



Strasbourg, 6 December 1996  
[s:\tpvs96\tpvs102E.96]

**T-PVS (96) 102**

CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF EUROPEAN WILDLIFE  
AND NATURAL HABITATS

Standing Committee

16th meeting  
Strasbourg, 2 - 6 December 1996

**REPORT**

Secretariat Memorandum  
established by the  
Directorate of Environment  
and Local Authorities

**PRELIMINARY NOTE- SUMMARY OF DECISIONS TAKEN**

1. The Standing Committee held its 16th meeting from 2 to 6 December 1996 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 was pleased to note that Tunisia was represented at the meeting for the first time as a Contracting Party and that Lithuania and Slovakia would become Contracting Parties to the Convention on 1 January 1997.
4. The Committee decided unanimously to invite the following states to attend its 17th meeting: Algeria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Cape Verde, Croatia, the Holy See, Mauritania and Morocco.
5. The Committee amended Appendices I and II of the Convention.
6. The Committee adopted the following Resolution No. 4 on endangered natural habitats requiring specific habitat conservation measures.
7. The Committee adopted the following recommendations:
  - ? Recommendation No. 50 on the conservation of *Margaritifera auricularia*;
  - ? Recommendation No. 51 on action plans for invertebrate species in the Appendices of the Convention;
  - ? Recommendation No. 52 on habitat conservation for invertebrate species;
  - ? Recommendation No. 53 on the conservation of the European otter (*Lutra lutra*);
  - ? Recommendation No. 54 on conservation of *Caretta caretta* at Patara (Turkey) ;
  - ? Recommendation No. 55 on giving consideration to ZNIEFF (nature reserves of ecological interest for fauna and flora) in the development of projects for the Biltzheim Forest and the areas of Niffer and the Petit Landau (France).
8. The Committee welcomed the Constantinople Declaration on "The Year for the Conservation of the Mediterranean and Black Seas 1998".
9. The Committee discussed the situation of marine turtles in Laganas Bay (Zakynthos).
10. The Committee discussed the situation of several species that require conservation .
11. The Committee approved a work programme and budget for 1997, using FR 800,000 provided for annually by the Committee of Ministers, some FR 537,000 remaining in the Convention's special fund and new donations to be made by Contracting Parties.
12. The Committee decided to hold its 17th meeting on 1 to 5 December 1997.

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 Appendices I and II;
- ? Resolution No. 4 (1996);
- ? Recommendations Nos. 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55 (1996);
- ? Programme and budget.

## **PART I ? DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION**

### **1. Opening of the meeting and adoption of the agenda**

- T-PVS (96) 59 Draft agenda
- T-PVS (96) 69 Annotated draft agenda
- T-PVS (96) 61 Rules of procedure

The 16th meeting of the Committee was opened by its Chairman, Mr Antti Haapanen who welcomed the participants (see Appendix 1 to this report). He congratulated Lithuania, Slovakia and Tunisia on their on their ratification of the Convention.

The draft agenda (Appendix 2 to this report) was adopted.

### **2. Chairman's report and communications from the delegations and from the Secretariat. Reports from new and forthcoming Contracting Parties (Lithuania, Slovakia, Tunisia)**

- T-PVS (96) 22 Chart of signatures and ratification
- T-PVS (96) 32 Report of Bureau meeting of May 1996
- T-PVS (96) 64 Report of Bureau meeting of October 1996
- T-PVS (96) 72 Introductory Report of Lithuania
- T-PVS (96) 73 Introductory Report of Slovakia

#### **Chairman's report**

The Chairman gave his report on the development of the Bern Convention since the last meeting of the Committee. The programme of activities was well implemented. He congratulated the Barcelona, Bucharest and Bonn Conventions for their work and the recent adoption of the Agreement on the conservation of cetaceans of the Black Sea, Mediterranean Sea and contiguous Atlantic area. He said that the work of these Conventions were complementary.

### **Communications from delegations and from the Secretariat**

The representative of Lithuania presented its introductory report. He expressed the pleasure and interest of his country at becoming a Contracting Party to the Convention. He hoped that material problems to permit participation in meetings could be solved.

The representative of Slovakia presented its introductory report. She mentioned that Slovakia had a very important tradition of nature conservation and said that her country was very pleased to become a Contracting Party. She hoped that their obligations would find a rapid effect in practice.

The representative of Tunisia also expressed the great interest of his country for nature conservation. He considered that accession to international conventions were an asset for a stable and solid environmental policy. He mentioned that a conservation project of sites for migratory species was in preparation as Tunisia was on one of the more important migration routes.

One delegation and one representative (United Kingdom and FACE) submitted written reports (Appendix 14 to this report).

### **3. Development of the Convention**

#### **3.1 Strategic issues. Role of the Convention in the implementation of the Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy**

STRA-FO (96) 6 Report of the Council for the Strategy

STRA-BU (96) 8 Report of Action Theme 11 (European Action Programme for Threatened Species)

At the Ministerial Conference, Environment for Europe, held in Sofia (Bulgaria) from 23 to 25 October 1995 the Ministers endorsed the Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy, as transmitted by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, as a framework for the conservation of biological and landscape diversity. The Council of Europe and the UNEP, in cooperation with the OECD and the IUCN established a Council for the Strategy, which met in Strasbourg in May 1996, and an executive Bureau which has its first meeting in Geneva in the week preceding the meeting of the Standing Committee to the Convention.

The Secretariat stated that the Council of Europe had been assigned a leading role in the implementation of three action themes of the Strategy:

- ? Action Theme 1: Establishing the Pan-European Ecological Network;
- ? Action Theme 3: Raising awareness and support with policy makers and the public;
- ? Action Theme 11: Action for threatened species.

The Bern Convention was expected, in particular, to lead Action Theme 11 (European Action Programme for Threatened Species/EUROSPECIES).

The Committee held an exchange of views on the subject. Several delegations pointed out that there was a coincidence of objectives of the Pan-European Strategy and those of the Bern Convention. The Convention had already been very active in the past in the field of threatened species and intended to continue with that work in the future. The Strategy and the Convention would re-inforce each other. The Convention could also make a useful contribution to Action Theme 1 of the Strategy (pan-European Ecological Network) through the building up of the Emerald Network. The delegations of the European Environment Agency, the Secretariat of the Protocol concerning Mediterranean Specially Protected Areas, IUCN and World Wide Fund for Nature expressed their willingness to collaborate with the Convention in the implementation of Action Theme 11 of the Strategy.

The Committee found acceptable the programme produced for Action Theme 11 and thought

that it should proceed in all the four fields presented, with a particular emphasis on Action Plans.

The delegate of Germany pointed out that from its legal point of view the Standing Committee acting under Article 14 of the Convention is not competent to decide on the enlargement of the field work which is not covered by the Convention such as taking a leading role for the implementation of the Pan-European Strategy. It has to be noted that the Pan-European Strategy covers more states than the Bern Convention. Therefore until now the Bern Convention can only work for its member states. Otherwise the Convention has to be amended.

Concerning the request of the Executive Bureau of the Council of the Strategy that the Convention take a leading role in implementing Action Theme 11 (threatened species), the Committee decided to communicate to the Executive Bureau their willingness to take up such a task on condition that new resources were found, as the present resources for the Convention were not enough to assure more work without strain on their current activities.

The Secretariat was charged to inform the Executive Bureau of the Strategy of this decision. The Bureau of the Standing Committee was charged to take appropriate decisions concerning the programme of Action Theme 11 following the answer from the Executive Bureau of the Strategy.

### **3.2 States to be invited as observers to the 17th meeting**

The Committee decided unanimously to invite the following non member states of the Council of Europe to attend its 17th meeting as observers:

Algeria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Cape Verde, Holy See, Mauritania and Morocco.

## **4. Legal aspects**

### **4.1 Amendment of the Appendices**

T-PVS (96) 57 Proposal from Bulgaria

T-PVS (95) 48 Data sheets of Plant Species (Bulgarian proposal)

T-PVS (96) 4 Proposal from Italy

T-PVS (95) 2 Proposal from Cyprus

T-PVS (96) 48 Proposal from Monaco

T-PVS (96) 48 Addendum and Addendum 1 Data sheets of species proposed by Monaco

T-PVS (96) 49 Criteria for listing species in the Appendices

### **Criteria on listing species**

The Secretariat presented a document on criteria for listing species in the Appendices of the Convention. The Secretariat noted that there were no provisions in the Convention as to the need for species to be threatened in order to be listed in Appendices I and II. Appendix I contains only (or mostly) threatened plant species. Appendix II contains both threatened and non-threatened species, this being the result of the consensus reached when the Convention was drafted and negotiated. The Secretariat thought it unwise to break that carefully reached consensus and start a process of revision of Appendix II to delete non-threatened species. If the Committee did not wish to carry on that revision, two options were open: to adopt criteria for addition of new species or not to adopt them (and continue as before).

The Committee had a lengthy discussion on the issue. Some Parties were in favour of an in-depth revision of Appendix II of the Convention following carefully chosen criteria, even if this would imply a substantial deletion of species (particularly those with little threat). Other Parties thought it was better not to change the consensus followed when the Convention was adopted. Other Parties felt that it would be preferable to examine criteria, so that new amendment of the Convention may follow such criteria. The delegate of Monaco and others considered that the criteria should be taken in a broad sense to include the aesthetic and intrinsic value of species, as recommended in the Preamble to the Bern Convention.

The Committee decided to ask the Secretariat to prepare a first draft listing criteria which might be used, in the first place, to guide new amendments and, if needed or wished, to revise Appendix II. The Secretariat is to proceed as follows: it will draft a first paper, taking into account suggestions made in writing by the Parties. Such a first draft will be circulated to a few Parties (Bulgaria, European Community, France, Iceland, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Switzerland and United Kingdom) which will send their comments. The Secretariat will then prepare a second draft to be circulated to all Parties and observers, so that it may be discussed at the next meeting of the Committee.

Parties were invited to send written suggestions for those criteria.

The Icelandic delegate expressed the view that the absence of clear-cut criteria, adopted by the Standing Committee made the acceptance or refusal of candidate species rather erratic and unpredictable. The lack of such criteria could not benefit the Bern Convention in the long run. The main aim of the Convention is to conserve those species and habitats whose conservation requires cooperation of several states, in particular those species which are endangered and vulnerable as well as endangered habitats. The Appendices should primarily be used for that purpose. The practice had been to accept species which were only threatened in a part of their range - even only in a small area at the margin of their distribution, but this practise had not taken into account the legal implications the listing has for the Parties or the cultural or economic implications as required by Article 2 of the Convention. In his view the Committee had to develop and adopt criteria for the inclusion of species in the Appendices, and use those criteria for amending Appendix II. The Committee had to be guided by the provisions contained in the text of the Convention when deciding on amendments of the Appendices. Such had been the case for amendment of Appendix I and it would be coherent to see the same approach for amendment of Appendix II. Thus Iceland supported option A in the Secretariat's paper.

The delegate of Norway expressed appreciation that work on criterias was now taken up by the Committee. In her view it was the objectives in nature conservation to bring about conservation measures that would keep species out of danger. This should be reflected in the way species were listed in the Appendices. She reiterated some general prerequisites concerning criterias from the last Standing Committee meeting, namely for the inclusion of Appendices I and II: i. the candidate species should be threatened and/or; ii. the population should be declining and/or; iii. application of the pre-cautionary principle, based on documentation that warrant concern. Therefore she urged the Committee to decide on option 1 in the Secretariat's proposal which implied a review of Appendix II. This revision would be considered according to fixed criterias which she urged the Committee to develop during the next year. Iceland seconded the proposal.

### **Amendments proposed**

On the proposals made by Bulgaria, Cyprus, Italy, Monaco and Turkey, Iceland wanted the position stated, that decisions on all these proposals should be postponed in the light of the decision already taken by the Standing Committee to develop criteria for inclusion of species in the Appendices.

The following proposals for amendment of the Appendices were presented:

- a. Proposal from Cyprus to add *Centaurea akamantis* (Cyprus endemic) to Appendix I

The Committee examined the Cyprus proposal and decided unanimously to amend Appendix I by adding *Centaurea akamantis*, 23 Parties being present.

- b. Proposal from Italy to add amphibians, reptiles and insects to Appendix II

The Committee examined the Italian proposal. The delegate from Iceland said that he would have preferred that the Committee amend Appendix II after some clear criteria for amendment had been adopted.

The Committee decided unanimously to add to Appendix II the list of species found in Appendix 3 to this report, 23 Parties being present.

- c. Proposal from Bulgaria to add plant species from Central and Eastern Europe to Appendix I

The Committee examined the Bulgarian proposal and decided to delay until its next meeting the discussion of species nos. 1, 4, 37, 50, 54, 60, 69, 78, 85, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 101, 105, 111 and 114.

The delegate of Turkey announced that his state might make reservations on some species. France and Norway announced that they might make a reservation on *Rheum rhaponticum*.

The Committee decided unanimously to add to Appendix I of the Convention the list of species found in Appendix 4 to this report, 22 Parties being present;

- d. Proposal from Monaco to add marine species for the area of the Mediterranean to Appendices I, II and III. The proposal was supported by France, which had contributed through the preparation of species data sheets

The Committee examined the Monaco proposal and decided to delay decision on Appendix III and on *Cetorhinus maximus* until its next meeting, on the grounds that European Community member states had no mandate.

The delegate of Iceland declared that he supported regional listing of species in the Appendices and listing of populations as well as species. The Committee should, however, discuss the issue and have general criteria developed for regional listing before embarking on the exercise. Also Iceland stressed the view that it was questionable to use the term "Mediterranean species" for some of the species proposed by Monaco for inclusion in Appendix II. The mammals being of particular concern as their main distribution is outside the Mediterranean area and specific populations of these species have not been determined there. Inclusion of species and populations in the Appendices of the Convention should be based on evaluation of scientific data with emphasis on population trends in the centre of the distributional range of the species in question.

The delegate of Iceland proposed that a decision on *Zostera marina* for inclusion in Appendix I and on the mammal species for inclusion in Appendix II be postponed to the next meeting of the Standing Committee. He informed the Committee that Iceland had "technical problems" and was not able to make a decision on these species. He said that the main reason being that the background material presented by Monaco on the proposed species had not been available for the Icelandic delegation before the meeting. The delegate of Iceland asked the Committee to take his concerns into account in the same way it had dealt with identical pleas made by the European Community, on the proposal of Monaco. The Icelandic proposal was seconded by Norway. Neither had the Norwegian delegate received the English version of the background material before the meeting and was thus in the same position as Iceland. She also stressed that Contracting Parties should be treated on an equal basis referring to the caretaking of the concerns expressed earlier by the European Union.

The Committee voted on the proposal of Iceland and rejected it.

The delegate of Iceland could not understand why his proposal did not receive the same treatment as that of the European Community, to postpone decisions on some species until the next meeting of the Standing Committee.

The proposal from Monaco was put to the vote but was not approved due to lack of the necessary quorum (2/3 of Contracting Parties). At a later stage the delegate of France asked for the matter to be reconsidered (following Article 14 of the Rules of Procedure) and the Committee (after of positive vote of more than 2/3 of votes cast) agreed to do so.

The Icelandic delegate questioned the proposal made by France to reconsider the proposal made by Monaco. He regarded the use of Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure of the Standing Committee for this purpose incorrect. Rule 14 should not be used unless there were new information given on the case in question. The only reason for re-examination given by France was that there were more Contracting Parties in the room than at the time a decision was taken, this reasoning not being acceptable to Iceland. After the decision had been taken to re-examine the Monaco proposal, Iceland proposed that the discussion should be on the agenda the next day due to the lateness of the hour. Some of the delegations supported the view that there was no need for a discussion and the proposal of Monaco should be put to the vote immediately. Iceland and Norway objected to the view expressed that no discussion was needed as the final decision would be political anyhow. Iceland proposed that a decision on the mammal species for Appendix II be postponed to the next meeting referring to the arguments given earlier. The proposal was seconded by Norway.

The Committee voted and rejected the proposal of Iceland and Norway.

During the discussion, the delegate of Hungary asked for clarification, and he was informed

that the amendment applies to the Mediterranean.

The Committee voted the rest of the Monaco proposal. Votes in favour 22, against 2, abstentions 1. The proposal was thus adopted by 2/3 of the 33 Parties to the Convention. The species listed in Appendix 5 to this report will be added to the relevant Appendices of the Convention.

The delegate of Turkey announced that his state might make reservations on some species.

The delegate of Norway understood the final decision to imply that the relevant species had been listed to Appendices I and II, exclusively for the Mediterranean Sea. In consistency with her earlier interventions she would have accepted the listing for a geographical region given that the species were endemic to or had a distinct population of that region. She regretted the inclusion of the mammal species as they are widely distributed and have their major distribution range outside the Mediterranean Sea. Norway would therefore consider objection procedure according to Article 17. Norway encouraged further research of the species in order to find out more about the population status, as the information that had been put forward was seen as insufficient. Finally, she pointed out that the background paper (T-PVS (96) 48 addendum) included *Balaenoptera physalus* - fin whale (Sp. no. 59) and that a clarification on the listing status of this species was needed.

The Icelandic delegate associated himself with the intervention by Norway. He also stated that he regretted the way the proposal of Monaco was handled by the Standing Committee. The Icelandic delegate stressed that the Standing Committee should work professionally and discuss the various proposals presented pragmatically with a view to taking decisions which are in line with the objectives and aims of the Convention. Also that the meetings of the Standing Committee should be run in a clear and transparent manner using formal and legal procedures. The Standing Committee had to take into account that its decisions have not only legal implications for the Contracting Parties, but also economic and cultural implications, as clearly stated in Article 2 of the Convention. The Bern Convention would lose much of its credibility if the Standing Committee followed the route taken this week.

e. Proposal from Turkey to add *Vipera barani* to Appendix II

The proposal was adopted unanimously, 23 Parties being present.

The Secretariat said that the new amendments would be forwarded to Contracting Parties and observer states. Three months after their adoption and unless one-third of the Contracting Parties have notified objections, the amendments shall enter into force for those Parties which have not notified objections.

#### **4.2 Biennial reports**

T-PVS (96) 27 Biennial reports  
T-PVS (96) 27 Addendum 1 (Iceland)  
T-PVS (96) 27 Addendum 2 (Sweden)  
T-PVS (96) 27 Addendum 3 (Norway)  
T-PVS (96) 27 Addendum 4 (Spain)

Biennial reports for the period 1993-94 were presented by the following Parties:

Bulgaria, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom, European Community (for 1993).

The following Parties did not present biennial reports:

Austria, Belgium, Burkina Faso, Cyprus, Estonia, France, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy,

Liechtenstein, Senegal, Switzerland, Turkey, European Community (for 1994).<sup>1</sup>

The delegate of Hungary presented his excuses for not having submitted the report. On his request it was clarified that the presentation of 4-year reports is not an obligation as they are submitted on a voluntary basis.

The Chairman reminded Parties that presentation of biennial reports was a clear obligation stated in Article 9 of the Convention and that it was important that Parties comply.

The Standing Committee examined the biennial reports submitted by the Contracting Parties and the synthesis table prepared by the Secretariat. The Secretariat noted that table n° 4 did not in fact concern falconry but birds.

The Standing Committee considered it very useful to have a general view of the derogations. It noted that some derogations for birds were extensive and should be diminished. The delegate of Denmark noted that the authority to grant exceptions, the Danish Hunting and Wildlife Administration was part of the Ministry of the Environment (National Forest and Nature Agency).

Some data were also corrected:

Table no. 3: concerning Malta; 0 number of licences and 0 number of individuals; Table no. 4: concerning Fringillidae: numbers of individuals = 460,000 (instead of 4,600,000).

The Committee asked Malta to include information on amendments introduced in local legislation on bird protection, presented as exceptions in respect to Article 9 of the Convention, in the 1995-96 biennial report.

---

<sup>1</sup> **Note of the Secretariat:** the European Community sent the report for 1994 after the meeting (T-PVS (96) 27 Addendum 6).

#### **4.3 General 4-year reports (1993-1996)**

- T-PVS (96) 28 General reports
- T-PVS (96) 28 Addendum 1 (Romania)
- T-PVS (96) 28 Addendum 2 (Portugal)
- T-PVS (96) 28 Addendum 3 (Spain)

In December 1992 the Committee decided to invite Contracting Parties to submit a four-year report. Draft guidelines for such reports were adopted in December 1993. The Secretariat presented the general 4-year reports that had been sent by the following Parties:

Austria, Bulgaria, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, Spain, United Kingdom and the European Community.

The Secretariat noted that 13 Parties had presented reports and congratulated them. These reports were very interesting and gave useful information for the implementation of the Convention and for international cooperation.

The delegate of the Netherlands found that the document was an excellent source of reference and drew the attention of the participants to the fact that reports were also prepared in the framework of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

The Standing Committee expressed its interest in this exercise and decided to pursue it. The next reports would be due in 2000 on the basis of information from the period 1996-1999. Contracting Parties which had not yet submitted their general reports for 1993-1996 to the Secretariat were invited to do so.

#### **4.4 Follow-up of recommendations**

- T-PVS (96) 66 Follow-up of specific recommendations

At its 14th meeting the Committee wished to be informed of how its recommendations were being applied by the Contracting Parties. The Secretariat reminded the Committee that implementation of recommendations concerning invertebrates, plants and amphibians and reptiles were examined by the relevant expert groups every two years.

The Secretariat presented a document which had been prepared with the replies obtained from some of the Contracting Parties.

The Standing Committee expressed its interest in the document prepared which constituted a good review of the implementation of its specific recommendations. The delegate of the Study, Research and Conservation Centre for Environment in Alsace recalled that the conservation of *Bufo viridis* is still very problematic and that something should be done about its conservation.

The delegates of Norway and Sweden considered that the follow-up of recommendations should be combined with biennial reports. The delegate of Portugal expressed the necessity also of analysing the follow-up of general recommendations.

Some delegates underlined that even if recommendations are not legally binding, they have a strong impact in countries.

The Committee agreed with a Secretariat suggestion to prepare a proposal to follow some recommendations on a more detailed basis.

Norway informed the Standing Committee of the Secretariat's request for information concerning lynx management in Norway, taking into account Recommendation No. 20 on the conservation of the European lynx (*Lynx lynx*.) The request for information was in response to a complaint against the Norwegian authorities filed by Bellona. Norway noted that the

Bureau/Secretariat had been pleased with the information given.

Norway further informed the Standing Committee that it was presently preparing a White Paper on carnivore management to be presented to the Parliament during the winter of 1997. While preparing this White Paper, extensive cooperation was undertaken between environmental and agricultural authorities and with environmental and farmer organisations. Norway had noted the willingness of the Bureau and the Secretariat to participate in any discussion panel that the Norwegian authorities would like to organise and announced that Norway would send an invitation in this respect in the early part of 1997.

The Committee approved this proposal.

