



Strasbourg, 24 March 1995  
[s:\tpvs95\TPVS26E.95]

T-PVS (95) 26

CONVENTION FOR THE CONSERVATION OF EUROPEAN WILDLIFE  
AND NATURAL HABITATS

Standing Committee

14th meeting  
Strasbourg, 20-24 March 1995

**REPORT**

Secretariat Memorandum  
established by the  
Directorate of Environment  
and Local Authorities

**PRELIMINARY NOTE: SUMMARY OF DECISIONS TAKEN**

1. The Standing Committee held its 14th meeting from 20 to 24 March 1995 in Strasbourg. The list of participants and the agenda appear in Appendices 1 and 2 to this document.

2. In accordance with Article 14, paragraph 1, the Standing Committee followed the application of the Convention, and the Chairman and Vice-Chairman were elected.

3. The Committee took note with satisfaction of the accession to the Convention by Moldova and Monaco.

4. The Committee decided unanimously to invite the following states to attend its 15th meeting: Albania, Algeria, Belarus, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Cape Verde, Croatia, the Holy See, Mauritania, Morocco, Russian Federation, Tunisia and Ukraine.

5. The Committee amended Appendix IV of the Convention.

6. The Committee took note of the Monaco Declaration on the Role of the Bern Convention in the Implementation of Worldwide International Instruments for the Protection of Biodiversity and decided to take due account in its future work.

7. The Committee adopted the following recommendations:

- Recommendation No 43 (1995) on the conservation of threatened mammals in Europe;
- Recommendation No 44 (1995) on the conservation of some threatened plants in Central Europe;
- Recommendation No 45 (1995) on controlling proliferation of *Caulerpa taxifolia* in the Mediterranean;
- Recommendation No 46 (1995) on the proposed Irueña dam site, Salamanca, Spain.

8. The Committee discussed the situation of marine turtles in Laganas Bay (Zakynthos) and adopted a Decision urging Greece to implement without delay a number of conservation measures, stating that failure of Greece to comply with them would be understood by the Committee as a grave and repeated breach of its obligations under the Convention and as an encouragement to Parties to proceed according to Article 18 paragraphs 2 to 5 of the Convention.

9. The Committee took different steps to improve protection of the otter, desmans and other threatened mammals, amphibians and reptiles, invertebrates, and threatened plants of Central and Eastern Europe. It also discussed the situation of several species that require conservation attention, such as tortoises (in Maures, France), marine turtles (in Patara, Turkey), bears (in the French Pyrenees), and several reptiles (in Totes Moor, Lower Saxony, Germany). The situation of the Missolonghi wetland (Greece) and of a number of dams built in Spain were also discussed.

10. The Committee approved a work programme and budget for 1995, using FR 760.000 provided for annually by the Committee of Ministers, some FR 300,000 remaining in the Convention's special fund and new donations to be made by Contracting Parties.

11. The Committee decided to hold its 15th meeting in January 1996.

12. The Committee wished, in particular, to launch a very strong appeal to the Committee of Ministers regarding the difficulties in implementing the work of the Convention due to lack of sufficient human and financial resources allocated by the Council of Europe to this activity. The Standing Committee asked the Committee of Ministers to consider carefully this issue and provide an answer to their request.

As provided for in Article 15, the Standing Committee forwarded to the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe the report on its work and on the functioning of the Convention.

The short report will have annexed:

- Abbreviated list of participants;
- Agenda;
- Amendments to Appendix IV;
- Monaco Declaration;
- Decision on Zakynthos;
- Recommendations Nos. 43 (1995), 44 (1995), 45 (1995), 46 (1995);
- Programme and budget.

**CONTENTS**

	page
List of points discussed and decisions taken (summary report for Committee of Ministers).....	2
Report of the meeting .....	5
Appendices	
1. List of participants .....	30
2. Agenda .....	38
3. Amendment of Appendix IV for freshwater fish and crayfish.....	40
4. Monaco Declaration .....	41
5. Recommendation No. 43 (1995) on the conservation of threatened mammals in Europe .....	47
6. Mammals for possible inclusion in Appendix II of the Convention.....	52
7. Recommendation No. 44 (1995) on the conservation of some threatened plants in Central Europe.....	53
8. Recommendation No. 45 (1995) on controlling proliferation of <i>Caulerpa taxifolia</i> in the Mediterranean .....	59
9. Decision concerning the conservation of Laganas Bay, Zakynthos, Greece.....	60
10. Recommendation No. 46 (1995) on the proposed Irueña dam site, Salamanca, Spain.....	62
11. Programme of activities and budget for 1995 .....	64
12. Programme of activities and budget for 1996 .....	73

## **PART I - DEVELOPMENT AND APPLICATION OF THE CONVENTION**

### **1. Opening of the meeting and adoption of the agenda** [T-PVS (95) 4 and T-PVS (95) 13]

The 14th meeting of the Standing Committee of the Bern Convention was opened by the Chairman, Mr. Antti Haapanen, who welcomed the participants (see Appendix 1).

He congratulated Monaco and Moldova on their accession to the Convention.

The draft agenda, as contained in Appendix 2, was adopted.

At the Secretariat's suggestion, the Standing Committee agreed to postpone discussion of the opening and closing of files and follow-up action on recommendations to its next meeting, so that it could first consider cases likely to affect member states of the European Union which were Party to the Convention. The Committee decided to create a small group of legal experts to discuss the issue.

Mr. Jean Renault informed the Standing Committee that he was unable to continue to be a member of the Bureau. He therefore asked the Chairman to provide for his replacement in the event that under Article 19 of the Rules of Procedure he should be expected to serve as a member of the next Bureau.

The Secretariat said that a representative of the Council of Europe Secretariat would give the meeting an outline of the Council's projected activities in the environmental field.

### **2. Chairman's report and communications from the delegations and the Secretariat. Reports from new Contracting Parties**

The Chairman introduced his annual report. He was very happy to be chairing the Standing Committee on the Bern Convention, on which he had been privileged to serve since it was founded. It was satisfying to see the number of Contracting Parties to the Convention, which was intended to protect endangered wildlife and natural habitats, increasing. He stressed the importance of working more effectively to improve the status of endangered species. It would be necessary to look at the work done at the Symposium on "The UNCED: the Rio and Bern Conventions, the next steps", and particularly the important Monaco Declaration adopted on that occasion. He also spoke of the work currently being done on the Pan-European Strategy for Biological and Landscape Diversity, which would be presented at the third Ministerial Conference, "An Environment for Europe", in Sofia in October 1995. The main guidelines would be laid down for the years ahead, and it would be necessary to identify priorities for nature conservation and decide what should be done.

The Chairman thought that the meeting should consider a number of points, including present or possible connections between the Standing Committee of the Bern Convention and the Steering Committee for the Conservation and Management of the Environment and Natural Habitats (CDPE).

He particularly thanked the Principality of Monaco for hosting the Symposium on the UNCED and the Bern and Rio Conventions so effectively in September 1994. He regretted Moldova's absence from the meeting.

The Monaco delegate said that the Principality was very pleased to be attending this meeting. She reminded the Standing Committee that Monaco had indeed hosted the Symposium on the UNCED and the Rio and Bern Conventions, and was also involved in a management programme for a Bulgarian nature zone near the Black Sea. The Bern Convention was a useful instrument for launching and developing nature conservation projects.

Since Malta's ratification (26 November 1994) had become effective on 1 March 1995, the Maltese delegate presented his country's introductory report on legislation regarding nature conservation, which it had not been possible to do in 1994 [cf. T-PVS (95) 1].

The Monaco delegate also presented Monaco's introductory report on nature conservation legislation [cf. T-PVS (95) 25].

The Secretariat reported on contacts with countries outside the Council of Europe - particularly Albania, Belarus, Moldova, Russia and Ukraine - which had developed in connection with preparation of the Sofia Conference and organisation of European Nature Conservation Year 1995. The aim was accession of all the countries of Europe to the Convention, so that they could work together to preserve biodiversity. Contacts with Morocco and Tunisia had also been maintained. Slovakia and Lithuania had already signed the Convention.

Some delegations (Burkina Faso, France, Germany, Greece, United Kingdom) had submitted written reports (contained in documents T-PVS (95) 27, 28, 29).

The French delegate informed the Standing Committee of the death of Professor François de Beaufort, and the Chairman voiced its deep regret. The Standing Committee acknowledged the exceptional contribution which Professor de Beaufort had made over the years to the work of the Bern Convention. The Secretariat said that working with Mr. de Beaufort had been an honour, and expressed its sincere sadness.

The Secretariat submitted the following documents for information:

- T-PVS (94) 2 Appendices revised
- T-PVS (94) 7 Follow-up of implementation of the Convention
- T-PVS (95) 14 Convention: state of signatures, ratifications, reservations and declarations.

### 3. Development of the Convention

- 3.1 Strategic issues: what to do next ? Relationship with Biodiversity Convention and other international legal instruments. The Monaco Declaration  
[T-PVS (94) 14 and T-PVS (95) 10]

The Secretariat reminded the Committee that a Symposium, "The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Bern Convention: the next steps" had been held in Monaco from 26 to 28 September 1994 to discuss strategies for further development of the Convention, as well as its relationships and co-ordination with other treaties and international legal instruments (in particular the Convention on Biological Diversity, the European Union's Habitats Directive and the European Agreements concluded under the Bonn Convention).

Having again thanked Monaco for its valuable help with organisation of the Symposium, the Chairman spoke of the pioneering scope of the Monaco Declaration on the role of the Bern Convention in the implementation of worldwide international instruments for the protection of biodiversity, which had been adopted on that occasion. This was of great interest for the preservation of biodiversity within the context of follow-up action on the UNCED and implementation of Action 21 at regional level.

A number of participants commented on the role and scope of the Declaration. The Netherlands delegation, after having expressed its wish to adopt the Declaration, wondered, for example, what schedule would be followed in implementing initiatives based on the Convention. The Swedish delegation thought that the Declaration should be noted but not adopted and thought given later to ways of allowing only parts of it in activity programmes conducted under the Convention. The Norwegian delegation thought that the Declaration should be taken note of and proposed that, in line with earlier discussions of the Standing Committee, the Bern Convention should orientate its activities more towards species habitat conservation. The German delegation thought that implementation of the activities envisaged might cause financial problems. Replying to the French delegation, which had expressed concern regarding the EECONET scheme referred to in the Declaration, the Chairman said that technical aspects of its implementation would be studied properly

later.

The Swiss delegation stressed that the Declaration was the fruit of the in-depth discussions which had taken place in Monaco, and said that the Symposium had been attended by the great majority of states party to the Bern Convention. A number of compromises had already been agreed on that occasion, and these should be fully reflected in activity programmes conducted under the Convention. Several delegations agreed, and the Standing Committee decided to take note of the Monaco Declaration on the role of the Bern Convention in the implementation of worldwide international instruments for the protection of biodiversity, adopted on 28 September 1994, and to take due account of it in future when examining its activity programmes (see Appendix 4).

The Chairman welcomed this decision, insofar as it allowed the Standing Committee to take useful account of the latest international legislative developments concerning the preservation of biological diversity. The Secretariat said that contacts had already been made with the Secretariat of the Convention on biological diversity, and that a joint meeting would be organised shortly in Sofia. It pointed out, however, that closer co-operation would take time to set up, since the Convention on biological diversity was relatively recent.

### 3.2 States to be invited as observers to the 15th meeting

The Committee decided unanimously to invite the following states, not member states of the Council of Europe, to its 15th meeting:

Albania, Algeria, Belarus, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Cape Verde, Croatia, Holy See, Mauritania, Morocco, Russia, Tunisia, Ukraine.

The Bulgarian delegate regretted that the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia was not invited as an observer state.

## 4. Legal aspects

### 4.1 Amendments to Appendix I (for one species from Cyprus) [T-PVS (95) 2]

The Committee discussed the proposal, made by Cyprus, to include *Centaurea akamantis* in Appendix I. The Committee decided to postpone the decision to a further meeting at which other proposals to modify Appendix I will be presented.

The Committee instructed the Group of experts on conservation of plants to verify the soundness of the scientific information concerning this species.

### 4.2 Amendments to Appendix IV (for freshwater fish and crayfish) [T-PVS (94) 24]

Norway presented formal proposals for amendment to Appendix IV of the Convention, to list new prohibited means and methods of killing, capture and other forms of exploitation for freshwater fish and crayfish.

Some delegations objected to the inclusion of ripping, gaffs and spears, on the grounds that they were selective methods which are not covered by Article 8 of the Convention. The delegation of Norway gave its assurance that all the methods listed had been chosen only on biological and conservation grounds. Ripping, for instance, would facilitate the taking of fish while entering spawning grounds or when water levels are at a low.

Many delegations, however, found that the inclusion of those methods in Appendix IV, as proposed by Norway, was appropriate.

The delegate of United Kingdom expressed concern that all the means contained in the proposal, aside from explosives and poisons, did not meet with criteria specified in Article 8 of the Convention.

The Committee agreed that "Prohibited means and methods of killing, capture and other forms of exploitation" should be translated as "moyens et méthodes de mise à mort, de capture, et autres formes d'exploitation interdits". This translation will apply to the whole of Appendix IV.

Discussing the prohibition of electric fishing with alternating current and of anaesthetics, explosives, etc., the delegate of Hungary pointed out that their prohibition is only applicable in practice if considered as completely banned (because mixed stocks of fish species were to be found in most European waters).

The Committee amended Appendix IV for freshwater fish and crayfish as it appears in Appendix 3.

4.3 Biennial reports for 1991-92 and general (four-yearly) report  
[T-PVS (95) 5 + Addendum, T-PVS (95) 11]

The Secretariat told the Committee that biennial reports had been received from the following Contracting Parties:

Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cyprus, Denmark, European Community, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom.

It accordingly asked France, Liechtenstein, Switzerland and Turkey to submit their reports as soon as possible.

The Secretariat reminded the Committee that account needed to be taken of the obligations laid down at world level by the Action 21 Programme, and particularly chapter 39, dealing with "International legal instruments and machinery", section 39.8 of which stated:

"The parties to international agreements should consider procedures and mechanisms to promote and review their effective, full and prompt implementation. To that effect, States could, *inter alia*:

- (a) Establish efficient and practical reporting systems on the effective, full and prompt implementation of international legal instruments;
- (b) Consider appropriate ways in which relevant international bodies (...) might contribute towards the further development of such mechanisms."

The Secretariat said that the system for implementation of the Bern Convention had been specially studied at the pan-European ministerial Conference on the environment in Lucerne, and that work was under way - particularly within the French Environment Ministry - on the application of international environment conventions. The Monaco Declaration was part of this, insofar as it stated that compliance with obligations accepted under the Convention needed to be monitored.

Concerning the biennial reports, the synoptic table prepared by the Secretariat did not seem to give very homogeneous results, and there were considerable disparities between the answers given. This might be improved if states stuck more closely to the pattern suggested by the Secretariat for replies. They must also reply in one of the Council of Europe's two official languages (English or French). It would be particularly useful to carry out a survey of the laws and regulations adopted by Contracting Parties for the species listed in the Appendices to the Convention, and make a comparative study of the procedures followed in granting exceptions and of the authorities empowered to do this.

The Committee took note of the document summarising the biennial reports.

The Secretariat said that, at the last meeting, the Contracting Parties had decided to prepare general reports on the application of the Convention every four years, the first being added to the



biennial reports for 1993-94. Guidelines for preparation of these reports were given in document T-PVS (95) 11.

Having discussed the tenor of these reports, the Committee decided that they would be a very useful working instrument, both in general and specifically for the groups of experts. The Contracting Parties should follow a pragmatic approach in preparing them, and send them to the Convention Secretariat before January 1996.

4.4 Draft resolutions on species requiring specific habitat conservation measures and on endangered natural habitats requiring specific conservation measures  
[T-PVS (95) 15, T-PVS (95) 16]

In its Recommendation No. 14 (1989) on species habitat conservation and on the conservation of endangered natural habitats, the Standing Committee resolved to identify species requiring specific habitat conservation measures. The Secretariat presented a draft resolution that had been made using information from various sources: group of experts on amphibians and reptiles, group of experts on invertebrates, Sofia seminar on mammals (and comments sent by Parties) and the list of European bird species with unfavourable conservation status published by BirdLife. For plants, the group of experts on plant conservation adopted a slightly different approach and provided a list of species requesting priority conservation action.

Several delegations pointed out that the lists proposed could be improved, so it was suggested that an expert be charged to prepare a more homogeneous version taking account of the Habitats Directive. The Committee decided that the document would be circulated for comment to the states and an expert be charged to amend the list.

Concerning endangered natural habitats, the Secretariat informed the Committee that a consultant prepared a report containing a list of natural habitats requiring priority conservation, which was circulated in 1994. The Secretariat presented a draft resolution.

The Committee had a first look at the draft resolution and wished that it be harmonised with the habitats directive. The Committee agreed to create a small group of experts to review the draft resolution, the group to be composed of a few experts from Central and Eastern Europe, the consultant and the European Commission. Other states might also participate if they so wished. It was recommended that Contracting Parties and other states send their comments on the present proposal as soon as possible. Once the group of experts makes a proposal, it will be sent to Contracting Parties and Observers for further comment, so as to enable the Standing Committee possibly to adopt the recommendation at a further meeting.

The delegates of Switzerland and France wished that a similar exercise be carried out in the future for Africa.

4.5 Report on the legal aspects of the introduction and reintroduction of wild species [T-PVS (95) 17]

The consultant, Mr de Klemm, presented his report. The Committee congratulated him and thanked him for having given it a further opportunity to benefit from his experience in a very important area. It was important to pay very close attention to the problem of the introduction and reintroduction of wild species because it often led to the extinction of species.

The German delegate hoped that the Group of Experts on legal aspects of introduction and reintroduction of wildlife species would not make a detailed study of the plant health problems connected with introductions and reintroductions.

The Swedish delegation expressed the need to consider not only intentional introductions, but also problems related to the unintentional release of species.

The Secretariat reminded delegates that the Group of Experts would meet on 11 and 12 May 1995 and asked Contracting Parties which had not sent in their replies to the questionnaire drawn up for the meeting to do so as soon as possible (including Austria, Bulgaria, European Community, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Moldova, Norway, Senegal and Turkey).

## **PART II - THREATENED SPECIES AND HABITATS**

### **5. Threatened species and habitats. Seminars, groups of experts and reports**

#### **5.1 Fauna**

##### **5.1.1 Draft recommendation on Recovery plans for European mammals [T-PVS (95) 7]**

The Secretariat presented the draft recommendation, which was originally produced at the Seminar on conservation of mammals held in Sofia in 1993, and had been circulated to Parties in 1994.

The Committee discussed the recommendation and adopted it as it appears in Appendix 5 to this document.

The delegates of Germany and the United Kingdom stated that, from their point of view, the obligation to take special measures under the recommendation concerned only those measures not already taken in the context of other Conventions.

##### **5.1.2 Informal proposal to add new mammals to Appendix II [T-PVS (95) 6]**

At the Sofia Seminar it was suggested new mammals be added to Appendix II. A proposal in that sense was circulated to Parties in 1994. The Secretariat presented an informal proposal that had been prepared using the comments received.

The Committee discussed the list, amended it as it appears in Appendix 6 to this document, and decided that the list was a good basis for amending Appendix II and Appendix III for mammals.

Regarding *Balaenoptera physalus*, some delegations were not in favour of including the species in Appendix II, as the question arose as to whether the Mediterranean populations constitute a sub-species requiring protection.

