

Strasbourg, 5 December 1997  
[S:\tpvs97\tpvs63e.97]

**T-PVS (97) 63**

CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF EUROPEAN WILDLIFE  
AND NATURAL HABITATS

Standing Committee

17th meeting  
Strasbourg, 1 - 5 December 1997

**REPORT**

Secretariat Memorandum  
established by the  
Directorate of Environment  
and Local Authorities

### **PRELIMINARY NOTE: SUMMARY OF DECISIONS TAKEN**

1. The Standing Committee held its 17th meeting from 1 to 5 December 1997 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 Latvia was represented at the meeting for the first time as a Contracting Party.
4. The Committee decided unanimously to invite the following states to attend its 18th meeting: Algeria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Cape Verde, the Holy See, Mauritania and Morocco.
5. The Committee amended Appendices I, II and III of the Convention.
6. The Committee examined Recommendation 1310 (1996) of the Parliamentary Assembly on the results and follow-up of the European Nature Conservation Year (ENCY 1995) and addressed an opinion to the Committee of Ministers.
7. The Committee adopted the following recommendations:
  - Recommendation No. 56 concerning Guidelines to be taken into account while making proposals for amendment of Appendices I and II of the Convention and while adopting amendments;
  - Recommendation No. 57 on the Introduction of organisms belonging to non-native species into the environment;
  - Recommendation No. 58 on the Reintroduction of organisms belonging to wild species and on restocking and reinforcing populations of such organisms in the environment;
  - Recommendation No. 59 on the Drafting and implementation of Action Plans of wild fauna species;
  - Recommendation No. 60 on the Implementation of the Action Plans for globally threatened birds in Europe;
  - Recommendation No. 61 on the Conservation of the white-headed duck (*Oxyura leucocephala*);
  - Recommendation No. 62 on the Conservation of regionally threatened birds in the Macaronesian and Mediterranean regions;
  - Recommendation No. 63 on the conservation of the Akamas peninsula, Cyprus, and, in particular, of the nesting beaches of *Caretta caretta* and *Chelonia mydas*;
  - Recommendation No. 64 on the conservation of *Caretta caretta* in Kaminia (Cephalonia, Greece).

8. The Committee adopted a map of biogeographical regions for the Emerald Network.
9. The Committee discussed the situation of several species that require conservation.
10. The Committee approved a work programme and budget for 1998, using 800,000 French francs provided for annually by the Committee of Ministers, some 670,000 French francs remaining in the Convention's special fund and new donations to be made by Contracting Parties.
11. The Committee decided to hold its 18th meeting from 30 November to 4 December 1998.

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, II and III;
- ? Recommendations Nos. 56 to 64 (1997);
- ? Programme and budget.

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

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

T-PVS (97) 18 Draft agenda  
T-PVS (97) 34 Annotated draft agenda

The 17th meeting of the Committee was opened by the Chairman, Mr Geko Spiridonov, who welcomed the participants (see Appendix 1 to this report). He congratulated Latvia on its ratification of the Convention and the Czech Republic on its signature.

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 Contracting Parties (Latvia)**

T-PVS (97) 14 Report of Bureau meeting of May 1997  
T-PVS (97) 32 Chart of signatures and ratifications  
Nature & Environment 75: Texts adopted by the Standing Committee 1982-1996  
T-PVS (97) 23 Nature conservation in Latvia

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

The Chairman made his report on the development of the Bern Convention since the last meeting of the Committee. The programme of activities was well implemented. He informed the Standing Committee on the work carried out for the preparation for the Ministerial Conference in Aarhus (Denmark), with particular emphasis on Action Theme 1 and Action Theme 11 of the Pan-European Biodiversity and Landscape Strategy.

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

The representative of Latvia presented an introductory report on nature conservation in Latvia. She spoke of the legal framework, measures undertaken by the Latvian government for nature protection, categories of protected areas and adherence of Latvia to international treaties related to nature conservation. She pointed out that 6.8 % of Latvian territory is under nationally protected areas. She expressed the pleasure and interest of her country at becoming a Contracting Party to the Convention.

The distinguished representatives of Hungary, Monaco, Switzerland, IUCN and EU welcomed the work carried out by the Latvian government.

The delegate of Switzerland proposed that a Memorandum of Understanding be prepared between the Rio and Bern Conventions, so that the Bern Convention may become an instrument of particular relevance in the regional implementation of the Biodiversity Convention, specially regarding conservation of wild biodiversity. Several delegations supported Switzerland on this point. The Secretariat said that several Memoranda of Cooperation had been passed between the Secretariat of the Biodiversity Convention and the Secretariats of other conservation related conventions (Ramsar, Bonn, Barcelona, etc). In the case of the Bern Convention, the Secretariat of which is the Council of Europe, it belongs to the Committee of Ministers to approve and sign such memoranda.

The Committee decided to ask the Secretariat to explore this question further and to present, at its next meeting, a draft Memorandum of Cooperation with the Convention on Biological Diversity (or

Memorandum of Understanding, as appropriate) to be proposed to the Committee of Ministers.

The full text of the declaration by the Swiss delegate is in document T-PVS (97) 63 Addendum.

The delegate of CMS (Secretariat of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals) made a declaration to be found in document T-PVS (97) 63 Addendum.

The Secretariat informed the Committee that the programme of activities had been fully implemented in 1997 without any serious difficulties. However changes of staff had slowed down the elaboration of some documents. Mrs Dejeant-Pons, who worked for the Convention for four and a half years, had now taken the responsibility of the Pan-European Strategy. Mrs Liri Kopaçi replaced her.

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

#### **3.1 Strategic issues. Contribution to the Aarhus Ministerial Conference**

STRA-BU (97) 22 Report of the Bureau for the Strategy

STRA-BU (97) 36 Progress report on Action Theme 11

STRA-BU (97) 45 List of decisions of the Bureau

The Secretariat informed the Committee that the Executive Bureau of the Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy had met twice in 1997, on 22-23 May and 20-21 November 1997. It took note of the willingness of the Standing Committee to take a leading role in the implementation of the European Action Programme for Threatened Species (Action Theme 11 of the Strategy) and recommended granting additional funds to carry work out under this Action Theme. The Secretariat wrote letters to all governments involved in the Strategy but not enough funds were received, which means that the activities developed have been financed using the Convention's own funds.

The Secretariat informed the Committee that, given the very limited funding attributed to Action Theme 11 of the Strategy, only two products, of general interest for other Conventions and agreements, would be relevant to present at the next Ministerial Conference to be held in Aarhus (Denmark) on 23-25 June 1998: these were the Recommendation and report on Action Plans for Animal species and the European Red Data Book of Vertebrates.

Concerning Action Theme 1 of the Strategy (on the setting up of a pan-European Ecological Network), the Secretariat informed the Committee that it had attended on its behalf meetings relevant to that Action Theme and that the Emerald Network, as an extension of the Natura 2000 Network approach to the whole of the European continent, could play an important role in the setting up of such network. It was important, though, to make further progress in the setting up of the Emerald Network.

The Committee held an exchange of views on the subject.

The Committee took note of Recommendation 1310 (1996) of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe on the results and follow-up to the European Nature Conservation Year 1995 (ENCY 1995).

The Committee thanked the Parliamentary Assembly for the interest and support it takes in the activities of the Convention and addressed to the Committee of Ministers the opinion which appears in Appendix 3.

#### **3.2 States to be invited as observers to the 18th meeting**

The Committee decided unanimously to invite the following non member states of the Council of Europe to attend its 18th 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 2 Data sheets of species proposed by Monaco  
T-PVS (96) 49 Criteria for listing species in the Appendices  
T-PVS (97) 2 rev. Criteria for list species in the Appendices  
T-PVS (97) 4 Updated Appendices  
T-PVS (97) 5 Proposal from Monaco

The Secretariat reminded the participants at the meeting of the procedure for the amendment of the Appendices and pointed out the key issues in this procedure in terms of timing, voting and entry into force of reservations.

