



ASSESSING CAPACITY-BUILDING NEEDS FOR RAPTOR CONSERVATION IN AFRICA AND EURASIA

Analysis of the replies received from Signatories of the Raptor MOU to the Capacity Needs Questionnaire 2024



About the Raptors MOU

The Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation of Migratory Birds of Prey in Africa and Eurasia (Raptors MOU) is an agreement established under the CMS. Its aims to promote internationally coordinated actions to achieve and maintain the favourable conservation status of migratory birds of prey throughout their range in the African-Eurasian region, and to reverse their decline when and where appropriate. It currently covers 94 species of birds of prey and owls, which are found in 131 Range States in Africa, Europe and Asia. 66 Range states have signed the Raptors MOU.

The Coordinating Unit of the Raptors MOU, based in Abu Dhabi (United Arab Emirates), serves as the administrative hub of the Raptors MOU. It supports Signatories, Cooperating Partner and facilitates, supports various conservation activities aimed at promoting internationally coordinated actions to safeguard migratory birds of prey.

Recommended citation

Teng Y., Franchi P., Caron-Strehlow A. & Gallo-Orsi U. 2026 - Assessing capacity-building needs for raptor conservation in Africa and Eurasia. Analysis of the replies received from Signatories of the Raptor MOU to the Capacity Needs Questionnaire 2024. Raptors MOU Coordinating Unit, Abu Dhabi, UAE 2026.

Disclaimer

The designations employed and the presentation do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of CMS or contributory organizations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area in its authority, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The enclosed photos are not to be taken as endorsement of the distances and practices displayed. Opinions, findings, conclusions and recommendations expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the official policy of CMS. Links to resources outside this document are provided as a convenience and for informational purposes only and should not be construed as an endorsement or approval by CMS or the Raptors MOU of information provided through other sites and computer systems.

Cover image

From left to right, top to bottom: Steppe eagle nesting monitoring, © I. Karyakin; Group photo, Vulture MsAP Action plan workshop © ARVW; Capacity-building field work, © Stoyan Nikolov; Sooty falcon © Environment Agency - Abu Dhabi.

Copies of this publication are available from the CMS website

[https://raptors.cms.int/publication/assessing-capacity-building-needs-raptor-conservation-africa-and-
eurasia](https://raptors.cms.int/publication/assessing-capacity-building-needs-raptor-conservation-africa-and-eurasia)

Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	4
INTRODUCTION	4
METHODOLOGY	5
SUMMARY OF THE RESPONSES	6
OVERALL CAPACITY NEEDS	6
COLLABORATIONS	8
STRATEGIES	10
MONITORING AND DATA COLLECTION.....	12
FUNDING	14
NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS (NBSAPs)	15
SYNERGIES.....	17
OTHER REMARKS/COMMENTS.....	19
PRIORITY ACTIVITIES	20
THE WAY FORWARD	21
ANNEX	24

Acknowledgement

The Coordination Unit of the Raptors MOU would like to extend our sincere gratitude to all Signatories who took the time to complete the questionnaire and provide their valuable feedback.

The Coordinating Unit expresses its sincere appreciation to the Environment Agency – Abu Dhabi (EAD) for making this work possible through hosting the CMS Office – Abu Dhabi and the Coordinating Unit of the Raptors MOU, as well as for its generous support to the implementation of the Raptors MOU.

Introduction

Migratory raptors are a varied group of birds that includes, but not limited to, vultures, eagles, falcons and owls. Many are long distance migrants that regularly cross geo-political borders.

Raptor populations are under increasing pressure from multiple threats, including habitat fragmentation and loss due to human development; agricultural intensification and other land-use changes; electrocution and collision with energy infrastructure; shooting, trapping (including for trade), and direct and indirect poisoning (including through the accumulation of pollutants in the food chain); and reduced breeding success due to poisoning and other contamination, including by pesticides and heavy metals.

Together, these pressures have resulted in declining population sizes, contractions in species' geographic ranges, and the loss of important ecosystem services that support human well-being. Addressing these challenges requires coordinated, international action across migratory ranges to restore and maintain healthy populations of birds of prey.

Across Africa and Eurasia, many migratory raptor populations have experienced significant declines. According to IUCN Red List data, 34 per cent of species covered by the Raptors MOU are classified as globally threatened (Critically Endangered, Endangered, or Vulnerable) or Near Threatened. Population trends further underscore the scale of concern: more than half (53 per cent) of raptor species are in decline, while only 11 per cent show increasing trends. Without strengthened conservation efforts, the number of threatened species is likely to grow in the near future.

The Raptors MOU aims to conserve migratory birds of prey across Africa and Eurasia, with the objective of ensuring that all populations of African–Eurasian migratory raptors, whether diurnal or nocturnal, are maintained at, or restored to, a favourable conservation status. Signatories to the MOU commit to coordinated action across species' ranges to maintain or restore this status and to reverse population declines where necessary and appropriate.

The Third Meeting of Signatories to the Raptors MOU (MOS3, Dubai, July 2023) provided an opportunity for Signatories to highlight the need for strengthened capacity to support national implementation of the MOU. In response, the Coordinating Unit of the Raptors MOU (hereafter 'the Coordinating Unit') conducted a questionnaire to identify priority capacity-building needs. The questionnaire is provided in **Error! Reference source not found.**

This report presents a summary and analysis of the information collected through the questionnaire and proposes a way forward. It is structured in four main parts: Methodology, Summary of Responses, Priority Activities and The Way Forward. The Methodology part introduces the questionnaire and outlines the report's objectives. The Summary of Responses synthesizes the key issues, evidence, and challenges identified in the responses, highlighting the main findings for each question. The Priority Activities and The Way Forward parts set out conclusions and identifies the priority actions to address capacity gaps that currently limit effective implementation of the MOU at the national level.

The findings presented in this report are intended to support a clearer understanding of capacity-building needs and to inform how these can be addressed, including the role of the Coordinating Unit in facilitating this process.

Methodology

The study was conducted between August 2024 and September 2024. An online questionnaire was used to collect the information. The questionnaire was distributed on 2 August 2024 to all Signatories' National Contact Points, as well as to four Cooperating Partners: BirdLife International, the International Association for Falconry and Conservation of Birds of Prey, the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) SSC Vulture Specialist Group, and The Peregrine Fund. Follow-up reminders were sent on 5, 16 and 23 September 2024. In total, the Coordinating Unit received 21 responses from Signatories (Table 1).

Table 1: List of Signatories who responded to the questionnaire.