The Norwegian delegate referred to the quoted IUCN status of *Monodon monoceros* (now in Appendix III of the Bern Convention) as being insufficiently known and pointed out the need for better population estimates of this species. She especially encouraged initiatives for the East-Greenland population to be better mapped.

The delegations of Iceland and Norway requested that reliable scientific information be provided before *Balaenoptera physalus* and *Balaenoptera acutorostrata* were proposed for Appendix II. The possible need for protecting *Balaenoptera physalus* in the Mediterranean does not warrant protection of the species in the North Atlantic. The delegations requested that both species should be deleted from the list with reference to the Scientific Committee of the International Whaling Commission and NAMMCO.

The French, Italian and Monaco delegates stressed the necessity of keeping the cetacean *Balaenoptera physalus* on the draft list of mammals which might be included in Appendix II to the Convention, since recent research showed that this population seemed to constitute a separate sub-species. This species was currently in need of protection, particularly in the international waters of the Mediterranean. Protecting it fell within the scope of a Franco-Italo-Monaco project for a marine sanctuary in the north-eastern section of the Western Mediterranean, the purpose of which was to

protect all marine mammals.

The Committee welcomed the suggestion by Germany to make a formal proposal, on the basis of the list discussed, for the next meeting of the Committee. Germany suggested that other species may also be proposed, so several Contracting Parties asked to be informed as soon as possible by Germany of any such new species, so that appropriate information could be gathered on the status of any species proposed. Germany agreed to do so.

#### 5.1.3 Seminar on the conservation of the monk seal (*Monachus monachus*)

The Secretariat informed the Committee on the results of a meeting on monk seal conservation organised with the Secretariat of the Barcelona Convention. The main decision of that meeting was the proposal to create, under the framework of the Barcelona Convention, an International Scientific Committee to inform on monk seal conservation projects involving taking animals from the wild. The Secretariat of the Bern Convention will

be invited to participate in that Committee. At that Seminar there was support for the French programme to carry out a pilot experience to test the viability of a captive breeding programme.

The delegate of France informed the Committee on the main aspects of the French programme on the conservation of the species.

The Committee took note of the information presented and instructed the Secretariat to participate in the International Monk Seal Scientific Committee.

#### 5.1.4 Seminar on the conservation of the European otter (*Lutra lutra*) [T-PVS (94) 11]

The delegate of The Netherlands presented the report of the Seminar on the conservation of the European otter held, in collaboration with IUCN and the Center AQUALUTRA, in The Netherlands, from 7 to 11 June 1994.

A summary of the guidelines adopted at the Seminar was presented. The Committee examined the guidelines and decided that they could be the basis for a recommendation of the Committee. It charged the Secretariat to circulate the guidelines to the Parties and observers as a draft recommendation for discussion at its next meeting.

The Committee expressed its gratitude to the government of The Netherlands for hosting the Seminar.

#### 5.1.5 Report on threatened mammals in Europe [T-PVS (94) 5]

The Secretariat presented the report of Professor de Beaufort, which is a general overview of the situation of mammals in Europe. One hundred and two species of European indigenous mammals (47% of the total) are threatened, of which 52 continue to regress in number. Twenty-four species are endangered, 17 of them suffering population decline. These figures leave little room for optimism and a greater commitment is needed from governments on mammal conservation.

The Committee recognised the good quality of the report of the late Professor de Beaufort, expressed its recognition of his valuable scientific work with the Committee over the years and asked that the report be published in the Nature and Environment Series. Contracting Parties that had sent their comments to Professor de Beaufort were asked to send a copy to the Secretariat, which was charged to prepare a final edition.

#### 5.1.6 Report on European desmans (*Galemys pyrenaicus* and *Desmana moschata*) [T-PVS (94) 22]

The consultant, Mrs Queiroz presented the report. Both the Pyrenean and the Russian desmans are vulnerable species which are, as other semi-aquatic mammals, threatened by modification of water courses, pollution, illegal fishing activities and destruction of riverine vegetation. Conservation of freshwater habitats is thus essential to the survival of these species.

The Committee congratulated Ms Queiroz and the other authors for the quality of the report; it was recognised that those species required priority attention on the European scale.

The Committee was reminded that in June 1995 a Seminar will be held in the Ordesa National Park (Spain) on the conservation of desmans and also of *Neomys fodiens*. Parties were invited to circulate the invitation letter to appropriate experts.

The Committee took note of the report presented.

#### 5.1.7 Report on the wolverine (*Gulo gulo*) [T-PVS (95) 23]

This report was presented by the Swedish delegate. He pointed out that the report contained information mainly for Scandinavian countries but not so much for Russia, where reliable population numbers were lacking. The species does not count more than 2000 individuals in Northern Europe and it is believed to be declining. A recommendation had not been proposed at this stage of the report mainly due to the difficulty in suggesting a common policy to deal with the interactions of the species with reindeer herding, as this pastoral activity is very differently organised throughout the range of the wolverine.

The Committee took note of the report and suggested that it be completed with information from Eastern European states where the species appears. The Secretariat was charged to circulate the report to the States concerned, asking them for corrections and additional data, which will help the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency to update the report for further publishing.

#### 5.1.8 Group of experts on conservation of amphibians and reptiles [T-PVS (94) 19]

The Group of experts on conservation of amphibians and reptiles met in October 1994. The Secretariat presented the results of the meeting.

The Group had, in particular, checked the implementation of Recommendation Nos 26 and 27, pointing out in which cases the Recommendations had been followed, and the case solved, and where there were still endangered populations at risk. Some of the recommendations needed updating or were no longer relevant. About 20% of the cases had been solved, at least partially, which was not a bad start, even if in some important cases, some of international importance and others more of a national interest, no substantial progress had been made.

The SEH presented the following updates of three of this first priority issues:

#### Recommendation 26 - Element 25:

By far the highest population of the endemic *Vipera schweizeri* occurs in natural habitats in Western Milos. Here, recent ecological investigations by the University of Goteborg, in conjunction with the Goulandrins Museum, have clarified key points of this species's seasonal habitat requirements. Their modern techniques have individually marked with micro-chips and also with body cavity transmitters.

Unfortunately, their field of work has also confirmed the impact of continued quarrying and new roads for that purpose.

1. Very significant numbers of snakes are now being killed by lorries in the heart of their habitat range.

2. The ever enlarging working for minerals is threatening the vital above ground and underground water catchment which arises from the adjacent higher ground.

The first point could be easily lessened by local road closures in the summer, between 9 pm and sunrise<sup>1</sup>.

The second point still awaits a mineral plan which would take account of the environment of Western Milos and of this unique taxa.

Recommendation 26 - Element 47:

This large soft-shelled turtle has declined to a dangerously low level in its Mediterranean range, estimated at only a few hundred and almost entirely based on identified small rivers and their estuarine habitats in Southern Turkey.

Here, it is threatened by pollution and persecution and a lack of protection for its breeding/egg-laying sites. Few, if any of the required conservation measures have yet been taken and the situation of some locations having been worsened, eg., in the Dalyan area.

Actions are urgently needed to save this taxa from its otherwise rapid path to extinction.

Recommendation 26 - Element 48 and Recommendation 27 - Element 45:

The noted pristine and semi-tropical Cocchida forest and montane habitats around the South East Black Sea are important for Europe's natural heritage *per se*, but also because they support a rich assemblage of herpetofauna including the threatened taxa:

*Lacerta clarkorum*, *Natrix megalcephala*, *Vipera kaznakovi*, *Mertensiella caucasica*, *Triturus vittatus*, *Pelodytes caucasicus*.

The Turkish government wishes expert guidance on these habitats and on the options for protected area borders. This has long been proposed, even to the point of an on-the-spot appraisal visit, but as yet, no such facility has been realised. Even after the October 1994 Experts' Meeting, when again both the Turkish, the SEH delegations and the Bern Secretariat were in the fullest agreement, three successive letters to Ankara have remained unanswered.

Such a field visit is now a priority if these Recommendations are to be advanced.

The Greek delegate reminded the Committee of the reasons for their country's reservations on the protection of *Vipera schweizeri* on Western Milos, already expressed when adopting relevant recommendations. Furthermore, she informed the Committee of the positive provisions in the Specific Land Use Planning Study. A proposal for carrying out a study on management planning was being drafted by the Goulandris Natural History Museum, seeking possible effective solutions for the conservation needs of this species. The intention of the relevant Greek authorities was to carry out this study in cooperation with the local authorities.

The Swedish delegate indicated that some measures (like closing of some roads at night) should be implemented as soon as possible.

The Committee welcomed the plans presented by Greece and encouraged this state to pursue the implementation of Recommendation 26.

The Committee discussed in detail some of these issues and encouraged Parties to implement Recommendation Nos 26 and 27, particularly where they are regarded as international

---

<sup>1</sup> Andren, Nilson, Dimitropoulos & Ioannides; Ann. Musei Goulandrins, 9: 245-252. 1994.

priorities such as in the following cases:

- protection of *Coluber cypriensis* in Cyprus
- protection on *Chelonia mydas* in Cyprus
- protection of *Vipera ursinii ursinii* in La Plaine de Caussols (France)
- protection of *Testudo marginata* in Gythion (Greece)
- protection of *Vipera lebetina schweizeri* in Milos (Greece)
- protection of *Natrix natrix cetti* in Italy
- protection of *Lacerta lepida* in Ciaxie and Finale (Italy)
- protection of *Trionix triunguis* in Turkey
- protection of sites of high herpetological interest in the region from Giresun to Hopa (Turkey)
- protection of sites of *Vipera albizona*, *V. pontica* and *V. wagneri* in Turkey
- protection of *Mertensiella luschani* in Greece
- protection of *Euproctus platycephalus* and *Spelomantes* spp, in Sardinia (Italy)
- protection of *Salamandra aurorae* in Bosco del Dosso (Italy)
- protection of *Proteus anguinus* in Trieste (Italy)
- protection of *Rana latastei* in Pra Coltello, Novazzano (Switzerland)
- protection of *Mertensiella luschani* in Turkey
- protection of *Rana holtzi* in Turkey

At the next meeting of the Committee particular attention will be paid to the follow up of those Recommendations.

The delegate from MEDASSET informed the Committee of the great interest of the Northern and Eastern coasts of Cyprus for marine turtle nesting, particularly for *Chelonia mydas* and *Caretta caretta*. Five areas of importance had been identified in a report by Glasgow University, which pointed out that many of the beaches were threatened by tourism development. Those areas are of capital importance for the survival of the very endangered population of *Chelonia mydas* in the Eastern Mediterranean.

#### 5.1.9 Report on threatened amphibians and reptiles of Eastern Europe [T-PVS (94) 3]

This document was presented to the Committee at its previous meeting, but copies were not then available. The SEH delegate gave additional information. The Committee took note of the report.

#### 5.1.10 Action plans for European globally threatened birds. Progress report

The representative of BirdLife informed the Committee that Action Plans had been finalised for the following species:

*Pterodroma feae*, *Pterodroma madeira*, *Phalacrocorax pygmaeus*, *Pelecanus crispus*, *Anser erythropus*, *Branta ruficollis*, *Marmaronetta angustirostris*, *Oxyura leucocephala*, *Aegypius monachus*, *Aquila heliaca*, *Aquila adalberti*, *Falco naumanni*, *Numenius tenuirostris*, *Crex crex*, *Chlamydotis undulata*, *Otis tarda*, *Larus audouinii*, *Columba trocaz*, *Columba bolli*, *Columba junoniae*, *Acrocephalus paludicola*, *Fringilla teydea* & *Pyrrhula murina*.

The Secretariat informed the Committee that a Seminar was being organised by BirdLife and the Bern Convention, to take place in Strasbourg from 19 to 21 June 1995, so that Contracting Parties may discuss such plans.

Once those plans are discussed with the Parties, revised action plans will be produced. The Committee will be invited, at a further meeting, to take note of the plans and, if it so wishes, to take them into account while designing their conservation strategies for those species.

The Committee took note of the progress of the activity and invited Parties to collaborate

with the exercise.

#### 5.1.11 Group of experts on conservation of invertebrates [T-PVS (94) 8]

The Group of experts on conservation of invertebrates held its 3rd meeting in Strasbourg from 25 to 27 May 1994. The Secretariat presented the report of the meeting.

The Group of experts had, in particular, checked the follow up of Recommendation Nos 35 (1992) and 22 (1991), finding out that there had been little progress in their implementation. Parties were asked to try to implement the Recommendations and inform their entomological institutes and the regional authorities of the content of those Recommendations. Protection of habitats for invertebrates had been the object of a report examined by the Group, which proposed to the Standing Committee to organise a seminar on that topic in Ireland in connection with the next meeting of the Group of experts. The Secretariat informed the Committee that Ireland, which was not represented at the meeting, had offered to host such a seminar. The proposed title of the seminar would be "Conservation, management and restoration of habitats for invertebrates: enhancing biological diversity".

The Committee took note of the report of the Group of experts, agreed that the Group of experts should continue to develop work in habitat protection, high mountain invertebrates and legislation on capture and collection of invertebrates, and encouraged Contracting Parties to implement Recommendations Nos 35 and 22.

## 5.2 Flora

### 5.2.1 Group of experts on plants of Central Europe [T-PVS (94) 12]

The Group met in Bern, on 22-23 August 1994. The report of the meeting was presented by the Secretariat. Following instructions from the Committee, it prepared a draft recommendation on the conservation of threatened plants in Central Europe, which was presented to the Committee.

The Committee amended the Recommendation, which was adopted as it appears in Appendix 7 to this document.

The Group also proposed that some species be added to Appendix I of the Convention.

The Committee invited Contracting Parties to examine the list proposed in view of a possible formal proposal for amendment of Appendix I in 1996.

In this context the delegate of Bulgaria informed the Committee that his state was willing to present a formal amendment for Appendix I for Central and Eastern Europe on the basis of the report to be prepared by a Bulgarian expert. At that moment Bulgaria would consider whether to propose for Appendix II new species of amphibians and reptiles, such as those identified as potential candidates by the Committee in 1992.

### 5.2.2 Reports on threatened flora of Eastern Europe (Poland, Romania, territory of ex-USSR) [T-PVS (94) 15, T-PVS (94) 16, T-PVS (94) 23]

The Secretariat presented these reports and informed the Committee that the proposals included in these documents, much as those from previous reports from Bulgaria, the Czech Republic and Hungary, should be considered as provisional. A consultant was preparing an overall proposal for amendment of Appendix I for Central and Eastern. That work was to be ready at the end of 1995, so that a formal proposal for amendment could be presented by a party any time in 1996.

The Committee took note of this information.

## 5.3 Habitats

### 5.3.1 Coastal areas of the Adriatic

The Secretariat reported on the Colloquy on the Protection of Coastal Areas of the Adriatic Sea, held in Tirana (Albania) from 27 to 29 October 1994, in the framework of the European Nature Conservation Year 1995. The conclusions of the Colloquy pointed at the need to prepare and conclude a legally binding international instrument on coastal protection. In this context the Bureau of the Committee had deemed it necessary to consider the extent to which additional protocols to the Convention could be adopted.

The Committee took note of this information.

### 5.3.2 Seminar on marine and coastal biodiversity (Alghero) [T-PVS (95) 8]

The Secretariat reported on the Seminar on marine and coastal biodiversity which had been organised by MEDMARAVIS at Alghero (Italy) from 19-22 January 1995 and, in this connection, presented a draft recommendation concerning control of the tropical seaweed *Caulerpa taxifolia*, which was invading the seabed in the north western Mediterranean.

The Seminar had set out to define a list of biological criteria which could be used to promote the conservation of coastal and marine habitats from the Ukraine to Morocco. It had particularly focused on the protection of habitats of priority importance for conservation of biodiversity in the Mediterranean and on means of guaranteeing a sufficient population level for sea birds, marine turtles, monk seals, cetaceans, endemic species (several reptiles and plants) and coastal or infra-littoral organisms.

A Declaration on coastal and marine biodiversity in the Mediterranean had been adopted on 22 January 1995. Some of its provisions concerned the Bern Convention and suggested that certain species should be added to the list contained in Appendix II to the Convention.

The Secretariat suggested that the Maltese delegation could introduce these amendments to the appendices. It was especially desirable that certain particularly endangered Mediterranean marine species, such as *Patella ferruginea*, should be added very rapidly to the Appendices to the Convention, so that they could be given protected status.

The French delegate supported this proposal and thought that a group consisting of representatives of France, Italy, Monaco, Malta and Spain should meet to suggest endangered Mediterranean species. The Standing Committee approved this suggestion (see Programme of activities). The Director of the RAC/SPA and delegate of the Secretariat of the Barcelona

Convention pointed out that following the revision of the Geneva Protocol currently in progress, a meeting of experts on endangered species in the Mediterranean was scheduled to be held in December 1995. He added that this meeting could be held in collaboration with the Bern Convention, as on several previous occasions, in connection with the conservation of cetaceans and of the monk seal, for example.

The Committee took note of this proposal.

The Secretariat also introduced the draft recommendation on controlling the proliferation of *Caulerpa taxifolia* in the Mediterranean. It noted that the weed had spread widely in the Mediterranean in the last ten years and was growing on substrata between one and thirty metres deep. It seemed to be continuing to spread and, according to scientists, it rapidly eliminated most other seaweeds and affected the poseidonian meadows.

The Monaco delegate said that this was a controversial issue and that some people took views less alarmist than those reflected in the findings of the Second International Seminar on *Caulerpa taxifolia* (Barcelona, December 1994), which were appended to document T-PVS (95) 8. The Monaco delegate also said that the question of *Caulerpa taxifolia* would be examined by the CIESM, from 27 to 31 March 1995 under the heading: "*Caulerpa taxifolia*, Danger or Opportunity for the Mediterranean". She thought that the Bern Convention should come closer to the CIESM for a



scientific assessment of the question.

The French delegation thought that it could not be denied that the proliferation of *Caulerpa taxifolia* was a major danger for the protection of Mediterranean species, insofar as the surface covered had increased from 3 ha in 1990 to 1,500 ha at the end of 1994. The Barcelona meeting mentioned in the appendix was part of a series of scientific meetings, all of which had reached similar conclusions. Ship anchors were particularly dangerous, and special account should be taken of protected species.

The Monaco delegate said that the problem must not be minimised, but that a less alarmist attitude should be adopted.

The Standing Committee adopted the draft recommendation as amended in accordance with the proposals of the Monaco and French delegation (see Appendix 8).

#### 5.3.3 Report on habitats losing wildlife interest as a result of ecological succession [T-PVS (95) 17]

The Secretariat presented the report, which concentrated on the biological changes in some ecosystems (particularly heathlands) following ecological succession. Some delegations regretted that the report had not a wider pan-european scope and that precise conservation measures (including legal ones) had not been proposed.

The Committee took note of the report.

#### 5.3.4 Joint actions with other conventions: - Barcelona Convention (Geneva Protocol): drafting of a revised protocol - Ramsar Convention: progress of MedWet Initiative

The Secretariat informed the Committee that had been collaborating with other Conventions on a number of projects, among which the following:

- revision of the 4th protocol of the Barcelona Convention to extend its scope to the high sea, to introduce special protection for endangered species, to include appendices containing the list of endangered species and to establish a list of Specially Protected Areas of the Mediterranean (SPAMI List).
- MedWet initiative: The Secretariat participated at the latest meeting of the project in Tunis, and will collaborate with the Ramsar Convention and the Secretariat of MedWet in the organisation of a Seminar, to be held in 1996, to present the results of the first phase of the initiative. A second phase, in which MedWet will be extended to new states, is being prepared. It is likely that it will be financed through a GEF project.

The Committed took note of the information presented.