#### **4.5 Draft recommendation on the introduction of non-native organisms into the environment**

T-PVS (96) 30 Draft recommendation on the introduction of non-native organisms

T-PVS (96) 30 Addendum 1 - Observations by Monaco

At its last meeting, in January 1996, the Standing Committee had examined the preliminary draft recommendation reworded by a small Working Party and forwarded to Contracting Parties for comments. The Secretariat presented the draft recommendation.

Several observations were made. The Standing Committee noted that the draft recommendation did not concern genetically modified organisms which were dealt with by means of specific measures. In addition, it should be made clear that the species in question had been introduced by mankind. The French delegate considered that it would be particularly useful to draw up a minimum list of species considered as invasive on a European level, to which the draft recommendation could be applied.

The delegate of Sweden said that the draft recommendation should apply to breeding installations such as fish farms, as aquatic species posed particularly difficult problems and required constant attention. The delegate of Germany, on the other hand, considered that the draft recommendation should not cover the introduction of species for cultivation or use in farming, forestry or fisheries.

Since several delegations had proposed amendments to the draft recommendation, the Standing Committee had set up a Working Party responsible for revising it. The Working Party should in particular define the expression "a given territory" and consider whether it might not be better to keep the guidelines and the recommendation separate.

The Standing Committee took note of the Working Party's observations in which it had updated the issues to be discussed in more detail. It decided to postpone to its 17th meeting the adoption of the draft recommendation subject to its forthcoming revision by the Group of Experts on the Legal Aspects of the Introduction and Reintroduction of Wildlife

Species. It requested the Contracting Parties who so desired to forward their possible observations to the Secretariat by 1st March 1997 so that the Group of Experts could take account of them.

#### **4.6 Draft recommendation on the protection and management of habitats through private or voluntary systems**

T-PVS (96) 52 rev. Protection of habitats through voluntary systems - Replies to questionnaire

T-PVS (96) 87 Seminar on the protection of habitats through private systems

T-PVS (96) 55 Addendum 1 Draft recommendation

T-PVS (96) 55 Addendum 2 Declaration of Constantza

A seminar, held in Constantza, in Romania, examined the possibility of using private and voluntary systems in order to improve the preservation and management of habitats. The Secretariat presented the recommendation proposed by the experts at the seminar.

The Standing Committee expressed its sincere thanks to the Romanian authorities for the welcome given at the Seminar. In addition, it referred to the importance of the partnership between the private sector and governments which should be promoted, in the spirit of the Rio Declaration and Agenda 21. It considered the draft recommendation. Certain delegations (France, Senegal and Switzerland) were in favour of adopting it, subject to certain amendments, while others (Germany and the United Kingdom) wished to postpone the adoption to the Standing Committee's 17th meeting, since they had not had sufficient time to examine it.

The Committee requested the Contracting Parties to forward their possible observations to the Secretariat by 1st March 1997, and decided to postpone to its next meeting the adoption of the recommendation as reformulated by the Secretariat on the basis of these observations.

In addition, the Standing Committee warmly welcomed the Declaration of Constantza (included in Appendix 7 to this report) on 1998, "Year of the Safeguard of the Mediterranean and Black Seas" and decided to take account of it in its Programme of Activities for 1998.

#### **4.7 Legal Aspects: other items**

The following items were presented only for information and were not discussed.

? Report on comparative analysis of the efficiency of legislation protecting plants (T-PVS (96) 104)

It was not ready for the meeting. It will be presented at the 17th meeting.

? Report on the introduction of non-native plants (T-PVS (96) 105)

It was not ready for the meeting. It will be presented at the 17th meeting.

? Proceedings of the Seminar on incentive measures to create and manage areas on a voluntary basis (T-PVS (96) 52 rev. and T-PVS (96) 87)

The conclusions of this seminar, held in Constantza (Romania) are presented as a draft recommendation (item 4.6 above).

? Document on possible use of insurance systems for compensation of damage caused by wild life (T-PVS (96) 97)

Following a study on the compensation for damages caused by wild life, some ideas were presented on how insurance companies and governments may deal with such damage.

The delegate of Germany suggested that the Secretariat prepare a legal document taking

stock of Article 14 of the Convention and the scope of the Standing Committee's resolutions and recommendations. The Standing Committee approved this proposal.

## PART II ? THREATENED SPECIES AND HABITATS

### 5. Threatened species and habitats

#### - Habitats

#### 5.1 Development of Resolution No. 3 (Emerald network) and of Recommendations Nos. 14, 15 and 16 on habitat conservation

T-PVS (95) 42 rev. Convention texts on habitat protection  
 T-PVS (95) 15 rev. Draft resolution on species requiring habitat conservation  
 T-PVS (95) 16 rev. Draft resolution on endangered natural habitats  
 T-PVS (96) 74 Report of Group of experts on setting up of the Emerald network  
 T-PVS (96) 75 The Emerald network: information document  
 T-PVS (96) 88 Comments from Parties concerning species requiring specific habitat conservation measures

In June 1989, the Standing Committee adopted Resolution No. 1 and Recommendations Nos 14, 15 and 16 concerning protection of habitats under the Convention. These recommendations ask Parties, among things, to:

- a. identify species requiring specific habitat conservation measures;
- b. identify endangered natural habitats requiring specific conservation measures;
- c. take steps to designate areas of special conservation interest (Emerald network)

**For a above**, the Secretariat presented the draft resolution on species requiring habitat conservation which had been seen by the Committee in January 1996 and circulated to Parties for comment.

The Secretariat suggested that the draft resolution, being much contested by the Parties, be redrafted. The Secretariat, aided by a consultant, will prepare a new draft to be submitted to the Emerald network Group of experts, so that a new version may be seen by the Committee at a further meeting. Some delegations suggested that Annex II of the Habitats Directive be taken into account in this exercise.

The delegates of Iceland and Norway asked for a clarification on the implications of this resolution, if adopted, for the Contracting Parties. They also stated that they had difficulties in accepting some of the species listed in the draft resolution being there. The delegates did not understand the criteria used for listing these species as put forward in document T-PVS (96) 8.

The Committee decided to instruct the Secretariat to prepare a new draft resolution.

**For b above**, the Secretariat recalled that the Committee examined in January 1996 a draft resolution on endangered natural habitats proposed by a group of experts and decided that Contracting Parties needed more time to examine the draft resolution.

The delegate of Switzerland stated that it has only limited interest in this activity, in particular owing to the national technique for listing biotopes which differs from that used in the European Community. A new typology of natural habitats in Switzerland will be available in 1997 and will be forwarded to the Convention Secretariat. In conclusion, in order not to hinder the measures hoped for in particular by representatives of Contracting Parties from central and eastern Europe and the majority of Standing Committee members, the delegate of Swizerland abstained in the vote taken on the Resolution envisaged for this activity.

The delegates of Iceland and Norway questioned the draft resolution for being too mid and southern Europe orientated. They asked for clarification on the legal and practical implications of this resolution, if adopted, for the Contracting Parties.

The delegate of Iceland proposed a change in the preamble:

"Conscious of the fact that some of the habitats listed in Appendix I are common in some countries and not in need for special conservation measures there".

The Committee discussed the proposal from Iceland seconded by Norway and decided not to amend the draft Resolution.

Several Parties proposed a change in the preamble:

"Acknowledging that for Contracting Parties which are member States of the European Union, the list of natural habitats requiring specific conservation measures corresponds to Annex I of the Council Directive 92/43/EEC".

The Committee discussed this change which was accepted.

The Committee adopted the Resolution as it figures in Appendix 6 to this report.

Norway pointed out that a clarification has to be given on the legal, financial and practical implications of the adopted Resolution.

**For c above**, (setting up of the Emerald Network) the Secretariat explained that three actions had been undertaken:

- a first meeting of the "Emerald network" Group of experts was held in Paris from 4 to 6 November 1996 to discuss ways to set up the network;
- a technical instrument has been prepared (extension of biogeographical areas and a new data sheet for register of information);
- an analysis of the legal possibilities to make a protocol under the Convention for the Emerald network was being prepared by an expert and would be ready by the end of 1996 but, unfortunately, not for the meeting.

The Secretariat and the consultant presented the technical documents and the conclusions of the group of experts.

Many delegations expressed the opinion that this activity was a very fundamental one in the development of the Convention and that they wished a high priority was given to the building of the proposed Emerald Network.

The delegations of the European Community and the Environmental Agency welcomed the initiative and expressed their openness to collaborate bearing in mind that they have acquired useful experience in the technical work of implementing the Habitats Directive. The delegate of Switzerland felt that Document T-PVS (96) 74 should also include some background information on the Maastricht Conference and the Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy, also covering the EECONET concept for the pan-European ecological network.

The Swiss and Netherlands delegates wished that the Emerald Network advance more in the conceptual basis to include interconnection of areas. The delegate of Switzerland said that the idea of interconnecting sites of importance for conservation was an integral part of the Emerald Network concept.

Germany stated that the Emerald Network can only deal with items within the territories of the member states of the Bern Convention.

The Standing Committee held an exchange of views on the issue, out of which the following items were of concern for most Parties:

- ? the criteria for designating Areas of Special Conservation Interest needed to be clarified;
- ? coordination with existing initiatives needed to be ensured;
- ? a possible new legal basis for the network (through amendments to the Convention or by way of a protocol) have to be explored;
- ? the financial aspects had to be tackled.

The delegate of Hungary seconded by the delegates of Bulgaria and Slovakia stated that the fast building of the Emerald Network was of high priority for Central and Eastern European States and therefore, for the building of a coherent network of Areas of Special Conservation Interest throughout Europe.

The Chairman summarised the discussion by stating that the great majority of Parties were much in favour of the project but that some practical questions were still unsolved. He proposed that the Group of experts that was created under Resolution No. 3 deal with the above items in the appropriate manner and that this Group present precise proposals to the Standing Committee. This was agreed by the Committee.

? **Fauna and Flora**

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

T-PVS (96) 50 Report of the meeting of the Group of experts

The Secretariat presented the report of the meeting, noting that the Group of experts had discussed many different cases which had been subject to previous recommendations by the Committee. Some of those cases were to be discussed by the Committee as "specific cases" (item 6 of the agenda). The Group had also expressed the wish to work more on Action Plans and, in particular, to organise a seminar in 1998 - in conjunction with its next meeting - to discuss the implementation of IUCN's Action Plans for threatened amphibians and reptiles in Europe.

Regarding specific cases, three of them were mentioned, concerning *Rana latastei* in Italy, *Lacerta agilis* in the Netherlands and on the Dorset heathlands (United Kingdom).

On the Dorset heathlands, the Secretariat reminded the Committee that a file on this issue had been examined by the Committee in previous years and closed, on the condition that it would be re-opened if necessary. The SEH had presented a request in that sense, which was examined by the Bureau, taking into account the observations of the United Kingdom government. The Secretariat said that this item was not on the agenda of the Committee, as the Bureau decided at its meeting of 7 October 1996, to await the outcome of negotiations in progress between the government and non-governmental organisations. The SEH delegate said that the heathland was suffering rapid urbanisation (33,000 houses planned close to sensitive areas). Accidental fires on the heathland were threatening the little heath remaining. The United Kingdom delegate noted that there was already a Dorset Heathland Forum to discuss conservation issues of the heath. His government was considering the problem of accidental fire, in part through an information campaign in which they hoped NGOs might be willing to cooperate.

Another issue dealt with was that of the proposed on-the-spot visit to Hopa (Turkey). The Secretariat explained, that due to an excess of work in 1996, it had not been possible to carry out the visit. The Turkish delegate remarked that his state was preparing such a visit for July 1997. The Committee thanked the Turkish delegation for its helpfulness and instructed the Secretariat to carry out the visit with an expert on the terms previously agreed.

The delegate of Hungary congratulated the traditionally good work of the Group of experts. At the same time he referred to an inaccurate formulation of the document (page 14) and he informed the Committee that the Hungarian government initiated the programme on *Vipera ursinii rakosiensis* following the Standing Committee Recommendation No. 23.

**5.3 Group of experts on conservation of invertebrates**

T-PVS (96) 33 Report of the meeting of the Group of experts

The Secretariat presented the report of the meeting of the Group of experts and called the attention of the Committee to the following issues:

- The Group of experts believed that the list of invertebrate species in Appendix II was too limited and a more comprehensive one should be made urgently.

The Committee discussed the issue and concluded that most of its future work on this subject should be aimed at conservation of the habitats of threatened invertebrates. It thus instructed the Group of experts to work in this perspective and to propose a list of threatened invertebrates which may be characteristic of some habitat types. The Committee will study the list once it is prepared by the Group, and will decide on the follow-up.

- The Group of experts presented a proposal for more work on marine ecosystems.

Several delegations expressed the view that marine ecosystems and wildlife were of great importance for the Convention and that Parties should take this into account in their conservation and fisheries policies. Yet it did not seem urgent that the Convention embark on a very complete marine programme such as the one proposed by the Group of experts, as much of that work is being presently done in the framework of the Biodiversity Convention, in the Pan-European Strategy (Action Theme 5, coastal and marine ecosystems), and in regional seas conventions (Barcelona, Bucharest, etc). To avoid overlap it was preferable that the Convention continue its present cooperation with existing initiatives, particularly in the field of biodiversity, at least for the moment. The Committee agreed with the views presented and decided to instruct the Secretariat to continue collaboration on marine issues with other biodiversity related conventions.

The Secretariat presented three draft recommendations for possible adoption by the Committee:

- Draft recommendation on the conservation of *Margaritifera auricularia*;
- Draft recommendation on action plans for invertebrate species;
- Draft recommendation on habitat conservation for invertebrate species.

The Recommendations were adopted as they figure in Appendices 8, 9 and 10 to this report.

The Committee took note of the other issues dealt with by the Group of experts.

#### **5.4 Draft recommendation on the conservation of the otter (*Lutra lutra*)**

T-PVS (96) 54 Draft recommendation on the conservation of the otter  
T-PVS (96) 54 Addendum 1 Observations by Portugal

The Secretariat presented this draft recommendation which was drawn up at a Seminar held in the Netherlands in 1994. It was adopted by the Committee as it figures in Appendix 11 to this report.

The delegate of the United Kingdom said that he reserved judgment on this item.

#### **5.5 Threatened species and habitats: other items**

The following items were presented only for information and were not discussed.

- ? Handbook on Amphibians and Reptiles - Conservation management of species and habitats (T-PVS (96) 68)

This handbook is aimed at site managers and includes the following items:

- \* the most frequent causes of disappearance of species from sites;
- \* types of site management which are potentially damaging to amphibians and reptiles;

- \* recommended management practices for different types of amphibians and reptiles;
- \* acceptable methods for translocation and colony establishment for different types of amphibians and reptiles;
- \* standard components of recovery plans for different types of amphibians and reptiles.

? Report on saproxylic invertebrates of Eastern Europe (T-PVS (96) 31)

This report is a compilation of threatened saproxylic invertebrates in Eastern Europe. Some suggestions are made concerning their conservation and the inclusion of some species in the Appendices of the Convention.

? Report on management of the beaver (*Castor fiber*) (T-PVS (96) 67)

This report reviews the status of the species in Europe, describes the conservation problems of the species and makes proposals for its management.

? Colloquium on conservation, management and restoration of habitats for invertebrates (Killarney, May 1996) (T-PVS (96) 51)

The seminar was held in coordination with the meeting of the Group of experts and permitted preparation of some of the recommendations proposed above. A number of very interesting cases of habitat management for invertebrates were presented. Some threatened species were pointed out as requiring urgent conservation or management of their habitats.

? Background information on invertebrates of the Habitats Directive and the Bern Convention (Nature and Environment series Nos. 79, 80, 81)

This report was financed by the European Commission, made by experts from the Group of experts on conservation of invertebrates and published by the Council of Europe. It contains interesting information on the species protected by the Directive (and the Convention), including useful conservation proposals. It was sent by mail in September to members of the Committee and will not be distributed again.

? Report on conservation of hamsters (*Cricetus cricetus*, *Cricetulus migratorius* and *Mesocricetus newtoni*) (T-PVS (96) ..)

The report, describing the biology, distribution and conservation of hamsters in Europe, was not ready in its final version for the meeting of the Committee. It will be presented at the next meeting of the Committee.

- ? European Red List of threatened invertebrates (Freshwater fish, Amphibians and Reptiles, and Mammals) (T-PVS (96) ..)

As requested by the Committee at its previous meeting, red books on the above groups have been prepared by the World Conservation Monitoring Centre. The funds required for this activity exceeded those foreseen by the Committee and the consultant work is being cofinanced by the European Environment Agency (Topic Centre for Nature Conservation). The final version was not ready for the meeting. It will be presented at the 17th meeting of the Standing Committee.

- ? Action Plans for Globally Threatened Birds: Book "Globally threatened birds in Europe"

At its previous meeting, the Committee adopted its Recommendation 48 (96) "on the conservation of globally threatened birds", which encouraged carrying out National Action Plans for 23 species listed. The Action Plans for those species, which were made by BirdLife International and Wetlands International and jointly financed by the European Commission and the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, have been published by the Council of Europe. The books have already been distributed to members of the Committee.

- ? Conservation of the leopard in Burkina Faso (T-PVS (96) 60)

At the Bureau meeting of 20 May 1996, the Secretariat had pointed out, with regard to the Programme on the conservation of the leopard (*Panthera pardus*, Appendix II to the Convention) carried out in Burkina Faso, that the expert had submitted a report on her visit and on possible projects for the protection of the leopard. The Bureau had noted that the Secretariat would send it a copy of the report. Copies had already been sent for information purposes to the French and Swiss delegates. The Secretariat had indicated that the Belgian Government was involved in co-operation work in Burkina Faso and that the report might give rise to other initiatives. At the Bureau meeting of 7 October 1996, the Bureau had noted the possible benefits of reinforcing the implementation of the African Convention on the conservation of nature and natural resources (Algiers, 15 September 1968) and the role that the Bern Convention could play in this respect.

- ? Otter project in the Biosphere Reserve of Trebon (Czech Republic) (T-PVS (96) 34)

The government of Luxembourg is financing a five-year otter conservation programme in the Biosphere Reserve of Trebon. The Secretariat of the Convention assures the follow-up of the project. The report by the consultant is presented. On the suggestion of the consultant, a workshop was held in Trebon in October 1996 and the project evaluated and redirected. The project is producing very useful conservation information and has satisfactory scientific results.

### PART III ? SPECIFIC SITES

#### 6. Specific sites

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

- T-PVS (96) 86 Document from MEDASSET
- T-PVS (96) 96 Legal situation
- T-PVS (96) 70 Report by Secretariat
- T-PVS (96) 98 Document from Sea Turtle Protection Society
- T-PVS (96) 101 Report by Greek Government

This issue concerns a bay of particular importance for the nesting of the marine turtle *Caretta caretta* which is threatened by tourist development. At its 14th meeting, the Standing Committee adopted a Decision, reproduced in Appendix 9 to document T-PVS (95) 26, and decided to draw the particular attention of the Committee of Ministers to this Decision.

At its 15th meeting the Standing Committee had observed that Greece had made only limited progress in implementing the Decision of 24 March 1995 and had decided to finance an expert to assess the legal situation in Zakynthos. The Committee had expressed the hope that the Greek Government would include relevant information in its report so that the problem could be solved as quickly as possible.

The Standing Committee took note of the report submitted by Mr Cyrille de Klemm, who had been mandated to assess the legal situation. The conclusion to Mr de Klemm's report set out the following proposals:

1. to adopt as quickly as possible (and without waiting for the possible revision of the 1986 Act) the Presidential Decree creating the Park of Zakynthos and provide in this text for the institution of a management body with the necessary powers, in the terrestrial and marine parts of the Park, to ensure the effective protection of the turtles, their nesting beaches and their reproductive processes;
2. introduce appropriate measures for compensation, indemnification or incentives where limitations on property rights entail restrictions considered by owners and local public opinion as unacceptable;
3. take the necessary measures to end existing legal insecurity over the boundaries of private property by establishing as a matter of urgency a cadastral plan for the whole of the zone which would be covered by the future Park, by accelerating the procedure for the delimitation of the public maritime domain and the "former shore" in each zone and by quickly compensating those who hold land in these areas in good faith;
4. more generally, undertake a revision of the Environmental Protection Law of 1986:
  - ? to simplify and shorten the procedure for the creation of protected areas, in respect of the adoption of Presidential Decrees as well as that of interim protection measures under interministerial decisions;

- ? establish a precise framework for the institution of management bodies for protected areas governing their composition and their jurisdiction and endowing them with the necessary powers to be able to accomplish their functions effectively.

The Greek delegate thanked the expert for the excellent work done which facilitates the understanding of the situation and the conditions, as presented in document T-PVS (96) 101. She also informed the Standing Committee that the necessary preparation for the establishment by a Presidential Decree of the Zakynthos National Marine Park (ZNMP) is progressing satisfactorily so that the park could be established by the beginning of 1998. The Decree will cover the issues of the boundaries of the ZNMP and its zones, the appropriate conservation measures, the conditions and restrictions for permitted activities, as well as the necessary prohibitions and the establishment/operation of the Park's Management Body. Furthermore, in parallel and in conjunction with the above, the Ministry of the Environment is preparing a Study on the Financial-Technical and Operational Prerequisites for the establishment of the ZNMP whose final draft is expected by the end of 1996. One main outcome of this Study is a set of proposals for compensation/indemnification measures for affected parties (because of the establishment of the ZNMP) according to article 22 of Law 1650/1986 as well as for other incentives. Through this Study and the related consultation process between the Ministry of the Environment and the concerned Regional, Prefectural, Local Authorities and other affected/interested parties and NGOs, a broad compromise has been reached, in respect to the conservation measures, restrictions (mainly for building activity) and the zoning of the park on the one hand and the compensatory/counterbalancing measures on the other. It is expected that this positive relation will also promote the selection phase, for the compensatory/indemnification measures, whereas each one of them necessitates an individual legal/administrative procedure, ranging from the level of the financial cost to time needed. The Greek delegation announced that Laganas Bay has been proposed for designation as a Natura 2000 site; technical infrastructure related to the ZNMP (eg Environmental Awareness Centre) and the sewage biological treatment and disposal for the area under concern are activities undertaken in the area with European Union's funds. The Greek delegate informed the Committee on the scheduled progress of works for the delimitation of the shore and former shore lines and for the "cadastral".

Some delegations expressed their regret for the delay and proposed that a precise timetable be fixed. The MEDASSET and SEH delegates manifested their long term involvement in this file and informed the Standing Committee of recent developments in Zakynthos.

The Netherlands on behalf of the European Community proposed the following: to thank Greece for the documents sent; to note that measures are to be adopted to create the marine park; to recognise that the decision of the Committee had not been followed and to keep the file open, a proposal which was accepted by the Committee. The Committee reminded Greece that according to its Decision of 24 March 1995 the natural marine park planned should be created before 25 March 1998. The Committee asked Greece to present a report on the advancement of the creation of the park at its 17th meeting.

## **6.2 Possible new files**

The Committee was invited to examine the files and decide on any follow-up to them, including the possible opening of new files.