Region	Responding Signatories
Africa (48 per cent of replies)	The Republic of Chad, the Union of the Comoros, the Arab Republic of Egypt, the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, the Republic of the Gambia, the Republic of Madagascar, the Kingdom of Morocco, the Republic of Senegal, the Federal Republic of Somalia, the Republic of the Sudan
Asia (38 per cent of replies)	The Republic of Armenia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, Mongolia, the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Arab Emirates
Europe (14 per cent of replies)	The French Republic, Hungary, the Kingdom of Norway

The questionnaire (provided in Annexe 1) was circulated in English and French, the two working languages of the Raptors MOU. The questionnaire is organised into eight main thematic sections:

- Section **1. Overall Capacity Needs** identified the capacity needs for raptor conservation in the country, including the relevant agencies and individuals involved.
- Section **2. Collaboration** explored the potential benefits of international cooperation for raptor conservation and identifies countries with which collaboration could be strengthened.
- Section **3. Strategies** investigated challenges to developing or finalising national raptor conservation strategies.
- Section **4. Monitoring** addressed issues hindering regular monitoring of raptors.
- Section **5. Data Collection** section focused on obstacles to consistent data gathering.
- Section **6. Funding** examined financial constraints affecting conservation efforts.
- Section **7. NBSAPs** looked at challenges to better integrating raptor conservation into National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans.
- Section **8. Synergies** considered the potential for improving collaboration with other organizations or entities to enhance the implementation of the Raptors MOU.

Throughout these sections, the questionnaire aimed to identify how the Coordinating Unit can support efforts to address the capacity-building needs and challenges outlined by the Signatories.

The data from respondent Signatories was collected and subsequently analysed. The summary of the responses is provided for each question, following the structure of the questionnaire. For each question, the summary of the responses has been organized in categories when responses aligned on certain topics (for example technical skills, financial capacity or human resources). These categories have been ranked according

to the proportion of responses that mentioned that category (the first category got the most responses, and the last category got the least).

Following the Summary of Responses, priority activities were determined on the proportion of responses highlighting specific needs and are intended to guide the Coordinating Unit's capacity-building efforts to support the implementation of the Raptors MOU by its Signatories.

Summary of the responses

OVERALL CAPACITY NEEDS

Q. 1.1 What type of capacity does your country need for improving its implementation of the Raptors MOU?

The responses received provided insights into the capacity needs of both Signatories' governmental agencies and civil society. These needs are summarized below and ranked from the most critical to the least prominent.

Technical Skills

Most Signatories identified a need to strengthen technical skills in species identification and monitoring. Saudi Arabia highlighted the importance of improving raptor identification and monitoring capacity, while Egypt, Chad, and Syria emphasized the need for training in both basic and advanced bird monitoring and reporting techniques. Syria also pointed to the requirement for specialized equipment, such as binoculars and field guides, to improve monitoring accuracy. The Gambia identified the need for enhanced data collection methods, while the United Arab Emirates emphasized building technical capacity in data management for both migratory and resident raptor species. Mongolia further noted the importance of developing data analysis skills to better support conservation efforts.

Financial Capacity

In addition to technical capacity, many Signatories reported the need for greater financial resources to support raptor conservation efforts. Armenia identified a specific need for dedicated units or personnel to secure sustainable funding and coordinate volunteers. Ethiopia expressed a limited financial resources to carry out species status surveys, update important sites for raptors, and develop a Multi-species Action Plan. Comoros, Morocco, Madagascar, and Senegal also indicated financial constraints, underscoring the general need for resources to support ongoing and future conservation initiatives. Mongolia also emphasized the importance of strengthening fundraising capacity to ensure the long-term sustainability of its programs.

Strategic Planning and Action Plans

Effective strategic planning is a priority for several Signatories. Saudi Arabia highlighted the importance of strategic planning to create a national action plan, while Ethiopia pointed to the need for a Multi-species Action Plan, particularly for vultures. Norway indicated challenges in prioritizing limited resources within the natural resource management sector, underscoring the need for stronger capacity in setting and maintaining conservation priorities. Hungary identified the importance of establishing favourable reference values for raptor species, which could support consistent monitoring and conservation standards across regions.

Human Resource Development

The United Arab Emirates highlighted the need for specialized expertise across multiple sectors, including agriculture, energy, and waste management, all of which impact raptors both directly and indirectly. These

human resource development needs reflect the importance of strong institutional support structures to enable effective and coordinated raptor conservation.

Community Engagement and Awareness Raising

Engaging local communities and raising awareness about raptor conservation were also identified as key priorities. Somalia and Sudan highlighted the need for programs that raise awareness about the importance of indigenous species. Morocco similarly expressed the need to expand awareness-raising capabilities to support local conservation actions and foster community engagement.

Anti-Wildlife Trafficking and Law Enforcement

Addressing wildlife trafficking remains a pressing issue in some regions. Syria, for instance, expressed the need for specialized training to curb trafficking and to conduct investigations related to wildlife crime. This highlights the importance of strengthening law enforcement capacity and monitoring systems to protect migratory species from illegal capture and trade.

Q. 1.2 What specific agencies, individuals, entities or others need that capacity?

Governmental Agencies

Responses indicated a widespread need for capacity-building efforts across a range of stakeholders. The primary focus is on governmental agencies, with multiple Signatories emphasizing the importance of training staff from ministries, wildlife authorities, and national parks departments. These include Armenia, Chad, Egypt, Ethiopia, Hungary, Jordan, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sudan, Syria, and The Gambia. Attention was given to law enforcement agencies, such as border police and custom officers in Syria and wildlife conservation forces in Sudan.

Academia

Academic and research institutes were also identified as key participants in training programs. Signatories such as Comoros, Ethiopia, Mongolia, Syria, and the United Arab Emirates highlighted the role of universities, while Norway and the United Arab Emirates mentioned the involvement of research institutes. These entities play an important role in bridging the gap between scientific research and practical conservation efforts.

Civil Society

Civil-society organizations were also identified as important contributors to training and capacity-building efforts. Armenia, Mongolia, and Saudi Arabia highlighted the role of NGOs engaged in bird conservation, while Egypt and Iran (Islamic Republic of) emphasized the importance of engaging local communities.

Others

Some Signatories identified the need for targeted training within specialized agencies. Morocco, for instance, emphasized the need to train operators in the energy sector on raptor conservation. Norway also mentioned agencies involved in research and management, underscoring the diversity of stakeholders that would benefit from tailored capacity-building efforts.

Q. 1.3 How could the Coordinating Unit of the Raptors MOU help you build that capacity?

To address the needs identified, the Coordinating Unit is encouraged to undertake several key actions.

Training and Capacity-Building Workshops

Many Signatories emphasized the importance of training programs tailored to their specific needs. Armenia suggested a "Training-for-Trainers" model to disseminate knowledge among governmental and non-governmental bodies. Jordan and Mongolia recommended conducting in-person or virtual training sessions. Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates focused on regionally tailored workshops to improve raptor monitoring, tracking, and reporting, aligning with strategic plans. Sudan and Syria prioritized specialized training for wildlife forces and law enforcement officers to enhance their capacity to protect raptors.