### **PART III - SPECIFIC SITES**

#### 6. Specific sites

The Committee was invited to discuss the problems concerning the different areas and to decide in each case if:

- a. the file was to be closed definitively;
- b. the file was closed, but might be re-opened by the Secretariat in case of significant new events;
- c. the file was to be kept open.

#### 6.1 Caretta caretta in Laganas Bay, Zakynthos (Greece) [T-PVS (95) 9]

This issue has been on the agenda of the Committee since 1986 and no satisfactory solution has yet been found. It concerns a bay of particular importance for the nesting of the marine turtle *Caretta caretta* which is threatened by tourist development. Following instructions from the Committee the Secretariat visited Athens from 26 to 28 January 1995 to hold conversations with the Greek government to look for long term solutions to the area. The Secretariat presented its report, which comprised a summary of the situation on the ground, a historical review of the discussion of the issue in the framework of the Convention. The Committee was informed that since 1993 there had been, in the Secretariat's opinion, little change on the ground, even if the new team at the Ministry of Environment had a long and very complete list of excellent plans for the area, including the demolition of illegal building and the creation of a marine national park. One of the main problems encountered seems to be a lack of enforcement of existing legislation. The Secretariat expressed the view that the credibility of the conservation projects proposed by the Greek authorities could only be tested by the accomplishment of measures and by factual changes on the ground, such as the demolition of illegal houses or the disappearance of illegal deck chairs and sun umbrellas.

The Secretariat presented the different options that, in its view, were open to the Committee.

The delegate of Greece referred to the official letter of 21 March 1995, addressed by the Secretary General of the Greek Ministry of the Environment to the Director of the Environment and Local Authorities of the Council of Europe, which has already been presented by Mr Albanese and was being circulated to the members of the Committee (see document T-PVS (95) 27). She also expressed the firm intention of her Government to give adequate protection of the nesting beaches of Laganas Bay and its willingness to demolish the illegal buildings in the area of Daphne Beach as well as its decision to create the National Marine Park of Zakynthos in the area concerned. She also referred to the adopted additional legal measures for the protection of the entire marine area of Laganas Bay (Zakynthos Part Regulation No 20/1994), and to the necessary actions taken by the relevant Greek authorities *inter alia* for the assessment of the socio-economic and managerial prerequisites for the establishment of the National Marine Park, the completion of the Specific Environmental Study (a prior prerequisite, by law, for the establishment of the National Park) and the public-awareness raising. However, it is clear that the socio-economic aspects of the issue have to be dealt with and it is necessary to take careful steps. She felt that the draft decisions presented were not appropriate as the assurance given by her Government implied that this matter should not be discussed in the framework of Article 18 paragraphs 2 to 5 of the Convention. Furthermore, she indicated that some part of information contained in document T-PVS (95) 9, App. 3 "List of illegal buildings..." and withdrawn of building permit for Marathonissi island (p. 10) were incorrect.

The MEDASSET delegate pointed out that the situation on the ground had not improved at all and that the promises of the Greek government had been heard many times before - without any improvement of the situation.

The delegate of WWF, the organisation that owns land on one of the beaches, was not satisfied to hear, every year, a repetition of the commitment of the government of Greece to solve the problems, while there was a lack of action on the ground.

Delegates of Contracting Parties and NGOs pointed out that the credibility of the Convention was at stake by the lack of a solution in this case and that the Standing Committee had tried all possible actions during many years with little practical result, so that a firm position needed to be taken at this meeting by the Standing Committee regarding this case.

The BirdLife delegate pointed out that NGO's were so seriously concerned by the lack of progress on this issue that their continued involvement with the Convention was actually in question.

The delegate of Greece presented two amendments to the draft Decision under consideration. They were the following:

- a. addition of a new paragraph in the preamble:  
*"Recognising that it has not been possible to find so far an acceptable balance between development and conservation in this case, to overcome the local social problems, which create obstacles to this end"*.

- b. modification of the last paragraph, so as to read:  
*"Declares that failure of Greece to comply with these four conditions will be understood by the Committee as a grave and repeated breach of its obligations under the Convention and as an encouragement to Parties to proceed according to Article 18 par. 2 to 5 of the Convention".*

The Committee adopted the Decision found in Appendix 9 to this document and decided to specially call the attention of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe of the decision taken. One Contracting Party abstained and Greece voted against the adoption of the Decision.

The Greek delegate regretted the fact that the proposed two amendments had not been adopted, taking into consideration their positive effect on the tactical approach of the Greek authorities.

#### 6.2 Possible new files:

##### - Dam project in the province of Salamanca (Spain) [T-PVS (94) 10]

This issue concerns a dam to be built in Spain, which is likely to affect several Appendix II species, although none so severely as to threaten its survival. At the request of the Committee Mr Laurence Rose, accompanied by a member of the Secretariat, carried out an on-the-spot appraisal from 3 to 6 May 1994, accompanied by the Spanish delegate to the Committee.

After having thanked the Spanish authorities for their reception during the on-the-spot appraisal, Mr Rose presented his report underlying the impact the construction would have on certain threatened species. He added that the project planned is part of a larger national plan of dam construction throughout the country. Moreover, he considered that the Secretariat and the Standing Committee of the Convention should seriously examine the situation of the scattered species which do not necessarily need protected areas, but the adoption of global measures (impact studies, financing of activities...).

While indicating that no final decision has been taken, the Spanish delegate asked that certain provisions included in the recommendation proposed by the Secretariat should be withdrawn.

The European Herpetological Society pointed out the importance of the area for three species of reptiles. The Portuguese delegate considered that the impact of associated projects and chain constructions would be very serious and that it should be necessary to obtain additional information on desmans and freshwater fish. She felt that the provision of the recommendation regarding Portugal was appropriate. The Luxembourg delegation thought it would be useful to deal with the dams considered as a solution to floods. The Swedish delegate pointed out that it would be necessary to follow the seasonal river flows, which is thought as a positive thing in Sweden. The Spanish delegate spoke of the problems of drought in Spain and admitted that there was a big divergence between the popular belief, according to which it would be better that rivers carry water all year long, and scientists' opinion.

The Committee took into consideration the modifications suggested and adopted recommendation No. 46 regarding the Iruña dam construction project (see Appendix 10).

##### - Caretta caretta in Patara (Turkey) [T-PVS (94) 13]

This case concerns a beach of interest for marine turtle nesting in Turkey, where news had been received that it was threatened by building projects. Recommendation No. 24 (1991) asked Turkey to halt construction activities on the beach of Patara until a management plan was drawn up. The Secretariat was informed by MEDASSET that there were several building projects on the shore which would seriously threaten the beaches. The Turkish delegate presented a report showing that there were no particular threats to this area, protected as a "Specially Protected Area" under Turkish

law.

The observer from WWF International reported that they had received a report from their partner organisation in Turkey, DHKD, concerning problems at Patara beach which were not reflected in the report provided by the Turkish government. The observer from WWF International offered to provide a copy of this report to the Secretariat and urged the Committee to undertake an on-the-spot appraisal as soon as possible, before development proceeds too far.

The Committee decided to leave the matter in the hands of the Bureau as to the timing of an on-the-spot appraisal.

- Wind powered generators in Cadiz Province (Spain) [T-PVS (95) 21]

The case concerns a wind farm in Tarifa and its extension with 90 new windmills. The Spanish Ornithological Society (SEO) claims that the location chosen (Sierra del Cabrito) is not an appropriate place in view of its interest for its position to migratory flyways.

The BirdLife delegation regretted that the Spanish authorities appeared powerless to stop the construction of 90 new turbines. He said that collisions with migrating and local populations of birds are now inevitable.

The Spanish delegate informed the Standing Committee that a permit for the installation of other new mills had been stopped awaiting the results of an Environmental Impact Assessment to be carried out by the Spanish Ornithological Society. He offered to present a report on the issue to the next meeting of the Committee.

- Dam of Itoiz (Navarre, Spain) [T-PVS (95) 22]

This case concerns the project to build a dam in Itoiz, which would have presumably serious environmental effects, as it would flood three natural reserves (declared under regional law) of interest for birds. Populations of over 150 protected species, some of them endangered, would be affected to varying degrees.

The Spanish delegate informed the Standing Committee that the project had been discussed in the framework of the Habitats Directive and that, after thorough consultation with the Commission, it had been finally concluded that the environmental impact foreseen was much lower than previously said. The project had received the green light from the government and was being carried out. The European Commission had decided not to start a procedure for presumed violation of the Habitats Directive. The Spanish delegate offered to present a written report for the next meeting of the Committee.

6.3 Information on the following issues:

- Testudo hermanni in Maures (France) [see T-PVS (95) 28]

The Secretariat reminded the Standing Committee that it had submitted an explanatory report on this question at the 12th Meeting. Hermann's tortoise (*Testudo hermanni*) was now found in France only in the Massif and Plaine des Maures, which was ecologically remarkable both for its flora and fauna, and constituted a unique ecosystem in Provence. A tyre test track (Michelin), which was planned for the central part of the plain, risked causing irreversible damage to local fauna, and particularly Hermann's tortoise. In the light of the information submitted in a letter from the Ministry of the Environment and expanded by the French delegation, the Standing Committee had noted, at its previous meeting, that the French Government was now paying special attention to the need to preserve the Massif and Plaine des Maures as a whole ecosystem, and to practical implementation of a conservation plan for *Testudo hermanni* at national level. The Committee had thought it unnecessary to open a file in these circumstances, but had asked the French Government to submit a report on developments for its 14th Meeting. Recommendation No 26 on the conservation of certain species of endangered reptiles in Europe, adopted by the

Standing Committee on 6 December 1991, recommended that the Government of France "protect as a nature reserve the habitat of *Testudo hermanni hermanni* in the Massif and Plaine des Maures, thus removing further threats from development [...]" (Section 7).

The Secretariat reminded the meeting that the Committee had also emphasized the special interest of the habitat in question for the conservation of Mediterranean and European biodiversity, and had urged the French Government to take steps to establish a classified site under the legislation on sites (1930) and a nature reserve under the Nature Conservation Act (1976) in the whole of this area.

It said that the French Government had sent it a text stating that:

"As indicated at the preliminary meeting on 6 December 1994, the French authorities have the honour to confirm [...] that negotiations are continuing, both on finding an alternative site for the Michelin tyre test centre and on ways of minimising the impact of the Bois de Bouis, coordinated development zone (ZAC). A special delegate was appointed six months ago by the Ministry of the Environment to follow these negotiations".

It also reminded the meeting that the Plaine des Maures had been classified as a ZNIEFF (a Type 1 natural zone of ecological, fauna and flora interest, sectors characterised by their biological interest) in 1987.

The French delegate described the present situation and said that several detailed studies (distribution of species, fire hazards, protection of forests ...) were under way and that the tortoises were not in danger. He recalled, however, that the fauna, flora and landscape of the Maures were of an interest which must be considered overall (a report prepared by Professeur Lefeuvre confirmed this). Negotiations were under way on the redeployment of the land.

The National Nature Conservation Society (SNPN) stressed the European significance of the site and thought it should be classified as a nature reserve. It also wanted the Bois de Bouis area included in the reserve, since it was an ecological continuum and was fundamental to the dynamic of the Plaine des Maures. The present development project (including a golf course) should be totally dropped. It also spoke of the water supply problems which would result from constructing a golf course in an area which already had three.

The delegations from BirdLife and the European Herpetological Society (SEH) agreed with the SNPN that a nature reserve should be established. The SEH particularly referred to Recommendation N° 26 (1991) and urged the government to pursue its efforts in this direction.

The IUCN strongly supported the SNPN's position and wondered whether the Conservatoire de l'espace littoral et des rivages lacustres had authority to acquire land which was neither on a coast nor a lake shore.

The French delegate thanked the NGOs for their support and suggested to the Standing Committee that the SNPN should meet the special delegate in charge of the file with a view to solving the problem. He added that the Conseil d'Etat would have to decide whether the Conservatoire could acquire the site.

The Standing Committee took note of the French delegate's comments and proposals, repeated its hope that the problem would be solved in a manner satisfactory for conservation of the Plaine des Maures, and asked the Government to submit a report at its 15th Meeting.

- *Ursus arctos* in the Pyrenees (France) [see T-PVS (95) 28]

The Secretariat said that the Standing Committee had, at its 12th Meeting, asked the French delegate to submit a report on the situation and problem of this bear in the Pyrenees. It reminded the

meeting that the French authorities were, regrettably, having problems at local level and were running into conceptions of land use which did not make for sustainable development. It said that a change in attitudes seemed essential for the preservation of species of wild fauna. Some delegations had wondered whether a charter would serve any purpose since the bear's habitat would be destroyed.

The Secretariat said that the French delegation had announced that it would submit a written report on the question at the Standing Committee's next meeting, and that this had, in fact, been distributed to the participants. It specifically questioned the advisability of a provision contained in the charter for sustainable development of the Béarnaise valleys and protection of the bear, which stated that "conservation management of the bear and its environment is, above all, a matter for the communities concerned." It pointed out that the French government was bound by its international obligations and particularly by the Bern Convention, and that *Ursus arctos* was one of the strictly protected species listed in Appendix II to the Convention.

The French delegate reminded the meeting of the measures which were being adopted and confirmed that France was in no way seeking to evade its responsibility for conservation of the Pyrenean bear. He added that a project to reintroduce bears from Slovenia was under way in the central Pyrenees.

The National Nature Conservation Society (SNPN) wondered whether transferring powers from the state to local authorities was a good thing, and noted that no practical action had been taken to protect the bear. Conservation associations had not, reportedly, been consulted on preparation of the charter, and would not be consulted upon its implementation. A scientific monitoring committee consisting of international experts would also be essential.

The Italian delegate stressed the danger of introducing bears which were not part of the same community and spoke of the grave risks of genetic pollution which might result from this. The question was whether it was important to have bears in the Pyrenees or to preserve the Pyrenean bear. He also wondered whether a minimum isolated community could reproduce successfully.

The Standing Committee expressed its intention of keeping a close watch on the problem of conservation of the Pyrenean bear, asked the French Government to ensure that the species survived in a suitable habitat, and asked the French delegate to submit a report at its 15th Meeting.

#### - Missolonghi wetlands (Greece)

This issue concerns several development projects in Greece, candidates to receive financial support from the European Community, which may result in adverse ecological effects on areas of great biological importance, including the Missolonghi wetlands. The Standing Committee produced its Recommendation N° 38 (1992) on this issue in which it recommended that Greece ensure that an environmental impact assessment be carried out to consider the effect of the project on species listed in the Appendices of the Convention, and that the proposal to divert the river Acheloos be subject to the findings of the assessment.

The Greek delegate regretted not having submitted a written report and was willing to do so promptly. She informed the Committee that quite recently the State Council (Supreme Court) had cancelled the Joint Ministerial Decision regarding the environmental conditions, authorised during the 1991 to 1993 period, for the technical works for the diversion to the Thessaly region of 1,100 million m<sup>3</sup>/year from the Acheloos river. According to this decision, a "holistic approach" was requested for the assessment of the environmental impact of the diversion of the Acheloos river and the associated technical works, both to the Thessaly and the Metoloakarnania regions. The Greek Government having reassessed the initial diversion plans, reached the decision for a diversion scheme to Thessaly for a quantity of only 600 million m<sup>3</sup>/year of the Acheloos river waters. On this basis and in line with the State Council's Decision, a new holistic Environmental Impact Assessment Study for all the aspects of natural and man-made environment, has been prepared and examined by the competent national authorities. According to the national legislation, in line with the respective European Community legislation, this very Environmental Impact Study and the relevant to the decision Draft Environmental Decisions, have been made public in the framework of the consultation

process at a prefectorial level. The Greek authorities are making themselves available to the Secretariat of the Bern Convention for providing information, not only on decisions taken, but also on written requests.

The Swedish, Swiss and Birdlife delegates were disappointed that a written report had not been sent by Greece, as this made the discussion of this point very difficult.

The Standing Committee took note of the situation and asked Greece to produce a report for the next meeting. The Secretariat was charged to follow events and keep the Bureau and the Committee informed, so that an early reaction of the Bureau may be possible.

- Reptiles on Totes Moor, Lower Saxony (Germany) [see T-PVS (95) 29]

At the previous meeting of the Committee, the German delegation offered to present an additional report on the site, which contains two herpetile species listed in Appendix II.

The German delegate presented a short report on the matter. The area is subject to peat extraction, but a site of about 100 ha will be developed for the purposes of reptile conservation.

The Standing Committee took note of the information and asked Germany to inform the Committee of the progress of the matter at its next meeting.

#### **PART IV - WORK PROGRAMME AND OTHER ITEMS**

##### **7. Organisation matters [T-PVS (94) 21]**

The Secretariat presented a paper that had been requested by the Committee, concerning the desirability of setting up a scientific committee. In its opinion, a small scientific consultative committee made up of a few renowned scientists could indeed help the Committee assess scientific matters.

The Committee discussed the issue and decided that for different reasons it did not need a scientific committee.

The Committee also discussed other organisation matters, such as the frequency and form of their meetings.

With regard to future activities, and particularly the preparation of the draft programme of activities for 1966, Mrs Battaini-Dragoni informed the Committee of the initial, still tentative reflections of the Secretary General concerning the readjustment/ rationalisation of the programme as a whole on a level commensurate with the challenges facing the Organisation in its current phase of enlargement, with the modest financial and human resources available.

She stressed that at this early stage these were hypotheses rather than concrete proposals, to which the Secretary General nevertheless wished the Committee of Ministers to react, without prejudice to the future orientations the Committee of Ministers might wish to propose. In the knowledge that the Organisation would have an increasingly important role to play in guaranteeing democratic security and stability on the continent, and that this role meant a new order of political priorities in the inter-governmental field, the Secretary General had also begun to examine environmental policy with a view to clearly identifying the specificity of these activities vis-a-vis the ambitions of the European Union, the rightful role of the Council of Europe in this field in a pan-European context, the objectives pursued and the adequacy of the resources available, and any reforms that might be required.

The special contribution of the Council of Europe resided in the initial pioneering work and the subsequent pilot work it had done on the conservation of the natural environment, its main achievement being the Bern Convention. The results already achieved needed to be preserved, consolidated and widely publicised. In the interest of optimum resource use, was it advisable to

maintain the CDPE, whose main activities could be transferred, if necessary, to the Standing Committee ? If this were done, changes of a budgetary and operational nature would have to be made. The aim would be to give the Standing Committee overall control of the protection of endangered species, with a global view of nature protection, and to make it alone responsible before the Committee of Ministers. Needless to say, if this hypothesis were to make headway within the Committee of Ministers, an agreement would be proposed to the Standing Committee. The proposed agreement would address sensitive questions that remained open, such as the consequent need for a coherent overall programme, the relevance of such a programme in an pan-European context, how to improve the functioning of the Standing Committee, etc. Mr Fernandez-Galiano supported the view that environmental activities should be linked up to the Bern Convention.

The Swiss delegate said that, while the current financial situation was admittedly difficult, what was being given was a political signal and environmental issues should definitely not be relegated to the tenth in order of priority. The work done over the past thirty-three years was extremely useful and needed to be pursued. The CDPE's work for the preparation of the Paneuropean Ministerial Conference of Sofia as well as on subjects such as tourism, agriculture, landscape conservation and nature conservation benefited the Bern Convention, whose impact would be weakened if it did not have a broader environmental basis at intergovernmental level. Transferring the CDPE's whole programme to the T-PVS would weaken the environmental cause in political terms. A careful study should be made of Agenda 21 and the message it conveyed.

The WCMC proposed that the flow of information on environmental matters be developed effectively.

