



Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals



THIRD RANGE STATE MEETING OF THE CENTRAL ASIAN MAMMALS INITIATIVE (CAMI)

24 – 26 June 2025, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

UNEP/CMS/CAMI3/Meeting Report

MEETING REPORT

(Prepared by the Secretariat)

MEETING REPORT

Agenda Item 1. Opening of the Meeting

1. The Meeting was opened by Mr. Alisher Salomov, Advisor to the Minister of Ecology, Environmental Protection and Climate Change of the Republic of Uzbekistan, who welcomed participants as the host of the Third Range State Meeting of the Central Asian Mammals Initiative (CAMI). In his opening remarks, Mr. Salomov reaffirmed Uzbekistan's strong commitment to wildlife conservation and sustainable development. He noted that this commitment is reflected in the country's role as host of the Fourteenth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS COP14) in February 2024, as well as the upcoming Twentieth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES COP20) in November 2025, both in Samarkand. He further emphasized Uzbekistan's growing role as a regional hub for environmental protection, highlighting the establishment of the Central Asian University of Environmental and Climate Change Studies (Green University) to build regional capacity, and the opening of the IUCN Central Asia Office to enhance regional cooperation in conservation efforts.
2. Ms. Clara Nobbe, Head of the Terrestrial Species Team at the CMS Secretariat, thanked the Government of Uzbekistan for hosting the meeting. In her welcoming remarks, she emphasized the global significance of Central Asia for migratory species and their habitats and CAMI as a framework for regional cooperation for their protection.
3. Dr. Michael Wimmer, Head of Cooperation at the Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany in Uzbekistan, also delivered remarks, commending Uzbekistan's strong commitment to environmental protection and highlighting the long-standing cooperation between the two countries in this field.

Agenda Item 2. Election of the Chair

4. Uzbekistan was elected as the Chair and Pakistan was elected as the Vice Chair of the Meeting.

Agenda Item 3. Objectives and Modus Operandi of the Meeting

5. The Chair explained that the Meeting intends to make decisions by consensus and that in case of disagreement the CMS COP Rules of Procedure would be followed *mutatis mutandis*. The Chair clarified that, as this is an intergovernmental meeting, Range State representatives would be given the floor first, followed by observer organizations.
6. The Secretariat outlined the objectives and *modus operandi* of the meeting, emphasizing that it served as an opportunity to review the implementation of the CAMI Programme of Work for 2021-2026 and to revise and endorse the draft Work Programme for 2026-2032 in view of its further discussion by CMS COP15, to be held in Campo Grande, Brazil, in March 2026, and its eventual adoption.

Agenda Item 4. Adoption of the Meeting Agenda

7. The Meeting considered [UNEP/CMS/CAMI3/Doc.1/Provisional Agenda](#) and it was adopted without amendment.

Agenda Item 5. Presentation of CMS and CAMI and Report of the Secretariat

8. The Secretariat provided background information about CMS and CAMI followed by the introduction of [UNEP/CMS/CAMI3/Doc.7. Report of the Secretariat](#). The Meeting agreed on the actions proposed in the document.

Agenda Item 6. Statements from the CAMI Range States

9. Upon the invitation of the Chair, the attending CAMI Range States provided an overview of key achievements and challenges in implementing the CAMI Programme of Work for 2021–2026 in their respective countries and shared their priorities for the forthcoming Work Programme.
10. The presentations are available online and can be accessed through the respective links provided:
 - China: [Country Statements: China | CMS](#)
 - India: [Country Statements: India | CMS](#)
 - Kazakhstan: [Country Statements: Kazakhstan | CMS](#)
 - Kyrgyzstan: [Country Statements: Kyrgyzstan | CMS](#)
 - Mongolia: [Country Statements: Mongolia | CMS](#)
 - Nepal: [Country Statements: Nepal | CMS](#)
 - Pakistan: [Country Statements: Pakistan | CMS](#)
 - Tajikistan: [Country Statements: Tajikistan | CMS](#)
 - Turkmenistan: [Country Statements: Turkmenistan | CMS](#)
 - Uzbekistan: [Country Statements: Uzbekistan | CMS](#)
11. Bhutan noted that to date they have not taken active part in CAMI discussions and expressed hope for being able to engage more in the future. Bhutan delivered a verbal statement highlighting its success in establishing a network of protected areas, including delineation of few snow leopard areas as high conservation value areas with the funding support from the International Climate Initiative (IKI) of the German Government. In addition, based on surveys conducted between 2022 and 2025, 34 snow leopards were recorded within protected areas in the northern part of the country. Bhutan also outlined key challenges, including habitat fragmentation because of infrastructure development and incidents of retaliatory killings.