Technical Support and Guidance

Several Signatories expressed a need for technical support and guidance. Hungary emphasized the importance of technical expertise in population modelling, while Saudi Arabia proposed the development of frameworks for monitoring, reporting, and national action plans. The United Arab Emirates suggested that the Coordinating Unit could provide technical assistance on policy development and on the use of advanced tools such as satellite tracking.

Financial and Material Support

Financial and material support was also identified as a critical area of need by the Signatories. Comoros, Mongolia, Somalia, and The Gambia called for funding, scholarships, and financial assistance to support training and research. Morocco highlighted the necessity of backing conservation project proposals for submission to donors, while Syria requested financial support for producing training materials and participating in international meetings.

Collaboration and Knowledge Exchange

Collaboration and knowledge exchange also emerged as key priorities. Egypt and the United Arab Emirates emphasized the importance of connecting Signatories with funding entities and facilitating partnerships. Saudi Arabia suggested establishing mechanisms for cross-border communication and expertise sharing across regions to improve conservation practices.

COLLABORATIONS

Q. 2.1 Would raptor conservation in your country benefit from more collaboration with other countries? If so, with which countries?

Q. 2.2 How would the improved collaboration with those specific countries help you?

Recommended areas of collaboration can be categorized into the following groups:

Regional Collaboration

Many Signatories prioritized collaboration within their geographic region to address shared challenges and opportunities. In Africa, Chad expressed interest in collaborating with Niger to share experiences and strengthen conservation practices. Similarly, Ethiopia highlighted its interest to collaborate with Djibouti, Sudan, and Uganda to facilitate knowledge exchange on the implementation of the Raptors MOU, fostering regional cooperation. In West Asia, several Signatories prioritized regional partnerships. Jordan sought to

collaborate with Lebanon, Syria, and Saudi Arabia to facilitate the transfer of knowledge and technology for raptor conservation. These collaborations aim to facilitate the exchange of experience and best practices to reduce risks and enhance conservation outcomes across regions.

Flyway Collaboration

Collaboration also aligned with the migratory flyways of raptors. Armenia emphasized its collaborative efforts across Africa and Eurasia, seeking conceptual support from European countries and networking opportunities with partners in Eastern Europe, West Asia, Central Asia, and Africa. These partnerships aim to improve sustainable funding mechanisms and expand knowledge on migratory raptor species. Saudi Arabia highlighted its focus on collaboration along the Central Asian Flyway and with countries situated along raptor migration routes in Europe, Asia, and Africa. Such cooperation is intended to facilitate the exchange of expertise and information while supporting the development of national awareness programs. The United Arab Emirates underscored its commitment to partnerships with countries along raptor migratory routes. Egypt and Madagascar recommended cooperation along the migratory pathway of the sooty falcon (*Falco concolor*), with Madagascar also indicated to cooperate with Oman on sooty falcon research. In Europe, Hungary identified partnerships with bottleneck countries such as Turkey, Egypt, and Angola as critical to addressing common threats to raptors, including electrocution and poaching. These collaborations focus on improving species reintroduction efforts, enhancing the protection of migratory species, and sharing expertise and resources to strengthen conservation outcomes.

Language and Culture Ties

Signatories with shared language or cultural ties demonstrated stronger inclination toward collaboration, facilitating the exchange of experience and best practices. Chad and Niger, as French-speaking neighbours with similar habitat and species, prioritized cooperation by sharing experiences to address similar conservation challenges. Similarly, Somalia suggested building cooperation based on existing platforms such as Arab League meetings and African Union (AU) expert groups to discuss strategies for combating illegal wildlife trade. Morocco emphasized collaboration with Spain, leveraging their shared historical and geographic ties to exchange experience, information, and best practices for monitoring and conserving raptors and their habitats. Armenia called for enhanced engagement with European countries and the United States of America to secure both conceptual and financial support.

Other Types of Collaboration

Some Signatories focused on partnerships among developing nations to address similar challenges. Ethiopia expressed its intent to collaborate with neighbouring African countries to facilitate knowledge exchange and strengthen relationships for future joint conservation initiatives. Similarly, Sudan emphasized cooperation with Egypt, Ethiopia, and Gulf countries to protect migratory birds of prey. Sudan highlighted the need to focus on raising awareness among hunting communities to curb the excessive use of raptors. Meanwhile, countries like Norway highlighted the importance of multilateral agreements, such as the CMS, to enhance collective efforts and reduce reliance on isolated partnerships.

Q. 2.3 How could the Coordinating Unit of the Raptors MOU help you improve collaboration with those countries?

The Coordinating Unit is mandated to support the implementation of the Raptors MOU notably by facilitating collaboration among Signatories and other stakeholders. By facilitating dialogue, organizing events, strengthening partnerships, and providing technical support, the Coordinating Unit can enhance the effectiveness of conservation efforts across raptor range countries and support the implementation of the Raptors MOU.

Networking Improvement

Many Signatories highlighted the need for facilitation and networking support to connect them with the right specialists, organizations, and stakeholders. Armenia requested assistance in identifying experts and organizations, while Chad and Ethiopia emphasized the need for organizing regional workshops and creating platforms to bring together neighbouring countries for discussions on collaboration and shared conservation goals. Similarly, Syria suggested arranging meetings and visits to enhance the exchange of knowledge and improve monitoring and conservation efforts.

Capacity Improvement

Comoros requested specific training courses, and Jordan suggested organizing training sessions and developing an online platform for National Contact Points of the MOU to access conservation-related information. Saudi Arabia highlighted the lack of national expertise in preparing strategies for raptor preservation and requested guidelines and awareness programs to address this gap. Pakistan sought events to enhance the skills of field staff and to facilitate interaction among Signatories of the Raptors MOU for future collaboration.

Resource and Technical Support

Resource and technical support were also identified as critical needs. Signatories such as Egypt and Madagascar requested assistance in connecting with funding entities and promoting research initiatives. The United Arab Emirates recommended that the Coordinating Unit facilitate the development of joint conservation efforts and data sharing mechanisms, and provide technical and scientific guidance for projects such as satellite tracking, cross-border habitat management, and international research initiatives. Sudan emphasized the need for bilateral or multilateral memoranda and joint workshops to foster cooperation and increase awareness about raptor protection.

STRATEGIES

Q. 3.1 What issues are preventing you from developing or finalizing a national raptor conservation strategy?

Financial Constraints

Most Signatories cited financial limitations as a major obstacle. Armenia, Comoros, Egypt, Jordan, Senegal, and The Gambia emphasized the lack of sustainable funding as a key barrier to develop conservation strategies. Pakistan and Sudan highlighted financial constraints combined with other issues, with Sudan explicitly mentioning that wildlife is not considered a priority. Jordan and Mongolia identified the need for funding to support capacity-building efforts and research activities, respectively.