M. Ribaut was of the opinion that, while the Bern Convention could deal with broad topics, its Standing Committee had always been extremely cautious with regard to the possibility of expanding its sphere of activity. The CDPE addressed issues of vital importance for the conservation of the environment, including soil, genetically modified organisms and tourism. It was also a sector with considerable potential for action, since the list of environmental issues needing to be tackled was far from exhausted at a time when the environment was becoming a priority issue both worldwide and at European level.

The Hungarian delegate also expressed that the Council of Europe should take greater care with environmental issues and should strengthen its efforts to support the activities of the Bern Convention, regarding e.g. the role of new and potential future Parties to the Convention in maintaining Europe's natural resources. He stressed the importance of the Bern Convention's activity in habitat conservation in the Council of Europe region.

The delegate of the Netherlands said that the growth of the Bern Convention's role should on no account lead to cutbacks in nature conservation activities and that the environmental sector needed to be strengthened rather than reduced. He underlined that this should also be considered in the light of the reduction of United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UN-ECE) activities in this field assumed to be taken by the Council of Europe. He stressed the importance of this issue and suggested that the Standing Committee devote its next meeting to the future Strategy for the Convention, taking into account *inter-alia* the results of the Sofia Ministerial Conference (1995) and the Monaco Declaration (1994).

The delegate of the United Kingdom generally welcomed the Committee of Ministers' review of its environmental sector on the basis that this could provide an opportunity to enhance its nature conservation activities.

The Sub-Committee on the Environment of Parliamentary Assembly representative considered that they should be seeking effective arrangements for co-operation. If budgetary restrictions were being applied, it was necessary to establish priorities and give environmental issues the attention they deserved. The Council of Europe had played a pioneering role in this area thirty-three years earlier and had continued to act effectively throughout the succeeding years. It was undoubtedly easier to destroy than to be constructive and it was unacceptable to claim at the very outset of European Nature Conservation Year 1995 that environmental issues were becoming less important. The Bern Convention was certainly important but it was not the only environmental



convention and lacked a sufficiently secure financial base to support the entire environmental sector. If the CDPE were to be abolished, the Convention would also become totally isolated with no general foundation and would lose its impact. Effective co-operation was needed but could not be established on the basis of a general reduction in resources. While there had to be a focus on the Council of Europe's initial task, human rights, it should be recognised that the organisation's wider function was to avoid a fresh outbreak of war in Europe and develop co-operation in a number of fields, in particular that of the environment. In order to work for peace, it was crucial to have a general base and ensure that we had a healthy environment. The proposals put forward in the Secretary General's name gave the wrong signal, pointing to a rationalisation of existing policies. An appeal should be issued to the ministers of the environment, and more generally to governments, inviting them to unite in opposition to these proposals.

The French representative said he was sensitive to the arguments put forward by the Parliamentary Assembly and by Mr Ribaut. He fully supported the Parliamentary Assembly representative and Mr Ribaut. The CDPE's area of responsibility was much wider than that of the Bern Convention and even if the latter were extended it could not cope with all the environmental problems which Europe currently faced. The Bern Convention emanated from the CDPE and if they were to co-ordinate activities and make sure that functions were not duplicated, they should not abolish the intergovernmental structure, particularly as since 1990 the CDPE had been an unique focus of co-operation between western and central and eastern Europe. It helped to ensure that there was a sharing of experience and represented a positive force for peace in Europe.

The German representative emphasised that rationalisation did not mean fewer staff and a smaller budget to undertake a wider range of tasks. There were legal limits to the Bern Convention and environmental matters which it could not cover. To give it new tasks would require an increase in staffing and budget and a change in delegations' composition. A written procedure should be followed and any decision taken by a specialist conference.

The Belgian representative expressed concern at the proposed reorganisation, mainly because the Convention contained no obligation concerning funding by the Council of Europe. He questioned the Council of Europe's willingness to transfer all the financial and human resources that had been devoted to the environment in recent years to the Bern Convention. He felt, for example, that the disastrous state in which the Naturopa Centre had been left, which prevented it from functioning properly, augured very badly for the future. He said that structural reorganisation should on no account reduce the scope of the Council of Europe's activities in the field of nature conservation.

The delegate from Luxembourg seconded the statement by the Belgian delegate.

The Swedish delegation thought that great priority must be given to monitoring the Convention and that it was necessary to see how the Contracting Parties were complying with their obligations. There was no need for widening the scope of the Convention, since the issues related to species and habitats always will be an important element in nature conservation and overlap with other conventions should be avoided.

The Parliamentary Assembly's delegate repeated that any dismantling of structures working at the Council of Europe for conservation of the environment would weaken the whole environmental sector. She pointed out that the United Nations regarded the Council as an organisation qualified to deal with environmental questions at pan-European level. It must therefore take up this challenge, and do so willingly, regarding it as a real privilege. It must have the instruments it needed to act at pan-European level, and the Bern Convention's machinery must be adapted to make it more effective. The question was not what funds were available, but what the Council wanted to do and how it could do it. It was regrettable that the importance of the role which the Council was expected to play at pan-European environmental conferences should be recognised, and yet that the funds needed to implement the policies decided upon should not be made available. The important thing was to have a clear idea of what one wanted to do, and then to go ahead and do it. Those in charge of the environmental sector and the delegates on the Standing Committee must make it clear that they were willing to take on this task. Trying to strengthen individual aspects was dangerous, a more

comprehensive approach must be adopted. The Bern Convention would lose its importance and be marginalised if the entire environmental sector was downgraded. It was totally inadvisable to pit the Standing Committee against the CDPE. Anything that was presented as a restriction must be rejected, and political resolution must be shown.

The Burkina Faso delegate pointed out that great importance must be attached to conservation of the African habitats of migratory species and thank the Bureau for the support which it had already provided in this area.

The Norwegian delegate thought that great attention must be paid to species habitat conservation and the follow-up of the Bern Convention as it stands.

The WCMC delegate thought that the Convention on Biological Diversity focused on national studies, but that there was no co-ordination at pan-European level, and that this must be provided by the Council of Europe.

The Committee took note of the information provided, in particular of the intention of the Secretary General to consult the Committee before structural changes are decided upon.

8. Programme of activities for 1996. Financing of activities [T-PVS (94) 20]

The Committee adopted its 1995 and 1996 programmes of activities and budget as they appear in Appendices 11 and 12. The 1996 programme (points 1 to 7 and point 12) was adopted on a provisional basis.

As far as financing of activities was concerned, the Committee encouraged Parties to make voluntary contributions to the special account.

9. Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman

In accordance with Article 18 (e) of the Rules of Procedure: "The Chairman and Vice-Chairman shall be elected at the end of each meeting. They shall execute their respective terms of office from their election onwards until the end of the meeting following the meeting where they were elected. Their terms of office may not exceed four years or, as appropriate, the end of the first meeting following the expiry of this period of four years."

The Committee elected Mr Haapanen (Finland) Chairman by 21 votes out of 20 votes cast. The Committee elected Mr Spiridonov (Bulgaria) Vice-Chairman by 21 votes out of 20 votes cast. The Committee elected Mr Boere (Netherlands) as third member of the Bureau instead of Mr Renault.

10. Date and place of the 15th meeting, adoption of the report and other business

The Committee decided to hold its 15th meeting on the second or third week of January 1996 and wished to have a reduced agenda. It charged the Bureau to prepare a short agenda with fewer technical matters and more of strategy.

Meetings to be attended by the Secretariat

The Committee authorised the Secretariat to attend several meetings of special relevance for the work of the Convention: the European Ministerial Conference on the Environment in Sofia, the first meeting of the Parties of the Bats Agreement, meeting of the Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds, the technical meetings of MedWet, the European Regional meeting of the Ramsar Convention, the coordination meetings on monk seal conservation, "Habitat" Directive meetings, meeting of experts of Barcelona and Ramsar Conventions on acquisition of coastal reserves. Assistance to other meetings may be authorised by the Chairman on request.

Adoption of the report

The Committee adopted this report on Friday 24 March 1995.

## APPENDIX 1

### LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

**AUSTRIA/AUTRICHE** Mrs Brigitte SELTENHAMMER, (Absent/Absente) Ministry of the Environment, Department I/1, Reisnerstraße 4, A-1030 WIEN (E)

Dr Joseph MIKOCKI, Amt der Wiener Landesregierung, Magistratsabteilung 22, Ebendorferstraße 4, A 1082 WIEN (E)  
Tel. ++ 43/1/88234 Fax ++ 43/1/9988215

**BELGIUM/BELGIQUE** M. Jean RENAULT, Ministère de l'Agriculture, Administration de la Recherche Agronomique, Avenue du Boulevard 21 - 7<sup>e</sup> étage, Manhattan Center, Office Tower, B 1210 BRUXELLES (F)  
Tél. (32 2) 211 72 11 Fax n° (32 2) 211 75 53

**BULGARIA/BULGARIE** Mr Geko SPIRIDONOV, Chef du Département de la Biodiversité, Aires protégées et Forêts, Ministère de l'Environnement de Bulgarie, 67 W. Gladstone Str., 1000 SOFIA (F) Tel. 87 61 51 (290) Telex 22145 Fax 359/2/521634

**BURKINA FASO** M. Lamine SEBOGO, Ministère de l'Environnement et du Tourisme, Direction Générale de l'Environnement, Direction des Forêts et de la Faune, 03 BP 7044 OUAGADOUGOU 03  
Tél. 226 33 24 77 Fax 266 30 67 67 (F)

### **CYPRUS/CHYPRE**

**DENMARK/DANEMARK** Mr Claus GOLDBERG, Ministry of the Environment, Skov- og Naturstyrelsen, Haraldsgade 53, DK 2100 KØBENHAVN Ø  
Tel. +45 39 27 20 00 Telex 21 485 NATURE DK Fax +45 39 27 98 99 (E)

### **ESTONIA/ESTONIE**

**EC/CE** M. Richard GEISER, Administrateur principal, Direction générale environnement, sécurité nucléaire et protection civile (DG XI/D/2), (adr. adm: TRMF 02/16) Commission européenne, 200 rue de la Loi, B 1049 BRUXELLES, Belgique (E/F)  
Tel. 00 32 2 296 87 32 Telex comeu b 21877 Fax 00 32 2 296 95 56

M. Jean-Paul DECAESTECKER, Principal Administrator, Council of the European Union, 175 rue de la Loi, B-1048 BRUXELLES, Belgique (E)  
Tel. 32 2 285 68 07 Fax 32 2 285 8426

M. Van der WOUDE, administrateur, Service Juridique, Commission Européenne, (adr. adm. N85 02/73), Rue de la Loi 200, B 1049 BRUXELLES, Belgique (F)

M. Pierre J. DEVILLERS, (1) Direction générale environnement, sécurité nucléaire et protection civile (D.G. XI), Commission européenne, (adr adm.: TRMF 02/16), 200 rue de la Loi, B 1049 BRUXELLES, Belgique et (2) Institut royal des Sciences naturelles de Belgique, 29 rue Vautier, B 1040 BRUXELLES, Belgique (F)  
Tél. 32 2 627 43 54 Fax 32 2 649 48 25

Mme Rosamaria GILI, DGIA - administrateur , Commission européenne, 200 rue de la Loi, MO/34  
5/121, B 1049 BRUSSELS, Belgique (F)  
Tel. 32 2 299 45 68 Fax 32 2 295 80 82

**FINLAND/FINLANDE** Mr Antti A.A. HAAPANEN (Chairman/Président), Director Conservation of  
Nature and Natural Resources, Land Use Department, Ministry of the Environment, P.O. Box 399  
(Korkeavuorenkatu 21), FIN 00121 HELSINKI (E)  
Tel. 358 0 1991 9330 Telex 123717 ymin sf Fax 358 0 1991 9364

Mr Christian KROGELL, Chief Inspector, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Dept of Fish and  
Game, Hallituskatu 3A, SF 00170 HELSINKI (E)  
Tel.+358 0 1603373 Fax +358 0 1604285

M. Seppo VUOLANTO, Ministry of the Environment, PB 399, 00121 HELSINKI, Finlande Tel. 0-  
19911 (E)

**FRANCE** M. Jean-Louis PONS, Ministère de l'Environnement, Direction Protection de la Nature, 20  
avenue de Ségur, 75302 PARIS 07 SP (F)  
Tel. 33 (1) 42 19 19 48 Fax 33 (1) 42 19 19 77

**GERMANY/ALLEMAGNE** Dr Joachim WOIWODE, Regierungsdirektor, Bundesministerium für  
Umwelt, Naturschutz und Reaktorsicherheit, Postfach 12 06 29, D 53048 BONN (E)  
Tel. 0049-228 305 2632 Fax 0049-228 305 2695

Ms Astrid THYSSEN, Regierungsamtfrau, Bundesministerium für Umwelt, Naturschutz und  
Reaktorsicherheit, Postfach 12 06 29, D 53048 BONN (E/F)  
Tel. 0049-228 305 2634 Fax 0049-228 305 2695

Mr Gerold SCHENKEL, (Absent), Landesanstalt für Umweltschutz, Griesbachstrasse 3,  
D 76185 KARLSRUHE (E) Tel. 0049 721 983 1423 Fax 0049 721 983 1414

**GREECE/GRECE** Mme Demetra SPALA, Ministry of the Environment, Physical Planning and Public  
Works, Environmental Planning Division, Natural Environment Management Section, 36 Trikalon  
Str., GR-11526 ATHENS (E)  
Tel. 30-1-6917620 Telex 216028 DYPP GR Fax 30-1-8647420 / 30-1-6918487

**HUNGARY/HONGRIE** Mr Gabór NECHAY, Senior Adviser, National Authority for Nature  
Conservation, Ministry of the Environment and Regional Policy, Költö u. 21, H 1121 BUDAPEST XII  
(E)  
Tel. 36 1/15 62 133 - 36 1/1756 458 Telex 22 61 15 Fax 36/1 1757 457

**ICELAND/ISLANDE** Dr Jon Gunnar OTTOSSON, Icelandic Institute of Natural History, Hlemmur 3,  
105 REYKJAVIK, Iceland (E)  
Tel. 354 1 629 822 Fax 354 1 15185

**IRELAND/IRLANDE** (Apologised for absence/Excusé)

**ITALY/ITALIE** Prof. Emilio BALLETO, Dipartimento di Biologia Animale, Via Accademia Albertina  
17, I 10123 TORINO (F) Tel. 39 11 8122 374 Fax 39 11 8124 561

**LIECHTENSTEIN** Mr Michael FASEL, Landesforstamt, FL 9490 VADUZ  
Tel. 19 41 75/236 64 05 Telex 888 290 Fax 19 41 75/236 64 11 (E)

**LUXEMBOURG** M. Charles ZIMMER, Conseiller de Direction, Ministère de l'Environnement, 18  
Montée de la Pétrusse, L 2918 LUXEMBOURG-VILLE  
Tel. (352) 478/6826 - /6812 Fax (352) 400 410 (F)

**MALTA/MALTE** Mr Alfred E. BALDACCHINO, O i/c Protected Species, Biodiversity, Environment Protection Department, FLORIANA (E)  
Tel. (356) 231895 / 232022 Telex 241378 Fax (356) 24 13 78

**MOLDOVA**

**MONACO** Mme Marie-Christine GRILLO, Chef de Division Biologie, Service de l'Environnement, 3 Avenue de Fontvieille, Ministère d'Etat, MC 98000 MONACO (F)  
Tel (33) 93 15 81 49 / 93 15 89 63 Telex GouvPR 469942 Fax (33) 92 05 28 91

**NETHERLANDS/PAYS-BAS** Dr Gerard C. BOERE, Senior Executive Officer, Division of International Affairs, Directorate for Nature, Forests, Landscape and Fauna, Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries, PO Box 20401, NL 2500 EK THE HAGUE Tel. 31 70 3793591/3793007 Telex 32040 LAVI NL Fax 31 70 3793751 (E)

Drs Jan-Willem SNEEP, Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries, Department for Nature, Forests, Landscape and Wildlife, PO Box 20401, NL 2500 EK THE HAGUE (E)  
Tel. 31-70-3793255 Telex 32040 LAVI NL Fax 31-70-3478228

**NORWAY/NORVEGE** Mr Jan ABRAHAMSEN, Ministry of the Environment, Myntgt. 2, N 0300 OSLO Tel. 22 34 5850 (E)

Ms Gunn M. PAULSEN, Directorate for Nature Management, Tungasletta 2, N 7005 TRONDHEIM (E) Tel. 47 73 58 05 00 Fax 47 73 91 54 33

**PORTUGAL** Ms Ana Isabel QUEIROZ, Instituto da Conservação da Natureza, Rua Filipe Folque 46-1º, P 1050 LISBOA (E) Tel. 351.1 3950456/64/5/6 Fax 351.1 601048

**ROMANIA/ROUMANIE** Mme Adriana BAZ, (Apologised for absence/Excusée), expert biologiste, Ministère de l'Eaux, Forêts et de la Protection de l'Environnement, Litertatii 12, Sector 5, BUCAREST Fax 401 312 1436 / 401 312 5507

**SENEGAL** M. Soulye NDIAYE, Directeur adjoint des Parcs nationaux, Ministère de l'Environnement et de la Protection de la Nature, BP 5135, DAKAR FANN (F)  
Tél. (221) 24 42 21 / 25 05 40 Fax n° 221 32 92 46

**SPAIN/ESPAGNE** M. Miguel AYMERICH HUYGHUES-DESPOINTES, Jefe de Sección de Inventario, ICONA, Sous-direction generale du milieu naturel, Servicio de Vida Silvestre, Gran Vía de San Francisco 4, E 28005 MADRID (F)  
Tel. (91) 3 47 61 85 Telex 47591 aeico e Fax (91) 3 47 6301

**SWEDEN/SUEDE** Mr Svante LUNDQUIST, Head of Section, Ministry of Environment, Tegelbacken 2, S 103 33 STOCKHOLM (E) Tel. +46 8 763 2064 Fax +46 8 219 170

Mr Torsten LARSSON, Conservation Officer, Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, S 17185 SOLNA (E) Tel. 46 8 799 1391 Telex 11131 Environ S Fax 46 8 799 1402

**SWITZERLAND/SUISSE** M. Raymond-Pierre LEBEAU, Chef de la Section compensation écologique, Département fédéral de l'Intérieur, Office fédéral de l'Environnement, des Forêts et du Paysage, Hallwylstrasse 4, CH 3003 BERNE (F)  
Tel. 19 41 31/322 80 64 Fax 31/322 99 81

**TURKEY/TURQUIE** Mr Tansu GÜRPINAR, (Absent), Deputy Director General Environmental Protection, Ministry of Environment, Department of International Relations, Çevre Bakanligi, Istanbul Caddesi n° 88, TR 06060 ISKITLER - ANKARA (E)  
Tel. 90 312 285 21 62 Fax 90 312 286 22 71

**UNITED KINGDOM/ROYAUME-UNI** Mr Roger B. BENDALL, (Absent), Head of Biodiversity & Species Conservation Branch, Department of the Environment, Tollgate House, Room 9/07B, Houlton Street, GB BRISTOL BS2 9DJ (E)  
Tel. +117 987 8791 Telex 449321 Tolgte G Fax +117 987 8642

Dr Michael J. FORD, Head of International Policy Branch, Joint Nature Conservation Committee, Monkstone House, City Road, GB PETERBOROUGH PE1 1JY (E)  
Tel. +44 1733 866 817 Fax +44 1733 555 948

Mr Trevor M. SALMON, Higher Executive Office, Biodiversity & Species Conservation Branch, Department of the Environment, Tollgate House, Room 9/02, Houlton Street, GB BRISTOL BS2 9DJ (E) Tel. +117 987 8791 Telex 449321 Tolgte G Fax +117 987 8642