##### **Criteria on listing species**

At its 16th meeting in 1996 the Committee asked the Secretariat to prepare a document listing criteria which might be used, in the first place, to guide amendments and, if needed or wished, to revise Appendix II. The Secretariat informed the Committee that a first draft was circulated to a few parties in March 1997, some of which submitted comments, which were used to amend a draft recommendation proposed. The Secretariat presented the document and the draft recommendation, which had been elaborated trying to keep all the flexibility provided both to Contracting Parties and the Standing Committee in Article 15 of the Convention.

The Committee discussed the draft recommendation. All delegations agreed that scientific criteria were priority in the choice of species for the Appendices. Some delegations thought that cultural and symbolic values could play a role in the choice of species, a view that was contested by other delegations.

A small working group was set up which could work out small editorial difficulties but could not find a solution to the main divergences expressed above.

The recommendation was finally adopted as it appears in Appendix 7 to this report.

##### **Amendments proposed**

The delegate of 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 and adopt criteria/guidelines for inclusion of species in the Appendices.

The following proposals for amendment of the Appendices were presented by the Secretariat and discussed:

- a) Proposal from Bulgaria to add plant species from Central and Eastern Europe to Appendix I

(only species not decided in 1996 were examined)

The Committee discussed the proposal of Bulgaria to add plant species from Central and Eastern Europe to Appendix I.

The delegate of the EU pointed out that several of the proposed species were present in the EU member states as well. The EU has asked advice from scientific bodies regarding a definition of species that are threatened and those that are not. The delegate of EU asked the Standing Committee to delay the voting until Wednesday. The request was accepted.

The delegate of Norway pointed out that *Chimphalia umbellata* and *Potentilla fruticosa* were present in Norway as well. The Standing Committee took note of this comment.

The Norwegian delegate made a reservation regarding *Cryptogramma crista*, *Crassula aquatica*, *Deschampsia setacea*, *Dracocephalum ruyschiana* and *Lilium bulbiferum*. He pointed out that the latter two are both non-native species to Norway. The Standing Committee took note of these reservations made by the Norwegian delegation.

The Committee examined species nos. 50, 60, 89, 90 and 93 and decided unanimously to add them to Appendix I of the Convention, 28 Parties being present (except for species no. 60, for which there was one abstention). The list of species added is in Appendix 4 to this report.

The European Community made the following statement:

"The Commission supports, from a scientific point of view, the proposal to include the species:

- 50 *Carex secalina* Willd. ex Wahlenb.
- 60 *Dracocephalum ruyschiana* L.
- 89 *Ophrys oestrifera* Bieb.
- 90 *Ophrys taurica* (Aggeenko) Nevski
- 93 *Orchis provincialis* Balb.

but it none the less thinks it inadvisable to support their inclusion in Appendix I to the Bern Convention until the Natura 2000 network has been established. The Community accordingly decides not to exercise its authority, and thus its right to vote, for the time being. It will lodge an objection, with a view to withdrawing it when the Natura 2000 network starts to operate and it is in a position to propose amendments to the Annexes to the Habitats Directive."

- b) Proposal from Monaco to add marine species of the Mediterranean to Appendices II and III (only species not decided in 1996 were examined)

The Committee decided to add to Appendix II of the Convention the species *Cetorhinus maximus* (in the Mediterranean), 29 Parties being present; votes in favour: 28, votes against 0, abstention: 1.

The Committee decided to postpone until its next meeting the discussion on species nos. 14, 23 and 25 (*Anguilla anguilla*, *Thunnus thynnus* and *Xiphias gladius*).

The Committee decided unanimously to add to Appendix III of the Convention the list of species found in Appendix 6 to this report, 28 Parties being present.

The delegate of Norway expressed reservations on a proposal from Monaco on species nos. 14, 17 and 23 (*Anguilla anguilla*, *Lamna nasus* and *Thunnus thynnus*). If those species are included in the Appendices, Norway will present a formal reservation.

The Maltese delegate made reservations as to a possible future inclusion of *Thunnus thynnus* and *Xiphias gladius* in Appendix II of the Convention.

The Maltese delegate made a reservation regarding *Palinurus elephas*, *Epinephelus marginatus*, *Lamna nasus*, *Raja alba* and *Squatina squatina*; at least until his country has appropriate regulations on these species and their exploitation.

- c) Proposal from Monaco (1997) to add two birds and two fish Mediterranean species to Appendix II

The Committee voted first on the species *Puffinus yelkouan*, *Phalacrocorax aristotelis* (in the Mediterranean) and *Valencia letourneuxi*.

The Committee decided unanimously to add these to Appendix II of the Convention, 27 Parties being present:

The Committee decided unanimously to add *Mobula mobular* (in the Mediterranean) to Appendix II of the Convention, 30 Parties being present.

Declaration of the European Community:

"The Commission supports inclusion of the species *Cetorhinus maximus* and *Mobula mobular* from a scientific point of view, but none the less thinks it inadvisable to support their inclusion in Appendix II to the Bern Convention until the Natura 2000 network has been established. The Community accordingly decides not exercise its authority, and thus its right to vote, for the time being. It leaves the member states to exercise their right to vote. The Community will lodge an objection, with a view to withdrawing it when the Natura 2000 network starts to operate and it is in a position to propose amendments to the Annexes to the Habitats Directive."

- d) Proposal from France to add *Acipenser sturio* to Appendix II

The Committee decided unanimously to add *Acipenser sturio* to Appendix II of the Convention, 28 Parties being present.

## 4.2 Biennial reports

T-PVS (97) 27 Biennial reports 1993-94 (Senegal, Switzerland, Turkey)

The Secretariat pointed out that all Contracting Parties were late in presenting the biennial reports. The Secretariat will produce a summarising document of biennial reports for 1993-94 when it receives all the reports from the member countries.

The Committee took note of the 1993-94 biennial reports presented. 1995-96 biennial reports were not discussed through lack of a reasonable number of reports having been received. The Chairman encouraged Parties to provide as soon as possible their 1995-1996 biennial reports, so that the Secretariat may prepare a summary document for the next meeting.

## 4.3 Group of Experts on introduction and reintroduction of wildlife species. Draft



### **recommendation on the introduction of non-native species**

T-PVS (97) 16: Group Introduction/Reintroduction - meeting report

The Standing Committee examined and took note of the report of the third meeting of the Group of Experts on Legal Aspects of the Introduction and Reintroduction of Wildlife Species (T-PVS (97) 16). It declared itself highly satisfied with the Group's work.

The Committee examined the draft recommendation on introduction of non-native species and decided to set up a small group (Belgium, Hungary, Italy, Netherlands, European Community, IUCN, International Association for Falconry and the Conservation of Birds of Prey) to revise it. In accordance with the Group's proposals, it decided to make the following three amendments:

- preamble, second indent: "*the introduction of non-native plants cultivated in managed agricultural and forest areas, or for the purpose of combating soil erosion*" (addition suggested by Iceland);
- preamble, fourth indent: "*aquaculture*" (addition suggested by the European Community);
- appendix, section 2.1, delete paragraph iv: "*recognising that organisms belonging to aquatic species which are meant to remain captive constitute such a potential risk of introduction that all the rules applicable to deliberate introductions should be applied to them with the same strictness; issuing instructions or guidelines to the purchasers of aquatic species;*" and renumber following paragraphs.

The European Community also made the following Declaration:

"In the spirit of Article 11.2.b of the Convention, the European Community interprets the Recommendation on the introduction of non-native species into the environment and the guidelines appended to it as establishing a system, in principle, of strict control of these introductions, and not of prohibition.

In so far as these strict controls may comprise certain prohibitions, the European Community supports this recommendation."

The recommendation was adopted as it appears in Appendix 8 of the report.

The Standing Committee examined the draft Recommendation on the reintroduction of organisms belonging to wild species and on restocking and reinforcing populations of such organisms in the environment. It adopted it with the following amendment:

- appendix, paragraph 1.b.i, third indent: add "*to fisheries and aquaculture, both marine and continental*" (addition proposed by France).