### **- Akamas Peninsula (Cyprus)**

T-PVS (96) 45 Secretariat Report

T-PVS (96) 84 MEDASSET document

The project in question focused on the construction of a huge tourist complex which could have harmful repercussions for an area of great environmental value which provided a habitat for many species of flora and fauna appearing in the Appendices to the Convention. A World Bank study considered that the site allowed only limited or strictly regulated development.

The Cypriot Delegate explained the situation and pointed out that tourist development had no

impact on the sea turtles (*Chelonia mydas* and *Caretta caretta*).

The representatives of the SEH and MEDASSET challenged this statement and considered that the site was particularly vulnerable.

The Standing Committee considered that the situation should be carefully assessed. It requested the Cypriot Government to forward to the Secretariat a copy of the World Bank study and instructed the Secretariat to establish contacts with the Cypriot authorities in order to arrange a visit to the site, in accordance with Rule 11 of the Rules of Procedure. It decided that the expert would be required to: examine the situation, inform the authorities of the conservation needs of the species appearing in the Appendices to the Bern Convention, propose effective measures for that purpose, and report on the visit to the Standing Committee. Consequently, it decided to open a file on the case.

#### **- Clearance project in Biltzheim forest (France)**

T-PVS (96) 71 Secretariat Report

This concerns plans to build a private motor-racing circuit in the heart of the forest of Biltzheim (designated a grade I area of fauna and flora ecological interest, ZNIEFF) which provides a habitat for several species included in Appendix II of the Convention.

The delegate of France pointed out that no development projects had as yet been initiated in the Niffer and Petit Landau areas. However, she said that the designation of a ZNIEFF had no legal force and was exclusively aimed at supporting decision-making within the measures already adopted.

Where Biltzheim forest was concerned, the French State would be leaving it to the courts to decide, and the French Government would be ensuring that the promised compensatory and other measures were actually implemented. Furthermore, it would be very time-consuming for the Standing Committee and its Secretariat to open files on such matters in all the Contracting Parties: it might be better for the latter simply to supply regular information on the points mentioned. Where France was concerned, no files needed to be opened on this type of question, and the delegate requested that the draft recommendation be amended on three different points.

The delegate of the National Society for Nature Conservation said that strict measures were needed to provide overall protection for the Rhineland forests and that such measures should be taken in co-operation with Germany. He considered that the Niffer and Petit Landau area should be made into a Natura 2000 Zone and that the consequent protective measures should be harmonised between France and Germany.

The Standing Committee expressed its concern at these issues and decided to adopt the draft recommendation on taking account of ZNIEFFs in the plans for developing Biltzheim forest and the Niffer and Petit Landau areas, as amended on the basis of the French delegate's proposals.

#### **- *Vipera lebetina schweizeri* in Milos (Greece)**

This species is threatened by mining activities in the islands as well as by uncontrolled traffic in some areas, as being killed on the road is one of the main factors of their mortality. Greece is expected to present the master plan for the species being prepared, with the cooperation of the Ministry of the Environment, Physical Planning and Public Works of Milos Municipality and the Goulandris Natural History Museum, and to inform the Committee on which legal measures are foreseen.

Owing to lack of time, the Committee discussed only the urgent measures required.

The representative of SEH expressed the wish that the deadly traffic of trucks be closed on critical roads as soon as possible and that a real conservation plan for the species be implemented, delimiting, in particular, which areas were to be left aside for nature conservation purposes.

The Greek delegate, due to lack of time for a full discussion on the subject, explained that, in view of minimizing road killings of the Milos viper, provided that it is actually proved, the Environmental Services of the Ministry of the Environment are formulating a proposal to the Minister for the Environment, and through him to other competent Ministers, for adopting one additional environmental condition, for the issue, by them, of environmental permits for mineral exploitation works. This condition is oriented to the prohibition of circulation of lorries carrying the products of mineral activities in the night, during the summer season.

The Committee wished to see progress in the measures taken by Greece to conserve this threatened species and asked Greece to present a complete report at the next meeting of the Committee.

**- *Caretta caretta* in Kaminia (Greece)**

T-PVS (96) 44 Secretariat report

T-PVS (96) 85 MEDASSET document

This is a tourist resort project in Kaminia with potentially harmful effects on the loggerhead turtle, *Caretta caretta*, a species listed in Appendix II of the Bern Convention.

The delegate of Greece gave the following indications:

"The Ministry of the Environment, Physical Planning and Public Works, is the National Competent Authority for physical planning. In this frame and for the Kefalonia island, a Special Physical Planning Study is in progress, which will result in the establishment, by a Presidential Decree, of a Controlled Urban Development Zone (ZOE) according to the Housing Law 1337/1983. With the aforementioned Presidential Decree the conditions and limitations for land uses or other conditions and limitations and, in particular, the minimum buildable land parcel size, are defined.

At present, the land use provision for the Kaminia area is 'preserved agricultural land', which coincides with controlled building activities. The Ministry of Agriculture, namely the Aesthetic Forest, National Forests and Game Management Division, is the Competent National Authority for issuing permits for field research work, for which the direct contact of the researcher(s) with the wild fauna species is necessary. Only in this sense, the so-called conjunction of the Cephalonian Marine Turtle Project-CMTP) with the Ministry of Agriculture has been established with regard to the ecological significance of the Kaminia coastal area, in relation to the nesting activity of *Caretta caretta*. It is emphasised that the very low nesting activity (average 40 nests/year) in correlation to the significance of other nesting areas in Greece (eg Laganas Gulf, Kyparissiakos Gulf with an average annual number of nests of 1,000 and 700 respectively), gives the clear picture for the actual and objective assessment for the formulation of the appropriate measures. To our knowledge, no development plans for the Kaminia coastal area is under consideration."

The MEDASSET representative voiced strong concerns and reiterated the fundamental importance of the beaches of Kaminia, on the island of Cephalonia, and of the island of Zakynthos, for marine turtles in the Mediterranean.

The Italian delegate pointed out the need effectively to adopt a preventive approach to save marine turtles and the Standing Committee insisted that the Greek Government take every necessary measure to protect marine turtles. The Standing Committee asked the Greek Government to present a report for its next meeting.

**- Urbanisation of Porto biotope (Greece)**

T-PVS (96) 41 Secretariat report

This concerns major building work carried out at Porto (island of Tinos) in an area with a unique and ecologically valuable biotope. At least 104 animal and plant species (including several listed in Appendices I and II to the Bern Convention) depend on the Porto site for their survival in

Tinos.

The delegate of Greece gave the following indications:

"The coastal area of Porto is located in the south-eastern part of Tinos island. This area has been a concern of the Ministry of the Environment since 1991 and according to our assessment, correlating, on the one hand, the occurrence of natural habitats, fauna/flora species (listed in national and international legislation and conventions) and, on the other hand, to their abundance/rarity/representativity/range at local and national level, the Porto area has been characterised of local significance, whose management should be based on physical and town planning regulations. With regard to some information included in document T-PVS (96) 41, according to the conclusions of a 4-year National Project for the Monk Seal, only three caves/potential habitats for *Monachus monachus* have been recorded in the Tinos island but in the western and northern parts.

With regard, however, to the town planning conditions, the limits of Porto-Tinos settlement have been adopted by the Decision of the Cyclades Prefecture No. T.M.oik 9468/1985 (Official Gazette 251/?/86), in such a way that three concrete urban units have been established. The aforementioned limits have been expanded by the Cyclades Prefecture's Decision No. T.M. oik 2400/1988 - Official Gazette 369/?/88). This Decision has been annulled by the Decision of the Supreme Administrative Court No. 3956 in 1995 and the former Prefecture's Decision is again in force, thus providing for stricter building conditions for the area than had been included in the town limits since 1988. However, during the 1988-1995 period 'third party rights' have been established [with regard to selling and buying land, with a reduced minimum buildable land parcel size, and to building permits], which constitute a really lawful situation."

The Standing Committee welcomed the measures which are taken by the Greek Government in order to ensure the conservation of the site. It requested that Greece ensure that its ecological value and biodiversity were taken into consideration, and accepted the proposal by the delegate of Greece to submit a written report to the Secretariat in December on the situation of the Porto area, to be examined by the Bureau at its next meeting.

#### **- *Testudo marginata* in Greece**

This species is highly threatened in Greece and requires protection of its most important sites.

The Standing Committee discussed this matter very briefly.

The delegate of Greece informed the Committee that general sites of importance for this species were to be included in the areas designated in Natura 2000. This item should be grouped with the others for which the discussion has been postponed for the next T-PVS meeting.

The Committee welcomed this news and invited Greece to submit a report on the situation and conservation of this threatened species, to be examined at its next meeting.

#### **- Construction of a road in the Grünewald Forest (Luxembourg)**

T-PVS (96) 58 On-the-spot appraisal

T-PVS (96) 99 Summary of the impact study and "Fir Gréngewald" Association letter

The aim of the project is to construct a road 17.4 kilometres in length in the Grünewald forest, an area which it had been considered necessary to protect in a decision taken by the government in a Council meeting of 24 April 1981. The forest provides a habitat for several species of fauna and flora appearing in Appendices I and II of the Bern Convention.

At its 15th meeting, the Standing Committee had expressed its concern regarding the fact that the construction of a road would be likely to have serious repercussions for the natural habitat

and the numerous fauna and flora species in the area concerned. Consequently, the Committee had instructed the Secretariat to establish contact with the Luxembourg authorities in order to arrange a visit to the site.

A visit to the site took place on 8 August 1996. Mr Alfred Froment, lecturer in the Earth Environment Department at the University of Liège, was instructed to produce the expert report. The visit was conducted in the presence of Mr Jean-Paul Feltgen, a Government Attaché at the Ministry of the Environment in Luxembourg. The expert presented his report to the Standing Committee. He pointed out that the impact study now stated that the road project must be accompanied by numerous compensation measures.

The Luxembourg delegation provided details of developments in the project and pointed out that the final decision would be a matter for political choice since it would be examined by Parliament with a view to the adoption of a draft law on the road project. He added that the government had taken measures to improve the layout of the road on the basis of the impact study conducted by the research consultancy on 13 September 1996: the length of the tunnel should be doubled, a programme of compensation measures was envisaged, the area undergoing deforestation must be reduced, measures were envisaged with a view to guaranteeing maximum protection for underground waters by means of draining them, the route taken by the road had been diverted and anti-noise measures planned. In addition, a reforestation plan was envisaged as were the setting up of ecological corridors, the restoration of a wetland and the establishment of an environmental observatory. A monitoring committee must be set up for that purpose by the Ministry of the Environment.

The Swiss delegate reported on the relative effectiveness of the compensation measures. The Standing Committee expressed its strong concern at the case under consideration. The Grünwald forest in fact constituted Luxembourg's largest area of beech forest typical of a sandstone plateau, which make it of unique value for the European ecological heritage. In addition, it was included in the list of sites representative of European forest ecosystems set out in the report "Europe's environment - The Dob\_řš Assessment" published by the European Environment Agency in 1994. In view of these facts, the Standing Committee decided to set up a case file and requested the Luxembourg Government to submit a report on the current situation and the compensation measures envisaged at its 17th meeting.

#### **- Introduction of exotic bees (Portugal)**

T-PVS (96) 37 Secretariat Report

T-PVS (96) 100 Government Report

The introduction of *Meliponinae quadrifasciata* from South America was likely to have a harmful influence on the continent's indigenous fauna and flora. The bees were noted for their size, which was greater than that of European bees; they could therefore compete with them and upset their role as pollinators.

The Portuguese delegate said that the fact that the *Meliponinae* had arrived in Portugal without the knowledge of the Nature Conservation Authorities (ICN) was regrettable and, consequently, there had been no assessment of the circumstances or preliminary study on the environmental impact. The amateur biologist who had conducted the experiment had not infringed the law, since in Portugal the law did not provide for the supervision of the introduction of non-indigenous species of fauna. The *Meliponinae* colonies, kept for the moment in experimental conditions, apparently did not constitute an ecological risk for the natural environment, to the extent that they could not invade European territory owing to their specific characteristics. The Nature Conservation Authorities were preparing an information file to be sent to the health authorities (*Direcção Geral da Pecuária*) and to the authorities responsible for beekeeping (*Instituto Florestal*) so that in future they could adopt a more prudent approach. Without being able to prevent them taking place for the time being, the ICN would carefully monitor the acclimatisation trials developed for species of exotic bees. In conclusion, she said that Portugal would endeavour to apply Article 11, 2(b) of the Bern Convention in a more effective manner; it was hoped that specific legislation on the introduction, capture and retention in captivity of non-indigenous species would be approved as soon as possible.

The Standing Committee thanked the Portuguese delegate for her explanations and accepted her proposal that the task of monitoring this case, as well as the adoption by Portugal of the legislation envisaged, should be entrusted to the Group of Experts on the Legal Aspects of the Introduction and the Reintroduction of Wildlife Species.

#### **- Trade in *Caretta caretta* carapaces (Senegal)**

T-PVS (96) 43 Secretariat Report

This concerns carapaces of *Caretta caretta* turtles (strictly protected species listed in Appendix II to the Bern Convention) which are being openly offered for sale in souvenir and gift shops in Senegal.

The delegate of Senegal informed the Committee that his government was highly conscious of the importance of marine turtles nesting on Senegalese coasts. Measures had been taken to protect the most relevant nesting beaches and to stop the illegal sale of carapaces.

The Committee expressed its satisfaction at the measures taken, wished that the problem may be completely solved soon and decided it was not necessary to deal with this question at its next meeting or to open a file.

#### **- *Caretta caretta* in Patara (Turkey)**

T-PVS (96) 53 and T-PVS (96) 53 Addendum 1 Report by MEDASSET

T-PVS (96) 62 Government Report

T-PVS (96) 65 On-the-spot appraisal

This issue concerns a beach which is important in terms of the reproduction of the sea turtle *Caretta caretta* (Appendix II to the Bern Convention) at Patara which, according to certain sources, is threatened by construction projects. Recommendation No 24 (1991) requested Turkey to put a stop to certain construction projects on the beach at Patara, and in fact put in place a management plan. The Secretariat had been informed by MEDASSET that several construction projects seriously threatened the beaches; however, the Turkish Delegate had presented a report showing that no particular threats existed in this region classified by Turkish legislation as a "specially protected area".

At its 15th meeting, the Standing Committee had decided to appoint an expert to examine the situation. A visit to the site took place between 21 and 23 August 1996. Mr Jean Lescure, Director of Research at the CNRS and the Zoology Laboratory (reptiles and amphibians) of the Natural History Museum in Paris, was instructed to produce an expert report. The visit took place in the presence of Mr Ergün Ergani, Director of Planning, and Mr Güner Ergun, Deputy Director of

Research at the Turkish Ministry of the Environment's Directorate of Specially Protected Areas.

Mr Lescure presented his report to the Standing Committee. In particular, he congratulated the Turkish authorities, especially the Ministry of the Environment's Directorate of Specially Protected Areas, for the measures already taken and the work carried out to protect the site used for laying eggs at Patara. He proposed various recommendations designed to enhance the protection provided.

The Turkish Delegate informed the Standing Committee of the interest which his Government had in nature conservation and of the importance which it attached to the conservation of sea turtles. His government has taken all actions and made all the necessary legal and administrative arrangements to protect nature in Patara. All the developments and implementations have been carried out in the framework of the Environmental Management Plan and of the Authority for the Protection of Special Areas (APSA).

The representatives of MEDASSET and WWF-International expressed their continuing concern as to the impact of tourism development and in particular buildings which had been illegally constructed. The two organisations were also particularly concerned about the construction of an airport in the Patara area which would considerably increase the number and impact of tourists.

The representative of WWF-International also wished it to be recorded that it took exception to the personal attacks on a member of staff of their Turkish partner organisation DHKD contained in the document T-PVS (96) 62 provided by the government of Turkey.

The Standing Committee made clear its interest in the activities conducted by the Turkish Government to support the preservation of sea turtles and adopted the recommendation on the conservation of *Caretta caretta* at Patara (Turkey). The Committee decided to open a case file so as to ensure that the Plan for the Development of the Specially Protected Area of Patara took account of the preservation of the species. It requested the Turkish authorities to provide information on the developments in the case at its 17th meeting.

#### **- *Trionyx triunguis* in Turkey**

The species is threatened in the Dalaman delta and in the Seyhan and Ceyhan lower rivers in the Goksu delta, as well as in the Dalyan delta. In all these four sites different threats (sewage, damage by powerboats, fish traps, urban development) put the species at risk.

The delegate of Turkey informed the Committee that the three most important sites for the species had been protected (one as a nature park and two as "Specially Protected Areas"), and that a project on the species was being launched.

The representative of SEH wished to see more action on there ground as his experience was that too often there was little implementation of well-meaning plans.

The Committee wished that management plans on the species might be drafted and implemented and asked Turkey to provide a report on the issue for its next meeting.

#### **- *Rana holtzi* in Turkey**

The species has been discussed by the Group of experts on amphibians and reptiles. It is an aquatic species restricted to only two sites in the world: lakes Karagöl and Cinegöl.

The delegate of Turkey informed the Committee that the species was not threatened and that some measures regarding habitat protection had been taken in the surrounding of those lakes.

The representative of SEH said that the water bodies of those lakes should be legally protected to avoid possible pollution problems.

The Committee wished that a report be presented on this issue at its next meeting.

**- Protection of Burdur Lake (Turkey)**

T-PVS (96) 35 Secretariat Report

Lake Burdur is threatened by the installation of an industrial complex in its vicinity. The lake is on the Ramsar Convention list of wetlands of international importance and is home *inter alia* to white-headed ducks *Oxyura leucocephala* (listed in Appendix II to the Bern Convention).

The BirdLife representative stressed the importance of this site, which did not quite come through in paper T-PVS (96) 35. As is noted in the new publication "Globally Threatened Birds in Europe" (which BirdLife hoped all delegates had now had and would spare time to study), Burdur Lake is the most important wintering site in the world for the White-headed duck (*Oxyura leucocephala*), with often over half of the world population present there in the winter months. Many other bird species occur on the lake in significant numbers, and there is also an endemic fish, *Aphanius burduricus*. For such an important site, and with such a complex development, we submit that the Standing Committee should keep an eye on this site by opening a file, and asking Turkey kindly to report at future meetings.

The delegate of Turkey said that his Government was planning to adopt all necessary measures to respect the ecological value of lake Burdur. A management plan was being drawn up for the lake, hunting had been prohibited since 1993 and the bird population had considerably increased (150 000 in 1993-1994, 200 000 in 1995 and 300 000 in 1996).

The Standing Committee thanked the delegate of Turkey for this information, and noted that a series of measures were currently being adopted. It therefore decided not to open a file on this matter, but asked the delegate of Turkey to submit a written report, at its 17th meeting, on the measures taken to control urbanisation and industrialisation in the area around the lake.

**- *Triturus cristatus* in Orton Bricks Pits site (United Kingdom)**

T-PVS (96) 36 Secretariat Report

This concerns the urbanisation of one of the most important breeding sites in the United Kingdom for *Triturus cristatus* (Orton Brick) and the transfer of the animals from their current site to another, specially-created one. Planning permission was granted for the area, which is to be developed. At the 15th meeting of the Standing Committee in January 1996, the United Kingdom delegate said that the matter was the subject of a letter from the European Commission prior to possible application of Article 169 of the Treaty establishing the European Community and that a reply was being prepared. The United Kingdom government was examining the biodiversity proposals made by the United Kingdom Biodiversity Steering Group, which included action plans for a number of threatened species in the country, including *Triturus cristatus*.

The delegate of the United Kingdom expressed the view of his government, namely that there was no breach of the Convention and that the ecological compensation measures taken assured a long term viability of an important newt population in the area through translocation.

The representative of SEH thought that the final population of newts would be much smaller and that compensation measures had not considered the use of a bridge when constructing a road that will destroy an important part of the site. In addition, the area to which the newts were being translocated was of new construction and the newts required and thrived in more mature areas.

The representative of WWF-International noted that the population threatened by the development was by far the most important in Europe (20 to 40 thousand newts), and that the principle of the Convention was to protect species "*in situ*", not translocate them to where they may not hinder development. The view of WWF-International was that compensation measures were at best a risk as there has been comparable translocation on this scale attempted and that there has been inadequate monitoring of the small scale translocations that have been attempted.

The Committee wished to see a report on this issue at its next meeting.

### 6.3 Information

The delegates of France, the Netherlands and Spain had presented information or written reports on the following cases:

- ? *Phoca vitulina* in the Somme Bay (France);
- ? *Lacerta agilis* (Netherlands);
- ? Wind powered generators in Tarifa (Spain);
- ? Dam of Itoiz (Spain);
- ? Gallocanta marshes (Spain).

Owing to lack of time the Standing Committee did not discuss the questions under item 6.3.

The representative of BirdLife International regretted the lack of time for discussing this very important agenda item, and hoped that this would not set a precedent for future meetings.

#### **- *Phoca vitulina* in the Somme Bay (France)**

T-PVS (96) 76 Secretariat Report

T-PVS (96) 89 Letter from the French Government

T-PVS (96) 91 *Communiqués* by *Collectif Somme Bay* and *Picardie Nature*

This concerns the problem of protecting the common seal (*Phoca vitulina*)(Appendix III to the Bern Convention) in the Somme Bay. The destruction of explosives, which was stopped in 1993, was resumed in 1995, and these activities have affected some animals.

**- *Testudo hermanni* in Maures (France)**

T-PVS (96) 77 Secretariat Report

T-PVS (96) 103 Document from the SNPN

Hermann's tortoise (*Testudo hermanni*) (Appendix II to the Bern Convention) is now only to be found in the massif of the Maures Plain, which is ecologically outstanding for both its flora and fauna and constitutes 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. The project has now been discarded and the site purchased by the Conservatory for Coastal and Lakeside Areas (*Conservatoire de l'espace littoral et des rivages lacustres*).

**- *Ursus arctos* in the Pyrenees (France)**

T-PVS (96) 78 Secretariat Report

At its 15th meeting, the Standing Committee expressed its continued interest in the preservation of the Pyrenean brown bear, and its habitat, in compliance with Article 4, paragraph 1, of the Bern Convention, and accepted the French offer to report back at the next meeting.

**- Missolonghi wetlands (Greece)**

T-PVS (96) 79 Secretariat Report

This issue concerns several development projects in Greece for which financial support has been sought from the European Community and which might have an adverse ecological impact on areas of great biological importance, including the Missolonghi wetlands. The Standing Committee has adopted Recommendation No. 38 (1992) on the conservation of the Missolonghi wetlands, Greece, in which it recommends that Greece ensure that an environmental impact assessment be carried out to consider the effect of the project on the species listed in the Appendices to the Convention, and that the proposal to divert the river Acheloos be subject to the findings of the impact assessment. At the Standing Committee's 14th meeting, the Greek delegate informed the Standing Committee that the State Council (Supreme Court) had cancelled the joint ministerial decision concerning the environmental conditions, and authorised, for the period 1991-1993, the technical works for the diversion to the Thessaly region of 1,100 million m<sup>3</sup> per year from the Acheloos river. The Secretariat had asked the Greek government to provide information and the text of the judgment.