### **OBSERVERS/OBSERVATEURS**

**CZECH REPUBLIQUE/REP. TCHEQUE** Mr Jaroslav \_ERVENÝ, Division of Nature Conservation, Department of Species Protection, Ministry of the Environment, Czech Republic, Vršovická 65, 10000 PRAHA 10 (E)  
Tel. (422) 67 12 2592 Telex 121266 Fax (422) 673 10308

Mr František KRÁL, Ministry of Agriculture of the Czech Republic, T\_šnov 17, 110 00 PRAHA 1 (E) Tel. 422 2881 2748

Mr František HAVRÁNEK, Czech Committee for Animal Protection, T\_šnov 17, 110 00 PRAHA 1 (E) Tel. 422 2881 1111

Ms Alena \_ERVENÁ, National Museum, Václavské Nám 68, PRAHA 1 (E)  
Tel. 2423 0485

**LITHUANIA/LITUANIE** Apologised for absence/excusé

**HOLY SEE/SAINT SIEGE** Apologised for absence/Excusé

**RUSSIA/RUSSIE** Apologised for absence/Excusé

**ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT/ ORGANISATION DE COOPERATION ET DE DEVELOPPEMENT ECONOMIQUES (OECD/OCDE)** Apologised for absence/excusé

**ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE/COMMISSION ECONOMIQUE POUR L'EUROPE (UNECE/CEE-NU)** Apologised for absence/excusé

**UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME / PROGRAMME DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ENVIRONNEMENT (UNEP/PNUE)**

**UNITED NATIONS EDUCATION, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION /ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'EDUCATION, LA SCIENCE ET LA CULTURE (UNESCO)**

**EUROPEAN ENVIRONMENT AGENCY/AGENCE EUROPEENNE POUR L'ENVIRONNEMENT** M. François BOILLOT, Centre thématique européen pour la conservation de la nature, Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 57 rue Cuvier, 75231 PARIS Cedex 05, France (F) Tel. 33 1 40 79 38 70  
Fax 33 1 40 79 38 67

**SECRETARIAT OF THE CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF MIGRATORY SPECIES OF WILD ANIMALS (BONN) / SECRETARIAT DE LA CONVENTION SUR LA CONSERVATION DES ESPECES MIGRATRICES APPARTENANT A LA FAUNE SAUVAGE (BONN) (UNEP/CMS :**

**PNUE/CMS)** Mr Arnulf MÜLLER-HELMBRECHT, (Apologised for absence/excusé) Co-ordinator, UNEP/CMS, Mallwitzstr. 1-3, D 53177 BONN, Allemagne (E) Tel.+49 228-954 3501/2/3/4 Telex 885 556 bfn d Fax +49 228-954 3500

**SECRETARIAT OF THE CONVENTION ON WETLANDS OF INTERNATIONAL IMPORTANCE ESPECIALLY AS WATERFOWL HABITAT (RAMSAR) / SECRETARIAT DE LA CONVENTION RELATIVE AUX ZONES HUMIDES D'IMPORTANCE INTERNATIONALE PARTICULIEREMENT COMME HABITATS DES OISEAUX D'EAU (RAMSAR)**

**SECRETARIAT OF THE CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES (CITES) /SECRETARIAT DE LA CONVENTION SUR LE COMMERCE INTERNATIONAL DES ESPECES SAUVAGES DE FAUNE ET DE FLORE MENACEES D'EXTINCTION (CITES)**

**SECRETARIAT OF THE PROTOCOL CONCERNING MEDITERRANEAN SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREAS (GENEVA) / SECRETARIAT DU PROTOCOLE RELATIF AUX AIRES SPECIALEMENT PROTEGES DE LA MEDITERRANEE (GENEVE)** Mr Mohamed SAIED, Regional Activity Centre for Specially Protected Areas (Geneva Protocol), 15 rue Ali Ibn Abi Taleb, Cité Jardins, 1002 TUNIS - B.P. 24, Tunisie  
Tél. (216.1) 795 760 Fax n° (216.1) 797 349 (F)

**SECRETARIAT OF THE CONVENTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE MEDITERRANEAN SEA AGAINST POLLUTION (BARCELONA)/SECRETARIAT DE LA CONVENTION POUR LA PROTECTION DE LA MER MEDITERRANEE CONTRE LA POLLUTION (BARCELONA)** M. Lucien CHABASSON, (Apologised for absence/Excusé) Coordinating Unit for the Mediterranean Action, UNEP (Barcelona Convention), Leoforos Vassileos Konstantinou 48 (2nd floor), GR 116 35 ATHENS, Grèce

**INTERIM SECRETARIAT OF THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY (RIO DE JANEIRO)/SECRETARIAT INTERIMAIRE DE LA CONVENTION SUR LA DIVERSITE BIOLOGIQUE (RIO DE JANEIRO)** Apologised for absence/Excusé

**THE WORLD CONSERVATION UNION/L'UNION MONDIALE POUR LA NATURE (IUCN/UICN)** Mr Simon STUART (apologised for absence/excusé), IUCN, rue Mauverney 28, CH 1196 GLAND, Suisse Fax +41 22-999 00 02

Mr Cyrille de KLEMM, 21 rue de Dantzig, F 75015 PARIS (F) (voir SFDE)

#### **GREENPEACE**

**WORLD WIDE FUND FOR NATURE-INTERNATIONAL / FONDS MONDIAL POUR LA NATURE-INTERNATIONAL (WWF)** Dr Christopher TYDEMAN, WWF-UK, Panda House, Weyside Park, Catteshall Lane, GB GODALMING Surrey GU7 1XR, Grande-Bretagne  
Tel. (44) 483 426444 Telex 859602 Fax (44) 483 424 409 (E)

**WORLD CONSERVATION MONITORING CENTRE / CENTRE MONDIAL DE SURVEILLANCE CONTINUE DE LA CONSERVATION DE LA NATURE (WCMC)**  
Dr Tim JOHNSON, World Conservation Monitoring Centre, 219 Huntingdon Road, GB CAMBRIDGE CB3 0DL, Grande-Bretagne (E) (22-23 mars 95)  
Tel. +44 223 277314 Telex 817036 SCMU G Fax +44 1223 277136

#### **BIRDLIFE INTERNATIONAL**

Mr Carlos MARTIN-NOVELLA, (Apologised for absence/Excusé) Head of the European Division, BirdLife International, Wellbrook Court, Girton Road, GB CAMBRIDGE CB3 0NA, Grande-Bretagne  
Tel. +44 (0)1223 277318 Fax +44 (0)1223 277200

Mr Borja HEREDIA, Action Plans Coordinator, BirdLife International, Wellbrook Court, Girton Road, GB CAMBRIDGE CB3 0NA, Grande-Bretagne

Tel. +44 223 - 277318 Fax + 44 223 277200 (E)

Mr John O'SULLIVAN (see The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds)

**EUROGROUP FOR ANIMAL WELFARE** Dr Bjarne CLAUSEN, 17 sq Marie Louise,  
Bte 6, B - 1040 BRUXELLES, Belgique (E)  
Tel. 231 13 88 Fax 230 1700

**FEDERATION OF FIELD SPORTS ASSOCIATIONS OF THE EEC/ FEDERATION DES ASSOCIATIONS DE CHASSEURS DE LA CEE (FACE)**

Dr Yves LECOCQ, Secrétaire Général, FACE, Rue F. Pelletier 82, B-1040 BRUXELLES Belgique  
Tel. 32 2/732 69 00 Fax 32 2/732 70 72 (F)

M. Charles LAGIER (Apologised for absence/excusé) FACE, 42 quai Joseph Gillet, 69004 LYON, France (F) Tel. 72 00 85 21 Fax 72 00 86 66

**INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR FALCONRY AND CONSERVATION OF BIRDS OF PREY / ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE DE LA FAUCONNERIE ET DE LA CONSERVATION DES OISEAUX DE PROIE**

Mr Christian de COUNE, President, The International Association for Falconry and Conservation of Birds of Prey, Le Cochetay, Thier des Forges 85, B-4140 GOMZE-ANDOUMONT, Belgique (E)  
Tel. [32] 41 68 73 69 Fax (32) 41 68 60 59

**MEDITERRANEAN ASSOCIATION TO SAVE THE SEA TURTLES**

Mrs Lily VENIZELOS, President, MEDASSET, (1) MEDASSET, 1c Licavitou Str. GR 10672 ATHENS, Grèce Tel. 01-361 3572 (Athens) Fax 01-7243007 (Athens) / (2) c/o 24 Park Towers, 2 Brick Street, GB LONDON W1Y 7DF, Grande-Bretagne  
Tel. +44 0171 6290654 Fax +44 0171 6290654 (E/F)

Mr Max KASPAREK, Scientific Adviser, 1 Bleichstrasse, 69120 HEIDELBERG, Allemagne (E) Tel. +49 6221/475069 Fax +49 6221/471858

**THE ROYAL SOCIETY FOR THE PROTECTION OF BIRDS / SOCIETE ROYALE POUR LA PROTECTION DES OISEAUX (RSPB)**

Mr John O'SULLIVAN, The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) (see also BirdLife International), The Lodge, GB SANDY Beds. SG19 2DL, Grande-Bretagne (E)  
Tel. 0767 680551 Telex 82469 Fax 0767 683211

Mr Laurence ROSE, The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB), The Lodge, GB SANDY Beds. SG19 2DL, Grande-Bretagne (E)  
Tel. 0767 680551 Telex 82469 Fax 0767 683211

**SOCIETAS EUROPAEA HERPETOLOGICA (SEH)**

Mr Keith F. CORBETT, SEH Conservation Chair, c/o Herpetological Conservation Trust, 655A Christchurch Road, Boscombe, GB BOURNEMOUTH Dorset BH1 4AP, Grande-Bretagne (E)  
Tel. 202-391319 / 524035 Telex Fax 202-392785

**SWISS LEAGUE FOR NATURE PROTECTION / LIGUE SUISSE POUR LA PROTECTION DE LA NATURE (LSPN)**

Mr Urs TESTER, (Absent), Chef de la Division de protection de la nature, Ligue Suisse pour la Protection de la Nature, (Wartenbergstr. 22, CH 4052 BASEL) Case postale, CH 4020 BALE  
Tel. 41-(0)61 /317 91 91 N° direct /317 91 36 Fax 41-(0)61/317 91 66

**FRENCH SOCIETY FOR ENVIRONMENTAL LAW/SOCIETE FRANCAISE POUR LE DROIT DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT (SFDE)**

Mme Claude-Hélène LAMBRECHTS, Secrétaire Générale, Société française pour le Droit de l'Environnement, Place d'Athènes, 67084 STRASBOURG CEDEX, France  
Tel. 88 41 42 56/ 57 Fax 88 61 30 37 (F)



Mr Cyrille de KLEMM, Vice-Président (voir UICN)

**NATIONAL ANGLING UNION OF FRANCE/UNION NATIONALE DE LA PECHE EN FRANCE**  
Monsieur Robert GASCOIN, Vice-Président, Union National pour la Pêche en France, 17 rue Bergère, F-75009 PARIS Tél. 48 24 96 00 Fax 48 01 00 65 (F)

M. Jacques ARRIGNON, Union nationale de la Pêche en France, 24 rue de la 8e Division, F-60200 COMPIEGNE, France (F) Tél. 44 20 17 33 Fax 44 86 69 50

**NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR NATURE PROTECTION/SOCIETE NATIONALE DE PROTECTION DE LA NATURE ET D'ACCLIMATATION DE FRANCE (SNPN)**

M. Jean-François ASMODE, Vice-Président, Société nationale de Protection de la Nature, 57 rue Cuvier, F-75005 PARIS (F/E)  
Tél. (33/1) 47 07 31 95 Fax (33/1) 47 07 07 16

Mme Christine VINCENOT, Société nationale de Protection de la Nature, 57 rue Cuvier, BP 405, F-75221 PARIS CEDEX 05 (F) Tél. (33/1) 47 07 31 95 Fax (33/1) 47 07 07 16

**CLRAE/CPLRE** Mr Horst LÄSSING, Alter Postplatz 10, D 71328 WAIBLINGEN (E)  
Tél. 7151 501 333 Fax 7151 501 712

**PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY/ASSEMBLEE PARLEMENTAIRE**

M. Efstratios KORAKAS, Grèce

M. Robert FICO, Slovaquie

Mme Leni ROBERT, Seminarstr. 24, 3006 BERNE, Suisse (F)  
Tel. 31 352 9643 Fax 31 352 2071

**SECRETARIAT**

Mr Ferdinando ALBANESE, Director of Environment and Local Authorities / Directeur de l'Environnement et des Pouvoirs Locaux

Mr Jean-Pierre RIBAUT, Head of Environment Conservation and Management Division / Chef de la Division de la Protection et de la Gestion de l'Environnement

Mr Eladio FERNANDEZ-GALIANO, Administrator, Environment Conservation and Management Division / Division de la Protection et de la Gestion de l'Environnement

Mme Maguelonne DEJEANT-PONS, Administrator, Environment Conservation and Management Division / Division de la Protection et de la Gestion de l'Environnement

APPENDIX 2

**AGENDA**

**PART I - DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION**

1. Opening of the meeting and adoption of the agenda
2. Chairman's report and communications from the delegations and from the Secretariat. Reports from new Contracting Parties
3. Development of the Convention
  - 3.1 Strategic issues: what to do next? Relationship with Biodiversity Convention. The Monaco Declaration
  - 3.2 States to be invited as observers to the 15th meeting
4. Legal aspects
  - 4.1 Amendments to Appendix I (for one species from Cyprus)
  - 4.2 Amendments to Appendix IV (for freshwater fish and crayfish)
  - 4.3 Biennial reports for 1991-92
  - 4.4 Draft resolutions on species requiring specific habitat conservation measures and on endangered natural habitats requiring specific conservation measures
  - 4.5 Opening and closing of files and follow up of recommendations
  - 4.6 Report on the legal aspects of the introduction and reintroduction of wild species

**PART II - THREATENED SPECIES AND HABITATS**

5. Threatened species and habitats. Seminars, groups of experts and reports
  - 5.1 Fauna
    - 5.1.1 Draft recommendation on Recovery plans for European mammals
    - 5.1.2 Informal proposal to add new mammals to Appendix II
    - 5.1.3 Seminar on the conservation of the monk seal *Monachus monachus*
    - 5.1.4 Seminar on the conservation of the European otter *Lutra lutra*
    - 5.1.5 Report on threatened mammals in Europe
    - 5.1.6 Report on European desmans (*Galemys pyrenaicus* and *Desmana moschata*)
    - 5.1.7 Report on the wolverine (*Gulo gulo*)
    - 5.1.8 Group of experts on conservation of amphibians and reptiles
    - 5.1.9 Report on threatened amphibians and reptiles of Eastern Europe
    - 5.1.10 Action plans for European globally threatened birds. Progress report
    - 5.1.11 Group of experts on conservation of invertebrates
    - 5.1.12 Report on saproxylic invertebrates of Eastern Europe
  - 5.2 Flora
    - 5.2.1 Group of experts on plants of Central Europe
    - 5.2.2 Reports on threatened flora of Eastern Europe (Poland, Romania, territory of ex-USSR)
  - 5.3 Habitats
    - 5.3.1 Coastal areas of the Adriatic
    - 5.3.2 Seminar on marine and coastal biodiversity (Alghero)

- 5.3.3 Report on habitats losing wildlife interest as a result of ecological succession
- 5.3.4 Joint actions with other conventions:
  - Barcelona Convention (Geneva Protocol): drafting of a revised protocol
  - Ramsar Convention: progress of MedWet Initiative

### **PART III - SPECIFIC SITES**

#### 6. Specific sites

6.1 *Caretta caretta* in Laganas Bay, Zakynthos (Greece)

6.2 Possible new files:

- Dam project in the Province of Salamanca (Spain)
- *Caretta caretta* in Patara (Turkey)
- Wind powered generators in Cadiz Province (Spain)
- Dam of Itoiz (Navarre, Spain)

6.3 Information on the following issues:

- *Testudo hermanni* in Maures (France)
- *Ursus arctos* in the Pyrenees (France)
- Missolonghi wetlands (Greece)
- Reptiles on Totes Moor, Lower Saxony (Germany)

### **PART IV - WORK PROGRAMME AND OTHER ITEMS**

7. Organisation matters

8. Programme of activities for 1996. Financing of activities

9. Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman

10. Date and place of the 15th meeting, adoption of the report and other business

APPENDIX 3

**APPENDIX IV FOR FRESHWATER FISH**

**ANNEXE IV POUR DES POISSONS D'EAU DOUCE**

**APPENDIX IV / ANNEXE IV**

**Prohibited means and methods of killing, capture and other forms of exploitation**

**Moyens et méthodes de mise à mort, de capture et autres formes d'exploitation interdits**

**FRESHWATER FISH / POISSONS D'EAU DOUCE**

Explosives	Explosifs
Firearms	Armes à feu
Poisons	Poisons
Anaesthetics	Anesthésiants
Electricity with alternating current	Electricité au courant alternatif
Artificial light sources	Sources lumineuses artificielles

**APPENDIX IV FOR CRAYFISH (DECAPODA)**

**ANNEXE IV POUR ECREVISSES (DECAPODA)**

**APPENDIX IV / ANNEXE IV**

**Prohibited means and methods of killing, capture and other forms of exploitation**

**Moyens et méthodes de mise à mort, de capture et autres formes d'exploitation interdits**

**CRAYFISH (Decapoda) / ECREVISSE (Decapoda)**

Explosives	Explosifs
Poisons	Poisons

APPENDIX 4

**MONACO DECLARATION ON THE ROLE OF THE BERN CONVENTION IN THE  
IMPLEMENTATION OF WORLDWIDE INTERNATIONAL INSTRUMENTS FOR THE  
PROTECTION OF BIODIVERSITY**

*The Participants in the Intergovernmental Symposium on the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Bern Convention: the next steps,*

*Meeting in Monaco from 26 to 28 September 1994 under the auspices of the Council of Europe;*

*Aware of the inestimable value of the earth's biological and landscape diversity and being anxious to preserve it and ensure the sustainability of its use for present and future generations;*

*Recalling Recommendation No. R ENV (90) 1 of the Committee of Ministers to member States on the European Conservation Strategy, which states that a European conservation strategy should promote a culture which respects nature for what it is and not only for what monetary value can be placed on it;*

*Determined to act promptly and efficiently in order to apply the principles pronounced in Rio de Janeiro on 14 June 1992 by the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, in the Declaration on Environment and Development, in the Declaration for a global consensus on the management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forest, as well as the provisions of Agenda 21;*

*Emphasising most particularly the importance they attach to the need to base themselves on the principle of precaution and to adopt anticipatory and preventive policies;*

*Observing that Agenda 21 mentions *inter alia* the "Management of fragile ecosystems" and the "Conservation of biological diversity" as fields of activity requiring specific and urgent action, and stresses that in the field of international cooperation, regional international organisations must contribute, along with the United Nations system, support and supplement national efforts made with a view to achieving the objectives which it outlines;*

*Noting that Article 5 of the Convention on Biological Diversity specifies that "Each Contracting Party shall, as far as possible and as appropriate, cooperate with other Contracting Parties, directly or, where appropriate, through competent international organisations, in respect of areas beyond national jurisdiction and on other matters of mutual interest, for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity";*

*Noting that Contracting Parties have the responsibility in implementing the obligations of the Bern and Biological Diversity Conventions;*

*Noting that Article 23, paragraph 4 (h), of the Convention on Biological Diversity asks the Conference of the Parties to "contact, through the Secretariat, the executive bodies of conventions dealing with matters covered by this Convention with a view to establishing appropriate forms of coordination with them";*

*Observing that the Council of Europe provides the functions of the Secretariat for the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats adopted in Bern*

*on 19 September 1979, and includes the environmental dimension in its activities as a crucial and integral part of the national policies of its member States;*

*Noting that the Bern Convention includes in its appendices lists of protected species, which should secure a high level of conservation, and that the procedures making it possible to ensure that the Convention is implemented, enhance the role of non-governmental organisations and individuals as partners involved in sustainable development, in accordance with the principles set out in the Rio Declaration;*

*Recalling that the Lucerne Declaration of 30 April 1993 adopted by the second pan-European*

Ministerial Conference "Environment for Europe" makes reference to the active role that the Council of Europe should play in the area of conservation of biological diversity;

*Noting* that the Maastricht Declaration of 12 November 1993 of the Conference "Conserving Europe's natural heritage: towards a European ecological network" asks the Council of Europe to establish co-ordination machinery for developing a European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy, and to present information on the progress made in this area at the European Ministerial Conference on the Environment, to be held in 1995 in Sofia, as its contribution towards the Environmental Programme for Europe;

*Noting* that Recommendation 1241 (1994) on the application of conventions concerning the environment, adopted on 18 May 1994 by the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, makes reference to the priority which should be given to improving the application of conventions concerning the environment and the special importance which should be attached to the Bern Convention;

*Noting* also that the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe recognised in its reply of 5 September 1994 to the Parliamentary Assembly, that "the Council of Europe, which provides the Secretariat of the Bern Convention adopted in 1979, has a crucial role to perform here in applying at regional level the principles and obligations set out at world level with regard to the conservation of biodiversity";

*Noting* that the 3rd Session of the Commission on Sustainable Development will review the progress made in the conservation of biological diversity and the sustainable use of its components;

*Acknowledge that:*

1. Regional international organisations should act with a view to favouring the application of the worldwide international instruments for the protection of biodiversity - in particular, the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Declaration on Environment and Development, the Declaration for a global consensus on the management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forest, and Agenda 21;
2. The Council of Europe has a fundamental role to play in the implementation at regional level of the principles and obligations adopted at global level;
3. The Bern Convention, which to date has 31 Contracting Parties, 17 of whom are also already Contracting Parties or signatories to the Convention on Biological Diversity, constitutes an instrument of major importance for the conservation of biological diversity at regional level by reason of its objectives and its geographical coverage ;
4. The objectives of the Bern Convention are largely in line with the objectives set in Agenda 21 and the Convention on Biological Diversity. The scope of Article 14 of the Bern Convention is broad enough to deal with many aspects of the Convention on Biological Diversity related to biodiversity conservation, if the Standing Committee so wishes.