The recommendation was adopted as it appears in Appendix 9 of the report.

#### **4.4 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),
- ? Report on the introduction of non-native plants (T-PVS (96) 105).

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

### **5. Threatened species and habitats**

#### **? Fauna and Flora**

STRA-BU (97) 36 Action Theme 11: Action for threatened species. Progress report.

#### **5.1 Seminar on elaboration of Action Plans for threatened species**

T-PVS (97) 20 Guidelines for Action Plans for animal species (Study)

T-PVS (97) 35 Report of Seminar on elaboration of Action Plans for threatened species

The Secretariat presented the results of a seminar on the subject held in Bértiz (Navarre, Spain) from 5-7 June 1997. The seminar analysed the main problems involved in the drafting, negotiation and implementation of Action Plans for threatened species. A consultant presented a thorough study on the matter and participants made proposals on how to tackle present legal, administrative and practical problems of Action Plans. The Secretariat presented a draft recommendation.

The delegate of Portugal suggested some changes to the recommendation and believed that the actions listed should be taken as guidelines within a recommendation.

The United Kingdom delegate expressed the view that:

the report on Guidelines for Action Plans for Animal Species (T-PVS (97) 20) prepared by Mr Antonio Machado and the report of the Workshop on Drafting and Implementing Action Plans for Threatened Species held in Navarre, Spain, from 5 to 7 June 1997 (T-PVS (97) 35 Bil.) constituted a valuable beginning to the Convention's contribution to the implementation of Action Theme 11;

thus the above reports would make a positive contribution to any progress report on implementation of the Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy to the next Ministerial Conference in Aarhus (Denmark) in June 1998.

He suggested the Committee instruct the Secretariat to:

- i. Forward the Guidelines for Action Plans for Animal Species (T-PVS (97) 20) and the report of the Workshop on Drafting and Implementing Action Plans for Threatened Species held in Navarre, Spain, from 5 to 7 June 1977 (T-PVS (97) 35 Bil.) to the Executive Bureau of the Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy for inclusion in their progress report to the Ministerial Conference and distribution to all participants in Aarhus;
- ii. Follow up the positive contributions and useful contacts made by participants at the workshop to seek their help in preparing further case examples of good practice on the drafting and implementation of species action plans to be distributed to participants in the Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy process.

Regarding point 2.2 of the draft recommendation, the delegate of Norway made the following statement:

"Consulting neighbouring states while planning and carrying out Species Action Plans of transboundary populations is useful and important. This consulting can not remove or

substitute that each of the states take full responsibility according to the BERN Convention to ensure long-time survival of their part of the population through a responsible management within the borders of the single state."

The Committee agreed with the United Kingdom proposal.

The Committee thanked the Spanish conservation authorities for the excellent preparation of the meeting, took note of the report presented by the Secretariat and adopted the recommendation on the drafting and implementation of Action Plans for Wild fauna species, found in Appendix 10 to this report.

## **5.2 Group of experts on the conservation of birds**

T-PVS (97) 15 Report of meeting of Group of experts on conservation of birds

T-PVS (97) 27 Action Plans for 4 more species (RSPB-BirdLife)

The Secretariat informed the Committee that the Group of experts on the conservation of birds had met for the first time in Izmir (Turkey), from 5 to 8 May 1997. The group examined the follow-up of recommendation No 48 (1996) of the Standing Committee on the conservation of globally threatened birds. The group noted the relatively successful implementation of the action plans for 23 globally threatened birds and made proposals for new species as subjects for action plans, suggested a modification of its terms of reference and proposed three draft recommendations, which were presented by the Secretariat.

The Committee took note of the report of the meeting, thanked the Turkish government for its excellent preparation, and discussed the three draft recommendations presented:

### Recommendation on the implementation of Action Plans for globally threatened species

The Committee had an exchange of views on the topic and introduced a few modifications in the draft recommendation.

Several delegations wished that the plans be updated to take into account the situation of some of the globally threatened species in Northern Africa, so that African Contracting Parties might be more fully associated with the conservation of the species. The Committee encouraged the Group of experts to take account of the whole geographical area covered by the Convention.

The Committee adopted the recommendation as it appears in Appendix 11.

### Recommendation on the conservation of the white-headed duck, *Oxyurus leucocephala*

The Committee discussed this point under item 6.2 of the agenda.

### Recommendation on the conservation of threatened birds in the Macaronesian and Mediterranean Regions

The Committee agreed on the scope of the recommendation.

The delegates of Spain and Portugal introduced small amendments to the draft recommendation.

The Committee adopted the recommendation as it appears in Appendix 13.

The Committee discussed new terms of reference, thanked the representative of BirdLife for the

support offered to the work of the group of experts and adopted the terms of reference as they appear in Appendix 14.

### 5.3 Group of experts on conservation of plants

T-PVS (97) 13 Group of experts on the conservation of plants: meeting report

The Secretariat informed the Committee that the group of experts had held its 4th meeting in Strasbourg from 28 to 30 April 1997 to review current issues of plant conservation in Europe and suggest appropriate action by Contracting Parties and the Standing Committee. The experts thought it would be of great value to elaborate a conservation strategy for the conservation of wild flora in Europe, to be integrated into the European Action Programme on Threatened Species (Action Theme 11 of the Strategy). They considered a priority the making of a red list for European flora, to be perhaps used as an information source for any possible amendment of Appendix I.

The Committee discussed the question of the regionalisation of the lists.

The Committee decided that for the moment there was no need to make regional lists but that the information to be provided by the Group of experts on threatened plants of Europe would be examined at a future meeting by the Committee and appropriate decisions taken.

The Committee took note of the report of the meeting

### - Habitats

### 5.4 Development of the Emerald Network

T-PVS (96) 75 rev. General document on the Emerald Network

T-PVS (97) 26 Group of experts on setting up of the Emerald Network: meeting report

T-PVS (97) 30 Draft Resolution on species requiring habitat conservation measures

T-PVS (97) 24 Draft Map of biogeographical regions

T-PVS (97) 41 Rules for the Emerald Network

The Secretariat presented the report of the Group of experts on the establishment of the Emerald Network, informing the Committee, in particular on the progress in the building up of the several technical instruments necessary for the designation of Areas of Special Conservation Interest (ASCIs), as well as for the collection and management of the information on ASCIs, in particular:

- a database to be able to store the information sent by states (on the model of Natura 2000)
- a draft map of Biogeographical regions of Europe (following Natura 2000)
- a draft resolution listing species that require specific habitat conservation measures
- a proposal of rules for the collection and management of the information on ASCIs

The Secretariat presented the different items under this issue:

#### Draft resolution on species requiring special habitat conservation measures

The Secretariat recalled that in 1989 the Committee adopted its Recommendation No. 14 inviting Parties to identify species requiring specific habitat conservation measures. In later meetings the Committee decided to identify such species and instructed the Secretariat to prepare a first draft resolution (document T-PVS (95) 16 revised). At its 16th meeting the Committee examined the draft

resolution and asked the Secretariat to prepare a new one.

The Secretariat presented the draft resolution.

The delegate of BirdLife thought that the list presented by the Secretariat was a very good starting-point as it made clear the links between the Annexes of the Birds and Habitats Directives and the Appendices of the Bern Convention. BirdLife agreed with all the bird species currently on the list. BirdLife had suggested to the Secretariat a further 22 species of birds for the list. Those 22 species were all of unfavourable conservation status in Europe and they were all on Appendix II of the Bern Convention. As all of these species were threatened by habitat loss or deterioration in one way or another they all required habitat conservation measures in at least part of their range. BirdLife noted the need to agree something at the meeting. The Secretariat might like to say what procedures there might be for adding species to this list in the future, which would certainly be necessary to allow for changed circumstances and improved scientific information.