The Greek delegate agreed at the 15th meeting of the Standing Committee to continue providing information on this matter in the spirit of cooperation, and the Committee urged the Greek government to submit a report for its next meeting, describing the state of affairs after the ruling by the Supreme Court and providing particular details on follow-up action to point 5 of Recommendation No. 38 (1992) on conservation of the Missolonghi wetlands, in which it recommended the government of Greece "to accelerate the process of delimitation of protected areas, including all areas of importance for species listed in Appendices I and II to the Convention".

**- Reptiles on Totes Moor, Lower Saxony (Germany)**

T-PVS (96) 80 Secretariat Report

This site contains two reptile species listed in Appendix II to the Convention (*Lacerta agilis* and *Coronella austriaca*). The area is subject to peat extraction, but a small site of 100 ha is to be developed for the purpose of reptile conservation. At its 15th meeting, the Standing Committee had noted that authorisation for the preservation of the site was due to be granted in spring 1996.

**- *Lacerta agilis* (Netherlands)**

T-PVS (96) 90 Report of the Government of the Netherlands

This concerns planned work which threatens to destroy the main habitat of the largest population of *Lacerta agilis* in the country if no precautionary measures are taken. At the 15th meeting of the Standing Committee, the SEH made a strong appeal for government action. The Secretariat received information from the government by letter dated 17 June 1996. The report of the 15th Standing Committee meeting stated that the delegate of the Netherlands would inform the Committee at its 16th meeting on any action taken on this matter.

**- Wind powered generators in Tarifa (Spain)**

T-PVS (96) 81 Secretariat Report

T-PVS (96) 94 Report by the Spanish Government

This case concerns a wind farm in Tarifa, where an additional ninety windmills are to be installed. The Spanish Ornithological Society (SEO) has claimed that the local chosen (*Sierra del Cabrito*) is inappropriate in view of its key position on migratory flyways. At its 15th meeting, the Standing Committee decided, in agreement with the Spanish delegate, to ask the Spanish government to submit a report for its next meeting on the impact which the Tarifa windmills were continuing to have on the griffon vulture (*Gyps fulvus*) population now that the waste dump that had attracted them had been removed.

**- Dam of Itoiz (Navarre, Spain)**

T-PVS (96) 82 Secretariat Report

T-PVS (96) 95 and 95 Addendum 1 Reports by the Spanish Government

This case concerns the plan to build a dam in Itoiz, which would probably have serious environmental effects, as it would flood through nature reserves (classified under regional law) of interest for birds. Populations of over one hundred and fifty protected species, some of them endangered, would be affected to varying degrees.

**- Agricultural projects in Gallocanta marshes (Spain)**

T-PVS (96) 83 Secretariat Report

T-PVS (95) 93 Report by the Spanish Government

The case concerns plans for the development of plots of agricultural lands which could affect the Gallocanta marshes, a resting area and site of major importance for the migration of cranes (*Grus grus*) (Appendix II to the Bern Convention). At its 15th meeting, the Standing Committee had decided to ask the Secretariat to write on its behalf to the Argon regional government indicating the very special importance which it attached to the Gallocanta wetlands and to the implementation of the regional plan to protect natural resources approved by decree 67/1995. It accepted the Spanish delegation's offer to keep it informed of developments at its next meeting. The Secretariat wrote to the Regional Government of Argon about these matters on 8 July 1996 and received information from the director general for the natural environment of the Argon Regional Government, in a letter dated 30 July 1996.

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

### **7. Organisation of work and financing of activities. Programme of activities for 1997**

T-PVS (96) 47 Draft programme of activities for 1997

The Secretariat presented a programme of activities for 1997 and informed the Standing Committee of the financial situation regarding implementation of the Programme of Activities for 1996.

The Secretariat explained that fairly substantial new voluntary contributions would be required to execute the draft budget, which was considerably larger than that for the previous year.

The delegate of France announced a major contribution to the setting up of the Emerald Network.

The Committee adopted the budget and programme of activities as reproduced in Appendix 15 to this report.

### **8. Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman**

Article 18.e of the Rules of Procedure read as follows: "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 be renewed, but the total length of term of office shall 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 Geko Spiridonov (Bulgaria) Chairman by 18 votes for, 1 blank vote and 1 invalid vote, out of 20 votes cast.

The Committee elected Mr Gerard Boere (Netherlands) Vice-Chairman by 16 votes for, 2 abstentions and 1 invalid vote, out of 19 votes cast.

Mr Spiridonov thanked the Contracting Parties for the trust they had placed in him and said that he was determined to take creative action to reinforce the Bern Convention. For instance, national committees might be set up. He assured participants that he was highly committed to the nature conservation cause.

The Standing Committee noted that the Bureau now consisted of Mr Spiridonov, Chairman, Mr Boere, Vice-Chairman, and Mr Haapanen, outgoing Chairman.

### **9. Date and place of the 17th meeting, adoption of the report and other business**

The Committee decided to hold its next meeting from 1 to 5 December 1997.

#### **Meetings to be attended by the Secretariat**

The Committee authorised the Secretariat to attend meetings of special relevance for the work of the Convention: meetings of coordination with Secretariats of Conventions on wildlife and biodiversity, PLANTA EUROPA coordination meetings, technical meetings of MedWet, meetings of Barcelona, Biological Diversity, Bonn, Bucharest and Ramsar Conventions, "Habitats" Directive meetings, European Environment Agency meetings and meetings connected with the implementation of the Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy. Assistance at other meetings may be authorised by the Chairperson on request.

#### **Adoption of the report**

The Committee adopted this report on Friday 6 December 1996.

#### **Other business**

##### ? **Norway**

The delegate of Norway mentioned procedural difficulties and asked the Bureau to prepare the agenda in such a way as to facilitate decision-making. She also requested that documents and reports be forwarded more expeditiously.

##### ? **Iceland**

The delegate of Iceland said that the report should also describe voting procedure. He also thought that consideration should be given to general developments in the Bern Convention since the Convention on Biological Diversity had come into force.

The Secretariat announced that the twentieth anniversary of the Bern Convention in 1999 might be an opportunity for considering these major issues.

##### ? **The Netherlands (declaration)**

"Mr Chairman, the Netherlands, acting as European Union chair *ad interim*, wishes to express its gratitude to the Standing Committee for its willingness to accept during this meeting the specific position of the European Union Commission and European Union chair, both having no formal mandate for negotiations.

The Netherlands will communicate the concern about this situation to the appropriate EU bodies and will undertake every action within its power to avoid a similar situation at further meetings of this Committee.

Furthermore: the Netherlands has already, in previous meetings, expressed its concern over the specific position of the European Union in relation to the work and functioning of the Standing Committee of the Bern Convention; for the file cases' procedure we will do this again towards the appropriate European Union bodies during our formal Presidency in the first half of 1997. We have no illusion that we can solve the specific formal and legal situation of the European Union but at least attempt to increase within the European Union the necessary awareness regarding its delicate position towards the functioning of the Bern Convention in general. Thank you, Mr Chairman."

##### ? **Societas Europaea Herpetologica**

The SEH delegate expressed NGO concerns about their exclusion from the European Union co-ordination meetings. Berne agenda items were being discussed with positions reached all without the benefit of an NGO input on data and any changes in situation. This contrasts unacceptably with the democratic debate encouraged in the Standing Committee of the Bern Convention. Relevant quotation was made to illustrate that such action conflicted with EU resolutions for NGO participation in the 5th Environment Programme (1992) and reflected in their Commission's recent review of same (1996). He said that the NGO's therefore requested reconsideration by the European Union and without which they would be forced to pursue the matter via the European Parliament.

##### ? **Agreement on the conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds (AEWA) (declaration of the delegate of the Netherlands)**

"The Netherlands, being the Interim Secretariat and Depository for the African Eurasian Waterbird Agreement wishes to inform the meeting that so far six countries have signed: Germany, Guinea, Ireland, the Netherlands, Switzerland and the United Kingdom Signing by Finland in imminent. We strongly invite other countries to sign and ratify the Waterbird Agreement.

Finally, I would like to draw your attention to the publication of the Flyway atlas for Anatidae, containing all species included in the first Action Plan of the Waterbird Agreement. It is our intention to facilitate the production of similar atlases for other species included in the Waterbird Agreement, notably waders, terns and gulls. Focal points for the Bonn Convention and Waterbird Agreement will automatically receive a copy. Further copies can be purchased from Wetlands International."

? **Monaco**

The delegate of Monaco mentioned the matter of ensuring that the Bern Convention was represented in meetings which the Secretariat was unable to attend. She also considered that the Bern Convention should seek ways of co-operating with the Convention on Biological Diversity. She mentioned in particular Resolution 214 of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the possibility of holding workshops on co-operation between conventions.

In connection with the Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans of the Mediterranean and Black Seas and the adjacent area of the Atlantic Ocean, adopted under the auspices of the Bonn Convention and signed in Monaco on 24 November 1996, the delegate of Monaco invited States Parties to the Bern Convention which had Mediterranean, Black Sea and adjacent Atlantic coastlines and States in the area of distribution and which had ships sailing under their flag conducting activities in the area covered by the Agreement liable to affect the state of conservation of cetaceans (within the meaning of Article 1.3.g of the Agreement) to sign this Agreement.

? **Protocol concerning Mediterranean Specially Protected Areas (declaration of the representative of the Secretariat of the RAC/SPA)**

"Concerning the inclusion of marine species of the Mediterranean region already included in the annexes to the Protocol concerning Specially Protected Areas and Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean into the Appendices of the Bern Convention, our Secretariat wishes to underline that while there are no contradictions between the provisions of the two instruments concerning the species in the annexes, the same provisions show on the other hand a good degree of complementarity. It is in this perspective of complementarity that we welcome the inclusion of these species into the Appendices of the Bern Convention.

We would like to take this opportunity to express our warm thanks to the concerned bodies of the Bern Convention for their support to our Secretariat throughout all the process of elaboration of the Barcelona Protocol and its annexes. We would like to mention in particular the participation of the Secretariat representative to the working group that elaborated the first draft of the Protocol, and the joint organisation of a meeting of experts on threatened species in the Mediterranean held in Montpellier in 1995, which is the origin of the process of identification of the species included in the annexes to the Barcelona Protocol and of the marine species included in the annexes to the Bern Convention for the Mediterranean region. Thank you for your attention."

? **Ukraine**

The delegate of Ukraine said that his country was greatly honoured to be allowed shortly to become a Contracting Party to the Bern Convention. He said that his country was determined to conduct an active policy in the nature conservation field. Lastly, he hoped that the Pan-European Ecological Network would be set up, and thanked the Netherlands Government for their support.

? **Hungary**

The delegate of Hungary expressed his interest in the proposal put forward by Monaco to intensify co-operation with the Convention on Biological Diversity.

\* \* \*

All the participants and the Secretariat General of the Council of Europe expressed their heart-felt thanks to the Chairman, Mr Haapanen, for the active role which he had played throughout

recent years in promoting the aims of the Bern Convention.

## LIST OF DOCUMENTS

## T-PVS (95)

- 2 Proposal by Cyprus to amend Appendix I adding the endemic *Centaurea akamensis*
- 15 rev Draft resolution on species requiring habitat protection measures
- 16 rev Draft resolution on endangered natural habitats requiring conservation measures
- 42 rev Convention's texts on habitat protection
- 48 Data sheets of plant species proposed by Bulgaria to amend Appendix I

## T-PVS (96)

- 4 Proposal from Italy to amend Appendix II (insects, amphibians and reptiles)
- 22 Chart of Signatures and Ratifications
- 27 Biennial Reports
- 27add1 Biennial Reports - Iceland
- 27add2 Biennial Reports - Sweden
- 27add3 Biennial Reports - Norway
- 27add4 Biennial Reports - Spain
- 27add6 Biennial Reports - European Community (for 1994)
- 28 4-year Reports
- 28add1 4-year Reports - Romania
- 28add2 4-year Reports - Portugal
- 28add3 4-year Reports - Spain
- 30 Draft recommendation on the introduction of non-native organisms
- 30add1 Observations of Monaco
- 31 Draft report on saproxylic invertebrates and their conservation throughout Europe
- 32 Report of Bureau meeting (May)
- 33 Report of group of experts on the conservation of invertebrates
- 34 Report of expert on Trebon Otter Project (Czech Republic)
- 35 Burdur lake (Turkey): Secretariat report
- 36 *Triturus cristatus* in Orton Bricks (United Kingdom): Secretariat report
- 37 Introduction of exotic bees in Portugal : Secretariat report
- 41 Planning activities in Porto (Greece): Secretariat report
- 43 Trade in *Caretta caretta* shells in Senegal: Secretariat report
- 44 Tourism development affecting *Caretta caretta* in Kaminia (Greece): Secretariat report
- 45 Tourism development in Akamas Peninsula (Cyprus): Secretariat report
- 47 Draft programme of activities for 1997
- 48 Proposal from Monaco to amend Appendices I, II and III for the Mediterranean Reg.
- 48 add Data sheets of species proposed for Monaco for the Mediterranean Region
- 49 Criteria for listing species into the Appendices
- 50 Report of group of experts on amphibians and reptiles
- 51 Proceedings of seminar on habitat conservation for invertebrates (Killarney, Ireland)
- 52 Habitat protection through private and voluntary systems:  
replies to questionnaire
- 53 Marine turtles in Patara: report by MEDASSET
- 54 Draft recommendation on the conservation of the otter
- 55 Seminar on incentive measures for the voluntary creation and management of protected areas - contributions
- 57 List of plant species proposed by Bulgaria to amend Appendix I
- 58 Road construction in Grünewald Forest (Luxembourg)
- 59 Draft agenda

- 60 Report of visit of expert on a leopard conservation project in Burkina Faso  
61 Rules of Procedure  
62 Marine turtles in Patara: report of the Turkish government  
63 Dorset Heathlands Progress 1993-94  
64 Report of Bureau meeting (October)  
65 Marine turtles in Patara: on-the-spot appraisal report  
66 Follow-up of recommendations  
67 Study on management of the beaver *Castor fiber*, in Europe  
68 Handbook on the management of the habitats of amphibians and reptiles  
69 Annotated draft agenda  
70 *Caretta caretta* in Zakynthos (Greece). Secretariat report  
71 Conservation of the Forest of Biltzheim: Secretariat report  
72 Slovak Republic: introductory report  
73 Lithuania: introductory report  
74 Report of group of experts on the Emerald Network  
75 Emerald Network: information document  
76 *Phoca vitulina* of Somme Bay (France): Secretariat report  
77 *Testudo hermanni* in Maures (France): Secretariat report  
78 *Ursus arctos* in Pyrenees (France): Secretariat report  
79 Missolonghi wetlands (Greece): Secretariat report  
80 Herpetiles in Totes Moor (Germany): Secretariat report  
81 Wind generators in Cadiz (Spain): Secretariat report  
82 Dam of Itoiz (Spain): Secretariat report  
83 Gallocanta wetlands (Spain): Secretariat report  
84 Akamas peninsula (Cyprus): MEDASSET document  
85 Kaminia (Greece): MEDASSET document  
86 *Caretta caretta* in Laganas Bay (Greece): MEDASSET document  
87 Report of Constantza (Romania) seminar  
88 Species requiring specific conservation measures: Comments received  
89 *Phoca vitulina* of Somme Bay (France): Government paper  
90 *Lacerta agilis* in the Netherlands: Government paper  
91 *Phoca vitulina* of Somme Bay (France): NGO paper  
92 Dorset heathlands (UK): SEH paper  
93 Gallocanta wetlands (Spain): Government paper  
94 Wind generators in Cadiz (Spain): Government paper  
95 Dam of Itoiz (Spain): Government paper  
96 Legal situation of the Zakynthos case (Greece): Report by expert  
97 Possible use of insurance systems to compensate for damage caused by wildlife  
98 *Caretta caretta* in Zakynthos (Greece): Document from Sea Turtle Protection Society  
99 Road construction in Grünwald Forest (Luxembourg). Report by Basler and lettre from ASRL  
100 Introduction of exotic bees (Portugal): Government paper  
101 *Caretta caretta* in Zakynthos (Greece). Report by expert  
-- European Red Book on threatened vertebrates (Freshwat. fish, amp & rept, mammals)  
-- Comparative analysis of efficiency of legislation protecting plants

#### Other documents

- STRA-BU (96) 8 report of meeting for the establishment of a European Action Programme for Threatened Species EUROSPECIES (Action Theme 11)  
STRA-FO (96) 6 Report of 1st meeting of the Council for the Pan-European Strategy

**APPENDICES TO DRAFT REPORT**

---

1. List of Participants
2. Agenda
3. Species added to Appendix II - Italian proposal
4. Species added to Appendix I- Bulgarian Proposal
5. Species added to Appendices I and II (for the Mediterranean) ? Monaco proposal.
6. Resolution No. 4 on endangered natural habitats requiring specific habitat conservation measures
7. Constantza Declaration on the "Year for the Conservation of the Mediterranean and Black Seas 1998"
8. Recommendation No. 50 on the conservation of *Margaritifera auricularia*
9. Recommendation No. 51 on action plans for invertebrate species in the Appendices of the Convention
10. Recommendation No. 52 on habitat conservation for invertebrate species
11. Recommendation No. 53 on the conservation of the European otter (*Lutra lutra*)
12. Recommendation No. 54 on conservation of *Caretta caretta* at Patara (Turkey)
13. Recommendation No. 55 on giving consideration to ZNIEFF (nature reserves of ecological interest for fauna and flora) in the development of projects for the Biltzheim Forest and the areas of Niffer and the Petit Landau (France)
14. Statements of participants
15. Programme of activities and budget for 1997

## APPENDIX 1

### LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

**Austria/Autriche** Ms Dipl. Ing. Monika PAAR, Umweltbundesamt, Spittelauer Lände 5, A-1090 VIENNA Tel. +43 1-31304 5456 Fax +43 1-31304 5400 (E)

**Belgium/Belgique** M. Alain CORDONNIER, Ministère de la Région wallonne, Direction générale des ressources naturelles et de l'environnement, Direction de la conservation de la nature et des espaces verts, 15 avenue Prince de Liège, B 5100 JAMBES  
Tel. +32 81 32 12 11 Fax +32 81 32 12 60 (F)

**Bulgaria/Bulgarie** Mr Geko SPIRIDONOV, Directeur, Office national pour la protection de la nature, Ministère de l'Environnement de Bulgarie, 67 W. Gladstone Str., 1000 SOFIA  
Tel. +359 2 981 66 11 Fax +359 2 981 33 84 (F)

#### Burkina Faso

**Cyprus/Chypre** Mr Konstantinos PAPAMICHAEL, Director of Game and Wildlife Service, Ministry of Interior, NICOSIA Tel. +357-2 30 32 59 Fax +357-2 45 34 65 (E)

**Denmark/Danemark** Mr Claus GOLDBERG, Biologist, Ministry of the Environment and Energy, Skov- og Naturstyrelsen, Haraldsgade 53, DK 2100 KØBENHAVN Ø (E)  
Tel. +45 39 47 2000 Telex 21485 NATURE DK Fax +45 39 27 9899 E-Mail CGO@SNS.DK

#### Estonia/Estonie

**European Community/Communauté européenne** M. Tanino DICORRADO, Coordinateur pour la Méditerranée, Direction générale environnement, sécurité nucléaire et protection civile (DG XI-A-5), Direction Affaires générales et internationales, Coopération technique avec les pays tiers, (TRMF 5/62), Commission européenne, 200 rue de la Loi, B 1049 BRUXELLES, Belgique (E/F)  
Tél. +32-2 2969147 Telex COMEU B 21877 Fax +32-2 299 4123

M. Olivier DIANA, Directive Habitats, Direction générale environnement, sécurité nucléaire et protection civile (DG XI/D2), (adr. adm: Triomflaan 174, B-1160 Brussels) Commission européenne, 200 rue de la Loi, B 1049 BRUXELLES, Belgique (E/F)  
Tel. +32 2 296 57 14 Telex comeu b 21877 Fax +32 2 296 95 56

M. Miguel AYMERICH, Direction générale environnement, sécurité nucléaire et protection civile (DG XI/B), Direction Instruments environnementaux, Unité Management et coordination des instruments financiers dans le domaine de l'environnement, évaluation des incidences sur l'environnement, (adr. adm. Av. Triomphe 174; TRMF - 2/9), Commission européenne, 200 rue de la Loi, B 1049 BRUXELLES, Belgique (F)  
Tel. +32 2 296 57 14 Telex comeu b 21877 Fax +32 2 296 95 56

M. Alessandro PICCIOLI, Direction Générale Pêche, Direction Structures et zones, dépendantes de la pêche, Commission européenne, 200 rue de la Loi, B 1049 BRUXELLES, Belgique (F)  
Tél. +32-2 295 9324 Fax +32-2 296 3033 E-mail Alessandro.Piccioli@DG14.CEC.BE

**Finland/Finlande** Mr Antti A.A. HAAPANEN (Chairman/Président), Deputy Director General, Ministry of the Environment, P.O. Box 399 (Korkeavuorenkatu 21), FIN 00121 HELSINKI(E) Tel. +358 9 1991 9330 Telex 123717 ymin sf Fax +358 9 1991 9364  
E-mail Antti.Haapanen@vyh.fi

Mr Christian KROGELL, Inspector General, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Dept of Fish and Game, (Hallituskatu 3A), PO Box 232, FIN 00171 HELSINKI (E)

Tel. +358 9 160 3373 Fax +358 9 160 2248

Ms Marina von WEISSENBERG, Senior Adviser, Ministry of the Environment, Korkeavuorenkatu 21, FIN 00120 HELSINKI (E)

Tel. +358 9 1991 9372 Fax +358 9 1991 9380 E-mail Marina.Weissenberg@vyh.fi

**France** Mme Véronique HERRENSCHMIDT, Ministère de l'Environnement, Direction Protection de la Nature, 20 avenue de Ségur, 75302 PARIS 07 SP (F)

Tel. 01 42 19 19 22 Fax: 01 42 19 19 79

Monsieur Henri JAFFEUX, Ministère de l'Environnement, Direction Protection de la Nature, 20 avenue de Ségur, 75302 PARIS 07 SP (F)

Tel. 01 42 19 19 14 Fax: 01 42 19 19 79

Prof. Jean LESCURE, Laboratoire de Zoologie (Reptiles & Amphibiens), Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, 57 rue Cuvier, 75005 PARIS, France (F)

M. le Professeur Charles-François BOUDOURESQUE, Directeur de l'UMR CNRS Dimar - 6540, "Diversité biologique et Fonctionnement des Ecosystèmes Marins", Station Marine d'Endonnie, rue de la Batterie des Lions, F-13007 MARSEILLE (F)

Tél. +33 4 9126 9130 Fax +33 4 9141 1265 E-mail boudour@com.univ-mrs.fr

**Germany/Allemagne** Dr Joachim WOIWODE, Administrator, Bundesministerium für Umwelt, Naturschutz und Reaktorsicherheit, Postfach 12 06 29, D 53048 BONN