*Adopt* the following Recommendations, which are an integral part of this Declaration:

## **I. RECOMMENDATION ON THE SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL ASPECTS**

*The Participants recommend:*

That the Standing Committee of the Bern Convention or the Contracting Parties, as appropriate

1. MAKE especially sure that the principles and obligations established at the global level in the worldwide international instruments for the protection of biodiversity are applied at regional level;

2. CONDUCT the research required for the identification and understanding of the components of biological diversity, especially with a view to:

- updating the lists of endangered wild flora and fauna species with a view to amend, if necessary, the Appendices to the Bern Convention;
- encouraging the conservation and traditional management of endangered varieties of domesticated and cultivated species in so far as they contribute notably to the conservation of wildlife;
- identifying endangered terrestrial and aquatic natural habitats, including wetlands;
- further implementing in coordination with NATURA 2000, EECONET and other initiatives, the objectives of Article 4 of the Bern Convention;
- examining the scope of the Bern Convention regarding landscape features important for nature conservation;

3. IDENTIFY processes and types of activity which have or are likely to have an appreciable adverse effect on conservation and the sustainable use of biological and landscape diversity and monitor these with a view to avoiding this adverse effect, paying particular attention to the following areas: agriculture and forestry, water use, fisheries, coastal and rural development, tourism and recreation, transport, energy and industry;

4. EVALUATE the extent to which the obligations incurred by the Convention are implemented by Contracting Parties, aiming to secure that they:

- actually do protect habitats and conserve viable populations of species by taking the necessary legislative, administrative and management measures;
- take steps to promote voluntary protection of natural habitats through incentive measures;
- encourage education and the dissemination of information on the need to conserve species and their habitats;

5. INCLUDE in the activity programme of the Standing Committee the measures, appropriate for the Bern Convention, deriving from the Convention on Biological Diversity, regarding:

- the identification and the monitoring of the state of biological diversity;
- the *in situ* conservation;
- the *ex situ* conservation;
- the sustainable use of components of biological diversity;
- guidance on incentive measures;
- the impact assessment and the minimising of adverse impacts;

6. TAKE into consideration national and international experiences aimed at calculating the economic value of the components of biological diversity and natural heritage.

## II. RECOMMENDATION ON STRATEGIC ASPECTS

*The Participants, recognising the need to coordinate available information and avoid*



*duplication, recommend:*

That the Standing Committee of the Bern Convention,

1. INSTRUCT its Secretariat in conjunction with the relevant organisations and institutes, such as the World Conservation Union (IUCN), the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) and the European Agency for Environment, to facilitate the mobilisation and exchange of information, from all publicly available sources, relevant to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. This information may include, for instance :

- conventions and other international, global and regional instruments applicable to the geographical region concerned;
- legislative and regulatory instruments, and texts defining the national or subregional strategies, plans and programmes of the Contracting Parties;
- information on national systems of protected areas or areas where special measures are taken to conserve biological diversity;
- guidelines adopted for the selection, establishment and management of protected areas or areas where special measures are taken to conserve biological diversity;
- information on efficient and innovative techniques for the conservation of biological diversity and the sustainable use of its components;
- data on measures to promote the protection of ecosystems and natural habitats, and the maintenance of viable populations of species in their natural surroundings; on environmentally sound and sustainable development in areas adjacent to protected areas with a view to furthering protection of these areas; and on the rehabilitation and restoration of damaged ecosystems and endangered species;

2. INSTRUCT its Secretariat to establish a network of partners and experts in the conservation of biodiversity, including legal aspects, in order to facilitate coordination of activities carried out in this area;

3. INSTRUCT its Secretariat to participate in the preparations of the European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy to be submitted to the next European Ministerial Conference on the Environment in Sofia, in October 1995;

4. REVIEW at regular intervals and in collaboration with the Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity the national policies of the Contracting Parties to the Bern Convention for implementing the parts of the Bern Convention and the Convention on Biological Diversity which are relevant to conservation of biological diversity and the sustainable use of its components;

5. CONTINUE to use the procedures which make it possible to ensure that the Bern Convention is enforced (general and special reports; case-file system; follow-up of recommendations);

6. BRING TO THE ATTENTION of the Conference of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity that the Bern Convention constitutes a fundamental regional instrument for the application of provisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity in matters relating to the conservation of biological diversity and the sustainable use of its components.

**III. RECOMMENDATION ON INSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS**

*The Participants recommend:*

1. That the Standing Committee of the Bern Convention

CONSIDER the need for a mechanism for:

- regularly reviewing and assessing general trends and needs in the field of the conservation of biological diversity at the regional level;
- drawing up and following the guiding principles of a long-term strategic action plan;

2. That the Standing Committee of the Bern Convention and the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity

ESTABLISH appropriate coordination mechanisms, in conformity with Article 23, paragraph 4 (h), of the Convention on Biological Diversity, so that both instruments may be applied and elaborated on together in matters relating to the conservation of biological diversity and the sustainable use of its components.

#### IV. RECOMMENDATION ON FINANCIAL ASPECTS

*The Participants recommend:*

1. That the Contracting Parties to the Bern Convention, the Council of Europe and the financial institutions involved

PROVIDE considerable financial support for the activities mentioned in the Declaration and its recommendations, which form an integral part of it.

2. That the Standing Committee of the Bern Convention

2.1 CONSIDER ways and means to strengthen the voluntary contributions' special fund of the Bern Convention, so that it may finance the Convention's work;

2.2 ADDRESS the problem of the funding structure of the Bern Convention;

2.3 EXPLORE the possibility to use other available funds to achieve the goals of the Bern Convention.

\* \* \*

The Participants in the Monaco Symposium call on the Standing Committee of the Bern Convention to examine the provisions of the Declaration and its Recommendations with a view to their possible adoption. They also request the Secretariat of the Bern Convention to send the Monaco Declaration as approved today, 28 September 1994: to the Contracting Parties to the Bern Convention and the Convention on Biological Diversity, to the Committee of Ministers, the Parliamentary Assembly and the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe (CLRAE) of the Council of Europe, to the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), to the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development (UNCSD), to the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UN/ECE), to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), to the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO), to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), to the European Investment Bank (EIB), to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), to the Global Environment Facility (GEF), to the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and to other interested international organisations,

governmental and non-governmental.

APPENDIX 5

Convention on the Conservation of  
European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

Standing Committee

**Recommendation No. 43 (1995) adopted on 24 March 1995  
on the conservation of threatened mammals in Europe**

The Standing Committee of the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats, acting under the terms of Article 14 of the Convention,

Having regard to the aims of the Convention to conserve wild fauna and its natural habitats,

Recalling that Article 1, paragraph 2 of the Convention requires Parties to give particular emphasis to the conservation of endangered and vulnerable species,

Noting that a considerable number of mammal species in Europe have decreased their numbers, reduced their geographical distribution or have critically endangered populations,

Desirous to avoid a further loss of biological diversity in the continent,

Aware that the design and implementation of Recovery Plans may be a useful tool to redress the situation of threatened mammals,

Aware of the obligations under the Agreements concluded in the framework of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (Bonn) and of the efforts to amend the Protocol concerning Mediterranean Specially Protected Areas (Geneva) (Protocol to the Barcelona Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution) to include provisions on the protection of mammal species,

Recalling Resolution (77) 7 of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on the protection of threatened mammals in Europe,

Recalling its own recommendations concerning the conservation of several mammal species, in particular the following recommendations

- No 6 (1986) on the monk seal (*Monachus monachus*),
- No 10 (1988) on the brown bear (*Ursus arctos*)
- No 11 (1988) on the common seal (*Phoca vitulina*)
- No 17 (1989) on the wolf (*Canis lupus*)
- No 19 (1991) on the pardel lynx (*Lynx pardinus*)
- No 20 (1991) on the European lynx (*Lynx lynx*)
- No 31 (1991) on the European mink (*Mustela lutreola*)
- No 37 (1992) on the Cantabrian bear

Recalling the guidelines (1992) on the conservation of the wildcat (*Felis silvestris*),

Recommends that Contracting Parties to the Convention or invites other states, as appropriate, to:

1. Give special conservation attention to all small populations of mammal species which are endangered or vulnerable at the European or regional (Carpathian, Balkan, Alpine, etc.) level;
2. Carry out extensive programmes of monitoring of threatened mammal populations to know the trends in their numbers and the causes affecting them;
3. Consider (or, if appropriate, reinforce) recovery plans for the list of populations or species listed in Appendix A to this proposal;
4. Evaluate whether the species or populations listed in Appendix B to this proposal require recovery plans. Monitor populations of those species and of any other species the conservation status of which may not be satisfactory, so that decline of populations may be known before they become very threatened;
5. Consider the need and viability to carry out re-introduction programmes, including if needed *ex situ* measures, of mammal species that have disappeared from a part or the whole of their territory, particularly when their disappearance is relatively recent; encourage such programmes where necessary; assure that those programmes are provided with a scientific follow-up.

#### DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF CONSERVATION AND RECOVERY PLANS

6. If appropriate and relevant, design conservation and recovery plans for the whole regional population involved, and in coordination with neighbouring states having a part of the population concerned. Pay special attention to coordination in the main European mountain ranges (Pyrenees, Alps, Balkans, Carpathians, etc.), especially for conservation of big carnivores (bear, wolf, lynx), trying to coordinate national strategies for those species. Use, if appropriate, the framework of the Bern Convention to enhance such cooperation;
7. Set clear and measurable goals for the conservation or recovery plans; provide adequate long-term administrative, legal and financial means for their implementation; reevaluate the plans as they are being implemented with the knowledge obtained in their development; base conservation plans on sound studies on the biology of the population concerned;
8. Involve, in the design and implementation of recovery plans, other administrative departments; local authorities, people responsible for economic activities which may be affected by the plan and other social groups (hunters, game managers, anglers, visitors, foresters, livestock raisers, voluntary conservation groups, etc.) with an interest in the species or population to be preserved;
9. Evaluate whether the species concerned requires particular habitat conservation measures and whether existing protected areas are able to sustain viable populations of the species. If required, take measures to give protection status to the core areas of the population, to the ecological corridors joining populations, and enlarge protected areas or improve their habitat quality; consider taking similar measures to neighbouring areas which may be naturally colonised by the species, and to potential ecological corridors joining isolated populations; establish policies to protect the species outside protected areas proper;
10. Avoid, as far as possible, conflicts with traditional or occasional users of the area where the concerned population lives, this by paying compensation for the damage caused by the species, by preventing that damage (protecting flocks, controlling feral dogs and cats, etc.), by not restricting unnecessarily economic or leisure activities and by promoting economic activities compatible with the conservation of the species; carry out adequate information campaigns on the conservation interest of the species and the need to preserve it.

: Taxa needing conservation or recovery plans  
 : Taxons nécessitant des plans de conservation ou de rétablissement

[] Not in the appendices of the Convention      {} in Appendix III of the Convention  
 [] Pas aux annexes de la Convention            {} à l'Annexe III de la Convention

### MAMMALS / MAMMIFERES

#### INSECTIVORA

##### *Talpidae*

[Desmana moschata]

#### MICROCHIROPTERA

##### *Rhinolophidae*

Rhinolophus ferrumequinum

Rhinolophus hipposideros

Rhinolophus euryale

Rhinolophus mehelyi

##### *Vespertilionidae*

Myotis emarginatus

Myotis myotis

Myotis blythii

Miniopterus schreibersi (RUS)

#### RODENTIA

##### *Cricetidae*

Cricetus cricetus (BG)

##### *Muridae*

[Spalax graecus] (RUS)

[Spalax leucodon H]

##### *Zapodidae*

Sicista subtilis (A,BG,H,ROM)

#### CARNIVORA

##### *Canidae*

Canis lupus (South E,N,S,Alps)

[Cuon alpinus]

##### *Ursidae*

Ursus arctos (A,F,GR,I,E,)

##### *Mustelidae*

Mustela lutreola (BEL,F,E,ROM, RUS,

EST)

Lutra lutra (LUX,B,DK,D,NL,

GR -Corfu-, CH,S)

Gulo gulo (SF,N,S)

{Vormela peregusna}

##### *Felidae*

Lynx pardinus

{Lynx lynx} (A,CZ,D,F,H,I, South  
Balkans)

[Lynx caracal]

Panthera pardus

##### *Odobenidae*

Odobenus rosmarus (RUS)

##### *Phocidae*

Monachus monachus

#### ARTIODACTYLA

##### *Bovidae*

Capra pyrenaica pyrenaica

{Ovis ammon anatolica}

[Bison bonasus]

{Rupicapra rupicapra balcanica}

#### CETACEA

##### *Delphinidae*

Tursiops truncatus

Delphinus delphis (Mediterranean  
and Black Seas)

Physeter catodon (Mediterranean)

Grampus griseus (Mediterranean)

Globicephala melas (Mediterranean)

##### *Phocaenidae*

Phocoena phocoena (Black and Baltic  
Seas)

##### *Ziphiidae*

Ziphius cavirostris (Mediterranean)

##### *Balaenopteridae*

Balaenoptera physalus  
(Mediterranean)

: Taxa to be evaluated as candidates for conservation or recovery plans  
: Taxons devant être examinés pour un plan de conservation ou de rétablissement éventuel

[] Not in the appendices of the Convention      {} in Appendix III of the Convention  
[] Pas aux annexes de la Convention            {} à l'Annexe III de la Convention

### MAMMALS / MAMMIFERES

#### INSECTIVORA

##### *Talpidae*

*Galemys pyrenaicus*

#### MICROCHIROPTERA

##### *Molossidae*

*Tadarida teniotis*

##### *Rhinolophidae*

All species not listed in Appendix A

Toutes les espèces qui ne sont pas à l'annexe A

##### *Vespertilionidae*

All species not listed in Appendix A

Toutes les espèces qui ne sont pas à l'annexe A

#### RODENTIA

##### *Pteromidae*

*Pteromys volans* (EST, LAT)

##### *Sciuridae*

*Sciurus anomalus* (GR)

*Spermophilus citellus* (C. citellus)

##### *Castoridae*

*Castor fiber* (D,F,NL)

##### *Cricetidae*

*Cricetus cricetus* (B,F,G,NL)

[*Cricetulus migratorius*]

(BG,GR,ROM)

##### *Gliridae*

[*Myomimus roachi*] (BG,TK)

##### *Muridae*

[*Mesocricetus newtoni*]

[*Apodemus uralensis* (microps)]

(BG,ROM)

#### CARNIVORA

##### *Canidae*

*Canis lupus* (CZ,D,I,P)

[*Canis aureus*] (GR,ROM)

*Alopex lagopus* (N,S,SF)

##### *Ursidae*

*Ursus arctos* (CZ,N,PL,S)

##### *Mustelidae*

[*Mustela eversmanni*]

*Lutra lutra* (F,I,N,A)

##### *Felidae*

*Felis silvestris* (B,CZ,F-Corse-,D,GR-

Pel.& Cret.-,I-Sard.Sic-,LUX,PL,

CH,GB)

{*Lynx lynx*} (CH)

##### *Odobenidae*

*Odobenus rosmarus*

#### CETACEA

##### *Delphinidae*

*Stenella coeruleoalba* (Mediterranean)

APPENDIX 6

**MAMMALS FOR POSSIBLE INCLUSION IN  
APPENDIX II OF THE CONVENTION**

INSECTIVORA

*Desmana moschata*

RODENTIA

*Sciuridae*

*Spermophilus suslicus* (*Citellus suslicus*)

*Muridae*

*Mesocricetus newtoni*

*Microtus cabreræ* (**now in Appendix III**)

*Microtus tatricus*

*Spalax graecus*

*Gliridae*

*Myomimus roachi* (*Myomimus bulgaricus*)

*Dryomys laniger*

CARNIVORA

*Vormela peregusna* (**now in Appendix III**)

*Mustela eversmanni*

*Cuon alpinus*

*Caracal caracal* (*Lynx caracal*)

ARTIODACTYLA

*Gazella subgutturosa*

*Gazella dorcas*

CETACEA

*Monodon monoceros* (more information requested)

*Phoca hispida saimensis*

*Phoca hispida ladogensis*

*Globicephala sieboldii* (*G. macrorhynchus*)

*Kogia breviceps*

*Stenella frontalis*

*Balaenoptera edenis*

*Balaenoptera physalus* (no agreement on this species)

**MAMMALS FOR POSSIBLE INCLUSION IN APPENDIX III OF THE CONVENTION**

ARTIODACTYLA

Bovidae

[*Bison bonasus*]



APPENDIX 7

Convention on the Conservation of  
European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

Standing Committee

**Recommendation No. 44 adopted on 24 March 1995  
on the conservation of some threatened plants in Central Europe**

The Standing Committee of the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats, acting under the terms of Article 14 of the Convention,

Having regard to the aims of the Convention to conserve wild flora and fauna and their natural habitats;