Agenda Item 7. Overview Report on the Implementation of the CAMI Programme of Work (POW) 2021-2026

12. A consultant, on behalf of the Secretariat introduced [UNEP/CMS/CAMI3/Doc.2. Overview Report](#) on the implementation of the CAMI POW for 2021-2026 based on the national reports. National reports submitted by seven Range States are available online and can be accessed through the respective links provided:
 - [Kazakhstan](#)
 - [Kyrgyzstan](#)
 - [Mongolia](#)
 - [Pakistan](#)
 - [Tajikistan](#)
 - [Turkmenistan](#)
 - [Uzbekistan](#)
13. While some progress was noted – particularly in transboundary cooperation, community-based conservation, and combating illegal wildlife trade – implementation was uneven, with many activities only partially or minimally executed. Persistent challenges were

identified in the areas of infrastructure development, governance, financing, and private sector engagement.

14. Conservation status of the CAMI species varied – while several species remain critically endangered, positive trends were observed for the saiga antelope and Bukhara deer, reflecting the impact of coordinated conservation measures.
15. Key recommendations emerging from the Overview Report included integrating CAMI objectives into national legislation and policy frameworks; establishing a CAMI Trust Fund to support long-term implementation; formalizing and scaling up successful community-based conservation models; promoting wildlife-friendly infrastructure development; and enhancing regional collaboration and scientific monitoring. A separate emphasis was put on the need to strengthen cooperation between CMS and CITES to more effectively address illegal cross-border wildlife trade.
16. Pakistan sought further clarification on how the management of linear infrastructure could be institutionalized. The delegation also requested additional information on the proposed way forward with regard to the development of indicators and the strengthening of collaboration among countries and institutions under CAMI. In response, the consultant explained that the issue of linear infrastructure is less about institutionalization and more about identifying and implementing appropriate mitigation measures in areas where barriers exist or may emerge in the future. Regarding indicators, the consultant noted that there has not yet been a discussion on their development.
17. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in Uzbekistan, which is leading the development of the country's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP), emphasized the importance of strengthening the linkages between the new WP and the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (KMGBF) under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). UNDP Uzbekistan also highlighted the need to consider sustainable financing mechanisms, such as the Biodiversity Finance Initiative (BIOFIN), in the new Work Programme. In response, the Chair noted that this topic was already included on the meeting agenda.
18. The Secretariat stated that the Meeting provides a platform for the discussion of the potential funding proposals, including at the regional level, to donors such as the Global Environment Facility (GEF). Upon the request from India, the Secretariat provided an example of the regional level project implemented with GEF funding to the Global Snow Leopard & Ecosystem Protection Program (GSLEP) and upcoming opportunities under the GEF9 funding cycle. Uzbekistan further highlighted an ongoing discussion about regional level project proposals under the GEF's Global Biodiversity Framework Fund (GBFF).

Agenda Item 8. Central Asian Mammals and Climate Adaptation (CAMCA) project

19. The Secretariat presented implementation of the CAMI POW 2021-2026 activities under the CAMCA project funded by IKI of the German Government followed by the recommendations to integrate project outputs in the new Work Programme.

Agenda Item 9. Draft Work Programme (WP) for the Central Asian Mammals Initiative 2026-2032

20. The Secretariat introduced the proposed structure of the WP and the Conservation Unit (CU) approach in line with CMS Decision 14.167 (d) that commissioned the revision of the CAMI POW with the aim of streamlining its actions to focus on cross-cutting activities