Capacity and Technical Limitations

Many Signatories reported insufficient technical skills, manpower, or expertise to develop effective conservation strategies. Chad and Syria cited a lack of skilled personnel, and Ethiopia added the challenge of limited collaboration with conservation agencies. Similarly, Mongolia identified insufficient manpower and data as limiting factors. Hungary acknowledged capacity issues but noted that raptor conservation efforts were partially covered under the EU Nature Restoration Regulation.

Political and Institutional Challenges

Some Signatories described obstacles related to political will or institutional inefficiencies. Sudan mentioned that wildlife not being identified as a priority is a significant hurdle, alongside a lack of qualified personnel and the impact of the ongoing war. Syria also pointed out to competing priorities undermining the finalisation of their conservation strategy. Pakistan highlighted the lengthy consultation process required to complete their document. Norway stated that while their raptor management is functioning well, competing priorities in biodiversity, environment, and climate policy currently took precedence.

Progress and Unique Circumstances

A few Signatories indicated progress in their conservation strategies. Madagascar reported that their strategy would be finalized soon. Morocco noted that they had already developed a national strategy in partnership with various organizations but identified implementation as the next challenge. Somalia shared that a national plan had been initiated but lacked sufficient resources for completion. Hungary, though relying on broader EU regulations, suggested that establishing favourable reference values for target species would enhance their national restoration plan. The United Arab Emirates reported no major constraints, reflecting a strong commitment to raptor conservation at national level.

Q. 3.2 How could the Coordinating Unit of the Raptors MOU help you overcome each of those issues?

Capacity-Building and Training

Several Signatories emphasized the need for targeted training programs to address gaps in skills and expertise. Armenia called for trainings to enhance their skills and improve collaboration with relevant organizations. Mongolia highlighted the need for instructors to support the development of a national conservation strategy. Sudan similarly expressed interest in participating in rehabilitation and capacity-building programs organized under the Raptors MOU. The Gambia sought the provision of experts to assist in capacity development. Hungary suggested workshops to establish reference values for raptor species as part of broader conservation efforts.

Financial Support and Partnerships

Financial constraints emerged as a recurring concern, with many Signatories seeking assistance in securing funding or establishing partnerships. Chad, Comoros, and Morocco called for support in identifying or providing financial resources. Egypt suggested assistance in connecting with funding entities and facilitating coordination with other countries. Senegal and Syria also highlighted the importance of financial support to cover capacity-building and technical requirements. Sudan specifically requested inclusion in funding opportunities for meetings, workshops, and training programs organized under the Raptors MOU.

Technical Support and Guidance

Technical assistance was another priority identified by Signatories. Ethiopia suggested close collaboration with the Ethiopian Wildlife Conservation Authority (EWCA) to address technical and financial gaps and ensure consistent monitoring of the Raptors MOU implementation. Syria emphasized the need for technical expertise to facilitate strategy drafting and related activities. Jordan and Mongolia echoed similar requests for guidance in developing national conservation strategies.

Regional Cooperation Initiatives

Some Signatories proposed initiatives to foster regional cooperation and knowledge sharing. Saudi Arabia recommended organizing regional workshops in local languages and preparing guidelines for strategy development. They also suggested facilitating collaboration among countries to monitor raptor migration

jointly. Somalia expressed interest in receiving recommendations and advice to better address raptor conservation nationally.

MONITORING and DATA COLLECTION

As, the challenges and the needs of Signatories were very similar in section 4. Monitoring and section 5. Data Collection, the responses have been consolidated below for a more intuitive presentation.

Q. 4.1 What issues are preventing you from regularly monitoring raptors occurring in your territory?

Q. 5.1 What issues are preventing you from regularly collecting data on raptors occurring in your territory?

Financial and Resource Constraints

Financial challenges remain a common barrier across many Signatories. Armenia, Chad, Comoros, Egypt, Ethiopia, Madagascar, Pakistan, Senegal, Sudan, and Syria all identified a lack of sustainable funding as critical limitation to implementing monitoring and data collection programs. Jordan specifically highlighted the need for funding to develop an online information system and support reporting capacities. Hungary also identified funding difficulties in improving satellite tracking efforts to gather comprehensive data on raptor habitats and migration patterns.

Capacity and Expertise Limitations

Several Signatories faced challenges related to capacity and expertise. Armenia and Mongolia highlighted the struggle with a shortage of researchers and volunteers while The Gambia, Jordan and Pakistan cited capacity-building needs for monitoring and conservation. Hungary and Saudi Arabia noted capacity issues despite relatively good monitoring for priority species. Syria highlighted a lack of technical expertise to maintain databases for raptor conservation. The United Arab Emirates also emphasized the need for specialist training and development to enhance monitoring efforts.

Logistical and Access Challenges

Logistical issues are particularly pressing for countries like Sudan and Morocco. Sudan's vast size, lack of sufficient vehicles, and limited modern monitoring technologies hindered its access to raptor habitats. Morocco faced transportation challenges to reach remote sites, while the United Arab Emirates identified the need to scale up ongoing efforts, to integrate advanced technologies such as satellite tracking and automated systems, and to improve coordination among stakeholders to enhance conservation and data management. Security issues are significant in Ethiopia, Somalia, and Syria, restricting travel and access to key areas for monitoring and conservation.

Coordination, Planning, and Political Barriers

Coordination and planning issues are evident in several Signatories. Iran (Islamic Republic of) reported informal communication, political resistance, and other organizational challenges. Saudi Arabia lacked sufficient programs covering all raptor species, a national action plan, and clear priorities for raptor monitoring and research. The Gambia faced inadequate coordination, while Egypt mentioned a lack of planning. Syria highlighted the need for technical support alongside coordination challenges due to insecurity.

Q. 4.2 and Q. 5.2 How could the Coordinating Unit of the Raptors MOU help you overcome each of those issues?

Training and Capacity-Building

Armenia requested training for fundraising and volunteer coordination, volunteer coordinators, and connecting with relevant organizations and networks, while Ethiopia sought tailored training to fill technical capacity gaps. Pakistan highlighted the need for capacity-building for species monitoring and field staffs. Saudi Arabia suggested developing training programs for specialists, encouraging national participation in raptor counting, and establishing mechanisms to exchange experts and organize workshops to enhance technical capacity. The Gambia specifically requested support for ranger training in protected areas and data collection training. Sudan emphasized the need for capacity-building programs for bird monitoring.

Financial and Technical Support

Financial assistance was a recurring request among Signatories. Chad, Comoros, Madagascar and Senegal highlighted the need for small grants or funding to support conservation programs. Egypt called for coordination with funding entities and better planning support like facilitating conservation programs. Morocco sought both financial assistance for projects and capacity-building training. Mongolia requested help in obtaining small grants for specific programs and proposed promoting sponsorships and funding mechanisms among Signatories to ensure long-term sustainability. Sudan called for funding to support monitoring and modern technologies. Syria requested general support to address technical and logistical challenges, while Jordan focused on general financial and technical support.