Recalling that Article 5, paragraph 1, of the Convention requires that Contracting Parties take appropriate and necessary legislative and administrative measures to ensure the special protection of the wild flora species specified in Appendix I;

Recalling that Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Convention requires that Contracting Parties give particular emphasis to the conservation of endangered and vulnerable species;

Conscious that in Central Europe plants are subject to special threats as a result of the high concentration of human activities;

Recalling that Flora Europaea defines the Central Europe floristic region as that comprising the following areas and states: Alsace and Lorraine, Germany, Switzerland, Austria, the Italian Alps from Monte Bianco eastward, Hungary, the Czech Republic, the Slovak Republic, Poland, the Ukrainian Carpathians, North, West and Central Romania and the territory north of the Danube-Sava-Kupa line in the Balkan peninsula;

Considering that the present recommendation can also apply to relatively industrialised territories close to the above-mentioned area, namely Belgium, The Netherlands, Luxembourg, Denmark, Southern Sweden, the Baltic States, Southern Romania and Northern Bulgaria;

Aware that the preservation of some threatened plants in Central Europe cannot exclusively be achieved by the protection of areas and that such an approach may not be effective, for some species;

Recognising four categories of species with particular conservation problems, namely:

a) species with erratic appearance

These are species which usually

- are rare to very rare throughout their whole range
- are living in symbiosis with fungi or as parasites
- have a lot of potential sites, but occurring only sporadically in time and space within these potential sites
- show high fluctuations in population size and occur unpredictably within suitable habitats
- have good dispersal abilities, but resettlement of these species by creation of new biotopes is often unsuccessful

b) rare pioneer species

These are species which usually

- are concurrence-weak (species of first successional stages following ecosystem disturbance)
  - inhabit sites created following disturbance
  - occupy a growth site only for some years (if disturbance does not continue)
  - have good dispersal abilities and often a long lifetime of diaspores (a resettlement of these taxa by creation of new biotopes by ecological compensation measures is often successful)
- c) species threatened by air and water pollution

Species, for which pollution of air and/or water is the main cause of threat. Additionally they must be threatened in the whole of Europe. They are usually

- especially sensitive to air pollution (eg with non-deciduous leaves)
- living in symbiosis with fungi sensitive to pollution (mycorrhiza)
- concurrence-weak (sensitive to concurrence-strong species which occupy the growth site after pollution)
- showing a strong and quick decline of the number of populations in strongly air-polluted areas

- d) culture-following species

These are species which

- are appearing in Europe clearly associated with manmade grassland or crops and with the potential natural vegetation
- often develop distinct biotypes or represent own taxa as a result of these associations
- have extended their range (mostly northward) with agriculture (or represent own taxa)
- are threatened in large parts of Europe;

Recommends that relevant governments endeavour to:

**A.** For species with sporadic appearance in Central Europe, such as those in Appendix A to this recommendation:

1. Carefully monitor those species;
2. In areas where the species are found, avoid for a number of years any changes in the ecological characteristic of the habitat so that the species may have time to reproduce;
3. Encourage research on the biology of these species, particularly on their germination and on other aspects that may help understand the reasons for their rarity.

**B.** For rare pioneer species, such as those in Appendix B to this recommendation:

1. Avoid changing the natural dynamics of rivers so that flood plains may continue to be naturally inundated, thus providing new habitats for riparian pioneer plant species; where the natural process is prevention (ie by regulation of the watercourses), recreate ecological conditions for those species;
2. Conserve sandy and loess areas in Central Europe, where wind erosion of the soil permits the establishment of pioneer species restricted to bare soils;
3. Encourage measures to manage fishponds and temporal pools in such a way that they may be emptied periodically, thus permitting the establishment of some of the pioneer species;
4. Promote sustainable agriculture where these pioneer species appear;

**C.** For species threatened by air pollution, such as those in Appendix C to this recommendation:

1. Encourage the research in the species threatened by air pollution, monitoring their populations over extensive areas;
  2. Take special measures against air pollution in areas known to be of importance for threatened plants;
  3. Ratify or accede to international treaties aiming at the reduction of transboundary air pollution;
  4. Avoid eutrophication and acidification of waterbodies;
- D.** For culture-following species, such as those in Appendix D to this recommendation:
1. Favour sustainable agricultural practices with low input in energy, nutrients, pesticides and weedkillers;
  2. Promote the widespread use of "conservation bands" in monoculture fields, these marginal bands receiving a less intensive pesticide and nutrient treatment than the rest of the field;
  3. Designate, as appropriate, areas to promote natural values and receive economic compensation by schemes similar to the European Community's "Environmental Sensitive Areas";

Appendix A. Some species with erratic occurrence in Central Europe

Botrychium lanceolatum (S.G. Gmelin) Ångström  
Botrychium matricariifolium A. Braun ex Koch  
Botrychium multifidum (S.G. Gmelin) Rupr.  
Botrychium virginianum (L.) Swartz BK  
Diphasiastrum alpinum (L.) Holub (except in the Alps)  
Diphasiastrum complanatum (L.) Holub  
Diphasiastrum issleri (Rouy) Holub  
Diphasiastrum tristachyum (Pursh) Holub  
Diphasiastrum zeilleri (Rouy) Holub  
Epipogium aphyllum Swartz  
Orobanche alsatica Kirschleger  
Orobanche caesia Reichenb. BK  
Orobanche coerulescens Stephan  
Orobanche elatior Sutton  
Orobanche loricata Reichenb. BK  
Orobanche lucorum A. Braun BK  
Orobanche picridis F.W. Schultz ex Koch BK  
Orobanche reticulata Wallr.  
Orobanche teucarii Holandre

Appendix B. Some rare pioneer species in Central Europe

a) plants of damp, muddy soils

Cicendia filiformis (L.) Delarbre  
Cyperus michelianus (L.) Link  
Drosera intermedia Hayne  
Elatine alsinastrum L.  
Eleocharis carniolica Koch  
Eleocharis parvula (Roemer & Schultes) Link ex Bluff, Ness & Schauer  
Eleocharis quinqueflora (F.X. Hartmann) O. Schwarz (except in the Alps)  
Gnaphalium luteo-album L.  
Juncus capitus Weigel  
Juncus pygmaeus L.C.M. Richard

*Juncus sphaerocarpus* Nees  
*Ludwigia palustris* (L.) Elliott BK  
*Pilularia globulifera* L.  
*Potamogeton coloratus* Hornem.  
*Scirpus supinus* L.  
*Veronica anagalloides* Guss.

b) plants of dry, barren, stony and sandy soils

*Androsace elongata* L.  
*Crassula tillaea* Lester-Garland  
*Eysimum repandum* L.  
*Filago lutescens* Jordan  
*Filago pyramidata* L.  
*Filago vulgaris* Lam.  
*Polycnemum majus* L.

#### Appendix C. Some species threatened by pollution in Central Europe

a) species threatened by air pollution

*Astragalus danicus* Retz.  
*Botrychium lanceolatum* (S.G. Gmelin) Ångström  
*Botrychium matricariifolium* A. Braun ex Koch  
*Botrychium multifidum* (S.G. Gmelin) Rupr.  
*Botrychium virginianum* (L.) Swartz BK  
*Carex davalliana* Sm. (excluding the Alps)  
*Carex dioica* L.  
*Crepis praemorsa* (L.) Tausch  
*Fumana procumbens* (Dunal) Gren. & Godron (excluding Alps)  
*Hymenophyllum tunbrigense* (L.) Sm.  
*Isoetes echinospora* Durieu  
*Isoetes lacustris* L.  
*Lobelia dortmanna* L.  
*Moenchia erecta* (L.) Gaertner, Meyer & Scherb.  
*Myriophyllum alterniflorum* DC.  
*Najas flexilis* (Willd.) Rostk. & W.L.E. Schmidt  
*Onosma arenaria* Waldst. & Kit.  
*Ophioglossum vulgatum* L.  
*Orchis coriophora* L.  
*Orchis laxiflora* Lamk. ssp. *palustris* (Jacq.) Bonnier & Layens  
*Pulsatilla patens* (L.) Miller (excluding alps)  
*Pulsatilla vernalis* (L.) Miller (excluding alps)  
*Pyrola chlorantha* Swartz  
*Pyrola media* Swartz  
*Spiranthes spiralis* (L.) Chevall.  
*Succisella inflexa* (Kluk) G. Beck  
*Thesium ebracteatum* Hayne  
*Viola elatior* Fries.  
*Viola persicifolia* Schreber  
*Viola pumila* Chaix BK  
*Wahlenbergia hederacea* (L.) Reichenb.  
*Woodsia ilvensis* (L.) R. Br.

b) species threatened by water pollution

*Armeria maritima* (Mill.) Willd. ssp. *purpurea* (Koch) A. & D. Löve  
*Baldellia ranunculoides* (L.) Parl.  
*Crassula aquatica* (L.) Schönl.

Deschampsia littoralis (Gaudin) Reuter  
var. rhenana (Gremli) Baumann  
Deschampsia setacea (Hudson) Hackel  
Hypericum elodes L.  
Isoetes echinospora Durieu  
Isoetes lacustris L.  
Littorella uniflora (L.) Ascherson  
Lobelia dortmanna L.  
Myriophyllum alterniflorum DC.  
Najas flexilis (Willd.) Rostk. & W.L.E. Schmidt  
Nuphar pumila (Timm) DC.  
Potamogeton coloratus Hornem.  
Potamogeton gramineus L.  
Potamogeton filiformis Pers.  
Potamogeton praelongus Wulfen  
Ranunculus hederaceus L.  
Ranunculus ololeucos Lloyd  
Ranunculus reptans L.  
Sparganium angustifolium Michx  
Sparganium minimum Wallr.  
Utricularia bremii Heer  
Utricularia minor L.

Appendix D. Some culture following species in Central Europe

Adonis aestivalis L.  
Adonis flammea Jacq.  
Agrostemma githago L.  
Ajuga chamaepitys (L.) Schreber  
Androsace maxima L.  
Arnoseris minima (L.) Schweigger & Koerte  
Asperula arvensis L.  
Bupleurum rotundifolium L.  
Bromus arvensis L.  
Camelina alyssum (Miller) Thell.  
Camelina sativa (L.) Crantz  
Conringia orientalis (L.) Dumort.  
Cuscuta epilinum Weihe  
Euphorbia falcata L.  
Fumaria rostellata Knaf  
Hypochoeris glabra L.  
Linaria arvensis (L.) Desf.  
Lolium temulentum L.  
Lolium remotum Schrank  
Nigella arvensis L.  
Polycnemum arvense L.  
Polycnemum majus A. Braun  
Silene linicola C.C. Gmelin  
Spergularia segetalis (L.) G. Don fil.  
Turgenia latifolia (L.) Hoffm.  
Valerianella ramosa Bast.  
Veronica acinifolia L.  
Veronica opaca Fries

APPENDIX 8Convention for the Conservation of European Wildlife  
and Natural Habitats

## Standing Committee

**Recommendation No. 45 adopted on 24 March 1995  
on controlling proliferation of *Caulerpa taxifolia* in the Mediterranean**

The Standing Committee of the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats, acting under Article 14 of the Convention,

Having regard to the Convention's aims of conserving wild flora and fauna and their natural habitats and safeguarding endangered natural habitats;

Considering that under Article 11, paragraph 2 b, each Contracting Party undertakes to strictly control the introduction of non-native species;

Noting that the tropical seaweed *Caulerpa taxifolia* has proliferated in the Mediterranean where the colonies extend along the northern coast from the Balearics to Sicily;

Noting that, in general, in the ecosystems typical of the Mediterranean that have been invaded by *Caulerpa taxifolia* a decline in biodiversity affecting both flora and fauna can be observed;

Taking note that, although all the repercussions of *Caulerpa taxifolia*'s proliferation in Mediterranean littoral environments cannot yet be foreseen, the data gathered so far do not exclude a major threat to indigenous biodiversity, ecological balances and resources used by humankind;

Considering the need to adopt precautionary measures in accordance with Principle 15 of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, which provides: "Where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing cost-effective measures to prevent environmental degradation",

Recommends that Contracting Parties bordering on the Mediterranean Sea and the Black Sea:

1. Control proliferation of *Caulerpa taxifolia*, in particular through systematic exploration of sites at risk along their coasts, especially in the vicinity of open moorings;
2. Eradicate *Caulerpa taxifolia* colonies wherever possible, ie where they form isolated patches of less than 100 to 200 square metres in area and then control subsequent regrowth, giving priority attention to protected areas;
3. Initiate coordinated action by countries affected or likely to be affected with a view to adopting a joint strategy;
4. Inform States not party to the Bern Convention, either directly or through the International Commission for Scientific Exploration of the Mediterranean Sea, the Coordinating Unit of the Mediterranean Action Plan or the Secretariat of the Bucharest Convention for the Protection of the Black Sea against Pollution of 21 April 1992, of any proliferation of *Caulerpa taxifolia* colonies in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea.

APPENDIX 9

Convention for the Conservation of European Wildlife  
and Natural Habitats

Standing Committee

**Decision of the Standing Committee adopted on 24 March 1995  
concerning the conservation of Laganas Bay, Zakynthos, Greece**

The Standing Committee, acting under Article 14 of the Convention,

Recognising that the beaches of Laganas Bay are very important nesting sites for the endangered loggerhead turtle *Caretta caretta*, listed in Appendix II of the Convention;

Recalling the obligations of Contracting Parties under Article 4 of the Convention to take measures to ensure the conservation of fauna species specified in Appendix II of the Convention;

Recalling that Article 4 of the Convention asks Contracting Parties to give special attention to the protection of areas of importance for the migratory species specified in Appendix II (such as *Caretta caretta*) and which are appropriately situated in relation to breeding areas;

Recalling that Article 6 of the Convention requires Parties to ensure the special protection of the wild fauna species specified in Appendix II and that the deliberate damage to or destruction of breeding sites is particularly prohibited in this context;

Recognising that the nesting beaches of *Caretta caretta* in Laganas Bay fall unmistakably within the scope of Article 4 paragraphs 1 to 3 and of Article 6 of the Convention;

Having been informed of a number of facts contributing to the deterioration of the nesting beaches of *Caretta caretta* in Laganas Bay;

Recognising that it has not been possible to find so far an acceptable balance between development and conservation in this case;

Recalling and confirming the positions it has taken on this issue, namely its Decision of December 1986, its Recommendation No. 9 of 1987, the measures it invited Greece to examine in 1989, the Declaration it transmitted to the Committee of Ministers in December 1992 and its Declaration of December 1993;

Concerned that the credibility of the Convention is at stake;

Eager to find an acceptable solution to the issue that may assure the long-term preservation of the nesting sites of *Caretta caretta*;

Taking note of the will expressed by the Greek government to give a quick and acceptable solution to the case:

1. URGES Greece to implement without any delay the decisions already taken to demolish 13 illegal buildings surrounding the Daphni beach;
2. URGES Greece to take without any delay all the necessary steps to reach decisions about all the other illegal buildings in the area of Laganas Bay and to swiftly implement these decisions;
3. URGES Greece to actually implement Recommendation No. 9 in order to achieve a favourable conservation statut;

4. URGES Greece to create within three years the planned national marine park in Laganas Bay;

5. DECLARES that failure of Greece to comply with any of these four conditions will be understood by the Committee as a grave and repeated breach of its obligations under the convention and as an encouragement to Parties to proceed according to Article 18 paragraphs 2 to 5 of the Convention.



APPENDIX 10

Convention on the Conservation  
of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

Standing Committee

**Recommendation No. 46 adopted on 24 March 1995  
on the proposed Irueña dam site, Salamanca, Spain**

The Standing Committee of the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats, acting under the terms of Article 14 of the Convention,

Having regard to the aims of the Convention to conserve wild flora and fauna and their natural habitats;

Recalling that Article 3 provides that each Contracting Party shall take the necessary steps to promote national policies for the conservation of wild flora, wild fauna and natural habitats, with particular attention to endangered and vulnerable species, especially endemic ones, and endangered habitats;

Recalling that Article 4, paragraph 1, provides that each Contracting Party shall take appropriate and necessary legislative and administrative measures to ensure the conservation of the habitats of the wild flora and fauna species, especially those species in Appendices I and II, and the conservation of endangered natural habitats;

Referring to the report of the expert on the site proposed for the construction of the Irueña dam (Salamanca, Spain), and conscious of the great biological interest of the area and of the threats of the project for the natural habitat concerned and some animal and plant species protected by the Convention;

Recommends that the government of Spain:

1. undertake a cost-benefit calculation for a mixed solution under a range of policy premises with due weight given to environment considerations;
2. include in cost-benefit comparisons the possibility of compensating farmers downstream of Ciudad Rodrigo for losses incurred during future floods. The options considered should include a range of possible retention volumes, corresponding to different flood return periods, to a minimum of 50 years;
3. undertake for Salamanca province an inventory of the remaining stretches of river which are home to *Lutra lutra*, and institute a plan for the conservation and monitoring of the species;
4. undertake research on the impact of the project on freshwater fish populations;

Recommends that the governments of Portugal and Spain:

5. collaborate in the conservation of the shared catchments, their habitats and species.

Recommends that the European Community:

6. be encouraged to support international river catchment management, with particular reference to habitats and species.

APPENDIX 11

**BERN CONVENTION PROGRAMME OF ACTIVITIES  
AND BUDGET FOR 1995**

1.	<b>CHAIRMAN'S EXPENSES</b>	FF
	Fixed appropriation to cover travel and/or subsistence expenses incurred by the Chairman or delegate of T-PVS after consultation with the Secretary General .....	15,000
2.	<b>ON-THE-SPOT VISITS</b>	
	On-the-spot visits, by independent experts designated by the Secretary General to examine threatened habitats and travel and subsistence expenses incurred by such experts to inform the Standing Committee or its groups of experts .....	0
3.	<b>DELEGATES OF AFRICAN STATES</b>	
	Travel and subsistence expenses incurred by the delegates of African states to attend T-PVS meeting or other meetings organised under its responsibility.....	35,000
4.	<b>TRAVELS OF EXPERTS AND SECRETARIAT</b>	
	Travel and subsistence expenses incurred by experts and the Secretariat to attend meetings of special relevance under instruction from the Committee or the Chairman .....	85,000
5.	<b>MEETING OF THE BUREAU</b>	
	Travel and subsistence expenses incurred by the three members of the Bureau to attend the Bureau meetings .....	50,000
6.	<b>CONTRIBUTION TOWARDS THE ORGANISATION OF COLLOQUIA</b>	

Element 6.1

**Seminar on the conservation of European desmans and water shrews**

Ordesa National Park, Spain

4 days

The terms of reference of this seminar are to present the conservation problems of European desmans (*Galemys pyrenaicus* and *Desmana moschata*) and water shrews (*Neomys fodiens* and *N. anomalus*) and to suggest guidelines which may improve the status of these threatened species.

Travel and subsistence expenses will be covered for 10 rapporteurs from the following states:

**Belarus, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Portugal, Russia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine.....** 80,000

Participants: all Contracting Parties

Observers: all observer states and qualified organisations active in this field

Element 6.2**Seminar on Hunting Law and management of Europe's Hunting Resources**Strasbourg

4 days

The purpose of this seminar, co-organised with the French Society on Environmental Law (SFDE), in association with FACE, CIC, IWRB, and the French Hunting Authorities (ONC) is to analyse different hunting legislations and strategies for the preservation of the hunting resources of Europe.

Participants: all Contracting Parties

Observers: all observer states and qualified organisations active in this field

Element 6.3**Seminar for the presentation of Action Plans for the conservation of globally threatened species in Europe (Part One: Birds)**Strasbourg

4 days

This Seminar will be organised in cooperation with BirdLife International. The Action Plans will be presented and discussed by the Governments and by the experts.