Tel. +49 228 305 2632 Fax +49 228 305 2695 (E)

Ms Astrid THYSSSEN, Amtsärztin, Bundesministerium für Umwelt, Naturschutz und Reaktorsicherheit, Postfach 12 06 29, D 53048 BONN (E/F)

Tel. +49 228 305 2634 Fax +49 228 305 2697

Mr Gerold SCHENKEL, Landesanstalt für Umweltschutz, Baden-Württemberg, Grisbachstraße 3, D 76185 KARLSRUHE (F)

Tel. +49 721 983 1423 Fax 0049 721-983 1414

*Absent*

**Greece/Grèce** 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 30-1-6918487 / 30-1-8647420

Mr Christos CHRYSSOMALIS, Ministère de l'Environnement, de l'Aménagement du Territoire et des Travaux publics, 36 Trikalon Str., GR-11526 ATHENS (F)

Tel. 30-1-6917620 Telex 216028 DYPP GR Fax 30-1-69 18 487/30-1-69 26 426

**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. & Fax +36 1 17 56 458 Telex 22 61 15 Fax 36-1-17 57 457 E-mail gabor.nechay@ktm.x400gw.itb.hu

**Iceland/Islande** Dr Jón Gunnar OTTÓSSON, Director General, Icelandic Institute of Natural History, Hlemmur 3, 125 REYKJAVIK (E)  
Tel. 354 562 9822 Fax 354 551 5185 E-mail: ni@nattfs.is

#### **Ireland/Irlande**

**Italy/Italie** Prof. Emilio BALLETTTO, Dipartimento di Biologia Animale, Università do Torino, Via Accademia Albertina 17, I 10123 TORINO  
Tel. +39 11 8122 374 Fax +39 11 812 4561 (E/F)

Mr Mauro BERTELLETTI, Ministry of Agriculture and Food, Fishery Section, Via dell'arte 16, I-00144 ROMA (E) Tel. +39-6 6596 48279 Fax +39-6 5908 4176

**Liechtenstein** Mr Michael FASEL, Amt für Wald, Natur und Landschaft, St. Florinsgasse 3, FL 9490 VADUZ  
Tel. +41 75 236 64 05 Telex 888 290 Fax +41 75 236 64 11 (E)

**Luxembourg** Mme Marie-Paul KREMER, Ministère de l'Environnement, 18 Montée de la Pétrusse, L-2918 LUXEMBOURG-VILLE (F) *Apologised for absence/excusé*

M. Guy WEISS, Ministère de l'Environnement

M. Fernand PESCH, Ministère des Travaux Publics

M. Jean-Paul FELTGEN, Ministère de l'Environnement, 18 Montée de la Pétrusse, L 2918 LUXEMBOURG-VILLE (F)  
Tel. +352 478 6813 Fax +352 400 410 E-mail jean-paul.feltgen@life.lu

**Malta/Malte** Mr Alfred E. BALDACCHINO, Principal Environment Officer, Environment Protection Department, Ministry for the Environment, FLORIANA (E)  
Tel. 356 231557 / 231895 / 232022 Fax 356 241378 *Apologised for absence/excuse*

#### **Moldova**

**Monaco** Mme Marie-Christine VAN KLAVEREN, Chef de Division Patrimoine naturel, Département des Travaux publics et Affaires sociales, Service de l'Environnement, 3 Avenue de Fontvieille, MC 98000 MONACO (F)  
Tel (377) 93 15 81 49 / 93 15 89 63 Fax (377) 92 05 78 50 E-mail vanKlav@mc.fr  
E-mail. vanklave@unice.fr

**Netherlands/Pays-Bas** Dr Gerard C. BOERE, Senior Executive Officer International Affairs, Directorate for Nature, Forests, Landscape and Fauna, Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries, PO Box 20401, NL 2500 EK THE HAGUE (E)  
Tel. +31 70 379 3591/379 3007 Telex 32040 LAVI NL Fax +31 70 379 3751  
E-mail G.C.Boere@N.agro.nl

Drs Jan-Willem SNEEP, Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries, Department for Nature Management, PO Box 20401, NL 2500 EK THE HAGUE (E)  
Tel. +31 70 379 3255 Telex 32040 LAVI NL Fax +31 70-3351 485/3478 228

**Norway/Norvège** Ms Gunn M. PAULSEN, Directorate for Nature Management, Tungasletta 2, N 7005 TRONDHEIM (E)  
Tel. +47 73-580500/580833 / +47 73 58 08 33 Fax 47 73 91 54 33  
E-mail. Gunn.Paulsen@dnpost.md.dep.telemax.no

**Poland/Pologne** Dr Zygmunt KRZEMINSKI, Deputy Director, Dept of Nature Conservation, Ministry of Environmental Protection, Natural Resources and Forestry, ul. Wawelska 52/54, 00 922 WARSZAWA  
Tel. +48 22 25 62 04 Fax +48 22 25 47 05 (E) *Apologised for absence/excusé*

**Portugal** Mrs Ana Isabel QUEIROZ, Instituto da Conservação da Natureza, DSCN/DEP, Rua Filipe Folque 46-1º, P-1050 LISBOA (E/F)  
Tel. +351 1 352 3018 Fax +351 1 357 4771

#### Romania/Roumanie

**Senegal/Sénégal** 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 Fax +221 25 23 99

**Spain/Espagne** M. Borja HEREDIA ARMADA, ICONA, Gran Via de San Francisco 4, E-28005 MADRID tel. +34 1 34 76 109 Fax +34 1 34 76 301 (E)

**Sweden/Suède** Mr Torsten LARSSON, Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, S-10648 STOCKHOLM  
Tel. +46 8 698 13 91 Fax +46 8 698 14 02 E-mail. tol@environ.se (E)

Ms Lena BERG, Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, Blenholms terrassen 36, S-10648 STOCKHOLM  
Tel. +46 8 698 12 63 Fax +46 8 698 14 02 E-mail. lbe@environ.se (E)

**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 (OFEFP), Division principale Protection de la Nature et du Paysage, Hallwylstrasse 4, CH 3003 BERNE Tel. +41 31 322 80 64 Fax +41 31 322 99 81 (F)  
(Dès février/mars 1997, changement d'adresse)

**Tunisia/Tunisie** M. Fethi AYACHE, Chef de service des aires protégées, Ministère de l'Environnement et de l'Aménagement du Territoire, Centre Urbain Nord, Cité Essalama, 208 ARIANA (F) Tél. +216 1 704 000/216 1 703 770 Fax +216 1 704 340

**Turkey/Turquie** Mr Osman ERDEM, Section Chief, Ministry of Environment, Eskisehir Yolu 8 Km, 06530 ANKARA Tel. +90-312 287 9963 Fax +90- 312 286 22 71 (E)

Mr Faruk MORTAS, The Authority for the Protection of Special Areas (Özel Çevre Koruma Kurumu Ba\_kanli\_i, Koza Sokak 32, G.O.P., TR- 06700 ANKARA  
Tel. +90-312 441 2304 Fax +90- 312 440 8553 (E)

Mr Hülya ÖZBEK, Agriculture Engineer, Ministry of Environment, Eskisehir Yolu 8 Km, 06530 ANKARA Tel. +90-312 287 9963 Fax +90- 312 286 22 71 (E)

**United Kingdom/Royaume-Uni** Mr John L. ANGELL, Senior Executive Officer, European Wildlife Division, Department of the Environment, Room 902C, Tollgate House, Houlton Street, GB-BRISTOL BS2 9DJ

Tel. +44 117 987 8138 Telex 449321 Tolgte G Fax +44 117 987 8182 (E)

Mr Roger PRITCHARD, Head, European Wildlife Division, Department of the Environment, Room 917, Tollgate House, Houlton Street, GB BRISTOL BS2 9DJ (E)

Tel. +44 117 987 8178 Telex 449321 Tolgte G Fax +44 117 987 8587

Ms Deborah PROCTER, International Coordinator, Joint Nature Conservation Committee, Monkstone House, City Road, GB PETERBOROUGH PE1 1JY (E)

Tel. +44-1733-62626 850 Fax +44-1733-555 948

**Albania/Albanie**

**Andorra/Andorre**

**Czech Republic/République Tchèque**

**Latvia/Lettonie**

**Lithuania/Lituanie** Mr K\_stutis BALEVI\_IUS, Ministère de la Protection de l'Environnement, rue A. Juozapaviciaus 9, LT-2600 VILNIUS Tel. +370 2 7277 86 Fax +370 2 72 0 20 (F)

**Russia/Russie** M. Sergueï NIKIFOROV, Consellor, Legal Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 54 Arbat Str., MOSCOW (E) Tel. +7 095 241 07 08 Fax +7 095 241 11 66

Mr Peter BOGDANOV, Director, Dept. for International Cooperation, Ministry for Environment Protection and Natural Resources, Russian Federation, GSP, ul. B. Gruzinskaya 4/6, MOSCOW 123812, Russie (E) *Apologised for absence/excusé*

Tel. 7 (095) 254 34 83 Telex 411692 BOREI RU Fax 7-095/254-82-83

**Slovakia/Slovaquie** Mme Jana ZACHAROVA, Ministry of Environment of the Slovak Republic, Department of Nature and Landscape Protection, Námestie L. Stura 1, 812 35 BRATISLAVA (E)  
Tel. +42 7 516 22 11 Fax +42 7 516 23 67 (temporarily)

**Slovenia/Slovénie**

**"the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"/l'"ex-République yougoslave de Macédoine"**

**Ukraine** Mr Yaroslav MOVCHAN, Vice-Minister for Environmental Protection & Nuclear Safety, 5 Khreshchatyk str., 252601 KYIV - 1 (E)

Tel. +380 44 226 2430 Fax +380 44 228 2922 E-mail: movchan@mep.FreeNet.Kiev.UA

**Algeria/Algérie**

**Belarus/Bélarus**

**Bosnia-Herzegovina/Bosnie-Herzégovine**

**Croatia/Croatia**

**Holy See/Saint Siège** *Apologised for absence/Excusé*

**Mauritania/Mauritanie**

**Morocco/Maroc**

**Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development/ Organisation de Coopération et de Développement Economiques (OECD/OCDE)** *Apologised for absence/excusé*

**Economic Commission for Europe/Commission Economique pour l'Europe (UN-ECE/ONU-CEE)** *Apologised for absence/excusé*

**United Nations Environment Programme / Programme des Nations Unies pour l'Environnement (UNEP/PNUE)** *Apologised for absence/excusé*

**United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organisation / Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'Education, la Science et la Culture (UNESCO)** *Apologised for absence/excusé*

**European Environment Agency/Agence Européenne pour l'Environnement**

Ms Ulla PINBORG, European Environment Agency, Kongens Nytorv 6, DK 1050 COPENHAGEN K, Danemark (E)  
Tel. +45 33 36 7100 Fax +45 33 36 71 99 E-mail Ulla.Pinborg@eea.dk

M. Juan M. DE BENITO, European Topic Centre on Nature Conservation/Centre Thématique Européen pour la Conservation de la Nature, Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 57 rue Cuvier, 75231 PARIS Cedex 05, France (F)  
Tél. +33 (1) 40 79 38 70 Fax +33 (1) 40 79 38 67 E-mail: ctecn.info@mnhn.fr

**Secretariat of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (Bonn) / Secrétariat de la Convention sur la conservation des espèces migratrices appartenant à la faune sauvage (Bonn) (UNEP/CMS : PNUE/CMS)**

Mr Arnulf MÜLLER-HELMBRECHT, Coordinator, UNEP/CMS, Martin-Luther-King Str. 8, D-53175 BONN, Allemagne (E) *Apologised for absence/excusé*  
Tel. +49 228 815 2401/2 Fax +49 228 815 2449 E-mail cms@unep.de

**Secretariat of the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar) / Secrétariat de la Convention relative aux zones humides d'importance internationale particulièrement comme habitats des oiseaux d'eau (Ramsar)**  
**Secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) / Secrétariat de la Convention sur le commerce international des espèces de faune et de flore sauvages menacées d'extinction (CITES)** *Apologised for absence/excusé*

**Secretariat of the Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution (Barcelona)/Secrétariat de la Convention pour la protection de la mer Méditerranée contre la pollution (Barcelone)**

Mr Marco BARBIERI (RAC/SPA, Tunis)

**Secretariat of the Protocol concerning Mediterranean Specially Protected Areas (Geneva) / Secrétariat du Protocole relatif aux aires spécialement protégées de la Méditerranée (Genève)**

Mr Marco BARBIERI, Regional Activity Centre for Specially Protected Areas (RAC/SPA) (Geneva Protocole), 15 rue Ali Ibn Abi Taleb, Cité Jardins, 1002 TUNIS - B.P. 24, Tunisie (E)  
Tel. +216 1 795 760 Fax +216 1 797 349

**Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (Rio de Janeiro)/Secrétariat de la Convention sur la diversité biologique (Rio de Janeiro)**

**The World Conservation Union / L'Union mondiale pour la nature (IUCN/UICN)**

Mr Cyrille de KLEMM, Chief Scientist, 21 rue de Dantzig, F 75015 PARIS, France (F)  
(voir aussi SFDE) Tel. +33 01 45 32 26 72 Fax +33 01 45 33 48 84

**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 (E)  
Tel. +44 1483 426 444 Telex 859602 Fax +44 1483 426 409

**World Conservation Monitoring Centre / Centre mondial de surveillance continue de la conservation de la nature (WCMC)**

*Apologised for absence/excusé*

**BirdLife International** Mr John O'SULLIVAN, International Treaties Officer, BirdLife, c/o The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB), The Lodge, GB SANDY Beds. SG19 2DL, Grande-Bretagne (E)

Tel.+44 1767 680 551 Telex 82469 Fax +44 1767 683 211 E-mail john.osullivan @rspb.org.uk

**Federation of Field Sports Associations of the EU/Fédération des Associations de Chasseurs de la UE (FACE)** Dr Yves LECOCQ, Secrétaire Général, FACE, Rue F. Pelletier 82, B-1030 BRUXELLES, Belgique (F)

Tel. +32 (02) 732 69 00 Fax +32 (02) 732 70 72 E-mail: face.europe@infoboard.be

Mme Karin MEINE, Research Assistant, FACE, Rue F. Pelletier 82, B-1030 BRUXELLES Belgique (F)

Tel. +32 -2 732 69 00 Fax +32 2 732 70 72 E-mail: face.europe@infoboard.be

M. Philippe JAEGER, Public Affairs Officer, FACE, Rue F. Pelletier 82, B-1030 BRUXELLES Belgique (F)

Tel. +32 (02) 732 69 00 Fax +32 (02) 732 70 72 E-mail: face.europe@infoboard.be

**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, Président, "Le Cochetay", Thier des Forges, 85, B 4140 GOMZE ANDOUMONT, Belgique (E)

Tel. +32 4 368 40 21 Fax +32 4 368 40 15 E-mail C.deCoune@infoboard.be

**Mediterranean Association to Save the Sea Turtles (MEDASSET)**

Mrs Lily VENIZELOS, President MEDASSET, c/o 24 Park Towers, 2 Brick St., GB LONDON W1Y 7DF, Grande Bretagne Tel. +44 171 62 90 654 (E)

Fax (Athens) +30-1 7243007 / 30-1 3613572 E-mail medasset@hol.gr

Dr Max KASPAREK, Scientific Committee of MEDASSET, 1 Bleichstr., 69120 HEIDELBERG, Allemagne Tel. + 49 6221 47 50 69 Fax +49 6221 47 18 58 (E)

Mr Kurt-Michael HERZOG, (MEDASSET), Hobsweg 22d, D-53125 BONN-Röttgen (E)  
Tel. + Fax +49 228 250 943

**Societas Europaea Herpetologica (SEH)** Dr Keith F. CORBETT, SEH Conservation Chair, c/o Herpetological Conservation Trust, 655A Christchurch Road, Boscombe, GB BOURNEMOUTH Dorset BH1 4AP, Grande Bretagne (E)  
Tel. +44 -1202 391319 Fax +44-1202 392785

**EUROGROUP for Animal Welfare** Mr Bjarne CLAUSEN, EUROGROUP for Animal Welfare, 13 rue Boduognat, B-1000 BRUSSELS, Belgique (E)  
Tel. +32 -2 231 13 88 Fax +32 -2 230 17 00

### European Habitats Forum

### European Environmental Bureau / Bureau européen de l'environnement (EEB/BEE)

### Wetlands International

**The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds / Société royale pour la protection des oiseaux (RSPB)** see/voir BirdLife International

**Swiss League for Nature Protection / Ligue suisse pour la protection de la nature (LSPN)** Dr Urs TESTER, Ligue suisse pour la protection de la nature, (Wartenbergstr. 22, CH 4052 BASEL) Case postale, CH-4020 BASEL, Suisse (F)  
Tel. +41-61 317 91 91 N° direct /317 91 36 Fax +41-61 317 91 66

**French Society for Environmental Law / Société française pour le droit de l'environnement (SFDE)** Mme Claude-Hélène LAMBRECHTS, Secrétaire Générale, Société française pour le droit de l'environnement, 11 rue Maréchal Juyin - BP 68, 67046 STRASBOURG CEDEX, France Tel. 03 88 14 30 42 Fax 03 88 14 30 44 (F)

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

### National Angling Union of France / Union nationale pour la pêche en France

Mme Françoise PESCHADOUR, Union nationale pour la pêche en France, 17 rue Bergère, F-75009 PARIS, France Tél. 48 24 96 00 Fax 48 01 00 65 (F) *Apologised for absence/excusé*

M. Jacques ARRIGNON, Conseiller, Union nationale de la pêche en France, (1) 24 rue de la 8e Division, F-60200 COMPIEGNE, (2) UNPF, 17 rue Bergère, F 75009 PARIS, France (1) Tél. +33 44 20 17 33 Fax +33 44 86 69 50 *Apologised for absence/excusé*  
(2) Tel. +33 1 48 24 96 00 Fax +33 1 48 01 00 65 (F)

M. Marcel CARABIN, vice-président, Fédération du Bas-Rhin pour la pêche et la protection du milieu aquatique, 17 rue Bergère, 75009 PARIS, France (F)  
Tél. +33 1 48 24 96 00 Fax +33 1 48 01 00 65

**National society for nature protection of France / Société nationale de protection de la nature et d'acclimatation de France (SNPN)** M. Jean-François ASMODÉ, Vice-Président, Société nationale de protection de la nature, B.P. 405, F-75221 PARIS CEDEX 05, France  
Tél. +33 1 47 07 31 95 (F)

**Study, Research and Conservation Centre for Environment in Alsace / Centre d'étude, de recherche et de protection de l'environnement en Alsace**  
M. Gérard BAUMGART, Président, Centre d'étude, de recherche et de protection de l'environnement en Alsace, 10 rue de Touraine, 67100 STRASBOURG, France (F)  
Tél. +33 3 88 39 24 96 Fax +33 3 88 39 42 74

M. Guy HILDWEIN, (Centre d'étude, de recherche et de protection de l'environnement en Alsace), 1 avenue d'Alsace, 67000 STRASBOURG (F)  
Tel. +33 3 88 45 52 01 Fax +33 3 88 45 52 09

**Zakynthian Ecological Movement (ZOK)** Mr Eleftherios LEVANTIS, Zakynthian Ecological Movement, ZOK, Ag Charalambis, GR 29100 ZAKYNTOS, Grèce  
Tel. +30 1 3231876 Fax +30-1 3232330 E-mail elan@lls.fovthnet.gr (E)

**France-Nature-Environnement (FNE)** M. Maurice WINTZ, Membre du Bureau de FNE, responsable de son réseau Milieux Naturels, ALSACE NATURE, 18 rue du 22 novembre, 67000 STRASBOURG, France Tel. 03 88 32 91 14 Fax 03 88 25 52 66 (F)

M. Frédéric DECK, Membre du directoire du réseau Nature de FNE, ALSACE NATURE, 18 rue du 22 novembre, 67000 STRASBOURG, France  
Tel. 03 88 37 07 58 Fax 03 88 25 52 66 (F)

**CLRAE/CPLRE** *Apologised for absence/excusé*

## **PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY / ASSEMBLEE PARLEMENTAIRE**

### **CONSULTANTS**

Mr Alfred FROMENT, Chargé de cours, Unité d'écologie terrestre, Université de Liège, Domaine du Sart Tilman - Bât. B.22, B-4000 LIEGE, Belgique (F)

Prof. Jean LESCURE, Laboratoire de zoologie (Reptiles & Amphibiens), Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, 57 rue Cuvier, 75005 PARIS, France (F)

Mr Marc ROEKAERTS, Ringlaan 57, B-3530 HOUTHALEN, Belgique (E/F)  
Tel. +32 11 52 67 05 Fax +32 11 60 24 59

### **SECRETARIAT**

**Council of Europe / Conseil de l'Europe**  
**Directorate of Environment and Local Authorities / Direction de l'Environnement et des Pouvoirs Locaux, F-67075 STRASBOURG CEDEX, France**  
Tel. +33 (0)3 88 31 20 00 Fax +33 (0)3 88 41 27 81 / 82 / 83

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 FERNÁNDEZ-GALIANO, Environment Conservation and Management Division / Division de la Protection et de la Gestion de l'Environnement  
Tel. +33 03 88 41 22 59 Fax +33 03 88 41 37 51 / 27 84 E-mail: eladio.galiano@dela.coe.fr

Mme Maguelonne DÉJEANT-PONS, Environment Conservation and Management Division / Division de la Protection et de la Gestion de l'Environnement  
Tel. +33 03 88 41 23 98 Fax +33 03 88 41-37 51 / 27 84

M. Pedro CERVERA RUIZ, Jurist, avda. Torres n° 49, 9°E, E 50008 ZARAGOZA, Espagne  
Tel. +34 (76) 499898 Fax +34 (76) 231854 (E)

Ms Marion VERSCHUREN, Stagiaire and Animal management student, Havenstraat 14, 9712TA GRONINGEN, The Netherlands  
Tel et Fax: +31 50 3185386 (E)

## 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 (Lithuania, Slovakia, Tunisia)**
3. **Development of the Convention**
  - 3.1 Strategic issues. Role of the Convention in the implementation of the Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy
  - 3.2 States to be invited as observers to the 17th meeting
4. **Legal aspects**
  - 4.1 Amendment of the Appendices
    - Proposal from Cyprus on Cyprus endemic *Centaurea akamantis* (Appendix I)
    - Proposal from Italy concerning amphibians, reptiles and insects (Appendix II)
    - Proposal from Bulgaria concerning plants (Appendix I)
    - Proposal from Monaco on marine species in the Mediterranean (Appendices I, II and III)
    - Proposal from Turkey concerning *Vipera barani* (Appendix II)
    - Criteria on listing of species in the Appendices of the Convention
  - 4.2 Biennial reports
  - 4.3 General 4-year reports
  - 4.4 Follow-up of recommendations
  - 4.5 Draft recommendation on introduction of non-indigenous species
  - 4.6 Draft recommendation on the protection and management of habitats through private or voluntary systems

\* Items for information:

- Seminar on incentive measures to create and manage protected areas on a voluntary basis
- Comparative analysis of the efficiency of legislation protecting plants
- Report on the introduction of non-native plants

**PART II ? THREATENED SPECIES AND HABITATS****5. Threatened species and habitats**

## ? Habitats

- 5.1 Development of Resolution No. 3 (Emerald network) and of Recommendations Nos. 14, 15 and 16 on habitat conservation

## ? Fauna and Flora

- 5.2 Group of experts on the conservation of amphibians and reptiles  
 5.3 Group of experts on conservation of invertebrates  
 5.4 Draft recommendation on the conservation of the otter (*Lutra lutra*)

## \* Items for information

- Report on the conservation of hamsters
- Follow up of Action Plans for Globally threatened Birds
- European Red List of Threatened Vertebrates
- Report on the beaver

**PART III ? SPECIFIC SITES****6. Specific sites**

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

## 6.2 Possible new files:

- Akamas Peninsula (Cyprus)
- Clearance project in Biltzheim forest (France)
- *Vipera lebetina schweizeri* in Milos (Greece)
- *Caretta caretta* in Kaminia (Greece)
- Urbanisation of Porto biotope (Greece)
- *Testudo marginata* in Greece
- Road construction in the Grünewald forest (Luxembourg)
- Introduction of exotic bees (Portugal)
- Trade in *Caretta caretta* carapaces (Senegal)
- *Caretta caretta* in Patara (Turkey)
- *Trionyx triunguis* in Turkey
- *Rana holtzi* in Turkey
- Protection of Burdur Lake (Turkey)
- *Triturus cristatus* in Orton Bricks Pits site (United Kingdom)

---

\* Items for information. No decision required. Not to be discussed unless proposed by a Party at the adoption of the agenda

6.3 Information on the following issues:

- *Phoca vitulina* in the Somme Bay (France)
- *Testudo hermanni* in Maures (France)
- *Ursus arctos* in the Pyrenees (France)
- Missolonghi wetlands (Greece)
- Reptiles on Totes Moor, Lower Saxony (Germany)
- *Lacerta agilis* (Netherlands)
- Wind powered generators in Tarifa (Spain)
- Dam of Itoiz (Navarre, Spain)
- Agricultural projects in Gallocanta marshes (Spain)

**PART IV ? WORK PROGRAMME AND OTHER ITEMS**

- 7. Organisation matters and financing of activities. Programme of activities for 1997**
- 8. Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman**
- 9. Date and place of the 17th meeting, adoption of the report and other business**

**APPENDIX 3**

**List of species added to Appendix II of the Bern Convention**

Amphibians

*Neurergus strauchi*  
*Neurergus crocatus*  
*Rana holtzi*  
*Discoglossus montalentii*

Reptiles

*Trionyx triunguis*  
*Rafetus euphraticus*  
*Lacerta clarkorum*  
*Coluber cypriensis*  
*Natrix megalcephala*  
*Vipera albizona*  
*Vipera pontica*  
*Vipera wagneri*

Insects (Butterflies):

*Polyommatus humedasaе*  
*Polyommatus galloi*

## APPENDIX 4

### List of Eastern European species added to Appendix I of the Bern Convention

#### PTERIDOPHYTA

##### OPHIOGLOSSACEAE

2. *Botrychium matricariifolium* A. Braun ex Koch
3. *Botrychium multifidum* (S. G. Gmelin) Rupr.