- that benefit multiple species and to reflect updated CMS mandates relevant to the region.
21. Further, the Secretariat introduced the [UNEP/CMS/CAMI3/Doc.3. Draft CAMI WP 2026-2032](#) developed with the input from experts at the Technical Workshop for the Central Asian Mammals Initiative co-organized by the German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation and the CMS Secretariat on Vilm, Germany, May 2025. As recommended by CMS COP14, draft WP includes conservation measures for the lynx and Pallas' cat and also includes linkages to KMGBF.
 22. The Secretariat explained that the CU approach is based on the approach of the [Mapping Transboundary Conservation Hotspots for the Central Asian Mammals Initiative](#) study and the consultant elaborated on the details of the process and the criteria for the CU selection.
 23. India sought clarification on the reduction of priority areas from 39 to 12, asking whether this reduction implies that some areas have now been excluded. The delegation further inquired whether all 39 areas are still covered in some form, and if not, whether there are plans to incorporate the remaining areas into future CUs. In response, the consultant explained that, as outlined in the methodology, all 39 sites were ranked, and the highest-ranking sites were selected for prioritization in the new WP. While the remaining sites are still considered important and deserving of conservation attention, they will not be included in the current cycle unless specific suggestions are made for additional inclusion.
 24. Pakistan raised concerns about the limited representation of its territory among the 12 selected priority sites, particularly in light of the consideration of two additional species for inclusion in the CAMI framework – the Himalayan lynx and the Pallas's cat – both present in Pakistan. The delegation inquired why Pakistan was not more reflected in the site selection, given its ecological relevance. In response, the consultant clarified that Pakistan is represented in the High Pamirs that is a range for both species.
 25. The Argali Species Focal Point (SFP) requested clarification on the shift in CAMI's approach from species-based conservation across entire ranges to an area-based approach on selected CUs. The Argali SFP expressed concern that this change could lead to confusion or create the impression that important species and large portions of their ranges—such as saiga antelope in Kazakhstan or argali in Mongolia—are no longer prioritized. The speaker emphasized the need for the Secretariat to clearly explain how the new approach will continue to support the conservation of target species across their full range and avoid the perception of a fragmented strategy.
 26. In response, the Secretariat clarified that the new CAMI WP includes both a general component, which covers all target species across their full range, and a targeted component focused on selected CUs. Also, the CUs were chosen based on their prior identification as important hotspots and are intended to facilitate access to area-based funding, which is often preferred by donors. As this approach was not static, participants were encouraged to discuss it and suggest additional areas or propose modifications during the working group discussions.
 27. The Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) thanked the organizers and praised the draft CAMI WP for its comprehensive nature. However, they raised concerns regarding the clarity and transparency of the criteria used to select CUs. They requested clearer definitions of key terms such as “sustainable numbers” and “regularly,” noting that these may be unclear to new readers. They also pointed to apparent inconsistencies in the scoring of species importance, using the High Pamirs as an example, and emphasized

- the need for a clearer methodology to explain how priorities were determined and scores assigned.
28. In response, the consultant explained that the scoring system used to rank CUs was derived from the study [Mapping Transboundary Conservation Hotspots for the Central Asian Mammals Initiative](#). They acknowledged the concern and recognized that scoring can be particularly challenging for recently added species, such as the lynx or Pallas's cat, and in countries like Afghanistan where data availability is limited. In such cases, the scores were based on the best available—though in some instances hypothetical—information regarding species presence and population estimates.
 29. The Institute of Zoology of Kazakhstan emphasized the significance of the Zhongar-Alatau hotspot for numerous CAMI species and proposed either the creation of a new CU or the extension of an existing one to encompass this area. In response, the consultant explained that the site had not been prioritized in the CU ranking assessment but encouraged the delegation to raise the proposal during the working group discussions.
 30. India acknowledged the quality of the document and recommended expanding the Western Trans-Himalaya CU, noting that some species occur there only at the fringe of their range and may not reflect optimal habitat. India also proposed including additional hotspots in the Eastern Himalayas to account for key transboundary species such as takin, blue sheep, eastern kiang, and argali. In response, the consultant confirmed that the boundaries of the Western Trans-Himalaya unit would be discussed and noted the potential for future inclusion of currently unlisted transboundary species under CMS and CAMI, such as the takin and blue sheep.
 31. Pakistan proposed extending the High Pamirs CU to include the Hindu Kush, noting that both regions share key species such as the Himalayan lynx and that the Hindu Kush, while smaller, overlaps with the Pamirs within Pakistan. The speaker highlighted that this extension would facilitate conservation efforts in transboundary areas where current delineations pose practical challenges. They emphasized the strong presence of target species in the Hindu Kush and offered to share relevant research to support the proposal.
 32. The Co-Chair of the Persian Leopard Working Group inquired whether the 12 identified CUs had been further prioritized based on levels of threat or potential for species recovery and habitat restoration, or whether such prioritization remains to be developed. In response, the consultant explained that the current assessment did not specifically consider areas unoccupied by CAMI species that may hold potential for future recolonization. This indicates that restoration-focused prioritization has not yet been addressed and may need to be incorporated into future planning.
 33. The Association for the Conservation of Biodiversity of Kazakhstan (ACBK) supported interventions from the Institute of Zoology of Kazakhstan on Zhongar-Alatau and India on the extension of the Western Trans-Himalaya CU.
 34. The Regional Ramsar Initiative noted that key transboundary habitats for the Bukhara deer are not reflected in the current CUs. They also highlighted the absence of desert ecosystems, such as the Kyzylkum Desert between the Amu Darya and Syr Darya rivers, which are important for species like the goitered gazelle and Severtsov's sheep. In response, the consultant explained that CUs containing Bukhara deer do not significantly overlap with other CAMI species, which resulted in lower rankings in the assessment. Regarding desert ecosystems, the consultant noted that such areas could

be addressed through cross-cutting activities under the WP. The Secretariat added that any new CUs could be proposed during the working group discussions.