The Committee had an exchange of views on the draft resolution, decided that a full compatibility with the Habitats Directive and other related instruments was necessary. The delegate of Belgium proposed to amend the list in the following way:

- to include all species in the relevant Annexes of the Habitats and Birds Directives;
- to delete all other species appearing in the territory of the EU.

The delegate of Iceland proposed to take into account the work of CAFF (Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna) and other relevant treaties.

As there was no material time to do that technical work during the meeting, the Committee instructed the Secretariat to prepare such a new draft for the next meeting of the Committee. The representatives of the European Commission and the European Topic Centre for Nature Conservation offered their technical help and agreed to meet with the Secretariat early in 1998 to be able to have a new draft as soon as possible, so that the Habitats Directive Committee may be consulted and Bern Convention Parties have enough time to study the list. The representative of the Commission expressed the firm support of the Union for the setting up of the Emerald Network and believed that a coordination and harmonisation with the Natura 2000 network could only benefit nature conservation throughout the continent of Europe.

Other delegations welcomed the progress in the setting up of the Emerald network since last year and expressed their commitment and support to build it soon.

Some delegations expressed the wish that the Emerald network be extended as soon as possible to Africa, an idea that was well received by the Committee.

#### Draft map of Biogeographical regions of Europe

The Secretariat presented this map, which is necessary to assign ASCIs a geographical region within the Emerald Network.

The Committee discussed briefly this map and adopted it incorporating the modifications presented by Hungary, Monaco, Romania, Slovakia and Albania.

The map appears in Appendix 15 to this report.

The Committee wished that the map be extended to Northern Africa in the future.

The Swedish delegate regretted that in the map adopted the boreal region was not divided into a boreal and a hemi-boreal zone.

#### Rules for the Emerald Network

The Secretariat presented a draft resolution containing the rules for the designation of ASCIs and for the collection and management of the information.

The Committee discussed the rules presented.

Several delegations supported the draft presented by the Secretariat but noted that two points needed further discussion:

- the role of the group of experts
- the role of the Standing Committee as the only organ being able to withdraw designations.

Other delegations expressed the view that the draft resolution needed more substantial changes. Most delegations wished to have more time to study the draft resolution.

The Committee instructed the Secretariat to prepare a new draft, to circulate it for comment to Parties and observers, and to put the item on the agenda for its next meeting.

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

The following item was presented only for information and was not discussed:

- European Red Data Book: Vertebrates - document T-PVS (97) 61

This report is a draft for comment of the first RDB on vertebrates in Europe. It was prepared by the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) and will be circulated for comment and presented in its final form to the Aarhus Ministerial Conference.

## PART III ? SPECIFIC SITES

### 6. Specific sites

#### 6.1 Files

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

T-PVS (97) 36 Report by Secretariat  
T-PVS (97) 33 Report from Sea Turtle Protection Society  
T-PVS (97) 46 Report from MEDASSET  
T-PVS (97) 52 Report from Zakynthian Ecological Movement  
T-PVS (97) 62 Greek government report

This issue has been on the agenda of the Committee since 1986 and no satisfactory solution has yet been found. It concerns a bay of particular importance for the nesting of the marine turtle *Caretta caretta* which is threatened by tourist development. 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 observed that Greece had made only limited progress in applying the Decision of 24 March 1995 and asked an expert to assess the legal situation regarding this problem in Greece. At its 16th meeting the Standing Committee took note of the report on the legal situation and expressed regret for the delay in the implementation of protection measures and reminded Greece that according to its Decision of 24 March 1995 the natural marine park planned should be created before 25 March 1998.

The Greek delegate informed the Committee on progress on this case. The delegate informed the Committee that Laganas Bay is included in the Greek National List of the Natura 2000 candidate sites. She pointed out that the Ministry of Environment, Physical Planning and Public Works had prepared the Special Environment Study (SES) for the establishment of the Zakynthos National Marine Park, which had been approved by Decision of the General Director of Environment, authorised as such by the Minister of Environment.

This document and the relevant Draft Presidential Decree for the Establishment of the Zakynthos National Park were submitted to the Zakynthos Prefectural Council for the expression of its opinion and the submission, through it, of written comments of any natural or legal person, having interest. The Draft Presidential Decree has also been officially submitted for comments to other competent Ministries.

The Environmental Division of the Ministry of the Environment having assessed the received opinion and comments, made the appropriate modifications to the Draft Presidential Decree and presented it to the legal services of the Ministry of Environment for final legal preparation. When it takes the final legal form, the documents will be signed by the relevant ministries and submitted for final examination to the Supreme State Council before being published in the Official Gazette. The Zakynthos National Marine Park is expected to be established by the end of March 1998.

The Presidential Decree provides the basis for the establishment/delineation of the Zakynthos National Marine Park (ZNMP), as well as, for the determination of the respective conditions and limitation, the establishment of the Management Body, the Advisory and Scientific Committees and the procedure for the establishment of the Management Regulations of the ZNMP. The ZNMP covers all the five breeding sites for the marine turtles and provides for a stricter protection, in relation to current legal protection measures.

The delegate of Greece also referred to the completion of the National Cadastral preparatory

technical phase and to the technical progress made in respect to shoreline delimitation process for the Dafni and Kalamaki sand dune areas.

The Greek delegate referred also to the Cooperation Agreement, prepared jointly by the Ministry of the Environment and the Zakynthos Prefectural Authority, by which the Greek Government and the European Union have ensured the necessary funds of 1,51 billion GRD (1 ECU  $\cong$  300 GRD) for technical works, activities and actions directly connected to the operation and management of the ZNMP.

The representative of EU pointed out that EU has contributed a substantial amount of money for the establishment and operation of the ZNMP (5 million ECU) and follows very closely developments on the case. The EU might make an on-spot appraisal during the next tourist season.

MEDASSET expressed its deep concerns related to continuing lack of progress and delays and pointed out the many problems related to implementation of the recommendations of the Standing Committee (6th meeting, 8-11 December 1987). MEDASSET referred to its complaint to the EU which was put into abeyance in 1996 and of its complaint to the Ombudsman of the EU in 1997. MEDASSET stated that the local authorities of Zakynthos had rejected the proposed marine park (in October 1997) in its actual form and have put forward their own different proposal for a much larger scale of development. The delegate of MEDASSET informed the Committee that the summer of 1997 was the worst for turtle conservation in Zakynthos since 1994.

The Sea Turtle Protection Society of Greece emphasised work carried out by this Society to raise public awareness and monitor nesting activity. The representative expressed his concern in terms of continuing illegal building in the area and violations of maritime zones by speed boats. This delegate said that the following points needed urgent attention:

- i) Immediate (before March 1998) drafting of a Presidential Decree in order to determine the financial status of the imminent National Marine Park. The Park should not only be on paper but must be able to operate with making funding available to meet running costs.
- ii) The land planning study for the rest of the island should be completed and implemented in order to secure a balanced development strategy for the whole of Zakynthos.
- iii) Immediate (before May 1998) purchase of a proper vessel to patrol the Bay of Laganas.
- iv) If EU money is to be frozen, this should not only apply to funds earmarked for the National Marine Park, but for all EU funds allocated to the whole island of Zakynthos. This can be used as a force of pressure toward the Local Authorities of Zakynthos in implementing protection measures.

The delegate of ZOK said it was not clear how and where the Greek government was going to create the National Marine Park, without proceeding first to the necessary delimitation of the coastal zone in the area. He was of the opinion that the way the Greek government was trying to delimitate - *de facto* - the coastal zone in the area of the park (with coordinates) was not in accordance with existing legislation. The coastal zone in Greece could only be delimited according to the procedure of Law 2344/1940 as analysed in the Survey of Mr de Klemm from last year. This is the reason why he proposed that the delimitation should end at the latest in March 1998 and he requested that this notion be noted.

The Committee congratulated the Greek government for the measures taken so far. It regretted deeply that there were no progressive developments on the situation. It urged the Greek government to implement measures for the establishment of the Zakynthos National Marine Park and recalled the decision of the Standing Committee adopted on 24 March 1995 and asked for its implementation.