##### ANGIOSPERMAE

##### AMARYLLIDACEAE

5. *Narcissus angustifolius* Curt.

##### ASCLEPIADACEAE

6. *Vincetoxicum pannonicum* (Borhidi) Holub

##### BORAGINACEAE

7. *Onosma polyphylla* Lebed.
8. *Onosma tornensis* Javorka
9. *Myosotis praecox* Hulphers

##### CAMPANULACEAE

10. *Campanula abietina* Griseb. et Schenk.
11. *Campanula gelida* Kovanda
12. *Campanula lanata* Friv.
13. *Campanula romanica* Savul.

##### CARYOPHYLLACEAE

14. *Cerastium alsinifolium* Tausch
15. *Dianthus hypanicus* Andrz.
16. *Dianthus nitidus* Waldst. et Kit.
17. *Dianthus serotinus* Waldst. et Kit.
18. *Dianthus urumoffii* Stoj. et Acht.
19. *Minuartia smejkalii* Dvorakova
20. *Moehringia hypanica* Grynj. et Klok.
21. *Moehringia jankae* Griseb. ex Janka
22. *Silene cretacea* Fisch. ex Spreng.

##### CISTACEAE

23. *Helianthemum arcticum* (Grosser) Janch.

##### COMPOSITAE

24. *Achillea glaberrima* Klok.
25. *Achillea thracica* Velen.
26. *Andryala levitomentosa* (E. I. Nayardy) P. D. Sell
27. *Anthemis trotziana* Claus ex Bunge.
28. *Carlina onopordifolia* Besser
29. *Centaurea dubjanskyi* Iljin.
30. *Centaurea jankae* Brandza
31. *Centaurea pineticola* Iljin.
32. *Centaurea pontica* Prodan & E. I. Nayardy
33. *Centaurea pseudoleucolepis* Kleop
34. *Dendranthema zawadskyi* (Herb.) Tzvel.
35. *Lagoseris purpurea* (Willd.) Boiss.
36. *Serratula tanaitica* P. Smirn.

## CRUCIFERAE

38. *Alyssum borzaeanum* E. I. Nayardy
39. *Armoracia macrocarpa* (Waldst. & Kit.) Kit. ex Baumg.
40. *Aurinia uechtriziana* (Bornm.) Cullen et T. R. Dudley
41. *Brassica sylvestris* (L.) Mill. subsp. *taurica* Tzvel.
42. *Cochlearia polonica* Frohlich
43. *Crambe koktebelica* (Junge) N. Busch.
44. *Crambe litwinonowii* K. Gross.
45. *Draba dorneri* Heuffel
46. *Erysimum pieninicum* (Zapal.) Pawl.
47. *Lepidium turczaninowii* Lipsky.
48. *Schivereckia podolica* (Besser) Andrz.
49. *Thlaspi jankae* A. Kern

## ERICACEAE

51. *Vaccinium arctostaphylos* L.

## GESNERIACEAE

52. *Haberlea rhodopensis* Friv.

## GRAMINEAE

53. *Bromus moesiacus* Velen.
55. *Poa granitica* Br.- Bl.
56. *Poa rhiphaea* (Ascherson et Graebner) Fritsch
57. *Stipa danubialis* Dihoru & Roman
58. *Stipa syreistschikowii* P. Smirn.

## IRIDACEAE

59. *Gladiolus felicis* Mirek

## LABIATAE

61. *Teucrium lamiifolium* D'Urv.

## LEGUMINOSAE

62. *Astragalus aitosenis* Ivanisch.
63. *Astragalus kungurensis* Boriss.
64. *Astragalus peterfii* Jav.
65. *Astragalus physocalyx* Fischer
66. *Astragalus psedopurpureus* Gusul.
67. *Astragalus setosulus* Gontsch.
68. *Astragalus tanaiticus* C. Koch.
70. *Genista tetragona* Bess.
71. *Hedysarum razoumovianum* Fisch. et Helm.
72. *Trifolium banaticum* (Heuffel) Majovsky

LILIACEAE

- 73. *Allium regelianum* A. Beck.
- 74. *Colchicum davidovii* Stef.
- 75. *Colchicum fominii* Bordz.
- 76. *Fritillaria graeca* Boiss.
- 77. *Fritillaria montana* Hoppe.
- 79. *Lilium jankae* A. Kerner
- 80. *Lilium rhodopaeum* Delip.
- 81. *Tulipa hungarica* Borbas

LINACEAE

- 82. *Linum dolomiticum* Borbas

NAJADACEAE

- 83. *Caulinia tenuissima* (A. br. ex Magnus) Tzvel.

OLEACEAE

- 84. *Syringa josikaea* Jacq. fil.

ORCHIDACEAE

- 86. *Himantoglossum caprinum* (Bieb.) C. Koch.
- 94. *Orchis punctulata* Stev. ex Lindl.
- 95. *Steveniella satyrioides* (Stev.) Schlechter.

PAEONIACEAE

- 96. *Paeonia officinalis* L. subsp. *banatica* (Rochel) Soo
- 97. *Paeonia tenuifolia* L.

POLYGONACEAE

- 98. *Rheum rhaponticum* L.

PRIMULACEAE

- 99. *Cyclamen coum* Mill.
- 100. *Cyclamen kuznetzovii* Kotov et Czernova.
- 102. *Primula deorum* Velen.
- 103. *Primula frondosa* Janka
- 104. *Primula wulfeniana* Scot subsp. *baumgarteniana* (Degen & Moesz) Ludi

RANUNCULACEAE

- 106. *Aconitum flerovii* Steinb.
- 107. *Aconitum lasiocarpum* (Reichenb.) Gáyer
- 108. *Anemone uralense* Nevski.
- 109. *Pulsatilla grandis* Wend. (*Pulsatilla halleri* (All.) Willd. subsp. *grandis* (Wend.) Meikle)
- 110. *Pulsatilla slavica* G. Reuss

ROSACEAE

- 112. *Geum bulgaricum* Panc.
- 113. *Potentilla emilii-popii* E. I. Nayardy
- 115. *Potentilla silesiaca* Uechtr.

RUBIACEAE

- 116. *Galium cracoviense* Ehrend.
- 117. *Galium moldavicum* (Dobrescu) Franco
- 118. *Galium rhodopeum* Velen.

SCROPHULARIACEAE

- 119. *Linaria loeselii* Schweigger
- 120. *Pedicularis sudetica* Willd.
- 121. *Verbascum purpureum* (Janka) Huber-Morath
- 122. *Veronica euxina* Turritt
- 123. *Veronica turrilliana* Stoj. et Stef.

THYMELACEAE

- 124. *Daphne arbuscula* Celak.

VALERIANACEAE

- 125. *Centranthus kellererii* (Stoj. Stef. et Georg.) Stoj. et Stef.

UMBELLIFERAE

- 126. *Ferula orientalis* L.
- 127. *Ferula sadleriana* Ledebour

## APPENDIX 5

### List of species added to the Appendices of the Bern Convention (for the Mediterranean)

#### Appendix I

##### Phanerogamia

*Cymodocea nodosa* (for the Med.)

*Posidonia oceanica* (for the Med.)

*Zostera marina* (for the Med.)

##### Algae

*Caulerpa ollivieri* (for the Med.)

*Cystoseira amentacea* (inclus var. *stricta* et  
var. *spicata*) (for the Med.)

*Cystoseira mediterranea* (for the Med.)

*Cystoseira sedoides* (for the Med.)

*Cystoseira spinosa* (inclus *C. adriatica*) (for  
the Med. )

*Cystoseira zosteroides* (for the Med.)

*Goniolithon byssoides* (for the Med.)

*Laminaria rodriguezii* (for the Med.)

*Laminaria ochroleuca* (for the Med.)

*Lithophyllum lichenoides* (for the Med.)

*Ptilophora mediterranea* (for the Med.)

*Schimmelmannia schousboei* = *S. ornata* (for  
the Med.)

#### Appendix II

##### Porifera

*Asbestopluma hypogea* (for the Med.)

*Aplysina cavernicola* (for the Med.)

*Axinelle polyploides* (for the Med.)

*Petrobiona massiliana* (for the Med.)

##### Cnidaria

*Astroides calycularis* (for the Med.)

*Errina aspera* (for the Med.)

*Gerardia savaglia* (for the Med.)

##### Echinodermata

*Asterina pancerii* (for the Med.)

*Centrostephanus longispinus* (for the Med.)

*Ophidiaster ophidianus* (for the Med.)

##### Molluscs

*Charonia rubicunda* (= *C. lampas* =  
*C. nodiferum*) (for the Med.)

*Charonia tritonis* (= *C. seguenziae*) (for the  
Med.)

*Dendropoma petraeum* (for the Med.)

*Erosaria spurca* (for the Med.)

*Gibbula nivosa* (for the Med.)

*Lithophaga lithophaga* (for the Med.)

*Luria lurida* (= *Cypræa lurida*) (for the Med.)

*Mitra zonata* (for the Med.)

*Patella ferruginea* (for the Med.)

*Patella nigra* (for the Med.)

*Pholas dactylus* (for the Med.)

*Pinna pernula* (for the Med.)

*Ranella olearia* (for the Med.)

*Schilderia achatidea* (for the Med.)

*Tonna galea* (for the Med.)

*Zonaria pyrum* (for the Med.)

##### Crustacea

*Ocypode cursor* (for the Med.)

*Pachyplasma giganteum* (for the Med.)

##### Fish

*Acipenser sturio* (for the Med.)

*Aphanius fasciatus* (for the Med.)

*Aphanius iberus* (for the Med.)

*Carcharodon carcharias* (for the Med.)

*Hippocampus ramulosus* (for the Med.)

*Hippocampus Hippocampus*(for the Med.)

*Huso huso* (for the Med.)

*Lethenteron zanandrai* (for the Med.)

*Pomatoschistus canestrinii* (for the Med.)

*Pomatoschistus tortonesei* (for the Med.)

##### Mammals

*Balænoptera acutorostrata* (for the Med. )

*Balænoptera borealis* (for the Med.)

*Kogia simus* (for the Med.)

*Mesoplodon densirostris* (for the Med.)

*Physeter macrocephalus* (for the Med.)

##### Reptiles

*Trionyx triunguis* (for the Med.)

**APPENDIX 6**

Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife  
and Natural Habitats

Standing Committee

**Resolution No. 4 (adopted 6 December 1996) listing endangered natural habitats requiring specific conservation measures**

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 its Resolution No. 1 (1989) on the provisions relating to the conservation of habitats,

Having regard to its Recommendation No. 14 (1989) on species habitat conservation and on the conservation of endangered natural habitats,

Acknowledging that for Contracting Parties which are Member States of the European Union the list of natural habitats requiring specific conservation measures corresponds to Annex I of the Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora,

Resolves to identify the natural habitats listed in Annex I to this resolution as endangered natural habitat types requiring specific conservation measures. (Selected habitats are marked with the sign !)

Resolves to update periodically Annex I to this resolution.

ANNEX I

ENDANGERED NATURAL HABITAT TYPES

**1. COASTAL AND HALOPHYTIC COMMUNITIES**

**11. OCEAN AND SEAS, MARINE COMMUNITIES**

**11.2 Benthic communities**

- ! 11.22 Sublittoral soft seabeds
- ! 11.24 Sublittoral rocky seabeds and kelp forests
- ! 11.25 Sublittoral organogenic concretions
- ! 11.26 Sublittoral cave communities
- ! 11.27 Soft sediment littoral communities

**! 11.3 Sea-grass meadows**

**11.4 Brackish sea vascular vegetation**

- ! 11.42 Marine spike-rush beds

**12. SEA INLETS AND COASTAL FEATURES**

**! 12.7 Sea-caves**

**13. ESTUARIES AND TIDAL RIVERS**

**! 13.2 Estuaries**

**! 14. MUD FLATS AND SAND FLATS**

**15. SALTMARSHES, SALT STEPPES, SALT SCRUBS, SALT FORESTS**

**15.1 Annual salt pioneer swards**

- ! 15.1132 Venetian glasswort swards
- ! 15.114 Iberian glasswort swards
- ! 15.115 Continental glasswort swards
- ! 15.13 Sea-pearlwort communities
- ! 15.14 Central Eurasian crypsoid communities

**15.3 Boreo-nemoral coastal salt meadows**

- ! 15.32 Atlantic lower schorre communities
- ! 15.33 Atlantic upper schorre communities
- ! 15.34 Atlantic brackish saltmarsh communities

**! 15.4 Suboceanic inland salt meadows**

**! 15.5 Mediterranean salt meadows**

**! 15.6 Mediterraneo-Nemoral saltmarsh scrubs**

**! 15.7 Mediterraneo-Canarian xero-halophile scrubs**

**! 15.8 Mediterranean salt steppes**

**! 15.9 Mediterranean gypsum scrubs**

**! 15.A Continental salt steppes and saltmarshes**

- 16. COASTAL SAND DUNES AND SAND BEACHES**
- ! 16.2 **Dunes**
- ! 16.3 **Humid dune-slacks**
- 17. SHINGLE BEACHES**
- ! 17.3 **Sea kale communities**
- 1A. COASTAL AGROSYSTEMS**
- ! 1A.1 **Machair**
- 2. NON-MARINE WATERS**
- ! 21. **COASTAL LAGOONS**
- 22. STANDING FRESH WATER**
- 22.1 Permanent ponds and lakes**
- ! 22.11 Lime-deficient oligotrophic waterbodies
- 22.3 Amphibious communities**
- ! 22.31 Euro-Siberian perennial amphibious communities
- 22.32 Euro-Siberian dwarf annual amphibious swards
- ! 22.321 Dwarf spike-rush communities
- ! 22.322 Dune-slack centaury swards
- 22.323 Dwarf toad-rush communities
- ! 22.3232 Small galingale swards
- ! 22.3233 Wet ground dwarf herb communities
- 22.34 Mediterraneo-Atlantic amphibious communities
- ! 22.341 Short Mediterranean amphibious swards
- ! 22.342 Tall Mediterranean amphibious swards
- ! 22.344 *Serapias* grasslands
- 22.35 Central Eurasian amphibious communities
- ! 22.351 Pannonic riverbank dwarf sedge communities
- 22.4 Euhydrophyte communities**
- 22.41 Free-floating vegetation
- ! 22.412 Frogbit rafts
- ! 22.413 Water-soldier rafts
- ! 22.414 Bladderwort colonies
- ! 22.415 Salvinia covers
- ! 22.416 Aldrovanda communities
- 22.43 Rooted floating vegetation
- 22.431 Floating broad-leaved carpets
- ! 22.4316 Sacred lotus beds
- 22.432 Shallow-water floating communities
- ! 22.4321 Water crowfoot communities
- ! 22.4323 Water violet beds
- ! 22.44 Chandalier algae submerged carpets
- ! 22.5 **Turlough and lake-bottom meadows**
- 23. STANDING BRACKISH AND SALT WATER**
- ! 23.1 **Athalassal saline lakes**

- ! 23.3      **Salt lake islands**
- 24.      **RUNNING WATER**
- ! 24.2      **River gravel banks**
- ~~3.~~      **SCRUB AND GRASSLAND**
- 31.      **TEMPERATE HEATH AND SCRUB**
- ! 31.1      **European wet heaths**
- ! 31.2      **European dry heaths**
- ! 31.3      **Macaronesian heaths**
- 31.4      **Alpine and boreal heaths**
- 31.42      Alpenrose heaths
- ! 31.424      Carpathian Kotschy's alpenrose heaths
- ! 31.425      Balkan Kotschy's alpenrose heaths
- ! 31.46      *Bruckenthalia* heaths
- ! 31.7      **Hedgehog-heaths**
- 31.8      **Western Eurasian thickets**
- 31.8B      South-eastern deciduous thickets
- ! 31.8B1      Pannonic and sub-Pannonic thickets
- 32.      **SCLEROPHYLLOUS SCRUB**
- 32.2      **Thermo-Mediterranean shrub formations**
- ! 32.22      Tree-spurge formations
- ! 32.24      Palmetto brush
- ! 32.25      Mediterranean pre-desert scrub
- ! 32.26      Thermo-Mediterranean broom fields (*retamares*)
- ! 32.2B      Cabo de Sao Vicente brushes
- ! 33.      **PHRYGANA**
- 34.      **STEPPEs AND DRY CALCAREOUS GRASSLANDS**
- 34.1      **Middle European pioneer swards**
- 34.11      Middle European rock debris swards
- ! 34.112      Houseleek communities
- ! 34.2      **Lowland heavy metal grasslands**
- ! 34.3      **Dense perennial grasslands and middle European steppes**
- ! 34.5      **Mediterranean xeric grasslands**
- ! 34.9      **Continental steppes**
- ! 34.A      **Sand steppes**
- 35.      **DRY SILICEOUS GRASSLANDS**

- 35.1 Atlantic mat-grass swards and related communities**
- ! 35.11 Mat-grass swards
- ! 35.7 Mediterraneo-montane mat-grass swards**
- 37. HUMID GRASSLAND AND TALL HERB COMMUNITIES**
- 37.1 Lowland tall herb communities**
- ! 37.13 Continental tall herb communities
- ! 37.14 Eastern nemoral tall herb communities
- ! 37.2 Eutrophic humid grasslands**
- ! 37.3 Oligotrophic humid grasslands**
- ! 37.4 Mediterranean tall humid grasslands**
- 37.7 Humid tall herb fringes**
- 37.71 Watercourse veils
- ! 37.711 *Angelica archangelica* fluvial communities
- ! 37.712 *Angelica heterocarpa* fluvial communities
- ! 37.713 Marsh mallow screens
- 38. MESOPHILE GRASSLANDS**
- 38.2 Lowland high meadows**
- ! 38.25 Continental meadows
- 4. FORESTS**
- 41. BROAD-LEAVED DECIDUOUS FORESTS**
- ! 41.1 Beech forests**
- ! 41.2 Oak-hornbeam forests**
- ! 41.4 Mixed ravine and slope forests**
- ! 41.5 Acidophilous oak forests**
- ! 41.6 *Quercus pyrenaica* forests**
- ! 41.7 Thermophilous and supra-Mediterranean oak woods**
- ! 41.8 Mixed thermophilous forests**
- ! 41.H Euxino-Hyrcanian mixed deciduous forests**
- 42. TEMPERATE CONIFEROUS FORESTS**
- 42.1 Western Palaeartic fir forests**
- ! 42.15 Southern Apennine silver fir forests
- ! 42.16 Southern Balkan silver fir forests
- ! 42.17 Balkano-Pontic fir forests
- ! 42.19 Afro-Asian fir forests
- 42.2 Western Palaeartic orogenous spruce forests**

- ! 42.21 Alpine and Carpathian sub-alpine spruce forests
- ! 42.22 Inner range montane spruce forests
- ! 42.23 Hercynian subalpine spruce forests
- 42.24 Sub-Mediterranean Norway spruce forests
- ! 42.241 Rhodope spruce forest
- ! 42.243 Montenegrine spruce forest
- ! 42.244 Paeonian spruce forest
- ! 42.245 Balkan Range spruce forest
- ! 42.27 Omorika spruce forests
- ! 42.28 Oriental spruce forests

**42.3 Alpine larch-arolla forests**

- ! 42.31 Eastern Alpine siliceous larch and arolla forests
- ! 42.32 Eastern Alpine calcicolous larch and arolla forests
- ! 42.35 Carpathian larch and arolla forests
- ! 42.36 *Larix polonica* forests

**42.4 Mountain pine forests**

- ! 42.41 Rusty alpenrose mountain pine forests
- ! 42.42 Xerocline mountain pine forests