35. The Goitered Gazelle SFP clarified that there is a separate WP for 2025-2032 under the Memorandum of Understanding concerning Conservation and Restoration of the Bukhara Deer (Bukhara Deer MOU).
36. The Institute of Zoology of Uzbekistan supported the inclusion of the Kyzylkum Desert as a CU. In response, the Secretariat clarified that a part of the desert is included in CU3. In addition, the Argali SFP emphasized that, for such cases, it is important to strengthen the overarching, non-area-specific component of the CAMI WP. They cautioned that attempting to define and list all relevant areas in detail risks making the approach overly broad – potentially encompassing nearly all of Central Asia – and diminishing its strategic focus. The speaker acknowledged the inherent difficulty in drawing clear boundaries and noted that quantitative ranking was particularly challenging, both in the original hotspot study and in the Secretariat's efforts to structure the assessment while minimizing subjectivity.
37. The Saiga SFP clarified that the identified CUs are intended to highlight areas of particular conservation importance, rather than to suggest that CAMI activities are limited to those areas. The speaker recommended rephrasing sections of the draft WP to explicitly state that the initiative continues to address the full range of target species across their entire distribution. They also proposed revising certain activities and indicators in the corresponding table that currently reference only the CUs, as this may give the false impression that surrounding areas are excluded. Additionally, Saiga SFP pointed out a potentially misleading table heading and offered to support the revision of relevant text to avoid misinterpretation.
38. UNDP Uzbekistan suggested simplifying the WP to enhance its accessibility and ensure it is easily understood by a diverse range of target audiences.
39. The Secretariat raised the question around the inclusion of the Eurasian lynx and Pallas's cat in the CAMI species list, in line with Decision 14.167(c) adopted at CMS COP14. This decision encourages Parties to consider adding newly listed CMS species to CAMI if they face similar threats and share habitats with existing CAMI species. As both species meet these criteria, they were provisionally included in the draft WP, but the Secretariat emphasized that the final decision rests with the Range States. The Chair then invited input from Range State delegations on the proposal. With no objections raised, consensus was reached, and the Eurasian lynx and Pallas's cat were formally added to the CAMI species list.
40. The attending Range States and observers were invited to participate in two parallel working groups: one focusing on cross-cutting matters and the other on CUs. A provisional schedule for the working group sessions was provided and slightly adjusted in accordance with the progress made during the course of the meeting.
41. Participants reviewed and revised the draft activities, as well as proposed changes to the boundaries and names of several CUs. These revisions of the CU boundaries and names are reflected in the sections below.
42. The Western Trans-Himalaya working group, with participation from China, India, Nepal, and Bhutan, proposed revising the boundaries of the existing CU and splitting it into two separate units to better reflect key conservation areas: the Western Himalaya and the Eastern Himalaya. It was noted that final confirmation of the revised boundaries remains pending, subject to confirmation from China. The Meeting endorsed the proposal.

43. The South Gobi, Jungarian Gobi, Trans-Altai Gobi working group, with participation from China and Mongolia, proposed merging the three CUs as “Gobi” to better reflect landscape connectivity, as well as the shared threats and conservation measures across the CU. The meeting endorsed the proposal.
44. The Western Tian Shan working group, with participation from China, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan, proposed expanding the CU to include the Karatau range, the Angren Plateau, Besh-Aral, and the eastern part of the Chatkal River and its valley. The meeting endorsed the proposal.
45. The High Pamirs working group, with participation from China, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan, and Tajikistan, proposed extending the boundaries of the CU and recommended renaming it to “Pamirs-Hindukush-Karakoram” to better reflect the revised geographic scope. The meeting endorsed the proposal.
46. The CAMI WP for 2026–2032, as endorsed by the attending Range States, shall be available online.
47. The meeting noted that input from the Russian Federation and the Islamic Republic of Iran was still needed regarding the Daurian Steppe, Altai, Koitendag/Kugitang, and Kopetdag CUs. To finalize the activities proposed under these regions, it was agreed that the Secretariat would conduct follow-up online consultations with the respective countries to seek their endorsement.
48. ACBK raised concerns about the term ‘Conservation Units’ noting that its meaning may be vague or unclear in Russian. This observation was supported by the Argali SFP, Institute of Zoology of Uzbekistan and International Takhi Group.
49. The Meeting agreed to rename ‘Conservation Units’ as ‘Priority Transboundary Conservation Regions’ (PTCR) and this change will be reflected in the revised CAMI WP.