The Committee decided to keep the file on Zakynthos open and wished to be informed of progress in the future.

**- Road construction in the Grünewald forest (Luxembourg)**

T-PVS (97) 39 Report from Secretariat

T-PVS (97) 37 Report from the Luxembourg government

This case concerns the construction of a 17.4 km long road in the Grünewald forest, an area on which the government has placed a compulsory protection order in a cabinet decision of 24 April 1981. The forest provides habitats for several species of fauna and flora listed in Appendices I and II to the Bern Convention. At its 15th meeting, the Committee expressed its concern at the probably serious repercussions the new road would have on the natural habitat and the numerous plant and animal species in the area concerned, and instructed the Secretariat to arrange for an on-the-spot enquiry, which took place on 8 August 1996. At the 16th meeting of the Committee, the expert presented his report and pointed out that the impact study stated that the road project must be accompanied by numerous compensation measures. The Committee expressed its strong concern and decided to set up a case file.

The delegate of the government of Luxembourg presented to the Standing Committee the report prepared by his delegation. The report confirmed the decision of the government of Luxembourg to go ahead with the construction of the road after approval by an act of 27 July 1997 passed by the Chamber of Deputies of Luxembourg. The delegate presented to the Standing Committee the compensatory measures adopted by the Government of Luxembourg to conserve nature and natural resources and pointed out that the government opted for a much more expensive development in order to prevent any hazards to the natural environment.

The Committee took note of the report and congratulated the government of Luxembourg on the compensatory measures adopted for the protection of nature and natural environment and requested information on the monitoring process of those measures. The delegate informed the Committee that monitoring is not provided by law but will be provided by the government which has every intention to do so. Measures will also be laid down in the Grand-Ducal regulation which will soon be officially published.

The representative of EUROBATS expressed his disappointment at the decision to go ahead with the construction of the road and wished that the compensatory measures would be closely monitored.

The Committee asked the delegation of Luxembourg that it be informed of future developments and decided to keep the file open to monitor the impact of road construction on nature and natural resources.

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

T-PVS (97) 45 Report by MEDASSET

T-PVS (97) 44 Report by Secretariat

T-PVS (97) 48 Report by Turkish government

This case concerns a beach in Patara which is a major nesting site for the marine turtle *Caretta caretta* (Appendix II to the Bern Convention) and which, according to some reports, is threatened by building projects. Recommendation No. 24 (1991) asked Turkey to halt construction activities on the beach at Patara until a management plan had been drawn up. The Secretariat was informed by MEDASSET that there were several building projects which posed a serious threat to the beaches, but the Turkish representative presented a report showing that there were no specific threats to this area, classified as a "Specially Protected Area" under Turkish legislation. At its 15th meeting, the Committee decided to commission an expert to do an on-the-spot appraisal. At its 16th meeting, the Standing Committee received the report by the expert, who proposed various recommendations designed to enhance the protection provided. The Standing Committee made clear its interest in the activities conducted by the Turkish government to support the preservation of sea turtles and adopted Recommendation No. 54 (1996) on this issue. The Standing Committee decided to open a case file.

The Turkish delegate informed the Standing Committee that in accordance with international conventions and the Turkish Environmental Law, 17 nesting sites of sea turtles at the coastal sites on the Mediterranean coast are under protection. He informed the Committee of the protection measures such as placement of barriers to prevent access to nesting sites during the nesting season from May to September, action to raise public awareness about the importance of the site for the protection of marine turtles, monitoring programmes to determine nesting places and prevent harmful factors, and control of illegal building. The Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Culture are working closely with relevant state ministries, regional and local authorities and the World Bank for the implementation of the management plan for nature conservation in Patara, financed by METAP and EU.

The representative of MEDASSET expressed concern and pointed out that there are still major problems related to continuing illegal building, 4-wheel car driving, motorbikes, horse riding, garbage, beach front leisure furniture, etc, in areas that are very important nesting sites for marine turtles and urged for measures to increase public awareness and enforcement of regulations and laws.

The WWF representative expressed similar concerns and raised some additional points. WWF also drew attention to the critical situation at another of the 17 important turtle nesting beaches at Belek. A marina is planned in the Specially Protected Area core zone where 50% of the *Caretta caretta* nests occur. The representative of WWF agreed to provide further information to the Bureau and the Chairman requested the government of Turkey also to provide information.

The Committee congratulated the Turkish government for protection measures undertaken so far. It noted that the situation still remains problematic and urged the Turkish Government to be more active and act quickly in enforcing regulations and implementing legislation established for the protection and conservation of nature. The Committee decided to keep the file open and wished to be informed of future developments on the case.

**- Akamas Peninsula (Cyprus)**

T-PVS (97 ) 21 On-the-spot appraisal  
T-PVS (97) 40 Report by MEDASSET

This issue concerns the building of a large tourist complex which could have a detrimental effect on an ecologically valuable area with many rare plant and animal species. The World Bank believed that the site could support only limited and strictly controlled development. At its previous meeting the Standing Committee decided that an on-the-spot appraisal be carried out. The appraisal took place on 21-23 July and was made by Prof. Lescure (France) and the Secretariat.

The expert presented the main findings of the visit:

The Akamas Peninsula has many and very interesting features of interest for nature conservation, the most relevant of which are its nesting beaches for marine turtles. Present regulations in the area offer some protection to a part of the nesting beaches, but not enough to assure a long term preservation of all areas of importance. The regulations in Lara and Toxteftra beaches are not always respected and the important beach of Limni receives no protection. The progress of building activities (such as the Thanos Hotel and other planned developments) is the main risk towards conservation of the natural values of the area, which should be subject to a far reaching conservation initiative through the creation of a National Park along the lines suggested in the World Bank report.

The Secretariat presented the draft recommendation.

The delegate of Cyprus informed the Committee that the World Bank report was being examined by the Cyprus Committee of Ministers and the creation of a park was pending decision. Most likely the zonation of the park will include a core area and buffer zones where different activities would be authorised. It is not clear yet which category will have the area where the Thanos Hotel is placed. The "relaxation" (increased capacity) given to the hotel is now contested in court. The protection of the Limni area should be seen as separate to the Akamas issue. The beach is of importance for nesting turtles and requires protection.

The SEH delegate welcomed the report, pointed out several areas requiring protection and wished that neighbouring sea grass areas of importance for turtles not be forgotten.

The MEDASSET delegate said that there were other development projects close to Limni and to the Thanos Hotel (construction of which is proceeding at a fast pace), and that it was important to stop them before the degradation became irreversible. A court case by NGOs against the government for the relaxations granted is not yet under way.

The Committee adopted a recommendation on the conservation of the Akamas peninsula, as it appears in Appendix 16 of this report

## 6.2 Possible new files:

The Committee examined the following cases:

### - Rhine-Rhone Grand Canal Project (France)

T-PVS (97) 47 Report from Secretariat

During its meeting of 12 May 1997, the Bureau noted that information had been requested from the French government regarding this case. It expressed its deep concern about the project's potential impact and asked the government to present a written report on the current situation to the Standing Committee's 17th meeting, under possible new files. The Secretariat presented a report stating that the project had been since abandoned by the French government.

The French delegate informed the Standing Committee on the positive developments of this case. She announced to the Committee that the plans to build the canal were officially abandoned by the French Government and there would be no need to pursue the case further.

The Committee expressed its satisfaction with the decision of the French government and decided not to pursue this case any further.