**42.5 Western Palaearctic Scots pine forests**

- ! 42.51 Caledonian forest
- 42.52 Middle European Scots pine forests
- 42.523 Western Eurasian steppe pine forest
- ! 42.5232 Sarmatic steppe pine forest
- ! 42.5233 Carpatian steppe pine forests
- ! 42.5234 Pannonic Scots pine steppe woods
- 42.54 Spring heath Scots pine forests
- ! 42.542 Carpatian relict calcicolous Scots pine forest
- ! 42.5C South-eastern European Scots pine forests
- ! 42.5F Ponto-Caucasian Scots pine forests

**42.6 Black pine forests**

- ! 42.61 Alpino-Appennine *Pinus nigra* forests
- ! 42.62 Western Balkan *Pinus nigra* forests
- ! 42.63 Salzman's pine forests
- ! 42.64 Corsican laricio pine forests
- ! 42.65 Calabrian laricio pine forests
- ! 42.66 Banat and Pallas' pine forests

**! 42.7 High oro-mediterranean pine forests**

**42.8 Mediterranean pine woods**

- 42.81 Maritime pine forests
- ! 42.811 Charente pine-holm oak forests
- ! 42.812 Aquitanian pine-cork oak forests
- ! 42.814 Iberian maritime pine forests
- ! 42.82 Mesogean pine forests
- ! 42.83 Stone pine forests
- 42.84 Aleppo pine forests
- ! 42.841 Iberian Aleppo pine forests
- ! 42.842 Balearic Aleppo pine forests
- ! 42.843 Provenço-Ligurian Aleppo pine forests
- ! 42.844 Corsican Aleppo pine woods
- ! 42.845 Sardinian Aleppo pine woods
- ! 42.846 Sicilian Aleppo pine woods
- 42.847 Italic Aleppo pine forests

- ! 42.8471 Gargano Aleppo pine forests
- ! 42.8472 Metapontine Aleppo pine forests
- ! 42.8473 Umbrian Aleppo pine forests
- ! 42.848 Hellenic Aleppo pine forests
- ! 42.849 Illyrian Aleppo pine forests
- ! 42.84A East Mediterranean Aleppo pine forests
- ! 42.85 Aegean pine forests

**! 42.9 Canary Island pine forests**

**! 42.A Western Palaearctic cypress, juniper and yew forests**

**! 42.B Western Palaearctic cedar forests**

**44. TEMPERATE RIVERINE AND SWAMP FORESTS AND BRUSH**

**! 44.1 Riparian willow formations**

**! 44.2 Boreo-alpine riparian galleries**

**! 44.3 Middle European stream ash-alder woods**

- 44.4 Mixed oak-elm-ash forests of great rivers**
  - ! 44.41 Great medio-European fluvial forests
  - ! 44.43 South-east European ash-oak-alder forests
  - ! 44.44 Po oak-ash-alder forests
- ! 44.5 Southern alder and birch galleries**
- 44.6 Mediterraneo-Turanian riverine forests**
  - ! 44.66 Ponto-Sarmatic mixed poplar riverine forest
  - ! 44.69 Irano-Anatolian mixed riverine forests
- ! 44.7 Oriental plane and sweet gum woods**
- ! 44.8 Southern riparian galleries and thickets**
- 44.9 Alder, willow, oak, aspen swamp woods**
  - 44.91 Alder swamp woods
  - 44.911 Meso-eutrophic swamp alder woods
  - ! 44.9115 Eastern Carpathian alder swamp woods
  - ! 44.914 Steppe swamp alder woods
- ! 44.A Birch and conifer mire woods**
- ! 44.B Euxino-Hyrcanian wet ground forests**
- ! 45. TEMPERATE BROAD-LEAVED EVERGREEN FORESTS**
- 5. BOGS AND MARSHES**
- 51. RAISED BOGS**
  - ! 51.1 Near-natural raised bogs
- ! 52. BLANKET BOGS**
- 53. WATER-FRINGE VEGETATION**
  - ! 53.3 Fen-sedge beds
- 54. FENS, TRANSITION MIRES AND SPRINGS**
  - 54.1 Springs**
    - ! 54.12 Hard water springs
  - ! 54.2 Rich fens
  - ! 54.3 Arcto-alpine riverine swards
  - 54.4 Acidic fens**
    - 54.42 Black-white-star sedge fens
    - ! 54.426 Peri-Danubian black-white-star sedge fens
  - ! 54.5 Transition mires
  - ! 54.6 White beak-sedge and mud bottom communities

! 54.8 Aapa mires

! 54.9 Palsa mires

! 54.A Polygon mires

6. **INLAND ROCKS, SCREES AND SANDS**

61. **SCREES**

61.3 **Western Mediterranean and thermophilous screes**

61.31 Peri-Alpine thermophilous screes

! 61.313 Paris Basin screes

! 64. **INLAND SAND DUNES**

! 65. **CAVES**

9. **WOODED GRASSLANDS AND SCRUBS**

91. **PARKLANDS**

! 91.2 Dehesa

! 93. **WOODED STEPPE**

## APPENDIX 7

### CONSTANTZA DECLARATION

**on the  
"Year for the Conservation of the Mediterranean and Black Seas 1998",  
adopted on 2 October 1996  
by the Seminar on incentive measures  
for the voluntary creation and management of protected areas**

*The participants* at the "Seminar on incentive measures for the voluntary creation and management of protected areas" organised by the Council of Europe in collaboration with the Ministry of Water, Forests and Environment of Romania from 29 September to 2 October 1996,

*Having taken note* of the proposal to proclaim 1998 as the "Year for the Conservation of the Mediterranean and Black Seas", adopted on 12 July 1996 in Istanbul by the participants in the First Interparliamentary Conference on the Environmental Protection of the Black Sea, organised by the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe and the Parliamentary Assembly of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation (PABSEC);

*Call* for the promotion of a common policy to improve the environmental situation of the integrated Black Sea-Mediterranean Sea system, including the Sea of Marmara, in the general interest of the Mediterranean and Black Sea populations, with a view to publicising at all levels the threats to the two Seas, and encouraging the active concern of the populations of all European countries and of the southern shore of the Mediterranean;

*Express* thus their wish that action be taken by the Bern Convention of 19 September 1979 on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats and Bucarest Convention of 21 April 1992 on the Protection of the Black Sea against pollution in order to protect the coastal and marine biodiversity of the Black Sea;

*Emphasise* moreover that measures for the voluntary protection of natural areas in particular can make an especially useful contribution to the conservation of coastal and marine areas.

## APPENDIX 8

Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife  
and Natural Habitats

Standing Committee

**Recommendation No. 50 (adopted on 6 December 1996) on the conservation of *Margaritifera auricularia***

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;

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

Recalling that *Margaritifera auricularia* is listed in Appendix II of the Convention, even if it had not been observed and was thought to be extinct for 80 years;

Recalling its Recommendation No. 35 (1992) on the conservation of some species of invertebrates listed in Appendix II of the Convention in which Spain is invited to survey and take appropriate means to protect *Margaritifera auricularia*;

Congratulating the government of Spain for having undertaken research actions that have resulted in the discovery of a population of *Margaritifera auricularia*, a species thought to be presumably extinct and of which no living specimen had been found since 1917;

Desirous to contribute to the implementation of the Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy and, in particular to its actions regarding threatened species;

Concerned that the only known colony of the species has been found in a canal (*canal Imperial de Aragón*) which has been subject in the last fifty years to a process of cementation in a good part of its length and which is periodically dragged, both actions being largely incompatible with the survival of the species;

Having been informed of plans to floor the canal to improve its efficiency for water transport;

Being aware that the presence of the species in the bed of the river Ebro, in Catalonia, has been ascertained;

Taking account of the serious risk of extinction of the species,

Recommends Spain to:

? establish, as a matter of urgency, recovery plans for the species as foreseen in the Spanish conservation law for species which are endangered;

? give appropriate protection and management to the sites where the species survives;

? carry out a full survey of the canal Imperial and appropriate sites in the river Ebro and tributaries (especially the river Jalon);

? promote research on relevant aspects of the biology and conservation of the species giving special attention to the identification of host freshwater fish species;

? consider carrying out a captive breeding and re-introduction programme.

Recommends member states of the European Union to:

? consider listing *Margaritifera auricularia* in Annex II of the Directive on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora, taking into account the fact that when the Directive was adopted no living population of the species was known.

Recommends France and Italy to carry out surveys to search for the species in sites where it is known to have occurred.

**APPENDIX 9**

Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife  
and Natural Habitats

Standing Committee

**Recommendation No. 51 ( adopted on 6 December 1996) on action plans for invertebrate species in the Appendices of the Convention**

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 1, paragraph 2 of the convention requires Contracting Parties to give particular emphasis to the conservation of endangered and vulnerable species;

Noting that some invertebrate species listed in the Appendices of the convention 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 invertebrates;

Recalling its own recommendations concerning the conservation of invertebrates, in particular the following recommendations

- ? No. 18 (1989) on the protection of indigenous crayfish in Europe,
- ? No. 21 (1991) on the conservation of insects of the order *Hymenoptera* and their habitats,
- ? No. 22 (1991) on the conservation of the pearl mussel (*Margaritifera margaritifera*), and other freshwater mussels (*Unionoidea*),
- ? No. 29 (1991) on the conservation of wetland invertebrates,
- ? No. 35 (1992) on the conservation of some species of invertebrates listed in Appendix II of the Convention,
- ? No. 36 (1992) on the conservation of underground habitats;

Recommends that Contracting Parties to the Convention or invites other states, as appropriate, to consider (or, if appropriate, reinforce) recovery plans for endangered endemic species and for species listed in Appendix A to this recommendation.

A P P E N D I X A

1. First priority species

INSECTA

*Odonata*

Leucorrhinia pectoralis

Ophiogomphus cecilia

Stylurus flavipes

*Coleoptera*

Graphoderus bilineatus

Osmoderma eremita

*Lepidoptera*

Coenonympha hero

Coenonympha oedippus

Hypodryas maturna

Maculinea nausithous

Maculinea teleius

Parnassius mnemosyne

CRUSTACEA

*Decapoda*

Austropotamobius pallipes

**Molluscs/Mollusques**

BIVALVIA

*Unionoida*

Margaritifera auricularia

Margaritifera margaritifera

2. Second priority species

INSECTA

*Odonata*

Coenagrion mercuriale

Leucorrhinia albifrons

Leucorrhinia caudalis

Oxygastra curtisii

*Coleoptera*

Buprestis splendens

Dytiscus latissimus

*Lepidoptera*

Lopinga achine

Maculineaalcon

Maculinea arion

Maculinea rebeli

## APPENDIX 10

Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife  
and Natural Habitats

Standing Committee

### **Recommendation No. 52 (adopted on 6 December 1996) on habitat conservation for invertebrate species**

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 Recommendation (86) 10 of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe concerning the Charter on invertebrates;

Recalling that diversity of invertebrate species accounts for most of the animal diversity of Europe;

Recalling that 81 species of invertebrates are listed in the Appendices to the convention;

Considering that habitat protection and habitat management are useful conservation tools as regards the preservation of invertebrate species;

Noting, however, that many invertebrate species are dependent on the presence of some features of their natural habitats, like dead wood, hedges or small wetlands which are of no particular interest for vertebrate species and the conservation of which tends to be neglected;

Desirous to promote the conservation of invertebrate diversity,

Recommends Contracting Parties to:

1. Establish conservation or recovery plans for threatened invertebrate species, particularly those in the Appendices of the convention; use in that context habitat conservation and habitat management measures; while designing those plans take into account the specificities of invertebrate conservation, in particular the need to preserve metapopulations and to conserve a mosaic of interrelated habitats which are all needed to maintain species in a favourable conservation status;
2. While protecting habitats, pay particular attention to the preservation of ecosystems which are of great importance for invertebrate conservation on the European side: marine ecosystems, old growth deciduous forests, wetlands, Mediterranean-type ecosystems; ecosystems which are isolated geographically or ecologically are of a particular importance for endemic species (islands, caves, high mountain ecosystems, hyperhaline habitats, very dry ecosystems);
3. Encourage that management of habitats be done in such a way that particular attention be given to the preservation of some landscape features (dead wood, small brooks, hedges, etc) which permit the creation of microhabitats fundamental to the survival of many invertebrate species;

4. Survey natural habitats for invertebrate fauna, making an extensive inventory of invertebrate species, with special attention to rare and endemic species; encourage sampling of under-sampled biotopes like swamps, summits, canopy, underground ecosystems and hyperhaline biotopes;
5. Promote research in habitat measures needed for invertebrate conservation.

**APPENDIX 11**

Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife  
and Natural Habitats

Standing Committee

**Recommendation No. 53 (adopted on 6 December 1996) on the conservation of the European  
otter (*Lutra lutra*)**

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 the otter is strictly protected in Appendix II of the Bern Convention,

Noting that the otter is at the peak of the food pyramid of wetland ecosystems protected by the Ramsar Convention and that, as such, its presence may be taken as a good indication of good wetland quality,

Noting that the first cause for the decline of the Western European otter *Lutra lutra* is habitat loss and degradation and, particularly, biocides,

Recalling the European Water Charter, adopted by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe as Resolution (1967) 10,

Recalling Resolution (1977) 8 of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on the protection of lake shores and river banks,

Recalling Recommendation (1981) 8 of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on sport and physical recreation and nature conservation in inland water areas,

Noting that cooperation and exchange of experiences among European states is necessary to obtain success in pan-European otter conservation,

Noting that otters need for their survival areas of wetland and riverine ecosystems in a satisfactory conservation status and that their conservation cannot be restricted to protected areas,

Noting that organochlorine residues are suspected to have a negative impact on otter populations,

Taking into account the objectives of the 1995 European Nature Conservation Year, which were to promote conservation of wildlife and natural habitats outside protected areas proper;

Recommends Contracting Parties and invites non-Contracting Parties to implement, in collaboration with scientists and conservation institutions, the following measures, as appropriate, in order to reach or maintain a favourable conservation status of the otter population:

## I. INSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS

1. Establish if appropriate at a national level an otter conservation programme aimed at preserving healthy otter populations, both to secure the species where it is abundant and to promote the natural recovery of areas from which it disappeared or where is declining.

2. Establish if appropriate at the national level an otter conservation programme aimed at the recovery of declining populations, for the different geographical areas of the state concerned.

3. Carry out bilateral and multilateral programmes of otter conservation involving states of Eastern and Western Europe, to enhance cooperation and the exchange of experiences throughout the continent.

4. Ratify the Bern and Ramsar Conventions as they protect the otter and its habitat.

## II. HABITAT PROTECTION

### 1. General

1.1 Identify processes and categories of activities that are having or are likely to have significant adverse impact on otter habitats.

1.2 Eliminate or adapt legal mandatory rules and incentives that have a significant adverse impact on otter habitats (such as compulsory clearing of river banks).

1.3 Identify and promote incentives for actions which may improve the environmental quality of otter habitats, such as measures against water pollution, natural reforestation of river banks, adaptation of roads to otter crossing, improvement of native fish stocks, etc.

1.4 Consider as a potential otter habitat sites in which:

? fresh water is present all year round, or a part of the year, with shores and banks that do not freeze even in hard winters;

? food is available throughout the year (fish, crayfish and amphibians);

? water pollution is not high;

? part of the river bank or the lake bank contains enough vegetation (bushes, trees, reed-beds, etc.) to provide resting and breeding areas;

? land use on the river banks is not intensive;

? otters are not subjected to direct killing by man.

## 2. River banks, lake shores sea shores, and fish ponds

2.1 Consider, as appropriate, making environmental impact assessment compulsory on any work affecting significantly the natural character of wetlands and their associated ground waters, such as building of dams, canals, channelling of rivers, water pumping stations, drainage or important changes in the land use of the river basin.

2.2 Avoid as far as possible artificialisation and channelling of rivers and streams.

2.3 Conserve natural vegetation of river banks, recommending its restoration where it is degraded and avoiding agricultural practices in the zone close to the water; avoid the clearing of trees along the banks of streams and their alteration for rafting, especially in some states of Eastern Europe.

2.4 Avoid, as far as possible, the use of pesticides and fertilisers harmful to freshwater ecosystems within a safety zone.

2.5 Restore as far as possible degraded river banks and lake shores; eliminate as far as possible artificial elements from river banks; modify, if appropriate, canals to improve their naturalness, both in the water flow, aspect and structure (eliminating in particular their strict linearity along straight lines and square angles).

2.6 Avoid intense tourist use of lakes, rivers and streams; regulate tourist use and encourage the establishment of recreational activities at suitable distances from the banks, thus reducing the pressures.

2.7 Conserve, as appropriate, dense thickets of vegetation and potential holts close to sites where freshwater is present throughout the year, within 1.5 Km of marine rocky coasts inhabited by marine feeding otters.

## 3. Water quality, quantity and flow

3.1 Adopt and implement efficient anti-pollution policies to improve water quality in freshwater and brackish ecosystems, avoiding in particular pollution from PCBs, other chlorinated pesticides and Hg from industrial sources.

3.2 Control in particular industrial effluents into natural freshwater ecosystems; pay special attention to the strict control of small local factories in some states of Central and Eastern Europe.

3.3 Avoid significant reductions in water quantity due to excessive pumping for agricultural activities or other purposes, maintaining as far as possible ecological flows, particularly where water resources are scarce. In Mediterranean Europe particular efforts should be made to prevent water pumping from stream pools during the dry season, for these are important refuges to fish and thus crucial to the maintenance of fish populations.

3.4 Maintain, as far as possible, the natural flow of rivers, avoiding unnecessary regulation.

3.5 Ensure that methods of water management of rivers affected by dams and reservoirs minimise artificial sudden changes of water level; ensure that minimum "ecological" flows are respected, particularly in Mediterranean countries; ensure that migration of fish, otter and other animals can happen where dams have been built.

4. Food

4.1 Regulate commercial fishing activities to avoid overfishing.

4.2 Promote the creation of river and wetland reserves where fishing activities are severely restricted.

4.3 Check regularly the level of fish resources in areas of importance for otters, limiting temporary exploitation if fish populations are low.

5. Direct killing or accidental mortality

5.1 Control poaching of otters, of other semi-aquatic mammals (beavers, musk-rats) and of fish, as illegal traps and nets may produce significant killing of otters.

5.2 Promote fishing methods that have otter-avoiding devices; ensure that no fishery is allowed to operate using methods that present risks to otter survival or movement.

5.3 Avoid, as far as possible, building new roads close to water bodies.

5.4 Build passages adapted to otter use on roads crossing rivers or in areas where otters are known to cross roads where traffic is intense enough to cause deaths; ensure that such passages have a dry, non floodable corridor.

5.5 Limit speed in areas known to be of particular importance as otter crossings.

5.6 Avoid, as far as possible, giving permits to kill otters causing damage to fish farms, and promote the establishment of systems which prevent otter attacks; evaluate more precisely the extent of damage caused by otters to fish farms, in relation to the fish species bed, the location and characteristics of the fish farm and the availability of alternative natural prey; evaluate the effectiveness of the use of different preventive measures to exclude predators.

### III. ECOLOGICAL NETWORKS

1. In the design of otter conservation policies, give priority to habitat conservation and restoration to build an inter-connected pan-European network of otter habitats which permits a genetic and population flow.

2. Establish a coordinated pan-European programme to implement the above-mentioned point; in such a programme the following elements need to be considered of importance:

? identification of threats to otters in the various regions, particularly these where otters are rare or have disappeared in recent years;

? identification of areas that could be considered as strongholds of the species and as a nucleus for further expansion;

? identification of areas that may be recolonised by the species;

? identification of areas that may act as corridors among isolated otter populations and which should be considered as candidates for priority action.

3. Designate for appropriate management, protection or restoration, areas of importance for

otters, integrating them in the various existing international networks or those being created in Europe (Nature 2000, Ramsar sites, Biogenetic Reserves, EECONET Areas, etc.); check presence of otters in those networks; evaluate them to identify whether the existing international schemes cover important otter areas.

4. Create a European register of sites of importance for otter conservation, linked to existing European information systems such as CORINE.

#### IV. RESEARCH AND MONITORING

##### 1. General

1.1 Promote common research programmes between Eastern and Western Europe.

1.2 Promote in particular small international projects (e.g. single visits) aided by "seed money" for national or other small agencies, so that larger international projects may be conceived and designed.

1.3 Promote contacts between otter experts from different disciplines (genetics, computer modelling, GIS technology, fish biology, etc.); ensure that such specialists are attracted to otter workshops.

##### 2. Field research

2.1 Promote standardisation and tightening of the methodology for monitoring otters; promote the comparison of results obtained from different assessment techniques.

2.2 Develop DNA fingerprinting technologies to identify spraints of individual otters, so that a combination of such techniques, with field surveys, may permit a better estimation of otter numbers and range.

2.3 Ensure that regular surveys are carried out at a national level, at least once every seven years, but preferably every five years; carry out more frequent surveys in sensitive areas; concentrate survey efforts in areas where changes in population status are expected; survey otters found dead, doing autopsy.

2.4 Encourage research on habitat use (particularly using radio tracking techniques) in areas of both low and high otter density.

2.5 Encourage research in otter diets, in connection with assessments of prey availability; encourage contacts between otter specialists and fish researchers.

### 3. Captive research and re-introduction

3.1 Encourage zoological gardens, otter centres, universities and other institutions holding otters in captivity to embark on research which will allow a better understanding of their biology and conservation needs.

3.2 Concentrate captive research in one of these two main fields:

? general otter biology, including genetic studies, nutrition, breeding, behaviour and pathology;

? research specifically aimed at complementing field research, such as improvement of fishing gear to avoid drowning, identification of spraint contents as a result of diet.

3.3 Encourage the collecting and studying, under appropriate conditions (including deep freeze), of blood and tissue samples from captive otters, as well as skulls from dead captive otters, documenting as far as possible the origin and known background of the individuals sampled.

3.4 Promote the extension of the stud book for the European otter, including new data on genetics, behaviour, reproduction, clinical-chemical data, post-mortem data and any other relevant data.

3.5 Improve cooperation between zoological gardens, otter centres, universities and research institutes, so that joint projects might be planned and carried out; improve cooperation between captive research centres and universities or research institutes involved in field research.

3.6 Establish a pan-European coordination group on otter captive research, made up of three people, to:

? review existing and past captive research;

? contact other workers to determine future captive research needs;

? encourage captive research and avoid duplication of work.

3.7 Make sure that any possible reintroduction programmes are designed and implemented following the guidelines laid down by IUCN's otter specialist group, by IUCN's position statement on the translocation of living organisms (approved at the 22nd meeting of IUCN Council in 1987) and by Recommendation R (85) 15 of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on reintroduction of wildlife species.

### 4. Research on the effects of pollution

4.1 Continue efforts to monitor PCBs and their effects on otter populations, including the use of biomarker techniques, which may provide information on the induction of physiological effects of specific PCB congeners and related persistent compounds, such as planar polyhalogenated aromatic hydrocarbons.