Agenda Item 10. Central Asian Mammals Migration and Linear Infrastructure Atlas (CAMI Atlas) (2nd Edition) and its online version

50. Senckenberg Biodiversity and Climate Research Centre (Senckenberg) presented [the 2nd Edition of the CAMI Atlas](#) and its [online version](#) on the CMS website.
51. The Institute of Zoology of Uzbekistan praised the updated CAMI Atlas, highlighting the value of real-time data on species and linear infrastructure. However, they raised concerns about its practical use beyond the conservation community, noting that key actors—such as development banks, investment companies, and infrastructure agencies—often lack access to or engagement with this data. They emphasized the need to make the atlas a living, actionable tool and called for concrete steps to expand its reach, engage stakeholders, and ensure implementation of mitigation measures, and invited suggestions on how to scale up communication and influence, stressing the urgency of doing so.
52. The Secretariat agreed that the issue raised by the Institute of Zoology of Uzbekistan was critical and requested the working group on linear infrastructure and migration barriers to address this.
53. The Argali SFP noted that the Persian leopard and Urial had not been included in the Atlas, although in his opinion this would have been possible with existing data. He then sought clarification on updates regarding planned infrastructure developments. In

response, the Secretariat explained that further expansion of the atlas depends on the availability of funding, which is not yet secured.

54. The Secretariat also drew participants' attention to the CMS Scientific Council Working Group on Infrastructure and invited interested parties to join and contribute.
55. Senckenberg emphasized the importance of input from species experts, particularly regarding species ranges, ecological corridors, and conflict areas, to ensure the accuracy and effectiveness of the Atlas.
56. Pakistan commended the updated CAMI Atlas. They further noted that there might be deviations between species range data in the IUCN Red List assessments and expert knowledge. In response, the Senckenberg clarified that such differences were taken into account during the Atlas update process.
57. The Argali SFP noted that the CAMI Atlas employs a different categorization of the range maps as IUCN, suggesting this was a missed opportunity to contribute to IUCN processes and suggested this aspect being considered in future updates.

Agenda Item 11. Financing Biodiversity Presentation of the BfN-CMS Report on the Identification of Funding Options for the Implementation of the CAMI and UNDP BIOFIN

58. The Secretariat presented the [Report on the Identification of Funding Options for the Implementation of the Central Asian Mammals Initiative](#) on behalf of adelphi.
59. UNDP Uzbekistan presented its work under the Biodiversity Finance Initiative (BIOFIN), including a proposed model for a blended finance fund that could potentially support snow leopard conservation, as an example of a fund that could support CAMI WP implementation. It was noted that the studies yielded similar results, encouraging future collaboration to build on these synergies.

Agenda Item 12. Terms of Reference for Species Focal Points (SFPs) of the CAMI

60. The Secretariat presented the current list of SFPs, with eight CAMI species being covered, and introduced document [UNEP/CMS/CAMI3/Doc.4](#) outlining the Terms of Reference (ToRs) for SFPs and the proposed procedure for their selection.
61. The Goitered Gazelle SFP inquired whether a single expert could serve as SFP for multiple species. The Secretariat confirmed that this was technically possible but would depend on the capacity of the expert.
62. The Chair reiterated that the final decision on whether one expert can serve as an SFP for multiple species rests with the Range States and invited any objections. As none were raised, it was agreed that a single expert may serve as SFP for more than one species. The Secretariat informed participants that it would facilitate the selection process and communicate with Range States via email or at an online meeting to receive their decisions regarding the designation of SFPs.
63. The Meeting adopted the ToRs for SFPs and associated selection procedure.

Agenda Item 13. Terms of Reference for Organizations Providing Technical Support for the Implementation of the CAMI WP 2026-2032

64. The Secretariat presented the ToRs for establishing the role of a CAMI Technical Support organization, as outlined in document [UNEP/CMS/CAMI3/Doc.5](#).

