucial ecosystem services that enhance community resilience. However, more than 60% of these grasslands have been lost, with less than 0.5% designated as protected areas. Additionally, over 130 species, including 30 bird species, are threatened, placing this ecosystem at high risk of disappearing.
172. Main threats to Southern Cone grasslands include land-use conversion to grain monocultures and afforestation, illegal hunting and wildlife killing, incompatible grazing regimes, altered fire regimes, invasive flora and fauna, urbanization, and climate change. These threats have led to habitat loss exceeding 60%, biodiversity decline, cultural erosion, and rural exodus.
173. The purpose of the plan is to identify strategies, actions, and required resources essential for achieving the conservation of the Southern Cone grasslands. Proposed strategies focus on nature-based solutions, including the productive model of the Alliance for the Grasslands (AdP); strengthening key stakeholders' capacities to implement best management practices for conserving natural grasslands; implementing key conservation and restoration actions; collaborating with public and private agricultural sectors to create favorable conditions and incentives for nature-based solutions; and driving a cultural shift in grasslands conservation through market-driven approaches, supported by a strategic communication plan.
174. It also includes a bird monitoring strategy with programs targeting specific conservation goals, such as evaluating the conservation of bird communities on Alliance properties with a focus on high-priority grassland species, obligate grassland species, and globally threatened species. It aims to assess the Alliance's impact on focal species in defined priority areas, monitor stable populations of grassland shorebirds over time, and establish a network of birdwatchers among livestock producers.

## 8.2 Place and date of next MOU Meeting, and other matters

175. By December 31, 2024, a spreadsheet would be sent outlining the action plan both as it was previously and as it now stands. By January 2025, comments and suggestions from participants on the action plan would be collected. A virtual meeting would take place on March 10, 2025, to present and discuss the revised action plan, along with the outcomes of the other two groups.
176. There was discussion about the frequency of future meetings. Uruguay proposed holding meetings once a year, as holding them only annually would be insufficient. Nadinni Sousa (Brazil) pointed out that the COP will take place in 2026 and suggested having a meeting slightly before to discuss the MoU. Patrícia Serafini (Brazil) said that having a meeting at the end of next year would be ideal, as the MoU coordination meeting would take place at that time. Iván Ramírez (CMS Secretariat) suggested the possibility of holding two meetings, with a final deadline of September 2025 at the latest. Ideally, a schedule for the meetings, with one to two meetings in 2025 and potentially one or two in 2026, would be included in the document. She proposed having meetings in March and August/September 2025, and holding two meetings per year starting in 2026. Iván Ramírez (CMS Secretariat) mentioned that there is also a more detailed meeting and working group meetings. The ideal situation would be for the coordination group (working group) to meet at least every three months, as there would be no need to convene a plenary session. These working groups would report to the plenary. Ms. Fonseca suggested appointing coordinators for the working groups. Ms. Serafini (Brazil) noted that there is one intersessional group and another group for the annual meetings. Mr. Vera (Paraguay) highlighted the challenges of mobilizing actors in his country unless technical reports are not mandatory, mentioning difficulties in securing participation.
177. **ACTION AGREED:**
- The leaders of the three groups were confirmed as follows:
    - Action Plan: Krishna Bonavides (Brazil), in coordination with Uruguay;
    - Species: Dr. Rob Clay (Manomet);
    - Coordination Mechanism: Patrícia Serafini (Brazil).
178. There was also a discussion about working on a resolution to potentially be presented at the COP, detailing aspects of the MoU, and the need to discuss its format. Iván explained that the process is relatively simple: one or several countries would present the resolution proposal, which must go through a filter of the standing committee and be translated. He noted that there is currently no resolution on grasslands. The deadline for the scientific committee is October 10, but due to the translation process, the proposal should be ready by September 2025. A working group could be formed to submit the proposal, or the Secretariat's support could be sought before submission. If successful, it could become a resolution at the COP.

## 9. Any other business

179. No other business issues were raised.

## 10. Closure of the meeting

180. The Chair and Mr. Ramírez (CMS Secretariat) thanked all participants, both in person and virtually, for their attendance, as well as the Government of Brazil for its hospitality and organization of the event. They also provided details about the field trip scheduled for the following day.
181. The Chair then declared the meeting closed at 17:30 Brasília time.