Collaboration and Networking

Several Signatories emphasized the importance of collaboration. Armenia requested connections with organizations, networks, and experts, while Saudi Arabia highlighted establishing communication schemes for specialists and facilitating access to raptor migration data. Somalia called for cooperation, and the United Arab Emirates proposed collaboration and knowledge sharing across countries to share best practices and improve monitoring outcomes.

Technical Cooperation

Signatories highlighted the need for technical support and cooperation mechanisms. Comoros requested access to specific materials to aid conservation efforts. Syria emphasized the need for technical support and guidance to address their conservation challenges effectively. Sudan proposed providing modern technical devices for databases and capacity-building programs to improve data management and monitoring capabilities. Hungary suggested coordinating international projects, such as satellite tracking, to foster technical research collaborations. Somalia stressed the importance of continuous cooperation to address all relevant issues systematically.

Modern Technologies and Data Infrastructure

Ethiopia outlined specific logistical needs, such as binoculars, spotting scopes, bird identification guides, and GPS apparatus, which are essential for fieldwork and monitoring. Sudan highlighted the need for modern monitoring technologies to overcome logistical challenges. The United Arab Emirates suggested developing centralized national data infrastructure to improve data management and enable effective monitoring and reporting of raptor populations. Saudi Arabia also sought satellite tracking data on migrating raptors to identify critical sites for protection.

Data Collection and Management

Improving data collection and management emerged as a key theme across responses. Morocco highlighted the importance of creating a dedicated platform for raptor-specific data collection, which would build upon existing avian research databases. The United Arab Emirates recommended that the Coordinating Unit should assist in capacity-building for data collection technologies, stakeholder collaboration, and best practices for data management systems. These efforts would ensure data accessibility and its integration into national conservation strategies. Senegal and The Gambia also emphasized the need for robust support in data collection activities.

FUNDING

Q. 6.1 Financial constraints are often identified as a capacity issue. If this applies to you, how could the Coordinating Unit of the Raptors MOU help you obtain more funding for your raptor conservation efforts?

Fundraising Support

Several Signatories expected the Coordinating Unit to assist in fundraising activities by building capacity and providing strategic support. Armenia requested training for fundraising units and connecting with relevant organizations and individuals to improve fundraising efforts. Jordan suggested activating agreement articles to secure support and expertise transfer from developed countries to assist developing nations. Mongolia recommended starting a campaign to establish sustainable government-backed efforts for raptor conservation. The United Arab Emirates suggested that the Coordinating Unit should play an active role in identifying funding sources, facilitating partnerships for joint funding applications, providing guidance on fundraising strategies, and advocating for resource allocation at international forums. Morocco called for support in securing funding for projects and programs submitted to donors by conservation stakeholders.

Identifying Funding Sources

Some countries emphasized the need for support in locating potential funding opportunities. Chad highlighted the need for assistance in identifying sources of funding. Comoros requested help in locating and accessing funding opportunities. Madagascar sought assistance in identifying potential donors to support conservation projects. Hungary proposed exploring potential donor organizations and grant opportunities to enhance funding availability. The Gambia sought help in identifying potential donors for proposal submission.

Capacity-Building and Technical Support

A few Signatories linked funding needs with technical capacity-building and community engagement. Ethiopia expressed the need for support in establishing sustainable funding mechanisms to ensure long-term conservation efforts. Sudan highlighted the need for funding to improve bird monitoring technologies (such as satellite tracking), enhance community awareness, and build the capacity of conservation forces. Somalia suggested developing clear guidelines to ensure funds are effectively delivered to support their needs. Syria requested facilitation of financial transactions to enable Raptors MOU-related activities and capacity-building activities.

NATIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS (NBSAPs)

Q. 7.1 What issues are preventing you from (better) integrating raptor conservation actions into your National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP)?

Signatories with Successful Integration

Some Signatories reported that their National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) included raptor conservation actions, and Chad, Madagascar and Mongolia reported that their NBSAPs have already addressed raptor conservation measures. Pakistan and the United Arab Emirates have successfully integrated raptor conservation into their NBSAPs and emphasized the need for continuous refinement to address emerging challenges such as habitat pressures and climate change.

Challenges Due to Generalized or Non-Specific NBSAPs

Several Signatories highlighted that their NBSAPs were too general to address raptor conservation effectively. Hungary, Morocco, and Jordan cited that their NBSAPs were too broad to address species-specific conservation needs, including raptor conservation, and required more targeted actions and additional support.

Technical, Scientific, and Institutional Barriers

Several Signatories identified technical, scientific, or institutional barriers that prevent better integration. Armenia pointed to a lack of scientific justification for policymakers. Ethiopia highlighted weak institutional collaboration, particularly between the Ethiopian Biodiversity Institute (EBI) and Ethiopian Wildlife Conservation Authority (EWCA). Iran (Islamic Republic of) cited the absence of a systematic and holistic view in their conservation efforts. Comoros raised concerns over technical and financial constraints, while Senegal noted a lack of specialized raptor groups and financial resources at national level.

Financial Constraints

Some Signatories identified financial constraints as a significant obstacle. Somalia noted that allocated budgets for wildlife conservation are insufficient to address raptor-specific actions. Sudan reported that while raptors are included in wildlife protection programs, limited funding and low prioritization of wildlife at state level hinder implementation. Sudan therefore suggested focusing funding on nature reserves and their rehabilitation rather than targeting specific species.

Countries Under Review or in Progress

Several Signatories were updating or reviewing their NBSAPs in 2024, while the questionnaire was being circulated. The NBSAPs in Egypt and the Gambia were under review. Norway stated that its revised NBSAP would be published in October 2024 and highlighted the challenge of balancing green energy development, land use planning, and biodiversity protection. Saudi Arabia reported that a national workshop in July 2024 included discussions to integrate migratory species, such as raptors, into their national biodiversity framework, aligning with the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.

Q. 7.2 How could the Coordinating Unit of the Raptors MOU help you overcome each of those issues? Please be aware of the information already available on NBSAPs and migratory species on the [CMS website](#).

The Signatories requested the Coordinating Unit to help secure financial support and facilitate stronger national and regional coordination. Signatories also expressed the need for improved technical expertise, capacity-building, and adaptive strategies to overcome the challenges faced in integrating raptor conservation into NBSAPs.

Financial Constraints and Support

Several Signatories expressed challenges related to financial constraints, and many sought assistances from the Coordinating Unit in addressing these barriers. Armenia highlighted the need for support in increasing sustainable fundraising and volunteer coordination. Chad and Comoros emphasized the necessity of financial assistance. Ethiopia requested assistance in establishing strong relations between national agencies to secure consistent funding for raptor conservation efforts. Jordan emphasized the need for specialized funding and support beyond general information, while Sudan requested inclusion in funding projects related to wildlife conservation.