65. The Range States agreed to establish the role, which can include non-governmental organizations and other interested stakeholders.
66. The Meeting adopted the ToRs for Organizations Providing Technical Support for the Implementation of the CAMI WP for 2026-2032 and associated selection procedure without changes.

Agenda Item 14. Terms of Reference for CAMI Chair

67. The Secretariat presented the ToRs for the CAMI Chair and Vice-Chair a position already created by Range States at their second meeting, as outlined in document [UNEP/CMS/CAMI3/Doc.6](#).
68. The Meeting adopted the ToRs for CAMI Chair and Vice-Chair without changes.

Agenda Item 15. Election of CAMI Chair and Vice-Chair

69. The Secretariat invited Range States to express interest in serving as Chair and Vice-Chair of the Initiative. Uzbekistan was elected as the CAMI Chair, and Turkmenistan was elected as the CAMI Vice-Chair for the intersessional period between the 3rd and the 4th meeting of the Range States.

Agenda Item 16. Proposal for de-listing the Bukhara Deer from CMS Appendix I

70. Uzbekistan presented their [proposal for de-listing the Bukhara deer from CMS Appendix I](#), noting that the Range States of the species expressed their support for this proposal at the Third Meeting of the Signatories to the Bukhara Deer MOU (MOS3), held in Almaty, Kazakhstan, September 2024.

Agenda Item 17. Proposal for listing Striped Hyena on CMS Appendix I

71. Tajikistan presented its proposal to list the striped hyena on CMS Appendix I and to include the species to CAMI, as outlined in document [UNEP/CMS/CAMI3/Inf.15](#).
72. Several countries, including India, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Pakistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan, expressed support for Tajikistan's proposal, noting that the striped hyena faces similar threats within their territories. Turkmenistan specifically reported a population of approximately 300 individuals and noted that the species is classified as vulnerable under its Red Book.
73. India raised a question of whether the species meets the criteria for listing under CMS Appendix I, particularly in terms of demonstrating migratory behaviour. In response, it was noted that the species' transboundary distribution may indicate migratory patterns, warranting further consideration.

Agenda Item 18. Synergies and Partnerships for the Implementation

74. Partner organizations were invited to present how they can support Range States in implementing the CAMI WP for 2026–2032. The presentations are available [online](#).
75. The Secretariat proposed the establishment of an Implementation Committee composed of Range States and partner organizations, which would meet quarterly to monitor progress and explore opportunities for collaboration in the implementation of the CAMI WP, including by preparing joint funding proposals – following a model similar to that of

the CMS Jaguar Initiative. The meeting welcomed the proposal and agreed on the establishment of the Committee.

Agenda Item 19. Next Steps

76. The Secretariat summarized the meeting outcomes and proposed next steps:
- The Secretariat shall contact the Governments of the Islamic Republic of Iran (Koitendag/Kugitang and Kopetdag) and the Russian Federation (Daurian Steppe and Altai) to finalize the activities for the relevant PTCRs.
 - The Secretariat shall finalize the maps reflecting the revised boundaries of existing PTCRs and the inclusion of newly proposed PTCRs, seeking approval from China and Pakistan.
 - The endorsed CAMI WP for 2026–2032 will be submitted to CMS COP15 as an annex to Resolution 11.24 (Rev.COP13) on CAMI. Once adopted, the CAMI WP for 2026–2032 will enter into force.
 - The Secretariat will launch an expression of interest for the nomination of CAMI SFPs, in line with the adopted ToRs.
 - The Secretariat will also launch an expression of interest for the nomination of organizations to provide technical support for the implementation of the CAMI WP for 2026–2032.
 - The Secretariat will convene the Implementation Committee on an informal basis.
 - The Secretariat will prepare the meeting report and share it with participants for adoption.

Agenda Item 20. Next Meeting of the Range States

77. The Secretariat introduced this item, proposing that the next Range States meeting should include a review of other species-specific instruments included under CAMI, if necessary.