4.2 Start in some of the Central and Eastern Europe states well directed contaminant monitoring programmes, in order to gather information on spatial and temporal trends in exposure levels.

4.3 Investigate the potential risk to otter populations of chlorinated dioxins (PCDDs), dibenzofurans (PCDFs), naphthalenes (PCNs) and related planar polyhalogenated aromatic compounds; nonionic detergents (e.g. nonylphenoethoxylates), modern agrochemicals (eg organophosphorous compounds) and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs); pay more attention to interactive effects of different contaminants.

4.4 Verify that experimental toxicological studies on otters are only allowed under very strict conditions, limiting them to low level exposure and reversible effects possibly within the framework of reintroduction projects; explore the suitability of otter cell lines as toxicological model.

4.5 Carry out comparative eco-physiological studies and field surveys in order to identify differences between otter and mink and other mammals in susceptibility towards specific pollutants in order to facilitate meaningful extrapolations between species from laboratory studies.

4.6 Apply and test non-invasive biomonitoring techniques, particularly in threatened populations or in reintroduction projects; further investigate the validity of spraint analysis for different compounds with appropriate toxicokinetic studies, clarify the relationship between contaminant levels in prey, otter tissue and spraints; explore the suitability of using blood samples, fat biopts, anal gland secretions and urine to the assessment of exposure parameters and suitable effect biomarkers.

4.7 Further research sources and pathways of pollutants and the physico-chemical and biological processes determining their bio-availability, bio-accumulation and transfer in the food chain, so as to be able to determine effective habitat remedy strategies, particularly in reintroduction programmes.

4.8 Encourage the assessment, at an international level, of quality objectives for contaminants in sediments, preys, organisms, otter tissues and spraints for protection of otter habitat.

4.9 Encourage standardisation of analytical methods in order to develop quality control monitoring on a comparative basis; for this purpose, encourage execution of intercalibration exercises and the distribution of existing standard reference among European laboratories; consider mandatory analysis of PCBs; encourage the presentation of data on the level of pollutants in otter tissue with relevant biological information on sex, age and condition indices.

4.10 Encourage, at national level, the development and updating of databases of available otter carcasses and research needs of such materials; encourage the exchange of protocols for sampling, registration and storage conditions of otter carcasses; encourage the banking of historical otter material.

#### IV. PUBLIC AWARENESS

Launch at the national level, if appropriate, a public awareness campaign on the species, aimed at decision makers, users of riverine areas (fishermen, fishfarmers, farmers, tourists, etc.) and the general public.

## APPENDIX 12

Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife  
and Natural Habitats

Standing Committee

### **Recommendation No. 54 (adopted 6 December 1996) on conservation of *Caretta caretta* at Patara (Turkey)**

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 of the Convention provides that each Contracting Party shall take steps to promote national policies for the conservation of the habitats 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, of the Convention provides that each Contracting Party shall take appropriate and necessary legislative and administrative measures to ensure the conservation of the habitats of the wild fauna species, especially those listed in Appendix II to the Convention;

Recalling that Article 6 of the Convention provides that each Contracting Party shall take appropriate and necessary legislative and administrative measures to ensure the special protection of the wild fauna species listed in Appendix II to the Convention, particularly by prohibiting damage to or destruction of breeding sites;

Noting that *Caretta caretta* is a strictly protected species listed in Appendix II to the Convention;

Drawing attention to Recommendation No 8 (1987) on the protection of marine turtles in Dalyan and other important areas in Turkey, Recommendation No 12 (1988) concerning the protection of important turtle nesting beaches in Turkey, and Recommendation No 24 (1991) on the protection of some beaches in Turkey of particular importance to marine turtles;

Referring to the report by Dr Jean Lescure on the visit to Patara (document T-PVS (96) 65);

Considering the unique ecological heritage value of the Patara beach as the fourth most important *Caretta caretta* nesting site in Turkey (Baran and Kasperek, 1989);

Bearing in mind that the Patara beach is included in a specially protected area established by joint decision of the Turkish Cabinet of Ministers of 2 March 1990;

Wishing, in this respect, to congratulate the Turkish Government and encourage it to continue its policy for the conservation of specially protected areas;

Having regard to current work on a Development Plan for the specially protected area of Patara;

Recommends that the Turkish Government:

1. ensure that the protection of the Patara archaeological site continues to prevent any human settlement behind the beach;
2. enforce regulations against illegal building;
3. control tourist flow, because too large a volume of tourists will generate numerous disadvantages for the environment in the specially protected area and for marine turtles in particular;
4. organise regular monitoring of marine turtles during the nesting season, as was done in 1996;
5. make the local population and tourists aware of the importance of protecting marine turtles;
6. erect a barrier in front of the car-parks for the middle and north sections of the beach and ban motor traffic from the north section;
7. put an information sign at the end of the hillside track at the edge of the beach and ensure that a fourth way onto the beach is not formed there, drawing attention to the ban on walking in the dunes;
8. continue plantations to stabilise the dunes, particularly the hedges on the top of the first range of dunes at the back of the beach, so as to accentuate the dark side of the horizon from which the marine turtles take their bearings;
9. ensure that no powerful, tall, seaward-facing lights are erected in the village or between it and the beach.

### APPENDIX 13

Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife  
and Natural Habitats

Standing Committee

**Draft Recommendation No. 55 (adopted 6 December 1996) on giving consideration to ZNIEFF (nature reserves of ecological interest for fauna and flora) in the development of projects for the Biltzheim Forest and the areas of Niffer and the Petit Landau (France)**

The Standing Committee on the Convention 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 habitats;

Recalling that Article 3 of the convention provides that each Contracting Party shall take 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, para. 1 of the convention provides that each Contracting Party shall take appropriate and necessary legislative and administrative measures to ensure the conservation of the habitats of wild flora and fauna species, especially those specified in Appendix II to the convention, and the conservation of endangered natural habitats;

Recognising the importance and the value of the ZNIEFF (nature reserves of ecological interest for fauna and flora) inventory as a tool for investigating France's natural heritage (Circular No. 91-71 of 14 May 1991);

Noting that, although the ZNIEFF inventory is not itself legally binding, it is designed to facilitate administrative decisions and policy of the State;

Noting that it is one of the main scientific bases of the state's wildlife protection policy;

Noting that a development project for an identified ZNIEFF should take the ecological needs of that zone into consideration;

Given that the conservation of a ZNIEFF in a municipality's territory is a means of enhancing that municipality in aesthetic, recreational, educational and sustainable local development terms;

Considering that the Biltzheim Forest and the Niffer and Petit Landau areas concerned by development projects are ZNIEFF and home to several species listed in Appendix II of the Bern Convention,

Recommends that the French Government:

1. generally take fully into consideration the fact that certain areas have been scientifically identified as:
  - ? areas, usually small in size and home to rare or outstanding species, groups of species or habitats, or representative of the national or regional natural heritage (type I ZNIEFF), especially sensitive to built installations or other transformations, even when their scope is limited;
  - ? large natural features (forests, valleys, plateaux, estuaries, etc), rich or unspoilt in natural terms, with considerable biological potential (type II ZNIEFF), whose major ecological balances must be respected and where special attention must be paid to the vital issue of sedentary or migratory fauna.
2. ensure that the quality of the ZNIEFF of the Biltzheim Forest and the Niffer and Petit Landau areas concerned are carefully examined prior to the scheduled development projects.

## APPENDIX 14

### STATEMENTS OF PARTICIPANTS

#### I. STATEMENT OF THE DELEGATE OF UNITED KINGDOM

1. Following the United Kingdom's ratification of the Biodiversity Convention in 1994 the Prime Minister launched Biodiversity: The UK Action Plan. The UK is one of the first countries to publish a strategy and action plan for conserving biodiversity and to carry out pioneering work in developing costed targets for key species and habitats. The work was overseen by the Biodiversity Steering Group led by the Department of the Environment, with representatives from central and local Government, industry, academic institutions, scientific collections, farming and land management and voluntary sector conservation organisations. The Plan was thus produced via the partnership approach which characterises UK biodiversity work. The Biodiversity Steering Group published its report in December 1995. It includes action plans for the conservation of 116 key species and 14 habitats and recommendations for a programme to improve biological recording and monitoring and a programme to improve public awareness. Work has already begun on drawing up a further 286 species and 24 habitat action plans. These targets and programmes will form a basis for Nature conservation in the UK into the next century.

2. The Government response to the Steering Group Report was issued in May 1996. It welcomed the objectives and targets put forward by the Group as relevant bench marks against which the future success of conserving individual species and habitat types can be assessed. To achieve all the objectives will require the co-operation and active participation of all sectors. Consequently, a number of groups have been established to carry this vital work forward. Implementation is being co-ordinated by a UK Group, and involves four Country Groups (covering England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland), who are responsible for implementing individual action plans; a Targets Group which has been tasked with completing the remaining species and habitat action plans and submitting them to Government for approval; an Information Group responsible for developing the proposed UK Biodiversity Database; and a Local Issues Group providing guidance on local biodiversity action plans. All these groups have begun their work.

3. The United Kingdom is developing a research and monitoring framework and associated information systems geared to ensuring that wildlife and countryside policies are based on the best scientific evidence available and will aim to improve the access to information on biodiversity and the wider countryside. Monitoring frameworks have been developed for bats and other animals, a national survey of ponds will be undertaken and a new atlas of plants in Britain and Ireland will be prepared in conjunction with the Irish Government. Feasibility studies will be undertaken for "Countryside Survey 2000" a major monitoring exercise which aims to record the state of the countryside at the end of the millennium and help to assess the effects of Government policies for the countryside during the 1990s.

4. The UK issued a public consultation paper in March 1995 inviting comments on the statutory conservation agencies' recommendations for 280 possible Special Areas of Conservation under the EC Habitats Directive covering over 900,000 hectares. Following consideration of the responses, 255 sites of which 30 are marine have now been submitted to the Commission. Further sites will be submitted when additional scientific work and consultation procedures have been completed. A number of suggested extensions to sites on the consultation list and the inclusion of additional sites have been received. Any additions which are agreed to qualify scientifically would be put out for public consultation before they are considered for submission to the Commission. There will also be public consultation on further sites where additional scientific work was necessary before site selections could be made or a full range of sites brought forward to represent some interests such as rivers and riverine species, otters, active raised and blanket bogs, fresh water pearl mussel and Great Crested Newt.

5. The United Kingdom Government continues to make good progress on the classification of Special Protection Areas under the EC Birds Directive. The UK total now stands at 136 sites covering 542,000 hectares. We expect to complete our programme of about 260 sites over the next five years.?

6. A best practice guide on Coastal Zone Management was published on 31 October 1996. The review of byelaw-making powers for the coast will be completed in 1997. The Coastal Forum for England ? established in 1994 ? continues to bring together a wide range of interests to discuss coastal issues. Following a consultation process earlier this year, a Coastal Forum has been announced for Northern Ireland which will advise on the development of a coastal zone strategy. Similarly, the Secretary of State for Wales has announced his intention to establish a Coastal Forum for Wales and responses to a coastal discussion paper containing a similar proposal are currently under consideration.

7. The Rural White Paper "*Rural England: A Nation Committed to a Living Countryside*" published by the UK Government in 1995 set out for the first time a framework for sustainable rural development. *Rural England 1996*, launched in October 1996, reports significant progress on virtually every one of the 126 commitments set out in the White Paper. The UK Government is also working to encourage sustainable agricultural policies and practices which take full account of environmental considerations. This includes ensuring that existing agri-environmental schemes are implemented effectively and also working with other EU Member States towards reforms of the Common Agricultural Policy which will safeguard and enhance the rural environment. In addition, consultation has recently taken place on draft Regulations for the protection of important hedgerows, which the Government intends to lay in Parliament for approval in early 1997. Woodlands and forestry initiatives also help to achieve the Convention's objectives. Support for the National Forest and Community Forests in England, together with similar projects in Scotland and Wales, is continuous. These initiatives aim to regenerate urban fringe landscapes by restoring derelict and under used land, creating wildlife habitats and providing recreational opportunities.

8. 1996 saw major changes in the way in which National Parks in England and Wales were administered. As from April in Wales and October in England, new free-standing authorities were created to run the 10 Parks. The Parks are Protected Landscapes (IUCN Category V) but the changes in their administration have been accompanied by an explicit reference to nature conservation objectives being included in their purpose for the first time.

9. The Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds is one of the most important and wide-ranging yet to be concluded under the Bonn Convention. It was signed subject to ratification by the UK in September, 1996.

10. Early 1996 saw the establishment of a permanent Secretariat in Bonn to co-ordinate work on the Agreement on the Conservation of Bats in Europe in line with the recommendations of the first meeting of the Parties to the Agreement. Similarly, an Advisory Committee was established with its first meeting held in Vilm, Germany on 18/19 April 1996 and chaired by the UK. The second meeting of the Advisory Committee is scheduled for 28/29 January 1997 in Krakow, Poland.

11. The aims of the Bern Convention for species protection can only be achieved if its controls are fully and effectively enforced. The UK has a good record in enforcing wildlife protection controls. The "Partnership for Action Against Wildlife Crime" actively promotes and encourages cooperation between enforcement organisations and a number of successful prosecutions have already resulted. In October 1996, the Partnership published a handbook "*Wildlife Crime - A Guide to Wildlife Law Enforcement in the UK*" which pulls together for the first time practical information about all the controls on wildlife. Wildlife law enforcers have welcomed the Guide and are already putting it to good use. The Partnership is also promoting the best use of DNA testing and other forensic techniques in the investigation of wildlife offences and plans to issue information and advice to enforcement agencies in the coming months.

## **II. STATEMENT OF THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE FEDERATION OF HUNTING ASSOCIATIONS OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (FACE)**

Presentation of FACE activities in the field of nature conservation in relation to the Bern Convention

### **1. The European Habitat Conservation Stamp Programme**

The European Habitat Conservation Stamp Programme, which had been officially presented at the previous meeting of the Standing Committee in December 1995, was aimed at raising funds for the conservation of wildlife habitats, particularly wetlands, by selling conservation stamps and the corresponding artistic reproductions (in a limited edition and signed by the artist). This programme was being conducted in close co-operation between Ducks Unlimited Inc., Wetlands International and FACE. The programme was launched in a different European country every year, and Sweden had been chosen to market its Stamp during the 1996-1997 season. In 1997 the first field projects (in the Baltic region) would be financed from the proceeds of the programme.

## **2. European Hunter's Handbook**

FACE had recently published the European Hunter's Handbook under a contact with the European Commission. This 750-page, 2-volume work was intended for hunters, politicians, civil servants, the media and the general public, and contained the Community regulations ("Bird" and "FFH" Directives), European regulations (Bern Convention, etc) and international regulations (Bonn and Ramsar Conventions, AEWA, CITES, etc), international NGOs, a report on the impact of hunting on animal populations, national sections giving an overview of hunting and wildlife management in 21 Council of Europe member States, etc. The Handbook had already been widely disseminated to the hunting press and European hunting associations, and was thus helping to improve awareness and information at all levels and intensify co-operation on a European scale.

## **3. LIFE Project: Conservation measures for the slender-billed curlew (*Numenius tenuirostris*)**

In co-operation with the Greek Ministry of the Environment, the Belgian Royal Institute of Natural Sciences, the German *Bundesamt für Naturschutz* and the Sea Mammal Research Unit (United Kingdom), FACE was contributing to the LIFE project "Conservation measures for the slender-billed curlew", one of the species which had been identified as being under particular threat in the BirdLife International book "Globally Threatened Birds in Europe - Action Plans", which had recently been published by the Council of Europe. FACE

had the specific task of disseminating information on the species and promoting awareness of the need for conservation measures in the various hunting associations in the area of distribution of the slender-billed curlew.

#### **4. International seminar: Hunting and protected areas in Europe**

On 19 September 1996 in the European Parliament in Brussels, at the invitation of the MEP Ms Astrid Lulling, FACE had held an International Seminar on hunting and protected areas in Europe.

At this event information was given on the legal status of protected areas (IUCN categories, Natura 2000 Network, etc), different approaches to managing such areas were outlined and the impact of hunting and fishing on wildlife was considered. The Proceedings of the Seminar would be published in 1997 by the *Office national de la chasse* (French national hunting office).

**APPENDIX 15**

**BERN CONVENTION PROGRAMME OF ACTIVITIES  
AND BUDGET FOR 1997**

**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. Expenses of the Chairman to attend meetings of the Standing Committee ..... 20,000

**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 AND OF SOME DELEGATES OF CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE**

Travel and subsistence expenses incurred by the delegates of African states to attend the Standing Committee meeting or other meetings organised under its responsibility..... 50,000

Travel and subsistence expenses incurred by some delegates from Contracting Parties of Central and Eastern Europe (on a temporary basis and after decision of the Bureau) to attend the Standing Committee meeting ..... 60,000

**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..... 90,000

**5. MEETINGS OF THE BUREAU**

Travel and subsistence expenses incurred by the three members of the Bureau to attend the Bureau meetings ..... 60,000

**6. CONTRIBUTION TOWARDS THE ORGANISATION OF COLLOQUIA**

Element 6.1

**Workshop on the making and implementation of Action Plans for threatened species**

Spain  
4 days

The terms of reference: to analyse what are the main problems involved in the drafting, negotiation, and implementation of Action Plans, making proposal to governments and other partners so that present legal, administrative and practical problems may be better tackled.

Travel and subsistence expenses will be covered for 1 rapporteur from each of the following 14 states:

**Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Hungary, Ireland, Luxembourg, Moldova, Netherlands Romania, Senegal, Switzerland, Tunisia, United Kingdom**..... 120,000

Travel and subsistence expenses for a consultant ..... 10,000

Participants: all Contracting Parties and appropriate observers

## 7. CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARD THE COST OF EXPERT GROUPS

### Element 7.1

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

Strasbourg

3 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 16 states:

**Austria, Bulgaria, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey** ..... 125,000

Participants: all Contracting Parties

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

### Element 7.2

#### **Group of experts on introduction and re-introduction 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** ..... 60,000

Participants: all Contracting Parties

Observers: all observer states and qualified organisations

Element 7.3

**Group of experts on conservation of birds**

Izmir  
4 days

The terms of reference of this group are: to revise current problems on bird conservation in Europe and to suggest adequate action. The group shall, in particular, follow up the implementation of recommendation 48 (1996) of the Standing Committee on the conservation of European globally threatened birds, and inform the Committee on the progress in the implementation of the Action Plans referred to in that recommendation. The group may suggest other species requiring Action Plans and propose measures that may be appropriate for the conservation of threatened birds.

Travel and subsistence expenses will be covered for 1 expert from each of the following 13 states:  
**Albania, Belarus, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Greece, Poland, Portugal, Russia, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Turkey, Ukraine** ..... 110,000

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

Element 7.4

**Group of experts for the setting up of the Emerald Network of Areas of Special Conservation Interest**

Strasbourg  
3 days

The terms of reference for this group are the following: to do the necessary work to implement Recommendation No. 16 (1989) on areas of special conservation interest. The group will review the technical documents prepared by the experts and make proposals to build up the Emerald Network.

The following expenses will be covered: travel and subsistence expenses for one expert from each of the following 21 states:  
**Albania, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Moldova, Monaco, Norway, Romania, Russia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine** ..... 175,000

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

SEMINARS AND GROUPS OF EXPERTS FOR 1998 p.m.

**Seminar on implementation of Action Plans for Amphibians and reptiles (in coordination with Group of experts on conservation of amphibians and reptiles)**

**Seminar on threatened marine biodiversity in the Mediterranean**

**Group of experts on conservation of invertebrates**

**Group of experts on the Emerald Network**

**Seminar on Action Plans for Large Carnivores (?)**

**Seminar on the conservation of the beaver *Castor fiber* (?)**

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

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. (PART III : Birds)

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

#### Element 8.2

### **Compilation and listing of Action Plans on European mammals**

Terms of reference: to compile a list on action plans currently being carried out on mammal species, giving details ? as far as possible ? on their implementation

Fixed appropriation for consultant..... 50,000

[Element 8.3 to be engaged with the approval of the Bureau]

### **Elaboration of European action plans for *Cyripedium calceolus***

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

#### Element 8.4

### **Elaboration of European action plans for *Maculinea spp***

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

#### Element 8.5

### **Invertebrate species candidates for listing in Appendix II of the Convention**

Terms of reference: to prepare a report making proposals for adding invertebrate species to Appendix II of the Convention. The report should contain the criteria used and summary data sheets for the species proposed.

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

#### Element 8.6

### **Red Book on Threatened butterflies**

Terms of reference: the 1981 Council of Europe report being outdated, a new report would gather information on the conservation state of European Rhopalocera. The report will include a checklist of European butterflies, a technical proposal for inclusion of species in Appendix II of the Convention and a list of species requiring action plans

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

[Element 8.7 to be engaged with the approval of the Bureau]

### **Report on micro-reserves as a tool for plants 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 extensions.

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

Element 8.8

**Guidelines for Species Action Plans**

Terms of reference: this report intends to support Element 6.1, by preparing a working document for the meeting. The expert will be asked to prepare a report analysing the way Action Plans for threatened species are presently drafted, what their contents are, how much detail they contain and what matters are dealt with, etc. The expert will propose guidelines for future Action Plans and include a draft recommendation proposing how they should be negotiated, what their legal reach should be and include any other matter that may of interest for states preparing Action Plans.

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 ..... 70,000

**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..... 40,000

**11. PART-TIME SECRETARY**

Element 11

Part-time secretary ..... 130,000

**12. CONSULTANTS FOR EMERALD NETWORK**

Element 12

Consultants will be hired to manage the setting up of the Emerald Network and to do the necessary technical work required, including software, lists, handling of data, etc ..... 210,000

Bern Convention Programme of Activities and Budget for 1997 (summary)

	FF
1. Chairman's expenses.....	20,000
2. On-the-spot visits.....	30,000
3. Delegates of African states and some Central & Eastern European states .....	110,000
4. Travels of experts and Secretariat .....	90,000
5. Meetings of the Bureau.....	60,000
6. Colloquia	
6.1 Seminar on making and implementation of Action Plans.....	120,000
7. Expert groups	
7.1 Group of experts on conservation of plants.....	125,000
7.2 Group of experts on introduction and re-introduction of species .....	60,000
7.3 Group of experts on conservation of birds.....	120,000
7.4. Group of experts for the setting up of the Emerald Network .....	175,000
8. Consultants	
8.1 European Red List of Vertebrates .....	60,000
8.2 Action Plans for European Mammals .....	50,000
8.3 European Action Plans for <i>Cypripedium calceolus</i> .....	*40,000
8.4 European Action Plans for <i>Maculinea spp</i> .....	40,000
8.5 Invertebrate species for Appendix II.....	60,000
8.6 Red Book on Threatened butterflies.....	60,000
8.7 Micro-reserves for plants conservation.....	*40,000
8.8 Guidelines for Species Action Plans .....	40,000
9. Publicity.....	70,000
10.* Habitat conservation projects.....	*40,000
11. Part-time secretary .....	130,000
12. Part-time officer.....	210,000
	1,750,000

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.