Coordination Issues

Several Signatories raised the need for improved coordination to better integrate raptor conservation at national and international level. Hungary identified the need for more specific national conservation strategies that go beyond its general NBSAP, while Iran (Islamic Republic of) proposed creating a liaison among different conventions to foster better coordination. Morocco recommended that the Coordinating Unit should strengthen connections with the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) to formulate specific recommendations on raptor conservation during COP meetings. Ethiopia asked for assistance in facilitating collaboration between the Ethiopian Wildlife Conservation Authority (EWCA) and (Ethiopian Biodiversity Institute) EBI to improve integration.

Technical Support for Strategy Development

For Norway, the primary concern was to address the conflicts between green energy development and biodiversity protection, and to promote adaptive management measures. The United Arab Emirates sought guidance on refining raptor conservation actions, emphasizing the need for adaptive management approaches to address challenges such as climate change. Senegal identified a need for technical support to form a national working group on raptors and develop an action plan. The Gambia asked for suggestions on how to integrate raptor conservation into their NBSAP effectively.

Implementation of Raptor Conservation Plans

Some Signatories have outlined specific requests for implementation support. Pakistan is revising its NBSAP to align with global biodiversity frameworks and seeks technical input from the Coordinating Unit. Meanwhile, Somalia stated confidence in contributing field survey data but expressed a desire for partnerships to improve their data collection on raptors. Sudan similarly requested inclusion in funded projects aimed at protecting raptors.

Regional Collaboration and Partnerships

The United Arab Emirates highlighted the importance of promoting regional collaboration, particularly for migratory raptors, to align conservation efforts across borders.

SYNERGIES

Q. 8.1 Do you think that improving synergies between the Raptors MOU and other entities/organizations could improve implementation of the Raptors MOU mandate? If so, which entities/organizations?

International Treaties and Conventions

Several Signatories emphasized the importance of leveraging international agreements to strengthen the implementation of the Raptors MOU. Pakistan pointed to international treaties and conventions such as the Convention on International Trade of Endangered Species (CITES), the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), and the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands as crucial platforms. Ethiopia similarly noted CMS, the African Eurasian Waterbird Agreement (AEWA), CBD, and CITES as key partnerships. Norway specifically mentioned the CBD, while Morocco aligned with CBD, IUCN, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). France focused on the AEWA agreement, underlining its relevance. Syria and Saudi Arabia also cited AEWA as a valuable partner for collaboration.

International and Regional Organizations

Multiple countries stressed the role of international and regional forums, organizations, and NGOs in achieving the Raptors MOU mandate. Pakistan identified entities like the Regional Wildlife Enforcement Networks, AEWA, IUCN, and WWF as key stakeholders. Armenia recommended organizations such as the WWF (through its Eco Corridors program), international development organizations with habitat restoration priorities (e.g. UNDP, UNEP), as well as international financial institutions like the World Bank Group, Asian Development Bank, and European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates all underscored the importance of BirdLife International and IUCN in this regard. Saudi Arabia further highlighted the Bird Protection Society within its own country, while Madagascar noted the Birds of Prey network.

Academic and Research Institutions

Signatories recognized the critical role of academic and research institutions in supporting raptor conservation efforts. Chad emphasized research institutions as a key area of collaboration. Senegal suggested partnerships with national research institutes, and Comoros identified the Université des Comores, particularly its Faculty of Science and Technology, as a relevant partner. The United Arab Emirates added the importance of collaboration with academic and research institutions within its borders.

Local Communities and Associations

Several countries emphasized engaging local communities and associations to enhance implementation. The Gambia pointed to Bird Watchers Associations and local communities as important stakeholders. Sudan also underscored the significance of local communities, while Senegal proposed partnerships with associations like Nature Communities Development (NCD).

National Parks and Site Management

Senegal highlighted national parks management as a priority area for collaboration, indicating its role in habitat and species conservation.

Funding Entities and Conservation Initiatives

To address resource needs, Signatories identified funding entities and specialized conservation programs. The United Arab Emirates mentioned the Mohamed Bin Zayed Raptor Conservation Fund as a key financial supporter for raptor conservation. Egypt also called for collaboration with all funding entities working on raptor conservation.

Standardization and Technical Forums

Hungary emphasized the need to engage with international standardization forums focused on power line designs, suggesting they could provide valuable technical solutions for raptor conservation.

Divergent Views on Independence

While many Signatories supported collaboration, Mongolia expressed a contrasting perspective, advocating for the Raptors MOU to remain an independent entity that focuses on supporting and coordinating the work of its member countries.

Q. 8.2 How would the improved synergies with those specific entities/organizations help?

Habitat and Species Protection

Several Signatories emphasized the importance of improved synergies in addressing habitat-related challenges. Armenia noted that enhanced cooperation could improve raptor protection on private or community lands where national protected areas cannot be established. It would also ensure that infrastructure development considers raptor safety and habitat requirements. Hungary suggested that international coordination could lead to global adoption of bird-friendly power line designs. France highlighted the need to focus on migratory routes, while Morocco proposed the development and funding of specific conservation programs for raptors and their habitats.

Capacity-Building and Knowledge Exchange

Improved synergies were seen as an opportunity for capacity-building and knowledge sharing. Chad and Comoros stressed the importance of training and experience exchange. Similarly, Ethiopia emphasized the role of scientific information exchange in promoting the global conservation status of raptors. Madagascar also identified information sharing as a key benefit. Syria highlighted the role of synergies in facilitating financial support and training opportunities.

Financial and Technical Support

Many Signatories pointed to the need for additional financial and technical resources. Egypt emphasized better financial support, implementation, and increased human resources. Norway noted that improved synergies would enhance access to funding, political support, and visibility while simplifying reporting processes. Pakistan suggested that collaboration could achieve better results with lower financial input. The United Arab Emirates detailed multiple benefits, including increased funding and technical expertise from entities like the Mohamed Bin Zayed Raptor Conservation Fund, IUCN, and BirdLife International.

Research and Innovation

Collaboration with research institutions and experts was highlighted to enhance conservation efforts. The United Arab Emirates emphasized that academic institutions could contribute innovative solutions for raptor monitoring, habitat protection, and threat mitigation. Saudi Arabia highlighted the need to develop

mechanisms for communication and information exchange to guide conservation strategies effectively. Iran (Islamic Republic of) stated that synergies could help build a larger, interconnected network for conservation.

Community Involvement and Local Relevance

Engaging local communities was recognized as a crucial element for effective implementation. Sudan noted that local communities' direct interaction with their environments makes them valuable stakeholders in conservation efforts. Similarly, The Gambia highlighted the importance of synergies in improving conservation ethics and data management. Senegal underscored the need for national coverage in conservation initiatives.