Agenda Item 21. Any other business

78. The Goitered Gazelle SFP recommended including the Central Kyzylkum area as a PTCR in the next revision of the CAMI WP, as this suggestion could not be further elaborated during the meeting. Tajikistan further suggested that the Tigrovaya Balka Nature Reserve also be considered for inclusion in the future.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

RANGE STATES

Representative	Position Institution Organization	Contact Email
UZBEKISTAN (HOST)		
Alisher SALOMOV	Adviser to the Minister of Ecology, Environmental Protection and Climate Change	International.uznature@gmail.com
Jakhongir TALIPOV	Head of Department, International Office, Ministry of Ecology, Environmental Protection and Climate Change	jakhongirtalipov@gmail.com
Javokhir ABDUKHALIKOV	Deputy Head of Department, International Office, Ministry of Ecology, Environmental Protection and Climate Change	javokhirabdukhalikov@gmail.com
Bakhrom KHOLKHUJAYEV	Head of Directorate of Policy for Forestry, Biodiversity and Ecotourism Ministry of Ecology, Environmental Protection and Climate Change	kholkhujaevbakhrom@gmail.com
Davron EGAMBERDIYEV	Ministry of Ecology, Environmental Protection and Climate Change	
Alexander KAZAKOV	Chief Specialist of the Division of Biodiversity Policy, Ministry of Ecology, Environmental Protection and Climate Change	a.kazakovbio@gmail.com
Gavkhar MAKHMUDOVA	Chief Specialist of the Division of Biodiversity Policy, Ministry of Ecology, Environmental Protection and Climate Change	gogosha-08@mail.ru
Luiza MARDONOVA	Chief Specialist, Ministry of Ecology, Environmental Protection and Climate Change	Mardonova.luiza@mail.ru
Sarvar AKHMEDOV	Chief Specialist, Ministry of Ecology, Environmental Protection and Climate Change	sarvar.akhmedov90@gmail.com
Otabek BABAMURADOV	Head of Department for Ecotourism and Hunting, Ministry of Ecology, Environmental Protection and Climate Change	o.bb3816@gmail.com

Representative	Position Institution Organization	Contact Email
Suhrob KURBANOV	Ministry of Ecology, Environmental Protection and Climate Change	
Djamshit MIRKHALIKOV	Ministry of Ecology, Environmental Protection and Climate Change	j.mirhalikov[at]gmail.com
BHUTAN		
Tshering DHENDUP	Chief Forestry Officer, Royal Manas National Park, Gelephu,	tsheringdhendup[at]moenr.gov.bt
Chhimi DORJI	Senior Forestry Officer, Nature Conservation Division, DoFPS	chhimid10[at]gmail.com
CHINA		
Yongzhe CHEN	Chinese Academy of Forestry	chen389612069[at]163.com
Wei Ji	Managing Director, Shanghai Wildlife Conservation Association	wjiseason[at]foxmail.com
INDIA		
Salvador LYNGDOH	Scientist Wildlife Institute of India, Dehradun	salvador[at]wii.gov.in
Sunil SHARMA	Joint Director (Wildlife), Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change	id-wl[at]nic.in
KAZAKHSTAN		
Olzhabek KHOLOV	Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources	holzhabek[at]mail.ru
Aibat MUZBAY	Scientific Expert at the Institute of Zoology	aibatmuzbay[at]gmail.com
KYRGYZSTAN		
Askar DAVLETBAKOV	Head of the Laboratory of Vertebrate Zoology, Institute of Biology of the Kyrgyz Republic	davaskar5[at]gmail.com
MONGOLIA		
Buuveibaatar BAYARBAATAR	Member, CMS Scientific council	buuveibaatar[at]wcs.org
Sonin-Erdene DALANTAI	Senior inspector of the state environmental control, Ministry	soninerdene4[at]gmail.com

Representative	Position Institution Organization	Contact Email
	of Environment and Climate Change	
NEPAL		
Birendra Prasad KANDEL	Senior Conservation Officer (Under Secretary- Tech)	bksurabi@gmail.com
Shiva Kumar WAGLE	Joint Secretary, Ministry of Forest and Environment	shivakwagle@gmail.com
PAKISTAN		
Zakir HUSSAIN	Chief Conservator Parks & Wildlife/Chief Wildlife Warden	zakir.gau@gmail.com
Mahvish RAUF	Deputy Conservator (Wildlife Management), Ministry of Climate Change	mahvishrauf95.mr@gmail.com
TAJIKISTAN		
Nurali SAIDOV	National Expert on Protected Area Management and Biodiversity Conservation, Committee of Environmental Protection	nurali_saidov@hotmail.com
Khurshed SHAMSUDDINOV	Director (Head) State Institution “Specially Protected Natural Areas”	khurshed.hs@gmail.com
TURKMENISTAN		
Rustem NURYEV	Head of the Department of Flora and Fauna Protection of the Ministry of Environmental Protection	nuryewrustem2@gmail.com
Jumamyrat SAPARMYRADOV	Scientific Secretary of the National Institute of Deserts, Flora and Fauna of the Ministry of Environment Protection (MoEPT)	saparmuradovdzuma@gmail.com
Aknabat POTAYEVA	Science lead Kopetdag reserve, MoEPT	aknabatkopetdag@gmail.com