### - Conservation of *Oxyura leucocephala* and eradication of *Oxyura jamaicensis* (United Kingdom)

T-PVS (97) 22 Report from SEO-BirdLife  
(see also appendix 7 of T-PVS (97) 15)

The Group of Experts on Conservation of Birds, at its meeting on 5-8 May 1997 in Izmir (Turkey) invited the Standing Committee to examine and, if appropriate, adopt a draft recommendation on the conservation of the white-headed duck (*Oxyura leucocephala*). The Bureau studied this issue and thought it would be appropriate to propose to the Committee the opening of a file. The case deals with the absence of measures of the United Kingdom government (and other governments) against the proliferation of the introduced species *Oxyura jamaicensis*. This species was first introduced in the United Kingdom, where it has its most important population. *Oxyura jamaicensis*, which hybridises with the European endemic *Oxyura leucocephala*, has become the main risk to the conservation of that threatened endemic.

The delegate of SEO-BirdLife informed the Committee on the progress of the ruddy duck in Spain, explaining all the conservation measures being taken by the conservation authorities to eradicate ruddy ducks. It was, however, vital that the United Kingdom population be controlled as otherwise present costly controls would prove useless. He congratulated Denmark for their commitment to control ruddy ducks.

The delegate of the United Kingdom said that his country was committed to the conservation of the white-headed duck but that no decision had been taken towards control of ruddy ducks. He informed the Committee that animal welfare organisations opposed the control of ruddy ducks and that the issue had other technical difficulties, such as access to private land where landowners may oppose ruddy duck control. His government was very willing to take into account the discussions held at the Standing Committee meeting and the recommendation.

The delegate of Switzerland said that his government was ready to control ruddy ducks but that this would only make sense if the United Kingdom did the same, as it would otherwise be useless.

The delegate of France said that her country had set up an action plan to protect the white-

headed duck by combating the ruddy duck. The objective was to eradicate the ruddy duck, alert and inform the partners concerned and monitor and control trade in this introduced species. She stressed that the plan, which had resulted in legislation would require a considerable investment now and in the future. It would be desirable if Great Britain, whose problems she understood, could set up a similar plan soon, otherwise the efforts made might be fruitless.

The delegates of Hungary and Iceland expressed great concern for this issue and invited all Parties with populations of ruddy ducks to control them.

The delegate of Iceland said that *Oxyura jamaicensis* had been breeding successfully in his country and that his government was evaluating how it might affect other native species.

The delegate of RSPB-BirdLife explained the involvement of his organisation in the solution of this matter and criticised the failure of the United Kingdom government to take measures, as this aggravated the case.

The delegate of the European Commission suggested that the issue also be discussed in the ORNIS Committee.

The Committee adopted the recommendation as it appears in Appendix 12 of this report.

#### **- Dorset Heathlands (United Kingdom)**

T-PVS (97) 29 Report from SEH

T-PVS (97) 50 Report from UK government

At its meeting of 12 May 1997, the Bureau requested the United Kingdom to present a written report to the Standing Committee's 17th meeting, under possible new files. It also hoped that the Standing Committee would agree to carry out an on-the-spot visit. The case, which has been discussed in previous years by the Committee deals with the insufficient protection given by the United Kingdom government to the remaining heathlands in Dorset. These valuable habitats, which support a number of species protected by the Convention, are seriously threatened by fires and building activities, including new housing and construction of roads.

The United Kingdom delegate explained the complexity of the issue, which concerned a highly populated area. He expressed the strong commitment of his government to the conservation of the valuable heathlands and its Appendix listed species. The United Kingdom government was addressing the different problems in an appropriate form. Heathland fires were adequately dealt with but prosecution of offenders was difficult due to lack of evidence, not to a lack of will to prosecute for breach of wildlife protection laws. Planning is also being carried out in an appropriate way by the competent panels, which take into account the needs of nature conservation.

The SEH delegate gave a detailed counter view on the current efforts to combat and prevent this arson and on the delays to Natura 2000 designation. He concluded that the total of 1200 fires in only three seasons reflected the inefficiency in tackling the problem.

BirdLife expressed doubts concerning the actual attention given to environmental planning constraint in urban planning in Dorset.

The Committee decided that it would be appropriate to carry out an on-the-spot appraisal to help define the problem and how it could be rectified. The appraisal would be carried out by an independent expert and the Secretariat. The United Kingdom delegation was in favour of an on-the-spot appraisal, to which its government would give appropriate support.

The observers from WWF International and IUCN reminded the Standing Committee that the

case file was closed on the understanding that if matters re-occurred or remained unresolved then the case file would be re-opened. The observers believed that this was the situation now and that the file should indeed be re-opened.

The issue will be included in the agenda of the next meeting of the Committee as a possible file.

### **6.3 Information on the following issues:**

#### **- *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 Baie* 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. At its 15th meeting, the Standing Committee welcomed the government's efforts to ensure that the explosives could be destroyed without impairing the wildlife of the Somme Bay, and accepted the French delegate's offer to report back at the next meeting. At its 16th meeting the Standing Committee did not discuss the questions under item 6.3 due to lack of time.

The French delegate informed the Standing Committee of the measures taken by the French government to reduce the threat to *Phoca vitulina* in the Somme Bay. She pointed out that the government is working very closely with nature protection associations to increase public awareness on the issue. The destruction of explosives had been permanently halted.

The Committee took note of the information provided and progress achieved and at the request of the French delegate decided to close the file.

#### **- *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*). At its 15th meeting, the Standing Committee expressed its continuing interest in the site. It welcomed the news that the Michelin company had voluntarily agreed to transfer its activities and praised this spirit of understanding by industry for nature conservation. It also congratulated the French government for having modified its texts so that the Conservatory for Coastal and Lakeside Areas could acquire this site, and for having drawn up, in consultation with local partners, a long-term conservation strategy for the site, and accepted its proposal to keep it informed of developments with regard to other building projects at its next meeting. At its 16th meeting, due to lack of time, the Standing Committee did not discuss this case.

The French delegate informed the Committee that the French government was working closely with the French Conservatory for Coastal and Lakeside Areas, local partners and NGOs to draw up and implement a conservation programme for this area. The main purpose of the general-interest programme, which resulted in legislation in May 1997, was to promote co-operation between the various parties in order to ensure the long-term preservation of this remarkable area.

The Committee took note of the information provided by the French delegate and decided to close the file.

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

T-PVS (97) 49 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. At its 16th meeting, due to lack of time, the Standing Committee did not discuss this case.

The delegate of France informed the committee that the Ministry of the Environment, in conjunction with, but also at the request of, local partners, had set up a scientific, technical and financial system, thanks to which the programme of experimental reintroduction in the Central Pyrenees had been successfully put into practice. Three bears had been released in this area since May 1996 with the agreement of the local authorities. One case of reproduction had already been noted. This programme was being conducted with the support of the European Community and in close collaboration with the Spanish authorities. The shooting of one of the three bears by a hunter last September, judged to have been in self-defence, would not cast doubt on the continuation of the programme.

In the Pyrénées atlantiques, the Haut Béarn Heritage Institution was pursuing the implementation of the charter signed in 1994 by the state and the local parties concerned. In December 1996, this same institution announced that it would like to reintroduce two bears. Needless to say, this project could not be carried out until all the requisite conditions were met.

The National Society for the Protection of Nature emphasised the need for the French government to work harder at a local level and convince local authorities and local people to protect the habitat.

The Committee took note of the report and decided to close the file. It requested the French government to continue to keep the Committee informed.

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

T-PVS (96) 80 Secretariat report

T-PVS (97) 59 German government 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. It accepted the German offer to keep the Bureau informed of developments and decided to examine the case at its next meeting. At its 16th meeting, due to lack of time the Standing Committee did not discuss this case.

The German delegate informed the Committee that, thanks to an arrangement between the Minister of Lower Saxony and the firm ASD, no peat was being extracted in the area occupied by the reptiles. The animals were being transferred to a new area which was being prepared as a suitable habitat for reptiles. The area receives protection from local authorities.

The SEH delegate congratulated the German government for its successful actions and

supported the closure of this file. He did, however, request a report in due course on the outcome of any translocation as this could have important implications for the working of the Convention.

The Committee decided that it was unnecessary to pursue this matter any longer.

The Committee suggested having in three or four years' time a report on the success of the transfer of the animals.