Visibility and Decision-Making

Improved synergies were also seen to enhance visibility and influence decision-making. Mongolia pointed to the benefit of increasing raptor conservation visibility among government agencies, while Norway stressed the importance of political support and simplified processes.

OTHER REMARKS/COMMENTS

Q. 9.1 Would you like to share any additional remarks or information with us?

Data and Knowledge Sharing

Improving data management and knowledge dissemination was identified as a priority. The Gambia emphasized the need for prioritizing data management and raising community awareness. Pakistan suggested that the Coordinating Unit of the Raptors MOU collects and shares materials such as best practices, national conservation strategies, and awareness resources for raptors. They also recommended leveraging social media platforms to enhance visibility and outreach. Egypt proposed the development of online curricula, such as short courses (20–30 minutes), to share knowledge and outcomes of single-species action plans, offering a modern and accessible learning tool.

Funding and Capacity-Building

A common concern among Signatories was the lack of sufficient funding and capacity to implement raptor conservation programs effectively. Armenia highlighted its strong scientific capacity and a National Bird Monitoring Program but cited a lack of targeted funding and volunteer coordination capacity, which hampers more intensive monitoring, particularly during migration periods. Similarly, Senegal emphasized the importance of a national strategy but stressed the need for adequate financial resources to implement it effectively. Chad called for regional workshops and additional funding opportunities to strengthen conservation efforts. Morocco underscored the significance of North Africa as a critical region for raptor conservation and urged support for strengthening state capacities to conserve birds of prey and their habitats.

Threat Mitigation and Conservation Efforts

Several Signatories highlighted specific threats to raptor species and called for urgent intervention. Ethiopia reported that vulture poisoning has recently emerged as a serious threat, requiring immediate support from international conservation organizations. They also noted that the information on Ethiopian raptor species occurring in their country as listed in the Raptors MOU website and the list of sites provided in Table 3 of Annex 3 are incomplete and should be updated. Saudi Arabia detailed ongoing initiatives to mitigate specific threats, such as electrocution and collisions with powerlines, and the National Center for Wildlife (NCW) is preparing a document on these threats which will be particularly useful for Arabic-speaking countries. The

United Arab Emirates reiterated its commitment to raptor conservation through initiatives like the Mohamed Bin Zayed Raptor Conservation Fund and the Sheikh Zayed Falcon Release Program. However, they emphasized the evolving challenges facing raptors and the need for innovative solutions and capacity-building to address these issues.

Collaborative Approaches and Regional Support

The need for collaborative efforts at both national and regional levels was identified as a general need. Saudi Arabia mentioned its collaboration with UNEP's Regional Office for West Asia to develop a National Biodiversity Framework. Somalia requested prioritization due to its unique and challenging circumstances. Morocco emphasized the importance of supporting North African countries in their conservation efforts. The United Arab Emirates expressed eagerness to work closely with the Coordinating Unit and international partners to enhance conservation strategies and ensure the long-term protection of raptor species.

Priority Activities

The analysis of the questionnaire responses received enabled the Coordinating Unit to identify priority activities addressing the most pressing needs in raptor conservation. These priorities are listed and described below.

Geographical scope

The questionnaire responses reflect broad geographic representation; the percentages below illustrate the geographical distribution of Signatories across regions and highlight their identified priority needs:

- **Africa** (48 per cent of replies): Strong emphasis on training, financial support, and collaboration.
- **Asia** (38 per cent of replies): High demand for financial support, data management, and NBSAP integration.
- **Europe** (14 per cent of replies): Focus on strategic planning, cross-border collaboration, and technical assistance.

Priority Activities

The Signatories identified numerous areas where assistance is needed. The following four categories represent the most urgent needs, which will also serve as the priority actions of the Coordinating Unit:

Financial Support (81 per cent replies): Financial constraints remain the primary challenge to implementing raptor conservation efforts. The survey outcomes suggested that need of the Coordinating Unit to assist Signatories in securing sustainable funding by fostering partnerships with international donors, foundations, and regional stakeholders. This includes assisting with grant applications, identifying sponsorship opportunities, and exploring innovative financing mechanisms. Promoting funding models for long-term sustainability, such as cross-border collaboration projects, is also cited as essential.

Monitoring Support (71 per cent of replies): A significant number of Signatories highlighted the needs for enhanced monitoring support. The outcomes of the survey suggested the need for the Coordinating Unit to provide help in the field of species identification, data management, monitoring strategies and logistics planning, field surveys implementation, and the development of standardized monitoring methods and frameworks. It further suggested that the Coordinating Unit is also required to promote best practices in data collection and to facilitate regional data-sharing initiatives to support collaborative monitoring efforts.

Conservation Planning (62 per cent of the replies): Many Signatories expressed the need for support in integrating raptor conservation into their NBSAPs. While the CMS Secretariat has already provided guidelines to assist in the development of NBSAPs, further efforts are needed to ensure their effective implementation. The Coordinating Unit is therefore requested to facilitate workshops and provide strategic guidance to address institutional and technical barriers to conservation planning. It is proposed that these efforts should focus on supporting the development of national or regional conservation strategies or equivalent documents (such as Multi- or Single Species Action Plans) and building capacity to apply the existing guidelines effectively. Aligning these initiatives with global frameworks such as the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework are suggested to further enhance consistency and impact.

Technological Support (57 per cent of the replies): Technological support is a key priority for over half of the responding Signatories. It was proposed that the Coordinating Unit should provide guidance on species monitoring, reporting, and the use of conservation technologies. This includes facilitating access to essential tools such as binoculars, spotting scopes, and field guides to improve monitoring outcomes. In addition, the responses to the survey suggested that the Coordinating Unit should offer access to expertise in managing databases, implementing advanced conservation technologies, and aligning efforts with global biodiversity frameworks. It was also proposed that there is also a strong need for capacity-building through training on technologies such as satellite tracking, GPS devices, and data management systems. Developing centralized national data platforms to enhance data accessibility and integrating these technologies into conservation strategies are also critical.

The Way Forward

The analysis presented in this report confirms the breadth and depth of capacity-building needs that exist across the Signatories to the Raptors MOU. Translating these findings into concrete action requires a shared and realistic understanding of the roles and responsibilities of all parties involved, including the Coordinating Unit and Signatories. In that spirit, the Coordinating Unit wishes to make an important clarification before setting out the path ahead.

Mandate of the Coordinating Unit of the Raptors MOU and Next Steps

The Coordinating Unit is mandated to assist communication, encourage reporting and facilitate activities between and among Signatories. Additionally, as described in the Raptors MOU Action Plan, the Coordinating Unit should:

- i. establish and operate suitable platforms for exchange of knowledge, experience and information (Activity 6.4),
- ii. strengthen capacity in relevant institutions and local communities, including by training, for actions in support of the conservation of birds of prey and their habitats (Activity 8),
- i. develop opportunities to cooperate internationally for coordinated implementation of the MOU, through regional cooperation mechanisms for exchange of information and best practices, resource mobilization, joint programmes of work and common emergency response protocols (Activity 9.1).