INVITED EXPERTS

Representative	Position Institution Organization	Contact Email
Islam ANNAMAMEDOV	Project Manager, Conservation X Labs	islamfitt[at]gmail.com
Elena BYKOVA	Programme Director Uzbekistan, Saiga Conservation Alliance	ebykova67[at]mail.ru
Nandintsetseg DEJID	Senckenberg Biodiversity and Climate Research Centre	nandintsetseg.dejid[at]senckenberg.de
Salamat DZHUMABAEVA	Project Coordinator, CAMP Alatau	salamat[at]camp.kg
Mohammad FARHADINIA	Co-Chair of Persian Leopard Working Group, Kent University	M.Farhadinia[at]kent.ac.uk
Dmitry GORSHKOV	Central Asia Regional Coordinator, IUCN	dmitry.gorshkov[at]iucn.org
Alexey GRACHEV	Head of the Laboratory of Theriology (Mammalogy), Institute of Zoology of Republic of Kazakhstan	alexey.grachev[at]zool.kz
Mariya GRITSINA	Institute of Zoology under the Academy of Sciences of Uzbekistan	mgritsina[at]gmail.com
Shirin KARRYEVA	Project Manager, Conservation X Labs	shirinkarryeva.sk[at]gmail.com
Katja KAUPISCH	Deputy Director of International Department, NABU e.V.	katja.kaupisch[at]nabu.de
Zairbek KUBANYCHBEKOV	Director, Ilbirs Foundation	zaikony1[at]gmail.com
Natalya MARMAZINSKAYA	Deputy Director of Science, Zerafshan National Nature Park	n-marmazinskaya[at]mail.ru
Stefan MICHEL	Independent Expert	st-michell[at]gmx.de
Maksim MITROPOLSKIY	Head of Ramsar Regional Initiative for Central Asia	max_raptors[at]list.ru
Muhammad Ali NAWAZ	Director, Snow Leopard Foundation	ali.nawaz[at]slf.org.pk
Mark PESTOV	Expert, Conservation X Labs	vipera[at]dront.ru
Sorosh POYA FARYABI	Regional Technical Advisor, Wildlife Conservation Society	spoyafaryabi[at]wcs.org
Tatjana ROSEN	Director Central Asia Program, Conservation X Labs	tanya[at]conservationxlabs.org
Katarzyna RUTA	Conservation Project Officer, Pallas's cat International Conservation Alliance, Royal Zoological Society of Scotland	kruta[at]rzss.org.uk

Representative	Position Institution Organization	Contact Email
Grigoriy SAMOYLOV	Advisor, GIZ	grigoriy.samoylov@giz.de
Reinhard SCHNIDRIG	President, International Takhi Group	reini.schnidrig@bluewin.ch
Iliya SMELIANSKII	Scientific Fellow, ACBK	ilya.smelansky@acbk.kz
Valentin SOLDATOV	Institute of zoology of the Uzbekistan academy of science	soldatovval@list.ru
Thomas TENNHARDT	Executive Board Member, Species Foundation Germany	TTennhardt@web.de
Vladimir TERYTYEV	Biodiversity Research Conservation Centre, Astana	vladi14_2000@yahoo.co.uk
Jubarek TULAEV	Researcher at the Biodiversity Conservation Laboratory, RIENCT (Ecology Institute) Uzbekistan	tulayevjurabek12@gmail.com
Adiya YADAMSUREN	Founder and Chairman, Wild Camel Protection Foundation & Institute of Zoology Mongolia	ya.adiya@gmail.com
Steffen ZUTHER	Research Fellow / Project Manager, Frankfurt Zoological Society, Saiga SFP	steffen.zuther@fzs.org

OTHERS

Representative	Position Institution Organization	Contact Email
Sergey ZAGREBIN	UNDP Uzbekistan	sergey.zagrebin@undp.org
Dr. Michael WIMMER	Head of Mission of the Embassy of Germany in Tashkent, Uzbekistan	v@tasc.auswaertiges-amt.de

CMS SECRETARIAT

Representative	Position Institution Organization	Contact Email
Fariza ADILBEKOVA	Associate Programme Management Officer	fariza.adilbekova@un.org
Clara NOBBE	Head, Terrestrial Species Team	Clara.nobbe@un.org
Polina ORLINSKIY	CAMI Coordinator	polina.orlinskiy@un.org