#### **- Missolonghi wetlands (Greece)**

Relevant document: T-PVS (96) 79 Secretariat Report  
T-PVS (97) 62 Greek government 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 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". At its 16th meeting, due to lack of time, the Standing Committee did not discuss this case.

The Greek delegate referred to the information on this subject supplied by her which is included in document T-PVS (96) 23. Furthermore she reported that the cost benefit study on the diversion of the Acheloos river had been completed and was expected to be officially submitted in December 1997. She reported that technical works for the Sykia and Mesochora dams and the Mesochora-Gistra diversion tunnel are progressing. The delegate told the Committee that a study has been undertaken to determine the migratory aquatic vertebrates that occur in the Acheloos river and the impact of existing and foreseen technical hydraulic works on the anadromous and catadromous movements of these vertebrates.

The delegate pointed out that the Missolonghi-Aetolikon wetlands area and the downstream and river mouths of Acheloos and Evinos as well as other biotopes in their greater area have been designated as candidates for the Natura 2000 Greek National List.

She report that a Special Environmental Study for the area was in hand and would provide the basis for the preparation of a Presidential Decree to adopt the appropriate conservation measures.

The delegate informed the Committee that a management cooperation agreement financed by the Ministry of Environment and operated by the Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Agriculture and regional and prefectorial authorities and the Aetolikon Municipality, had been operating as from



October 1997. The financing is directed towards action to provide information to the public and promotion of the environmental values of the area. NGOs are actively involved in its implementation, with one of them acting as technical adviser to the ruling body of this agreement.

The delegate of BirdLife stressed that one must not lose sight of this issue, which is of vital importance to the operation of the Convention. Rapid verbal reports do not allow the Committee to see whether progress is being made in line with Recommendation No. 38 and other formal decisions of the Committee. BirdLife requested that next year the Committee has a comprehensive report in writing to enable meaningful discussion.

BirdLife also indicated that it had recently heard of another case in a Greek wetland of great importance. This involved drainage at Lake Vistonis in the National Park of East Macedonia and Thrace. BirdLife proposed to pass a paper on this to the Greek government and to the Bureau, for consideration for discussion at the next meeting.

The Committee took note of the report from the Greek delegate and decided that the information was insufficient and unclear. The Greek delegate offered to provide written information for the next meeting of the Bureau and the 18th meeting of the Standing Committee.

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

T-PVS (97) 28 Report by SEH

T-PVS (97) 62 Greek government report

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.

The delegates of SEH regretted that no written report had been produced and said that the matter was very urgent because, according to their studies, the species was declining, mainly through illegal collection and kills on the road. The major long-term threat was the quarrying of its habitat. They said that Greece was just not acting to protect the species.

The delegate of Greece reported to the Committee that the Ministry of the Environment in cooperation with the Milos Municipality and the Goulandris Natural History Museum had launched, with EU funding, the project "The Milos Viper Biotopes" which is being carried out (1996-1999). This project involves a Special Environmental Study (documentation for the associated legal conservation measures in the form of a Draft Presidential Decree), the development and operation of an Information Centre, Information/Awareness activities for the locals on the Viper biotopes management measures and a Study on the biology/ecology of this species. This latter study will cover the monitoring of the biology/ecology of the Milos viper and will also lead to an estimation of habitat quality and availability in the islands of Polyegos, Kimolos and Sifnos. However, the delegate of Greece recalled former statements of her delegation, during previous T-PVS meetings, according to which the whole western Milos is recognised as an area with mineral resources of supreme national importance (relevant Decision of the National Physical Planning and Environment Council, 1981). Therefore, any institutional conservation and appropriate physical planning proposal leading, as much as possible, to a compromise between the conflicting interests, has to be forced in the context of this Decision. Change of this decision, if any, is connected to the adoption, in the future, of a new legal frame for the Physical Planning Procedures and Mechanisms.

Finally, the Greek delegate referred to the alternative solutions, under examination, for minimising the accidental killings of this species and to the successful result of guarding against the attempts of illegal collectors for illegal collection and exportation.

The SEH delegate said that protection of the viper's habitat in Natura 2000 took a negligible

part of the species distribution and that this was clearly insufficient for the requirements of the Habitats Directive.

The Committee asked Greece to implement, as a matter of urgency, its Recommendation No. 26 (1991), to put into practice measures to avoid road kills and to present a detailed report to its next meeting.

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

T-PVS (96) 44 Secretariat report  
T-PVS (96) 85 MEDASSET document  
T-PVS (97) 43 MEDASSET report  
T-PVS (97) 62 Greek government report

This concerns a tourist development at Kaminia which is felt could pose a threat to the loggerhead turtles *Caretta caretta*, a species listed in Appendix II to the Bern Convention, which lay their eggs on the beach. At its 16th meeting, the Standing Committee took note of the explanations given by the Greek Delegate and insisted that the Greek government take every necessary measure to protect marine turtles.

The delegate of Greece informed the Committee that the case of Kaminia can not be considered and treated the same way as that of other significant sea turtle nesting sites such as Laganas Bay, Kyparissiakos Gulf and the Northern Coast of Crete, all designated for inclusion in Natura 2000 Greek National List.

The delegate reported that the Ministry of Environment is assessing all available data and information for the nesting activity in Kaminia in the framework of a Special Physical Planning Study for the Kaminia island. She pointed out that the Ministry of Environment will draft proposals for the conservation of *Caretta caretta* in the area and will bring the proposals to the attention of the competent regional and prefectural authorities to seek the appropriate solutions.

The representative of MEDASSET expressed her concerns about the situation in Kaminia and pointed out problems associated with the disruption of dune systems and the negative impact of artificial lighting, camping, tree planting, speedboats, litter, recreational vehicles and beach furniture on the nesting beaches.

The Committee took note of the report and approved the recommendation attached to it (see Appendix 16 to this document). It decided to keep the file open and requested the Greek government to present information for the 18th meeting of the Committee.

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

T-PVS (96) 41 Secretariat report  
T-PVS (97) 60 Planning activities in Porto: NGO report  
T-PVS (97) 62 Greek government 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. At its 16th meeting, the Standing Committee took note of the indications presented by the Greek delegate. 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.

The Greek delegate informed the Committee that the Ministry of Environment had officially

asked the Environmental and Physical Planning Division of the Region of South Aegean, as the competent authority, to proceed with the preparation of a town planning study for the three existing urban units that have been established in the Porto-Tinos settlement, to ensure the protection of the existing water streams. However, the coastal area of Porto has been under the concern of the Ministry of the Environment since 1991 and it has been assessed of local significance, in terms of ecological characteristics, whose management should be based on physical and town planning regulations.

The Committee took note of the report and decided to close the file. The Committee suggested that it would rely on the goodwill of the Greek government to receive information on future developments.

**- *Testudo marginata* in Greece**

T-PVS (97) 62 Greek government report

This species is highly threatened in Greece and requires protection of its most important sites. At the 16th meeting 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.

The Greek delegate mentioned that on the basis of scientific field work, this endemic species has a great range on insular and continental Greece, with the exception of Central and Eastern Macedonia and Thrace, and it occurs in 52 out of the 265 candidate Natura 2000 sites included in the Greek National List. The main threats against *Testudo marginata* are illegal collection for the illegal export trade, consumption by illegal emigrants (at least for the last four to five years in Northern Greece) and the forest fires. The Ministries of the Environment and Agriculture will undertake coordinated action for a campaign for the competent services, to control illegal collection and trade.

The SEH delegate regretted that the largest known population at Gythion, the subject of Recommendation No. 26 (1991), had now been lost through habitat destruction. He was unaware of any comprehensive national field survey that might support Natura 2000 selection for this sparsely populated species. He urged a start on a national survey.

The Committee took note of the information received, encouraged Greece to carry out a national survey as soon as possible, and to implement fully its Recommendation No. 27 (1991) and decided not to pursue any further the discussion on this issue at its meetings.