Travel and subsistence expenses for 10 experts..... 80,000 FF

Participants: all Contracting Parties

Observers: all observer states and qualified organisations active in this field

Element 6.4**Seminar on plant conservation in Europe PLANTA EUROPA**Port Cros, France

4 days

This meeting will be held in coordination with the group of experts on plant conservation. It will be co-organised with PLANTLIFE and the French government.

Participants: all Contracting Parties

Observers: all observer states and qualified organisations active in this field

Element 6.5**Conference on the biological diversity of coastal and marine areas in the Mediterranean**Alghero

4 days

This Seminar will be organised in cooperation with MEDMARAVIS. Its purpose is to draw up a priority list of unprotected coastal and marine areas from Ukraine to Morocco for which measures are needed in order to maintain their value for seabirds, loggerhead turtles, Mediterranean seals and

whales.

Participants: all Contracting Parties  
Observers: all observer states and qualified organisations active in this field

Element 6.6

**Seminar to present the objectives of the Convention of Biological Diversity to states of Central and Eastern Europe**

Bulgaria  
4 days

Terms of reference:

The Convention has been approached by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity to contribute to the above seminar. In the spirit of the new role of the Bern Convention suggested by the Monaco Declaration, the Convention will help in the preparation of that seminar by covering interpretation costs and travel and subsistence expenses of one representative for each of its Contracting Parties in the region.

Travel and subsistence expenses for 1 expert from each of the following 4 states:

**Estonia, Hungary, Moldova, Romania** ..... 36,000

Element 6.7

**Seminar on the conservation of lynx in the Alpine region**

Switzerland  
3 days

This Seminar will be organised in cooperation with the Swiss Lynx Project. The objective of the meeting is to review the conservation action carried out in the region, and to evaluate the status and needs of the populations of lynx.

Participants: all Contracting Parties  
Observers: all observer states and qualified organisations active in this field

## 7. CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARD THE COST OF EXPERT GROUPS

### Element 7.1

#### **Group of experts on Conservation of Plants in Appendix I**

##### Port Cros, France

4 days

The terms of reference of this group are the following:

- to revise current issues on plant conservation in Europe,
- to suggest adequate action to the Contracting Parties to the Bern Convention on plant conservation matters,
- to present to the Standing Committee any proposal for improving the effectiveness of the Convention in plant conservation, including the presentation of recommendations and suggestions for inclusion of species in Appendix I to the Convention.

The Council of Europe will finance travel and subsistence expenses of one expert from each of the following 14 states:

**Austria, Bulgaria, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey**

and also the travel and subsistence expenses of the Chairman of the

group of experts (from **France**)..... 115,000

Participants: all Contracting Parties

Observers: all observer states and qualified organisations active in this field

### Element 7.2

#### **Group of experts on legal aspects of introduction and reintroduction of wildlife species**

##### Strasbourg

3 days

The terms of reference for this group are the following:

to review and evaluate, in the light of Article 11 paragraph 2 of the Convention, the legislation of Contracting Parties to the Convention concerning introduction and reintroduction of species, making any proposals that may be useful to the Committee.

The following expenses will be covered:

\* travel and subsistence expenses for one expert from each of the following 8 states:

**Belgium, France, Germany, Hungary, The Netherlands, Norway, Portugal,**

**United Kingdom** ..... 57,000

Participants: all Contracting Parties

Observers: all observer states and qualified organisations

### Element 7.3

#### **Group of experts on the inventory of endangered natural habitats**

##### Strasbourg

2 days

The terms of reference for this group are the following:  
to review the draft resolution listing the endangered natural habitats requiring specific conservation measures

The following expenses will be covered:

\* travel and subsistence expenses for the consultant:

\* travel and subsistence expenses for one expert from each of the following states:

**Bulgaria, Estonia, Hungary, Rumania, Russia** ..... 50,000

Other Participants: European Community, France, Netherlands, United Kingdom

Element 7.4

**Group of experts on the file procedures concerning European Community states**

Strasbourg

1 day

The terms of reference for this group are the following:

To examine the different cases which may appear when dealing with files concern European Community states, so as to find solutions which may permit the adoption of a procedure to deal with opening and closing of files

The following expenses will be covered:

\* travel and subsistence expenses for one expert from each of the following states:

**Belgium, Denmark** ..... 10,000

Other Participants: European Community

**8. CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARDS THE COSTS OF CONSULTANTS**

Element 8.1

**Study on threatened plants of Eastern Europe**

Terms of reference:

To examine the reports on threatened flora of Eastern Europe and, using the criteria set up by the Group of experts, to present a coherent list of species for amendment of Appendix I of the Convention.

Fixed appropriation for consultant ..... 30,000

Element 8.2 to be provided by Sweden

**Report on the wolverine (*Gulo gulo*)**

Terms of reference:

This report will deal with the conservation problems of the wolverine (*Gulo gulo*). It will include data on its geographical distribution, the status of its population, the threats this species faces and the ways to improve its conservation.

Fixed appropriation for consultant ..... p.m.

Element 8.3**Report on compensation for damage caused by wild fauna to farming, forestry, fish farms and livestock raising**

Terms of reference:

To analyse the compensation systems which the Contracting Parties to the Convention use for damage caused by wild fauna to crops, farm animals, forestry and livestock raising. The author should also make proposals to improve their effectiveness.

Fixed appropriation for consultant ..... 40,000

Element 8.4**Handbook outlining general principles of site management for amphibians and reptiles**

Terms of reference:

The handbook would be a text directed at site managers and could include the following items:

- most frequent causes of disappearance of species from sites
- types of site management likely to be damaging to amphibia and reptiles
- management practices which can be recommended for different types of amphibian and reptile
- acceptable methods for translocation and colony establishment for different types of amphibian and reptile
- components normally required in compilation recovery plans for different types of amphibian and reptile

Fixed appropriation for consultant ..... 60,000

Element 8.5**Report on traditional management of species-rich grasslands**

Terms of reference:

This report will describe different types of traditional management of species-rich grasslands throughout Europe, suggesting ways and means to maintain such systems and their plant diversity.

Fixed appropriation for consultant ..... 40,000

Element 8.6**Report on the legal obstacles to the application of nature conservation legislation**

Terms of reference:

Nature conservation legislation is often more easy to adopt than to apply, mainly due to its contradiction with other legislation, to the dispersal of competences among different state or regional bodies and to the difficulty in applying criminal law to offences against nature conservation legislation. The report will analyse all these circumstances and suggest possible solutions to obtain a sounder application of nature protection legislation.

Fixed appropriation for consultant ..... 40,000

Element 8.7**Report on private or voluntary systems of habitat protection and management**

Terms of reference:

The report will describe briefly some of the European systems that enable private institutions to



acquire or manage land for nature conservation purposes. The role of NGOs in this process will be examined. The report should make recommendations that may permit the development of such systems in states of Eastern Europe.

Fixed appropriation for consultant..... 40,000

Element 8.8

**Elaboration of a list of European species requiring special habitat conservation measures**

Terms of reference: On the basis of existing documents the consultant will compile a list of species requiring special habitat conservation measures, taking into account in particular the "Habitat" Directive.

Fixed appropriation for consultant..... 25,000

**9. PUBLICATIONS**

Element 9.1

Funds for the conception, the photo composition and publication of poster, brochures, stickers, postcards, making of buttons, other documents ..... 90,000

**10. HABITAT CONSERVATION**

This budget line will gather funds sent voluntarily by Contracting Parties to help conservation of habitats in other states. Decision on its expenditure will be agreed by the

Bureau with approval of the Parties which have sent contributions and only on presentation of precise projects..... 20,000

**11. CONTRIBUTION TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION IN BURKINA FASO AND SENEGAL**

[Element 11.1 to be engaged with approval of Bureau]

Funds for the conception and the implementation of a training programme for representatives of Burkina Faso and Senegal on implementation of the Convention in these countries..... 100,000

**12. PART-TIME SECRETARY**

Element 12

Part-time secretary ..... 120,000

Bern Convention Programme of Activities and Budget for 1995 (summary)

	FF
1. Chairman's expenses .....	15,000
2. On-the-spot visits .....	
3. Delegates of African states.....	35,000
4. Travels of experts and Secretariat.....	85,000
5. Meetings of the Bureau .....	50,000
6. Colloquia	
6.1 Seminar on the conservation of European desmans and water shrews.....	80,000
6.2 Seminar on hunting law.....	---
6.3 Seminar for the presentation of Action Plans for the conservation of globally threatened species in Europe (Part One: Birds).....	80,000
6.4 Seminar on plant conservation in Europe PLANTA EUROPA.....	---
6.5 Conference on the biological diversity of coastal and marine areas in the Mediterranean .....	---
6.6 Conference with Biodiversity Convention .....	36,000
7. Expert groups	
7.1 Group of experts on conservation of plants in Appendix I.....	115,000
7.2 Group of experts on legal aspects of introductions and re-introductions.....	57,000
7.3 Group of experts on endangered natural habitats .....	50,000
7.4 Group of experts on procedures for opening of files of Community states .....	10,000
8. Consultants	
8.1 Threatened plants of Eastern Europe .....	30,000
8.2 Wolverine .....	---
8.3 Compensation for damage by wild fauna.....	40,000
8.4 Site management for amphibians and reptiles.....	60,000
8.5 Traditional management of species-rich grasslands .....	40,000
8.6 Obstacles to the application of nature conservation legislation .....	40,000
8.7 Private and voluntary systems of habitat protection.....	40,000
8.8 List of species requiring special habitat conservation measures .....	25,000
9. Publicity .....	90,000
10.* Habitat conservation projects .....	*20,000
11.* Training of experts in Burkina Faso and Senegal .....	*100,000
12. Part-time secretary.....	120,000
	1,218,000

The Bern Convention Special Account will be used to cover expenses that cannot be covered by the ordinary budget (Note II.13 a, Article 2218) of the Council of Europe.

\* The activities marked with an asterisk (\*) will only be engaged with the approval of the Bureau.

APPENDIX 12

**BERN CONVENTION PROGRAMME OF ACTIVITIES  
AND BUDGET FOR 1996**

- 1. **CHAIRMAN'S EXPENSES** FF  
 Fixed appropriation to cover travel and/or subsistence expenses incurred by the Chairman or delegate of T-PVS after consultation with the Secretary General ..... 15,000
- 2. **ON-THE-SPOT VISITS**  
 On-the-spot visits, by independent experts designated by the Secretary General to examine threatened habitats and travel and subsistence expenses incurred by such experts to inform the Standing Committee or its groups of experts ..... 30,000
- 3. **DELEGATES OF AFRICAN STATES**  
 Travel and subsistence expenses incurred by the delegates of African states to attend T-PVS meeting or other meetings organised under its responsibility ..... 35,000
- 4. **TRAVELS OF EXPERTS AND SECRETARIAT**  
 Travel and subsistence expenses incurred by experts and the Secretariat to attend meetings of special relevance under instruction from the Committee or the Chairman ..... 85,000
- 5. **MEETINGS OF THE BUREAU**  
 Travel and subsistence expenses incurred by the three members of the Bureau to attend the Bureau meetings ..... 50,000
- 6. **CONTRIBUTION TOWARDS THE ORGANISATION OF COLLOQUIA**

Element 6.1

**Seminar on incentive measures to create and manage protected areas on a voluntary basis**

United Kingdom ? Romania ?

4 days

The terms of reference of this seminar are to examine the different national systems of privately owned or privately managed protected areas; to review the initiatives that have been developed to promote voluntary reserves and to suggest ways and means of facilitating the creation and enlargement of privately owned or privately managed reserves. Legal and economics aspects will be dealt with.

Travel and subsistence expenses will be covered for 1 rapporteur from each of the following 12 states:

**Bulgaria, Estonia, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Moldova, Monaco, Romania, Switzerland, Turkey** ..... 105,000

Participants: all Contracting Parties and appropriate observers

Element 6.2

**Seminar on conservation, management and restoration of habitats for invertebrates:  
enhancing biological diversity**

Ireland ?

4 days

The seminar will be held in coordination with the meeting of the Group of experts on Conservation of Invertebrates.

The terms of reference of this seminar will be to suggest practical measures to manage natural habitats in a way that can improve their invertebrate biodiversity. Special sessions will be devoted to management of forests, agricultural land, grasslands and heathlands.

Participants: all Contracting Parties and appropriate observers

Element 6.3

**Seminar to present the results of the 1st Phase of the MedWet initiative (in  
collaboration with the Ramsar Convention)**

Italy ?

4 days

The 1st phase of the MedWet initiative will end in 1995. Its results will be presented in a seminar.

The Council of Europe participated as a collaborating institution in the MedWet initiative. The co-organisation of the seminar will permit better integration into the project of non European Community Mediterranean states which are Parties to the Convention and to which it is intended to extend the initiative.

Travel and subsistence expenses will be covered for 1 expert from each of the following states:

**Cyprus, Malta, Turkey** ..... 21,000

Participants: those of MedWet

**7. CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARDS THE COST OF EXPERT GROUPS**

Element 7.1

**Group of experts on conservation of amphibians and reptiles**

Strasbourg

3 days

The terms of reference of this group are to revise current problems on herpetile conservation in Europe and to suggest adequate action. Particular attention will be given in this meeting to site management.

Travel and subsistence expenses will be covered for 1 expert from each of the following 14 states:  
**Austria, Bulgaria, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, The Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom** ..... 120,000

Participants: all Contracting Parties

Observers: all observer states and qualified organisations active in this field

Element 7.2

**Group of experts on conservation of invertebrates**

Ireland ?

4 days

The terms of reference of this group are to revise current problems on invertebrate conservation in Europe and to suggest adequate action. The group shall propose measures that are adequate for the protection of invertebrates focusing on habitat types that are specially rich in invertebrates and/or specially important for threatened groups of invertebrates.

Travel and subsistence expenses will be covered for 1 expert from each of the following 15 states:  
**Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Iceland, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Switzerland, United Kingdom** ..... 115,000

Participants: all other Contracting Parties

Observers: all observer states and qualified organisations active in this field

Element 7.3

**Group of experts on threatened marine and coastal species of the Mediterranean**

France

3 days

The terms of reference of this group are to identify the marine and coastal species of the Mediterranean which are endangered and need a protection status, so that they may be possibly proposed for inclusion in the appendices of the Convention.

Participants: Cyprus, France, Greece, Italy, Malta, Monaco, Spain, Turkey

Observers: all Mediterranean observer states and qualified organisations active in this field

**8. CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARDS THE COSTS OF CONSULTANTS  
[to be decided by the Committee in 1996]**

[Element 8.1

### **European Red List of Threatened Vertebrates**

Terms of reference: To compile a European Red List of Threatened Vertebrates, pointing out which species or endangered populations require conservation measures. The report will also point out which species require action plans, what action plans have already been made by Contracting Parties and how they are being implemented.

Fixed appropriation for consultant..... 60,000

#### Element 8.2

### **Report on the implementation of the Convention, Part I: Nordic States**

Terms of reference:

To analyse, in coordination with the states concerned, the conservation policies of the Nordic countries, their systems of protected areas and protection and management of wild fauna and flora, and the extent to which they satisfy the obligations of the Bern Convention. The report will make suggestions which may improve the implementation of the Convention in those states.

Fixed appropriation for consultant..... 60,000

#### Element 8.3

### **Report on micro-reserves as a tool for plant conservation**

Terms of reference:

To study the application of micro-reserves to protect very localised populations of threatened species. The report should analyse how the system of micro-reserves is working in the different states or regions where it has been applied and to make recommendations as to its improvement and extension.

Fixed appropriation for consultant..... 40,000

#### Element 8.4

### **Report on marine invertebrates in the Mediterranean**

Terms of reference:

This report will deal with the conservation problems of threatened coastal marine invertebrates. It will include data sheets of endangered and vulnerable species and will propose adequate action within the framework of the Convention.

Fixed appropriation for consultant ..... 40,000

#### Element 8.5

### **Study on the potential implications of global change (including climatic change) in the conservation of threatened plants in Europe**

Terms of reference:

To prepare a report on the long term implications of global change (including climatic change) on the survival or reduction in area of European plant species, especially endemic species from island or mountain ecosystems and threatened species listed in Appendix I of the Convention. The report will propose new conservation strategies and solutions aimed at dealing with this problem and will include a list of Appendix I species that may be affected in the long term.

Fixed appropriation for consultant..... 40,000

Element 8.6

**Report on the status and conservation of the beaver (*Castor fiber*) in Europe**

Terms of reference:

The report will describe the distribution status and conservation problems of the beaver (*Castor fiber*) in Europe, analysing the causes of its decline in a part of the Continent, describing possible future threats and proposing guidelines for its conservation.

Fixed appropriation for consultant..... 40,000

Element 8.7

**Report on the impact of cycles, motorbikes and 4 wheel drives on wildlife and natural habitats**

Terms of reference:

The report will describe the impact of cycles and motor vehicles on wildlife and natural habitats in Europe suggesting ways to deal with such vehicles both inside and outside protected areas.

Fixed appropriation for consultant..... 40,000]

**9. PUBLICATIONS**

Element 9.1

Funds for the conception, the photo composition and publication of poster, brochures, stickers, postcards, making of buttons, other documents ..... 90,000

**10. HABITAT CONSERVATION**

[Element 10.1 to be engaged with approval of Bureau]

This budget line will gather funds sent voluntarily by Contracting Parties to help conservation of habitats in other states. Decision on its expenditure will be agreed by the Bureau with approval of the Parties which have sent contributions and only on presentation of precise projects ..... 35,000

**11. CONTRIBUTION TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION IN BURKINA FASO AND SENEGAL**

[Element 11.1 to be engaged with approval of Bureau]

Funds for the conception and the implementation of a training programme for representatives of Burkina Faso and Senegal on implementation of the Convention in these countries ..... 100,000

**12. PART-TIME SECRETARY**

Element 12

Part-time secretary..... 120,000

Bern Convention Programme of Activities and Budget for 1996 (summary)

	FF
1. Chairman's expenses .....	15,000
2. On-the-spot visits .....	30,000
3. Delegates of African states.....	35,000
4. Travels of experts and Secretariat.....	85,000
5. Meetings of the Bureau .....	50,000
6. Colloquia	
6.1 Seminar on incentives for private reserves.....	105,000
6.2 Seminar on management of habitats for invertebrates .....	- - -
6.3 MedWet .....	21,000
7. Expert groups	
7.1 Group of experts on conservation of amphibians and reptiles.....	120,000
7.2 Group of experts on conservation of invertebrates .....	115,000
7.3 Group of experts on threatend marine and coastal species in the Mediterranean.....	
8. Consultants	
8.1 European Red List of Vertebrates.....	60,000
8.2 Implementation of the Convention, Part I: Nordic States .....	60,000
8.3 Micro-reserves as a tool for plant conservation .....	40,000
8.4 Report on marine invertebrates in the Mediterranean .....	40,000
8.5 Implications of global change in conservation of threatened plants.....	40,000
8.6 Status and conservation of the beaver ( <i>Castor fiber</i> ) .....	40,000
8.7 Impact of vehicles on wildlife and natural habitats.....	40,000
9. Publicity .....	90,000
10.* Habitat conservation projects .....	*35,000
11.* Training of experts in Burkina Faso and Senegal .....	*100,000
12. Part-time secretary.....	120,000
	1,241,000

The Bern Convention Special Account will be used to cover expenses that cannot be covered by the ordinary budget (Note II.13 a, Article 2218) of the Council of Europe.

\* The activities marked with an asterisk (\*) will only be engaged with the approval of the Bureau.