## ANNEX

## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES		
Representative	Position   Institution   Organization	Attendance
Argentina - Jorge Meriggi	Director of the National Biodiversity Directorate of the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MAyDS)	In-person
Bolivia - Armando Calizaya	Biodiversity, Flora, and Fauna of the Ministry of Environment and Water (MMAyA)	In-person
Brazil - Andrei Langeloh Roos	Environmental Analyst from the National Center for Wild Birds Conservation and Research (CEMAVE)/ Chico Mendes Institute for Biodiversity Conservation (ICMBio)	In-person
Brazil - Daniel Vilela	Environmental Analyst from the Brazilian Institute of Environment and Renewable Natural Resources (IBAMA)	In-person
Brazil - Krishna Bonavides	Environmental Analyst from the Department of Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity of the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MMA)	In-person
Brazil - Lilian Costa	Environmental Analyst from the Department of Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity of the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MMA)	In-person
Brazil - Lucilene Jacoboski	Environmental Analyst from the National Center for Wild Birds Conservation and Research (CEMAVE)/ Chico Mendes Institute for Biodiversity Conservation (ICMBio)	In-person
Brazil - Nadinni Sousa	General Coordinator and Deputy Director of the Department of Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity of the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MMA)	In-person
Brazil - Rodrigo Braga	Environmental Analyst from the Department of Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity of the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MMA)	In-person
Brazil – Roberto Barbosa Filho	Environmental Analyst from the National Center for Wild Birds Conservation and Research (CEMAVE)/ Chico Mendes Institute for Biodiversity Conservation (ICMBio)	In-person
Brazil - Roberto Cavalcanti	Environmental Analyst from the National Center for Wild Birds Conservation and Research (CEMAVE)/ Chico Mendes Institute for Biodiversity Conservation (ICMBio)	In-person
Brazil - Rita de Cassia Guimarães Mesquita	National Secretary for Biodiversity, Forests, and Human Rights of the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MMA)	In-person

Brazil - Wilson Fernandes Negrão Júnior	Environmental Analyst from the Office of International Affairs of the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MMA)	In-person
Chile - Paola Rossi	Agricultural and Livestock Service (SAG)	In-person
Dominican Republic - Pedro Julio Araujo	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MMARN)	In-person
Ecuador - Danny Guarderas	Ministry of Environment, Water, and Ecological Transition (MAATE)	In-person
Mexico - Humberto Berlanga	Coordinator of the National Commission for the Knowledge and Use of Biodiversity (CONABIO)	In-person
Panama - Alexander Montero Arango	Wildlife Specialist, Department of Biodiversity, Protected Areas and Biodiversity Directorate of the Ministry of Environment	In-person
Paraguay - Héctor Vera	Scientific Advisor of the National Museum of Natural History of Paraguay	In-person
Peru - Allan Flores	Director of Sustainable Management of Wildlife Heritage of the Ministry of Agrarian Development and Irrigation (MIDAGRI)	In-person
United States - Deborah Hahn	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Online
United States - Eric Kershner	Division Chief, Bird Conservation, Permits, and Regulations of Migratory Birds of the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	In-person
United States - Guy Foulks	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	Online
United States - Jo Anna Lutmerding	Wildlife Biologist on Migratory Birds of the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	In-person
Uruguay - Carmen Leizagoyen	Head of the Fauna Area of the Ministry of Environment (MIAMBIENTE)	In-person

<b>NON-GOVERNMENTAL REPRESENTATIVES</b>		
<b>Representative</b>	<b>Position   Institution   Organization</b>	<b>Attendance</b>
Laura Dodyk	Migratory Bird Program Director at Aves Argentinas	In-person
Alice Reisfeld	Project Coordinator at SAVE Brasil	In-person
João Damasceno	Coordinator at SAVE Brasil	In-person
Raquel Carvalho	Shorebird Program Coordinator at SAVE Brasil	In-person
Hugo del Castillo	Biodiversity Database Manager at Guyra Paraguay	In-person
José Luis Cartes	Executive Director at Guyra Paraguay	In-person
Pier Cacciali Sosa	Technical Team Member, Species, at Guyra Paraguay	In-person
Rob Clay	Manomet Conservation Sciences	In-person
Lucía Rodríguez Valverde	Flyways Conservation Manager at BirdLife International	In-person
Nicola Crockford	International Species Policy Officer at BirdLife International	In-person
Adrian Stagi	Director General of Environment, Hygiene and Bromatology; Executive Coordinator at Aves Uruguay	In-person
Daniela Schossler	National Coordinator of the Pasture Alliance at Aves Uruguay	In-person
Diego Luna Quevedo	Manomet Conservation Sciences	In-person
Joaquín Aldabe	Ranching and Conservation Specialist at Manomet Uruguay	In-person
André de Camargo Guaraldo	Universidade Federal do Paraná	In-person
Angel Alberto Yanosky	CONACYT	Online
Carla Suertegaray	Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul	In-person
Carolina Cáceres	Costa Rica	Online
Diego Tomás Tuero	CONICET	Online
Juliana Bosi de Almeida	MANOMET Brazil	In-person
Mauricio Velasquez	CAF	In-person
Natalie Savoie	Canada	Online

Patricia Serafini	Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina (Chair)	In-person
Roberta Costa Rodrigues	SAVE Brasil	Online
Rodrigo W. Soria Auza	Asociación Armonía Bolivia	Online
Tjalle Boorsma	Asociación Armonía Bolivia	Online
Wallace Rodrigues Telino Júnior	Universidade Federal do Agreste de Pernambuco	In-person
Rossana Guzman	Dominican Republic	Online

**SECRETARIAT**

**CONVENTION ON MIGRATORY SPECIES (CMS)**

Iván Ramírez	Head of the Avian Species Team of the CMS Secretariat	In-person
Tilman Schneider	Associate Programme Officer of the Avian Species Team of the CMS Secretariat	Online
Ximena Cancino Ordenes	Programme Assistant of the CMS Secretariat	In-person

**REPORT WRITER**

Wilson FERNANDES NEGRÃO JÚNIOR	Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change of Brazil	In-person
--------------------------------	--	-----------