Signatories are reminded that the Coordinating Unit of the Raptors MOU does not hold or administer conservation grants, and it cannot directly finance the implementation of national raptor conservation activities.

However, the Coordinating Unit would actively support Signatories in preparing funding proposals to address the capacity-building needs identified in this report. This support may include assistance with drafting project proposals, such as helping to develop the concept, providing comments on or reviewing draft submissions,

and offering guidance on how to strengthen proposals, including identifying priority areas for countries to focus on.

The Coordinating Unit could also support the identification of appropriate funding opportunities and potential donors, facilitate linkages between Signatories and international financial mechanisms, and provide letters of support or endorsement for projects that align with the Raptors MOU Action Plan. The Coordinating Unit stands ready to serve as a strategic partner in this process, helping Signatories navigate the funding landscape and make a compelling case for investment in raptor conservation.

At the same time, the effective implementation of the Coordinating Unit's mandate and activities under the Raptors MoU is dependent upon the timely provision of annual voluntary contributions by Signatories.

A Call to Signatories: Supporting One Another

The questionnaire responses reveal that while some Signatories face significant capacity constraints, others possess well-developed technical expertise, institutional frameworks, and programmatic experience. The Coordinating Unit warmly invites those Signatories who are in the position to do so to play an active role in supporting other Signatories. Such support could take many forms:

- i. sharing, through the Coordinating Unit, national conservation strategies and monitoring protocols as models for others;
- ii. hosting or co-organizing regional training workshops;
- iii. providing in-country mentoring and technical assistance;
- iv. contributing expertise to the review of funding proposals;
- v. serving as a resource and point of contact for peer-to-peer knowledge exchange.

Roadmap for Implementation

Building on the four priority areas identified in the Priority Activities part of the report (financial support, monitoring support, conservation planning, and technological support) the following roadmap outlines the key actions to be pursued by the Coordinating Unit and Signatories over the next triennium.

Phase 1 – Consolidation and Engagement

The immediate focus will be on disseminating this report's findings to all Signatories and initiating direct dialogue with those who identified the most pressing needs. The Coordinating Unit will circulate this report to all National Contact Points. Furthermore, the Coordinating unit will organize a workshop (in person or online depending on resources available) to discuss how identified needs can best be addressed, identify responsibilities and actions required. A register of Signatories willing to offer peer support will be compiled, together with a mapping of potential funding sources relevant to the identified priority areas. The Coordinating Unit will also begin developing a template toolkit to assist Signatories in preparing funding proposals tailored to their specific capacity gaps.

Phase 2 – Capacity-Building and Proposal Development

During this phase, the Coordinating Unit will work in close collaboration with Signatories to advance concrete capacity-building initiatives. This will include organizing at least one regional workshop per region (Africa, Asia, Europe) to address the priority needs identified, with a particular focus on monitoring methodologies, data management, and the integration of raptor conservation into NBSAPs. The Coordinating Unit will facilitate the development of joint or multi-country funding proposals targeting the identified priority areas, connecting Signatories with appropriate co-applicants and donor agencies. Peer-support partnerships between Signatories will be actively facilitated and promoted, with the Coordinating Unit providing a coordination and matchmaking function. Progress against the identified needs will be tracked and reported to the wider Signatory community.

Phase 3 – Review and Consolidation

The Coordinating Unit will undertake a review of progress made against the roadmap and the needs identified in this report. A follow-up questionnaire or targeted consultations will be used to assess whether capacity gaps have been reduced and to identify any emerging or unresolved needs. The findings of this review will inform the preparation of a progress report and a revised capacity-building strategy to be presented to Signatories at MOS4, enabling an evidence-based discussion on next steps and priorities for the subsequent intersessional period.

Invitation to Act

The Coordinating Unit calls upon all Signatories to engage constructively with this roadmap. Signatories that require support in preparing funding proposals, establishing monitoring programmes, developing national conservation strategies, or addressing any of the other priority needs identified in this report are encouraged to contact the Coordinating Unit directly. Signatories that are in a position to offer technical, scientific, or programmatic assistance to fellow Signatories are equally invited to come forward, their contribution will be instrumental in building a stronger, more cohesive Raptors MOU community.

It is important to reiterate that in order to enable the Coordinating Unit to effectively fulfil its mandate and continue supporting the implementation of the Raptors MoU, Signatories are encouraged to provide their voluntary contributions on an annual and timely basis. Together, through coordinated effort and solidarity among Signatories, the Raptors MOU community can make measurable progress toward reversing the decline of migratory birds of prey across Africa and Eurasia.

Annex

Annex 1: Questionnaire

Section	Question
1. Overall Capacity Needs	1.1 What type of capacity does your country need for improving its implementation of the Raptors MOU?
	1.2 What specific agencies, individuals, entities or others need that capacity?
	1.3 How could the Coordinating Unit of the Raptors MOU help you build that capacity?
2. Collaboration	2.1 Would raptor conservation in your country benefit from more collaboration with other countries? If so, with which countries?
	2.2 How would improved collaboration with those specific countries help you?
	2.3 How could the Coordinating Unit of the Raptors MOU help you improve collaboration with those countries?
3. Strategies	3.1 What issues are preventing you from developing or finalising a national raptor conservation strategy?
	3.2 How could the Coordinating Unit of the Raptors MOU help you overcome each of those issues?
4. Monitoring	4.1 What issues are preventing you from regularly monitoring raptors occurring in your territory?
	4.2 How could the Coordinating Unit of the Raptors MOU help you overcome each of those issues?
5. Data Collection	5.1 What issues are preventing you from regularly collecting data on raptors occurring in your territory?
	5.2 How could the Coordinating Unit of the Raptors MOU help you overcome each of those issues?
6. Funding	6.1 Financial constraints are often identified as a capacity issue. If this applies to you, how could the Coordinating Unit of the Raptors MOU help you obtain more funding for your raptor conservation efforts?
7. NBSAPs	7.1 What issues are preventing you from (better) integrating raptor conservation actions into your National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP)?
	7.2 How could the Coordinating Unit of the Raptors MOU help you overcome each of those issues? Please be aware of the information already available on NBSAPs and migratory species on the CMS website.
8. Synergies	8.1 Do you think that improving synergies between the Raptors MOU and other entities/organisations could improve implementation of the Raptors MOU mandate? If so, which entities/organisations?
	8.2 How would improved synergies with those specific entities/organisations help?
9. Additional remarks	9.1 Would you like to share any additional remarks or information with us?