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

T-PVS (96) 90 Document submitted by the Netherlands government

T-PVS (97) 54 Document submitted by the Netherlands government

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. In view of the importance that should be attached to the species, the Bureau decided to include the matter on the agenda of the 16th meeting of the Standing Committee as a possible file. Due to lack of time, the Standing Committee did not discuss this item at its 16th meeting.

The delegate of the Netherlands presented the new developments regarding the construction of this high speed track. In 1996 the plans had been subjected to public consultation, as a result of which a paper was published. The government is to carry out an Environmental Impact Assessment which will also be subject to widespread consultation. The final position of the Minister will be decided around 2000, when a draft Track Decree will be published. Work is to start in 2002 or 2003. His government recognises the high herpetological value of some of the areas that may be affected and will

take all necessary measures to minimise the impact, particularly on threatened species.

The SEH delegate thanked the Dutch delegate for such precise information which accurately reflected the situation today. However, as this railway line would necessitate receptor site preparation for translocated reptiles, he urged that a programme of habitat enhancement be started sooner rather than later.

The Dutch delegate expressed his will to do so and the Committee decided not to discuss this issue before the Track receives official approval.

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

T-PVS (96) 81 Report from Secretariat

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

This case concerns a wind farm in Tarifa, where an additional 90 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.

The Spanish delegate informed the Committee that the Regional government of Andalusia had carried out an Environmental Impact Assessment on the windmills and was ready to impose appropriate restrictions as to the locating of windmills.

The BirdLife delegate stressed that in this case the most important factor for consideration was the choice of specific sites in respect of their interaction with the birds which use them. There are now some 37 new windfarms proposed for the area, with a total of 1700 turbines - an increase of five times the present number: several of these are in areas which the official plan recommended should be excluded from such development. It should be noted, however, that this plan is regrettably not legally binding, nor compulsory and does not take corrective measures for existing wind farms.

BirdLife is worried that no mitigation measures have yet been taken at the 28 windmill sites which caused 60% of the mortality to Griffon Vultures. BirdLife believes that this file for information should be kept open. The Committee should consider next year whether the Andalusian government was acting appropriately to select sites for wind farms in this important area.

The Committee thought this was a serious matter, invited the governments of Spain and Andalusia to avoid authorising windmills in critical areas and asked the government of Spain to present an information document at the next meeting of the Committee.

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

T-PVS (97) 57 Turkish government report

The species is threatened in the Dalaman delta and in the Seyhan and Ceyhan lower rivers, 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 Turkish delegate, informed the Standing Committee at its 16th meeting, 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 Committee wished that management plans on the species might be drafted and implemented.

The delegates of MEDASSET and SEH gave a detailed account of the lack of protection of this species and the many threats it was subject to, particularly in Dalyan and in the Dalaman delta. Persecution by fishermen and damage from boat traffic was common. They urged Turkey to implement Recommendation No. 26 (1991) of the Committee.

MEDASSET took this opportunity to point to the report on Nature Conservation in Dalyan by MEDASSET in 1996 and 1997 (T-PVS (97) 42) and asked the Secretariat to include Patara in the agenda of the next meeting of the Contracting Parties in 1998 in order to consider the opening of a file on this issue.

The delegate of Turkey stated that his government had prepared a conservation programme to determine the areas of importance for this species and the factors affecting its survival. Monitoring of the species was carried out in a number of areas.

The Committee asked Turkey to implement without delay Recommendation No. 26 (1991) and to present an updated report at the next meeting of the Committee.

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

T-PVS (97) 58 Turkish government report

The species has been discussed by the Group of experts on amphibians and reptiles. Turkey was encouraged to create nature reserves around lakes Karagöl and Cinegöl but the borders of those lakes also require protection. The Turkish delegate informed the Standing Committee at its 16th meeting 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 delegate of Turkey informed the Committee that the species exists in two small lakes high in the Bolkar mountain, in an area relatively free of negative impacts and that the species was safe. The species is legally protected. A research on the species is to be carried out in 1998 by the Ministry of Environment, aimed at drafting of an action plan on the species.

The delegates of SEH said there seemed to be confusion as to which lakes had received protection and that, the species being so localised and vulnerable, strict protection measures needed to be implemented.

The Secretariat informed the Committee that trout had been introduced into lake Karagöl, which might be a serious threat to the species. He proposed to mediate between the SEH and the Turkish government so as to permit that a " safe net" population might be created in captivity, following what was done with the Majorcan midwife toad (*Alytes muletensis*).

The Turkish delegation stated that their government was ready to consider such a possibility in a positive spirit of international cooperation and added that carp and trout species were introduced into Lake Karagöl during the years 1993, 1994 and 1995. These species had been fished by the Governorship of Ni\_de since 1996.

The Committee wished to be informed at its next meeting of any news on this population and invited the government of Turkey to submit a written report for its next meeting.

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

T-PVS (96) 35 Secretariat report

T-PVS (97) 56 Turkish government 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). At the 16th

meeting of the Standing Committee, the Turkish delegate informed the Committee 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 to 300 000 in 1996).

The Turkish government delegate informed the Committee that the Burdur lake was declared a Ramsar site. She reported on the measures undertaken by the Turkish government to ensure protection of the area from the activities of the industrial complex, among which the afforestation of the area, control of solid and liquid waste, completion of the feasibility study for Burdur Municipal Waste Water Treatment, acquisition of land for the waste water treatment plant and plans to finish its construction in 1998.

The Committee took note of the report and requested the Turkish government to provide information for the 18th meeting. The Committee suggested that the Turkish government cooperate with BirdLife International on the case.

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

T-PVS (96) 36 Secretariat report

T-PVS (97) 51 WWF report

T-PVS (97) 53 UK government 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 his government was examining the biodiversity proposals made by the UK Biodiversity Steering Group, which included action plans for a number of threatened species in the country, including *Triturus cristatus*.

The United Kingdom delegate presented a progress report on this matter. In 1997 work had progressed in the creating of the new reserve and the translocation exercise appeared to be going well. Monitoring of newts translocated in 1993/94 indicated that high numbers of newts were being maintained and breeding was successful. Three thousand newts were translocated in 1996 and 2 500 in 1997. The United Kingdom remained committed to completing the translocation programme.

The delegate of WWF presented a very full report on the issue, and doubted that translocation of over 12 000 newts could be done successfully without major loss of animals. It was obvious that the protection of the newt in its original colony was a more satisfactory approach, and the one that was favoured by the spirit and the text of the Convention. The matter was of considerable interest as this was the greatest newt population in Europe. The delegate of SEH agreed with this view and said that the United Kingdom government had only contemplated mitigation measures, not real protection.

The Committee decided that the matter should be kept open for discussion by the Committee and instructed the Secretariat to prepare, for its next meeting, a draft recommendation on the issue. The Committee asked the United Kingdom government to submit a progress report for its next meeting.

**- Areas of herpetile interest in Hopa and Giresun (Turkey)**

T-PVS (97) 55 On-the-spot appraisal report

This issue has been on the agenda of the Committee on several occasions, the Committee having instructed the Secretariat to prepare an on-the-spot appraisal in 1993 to assist the Turkish authorities in the design of measures to protect the exceptionally rich herpetological fauna of the area. The appraisal was carried out in September 1997 by Mr Claes Andrén and the Secretariat.

Mr Claes Andrén presented his report to the Standing Committee. The report describes the findings and outlines the recommendations and conservation proposals for the Turkish government.

The Committee took note of the report.

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

### **7. Organisation matters and financing of Programme of activities for 1998**

T-PVS (97)12 Draft programme of activities for 1998

The Secretariat presented a programme of activities for 1998 and informed the Standing Committee of the financial situation regarding implementation of the Programme of Activities for 1997.

The Chairman thanked the parties having made financial contributions. The Secretariat explained that substantial voluntary contributions would be required to execute the draft budget.

The Committee adopted the budget and programme of activities as reproduced in Appendix 17 to this report.

The delegate of France said her government would be glad to cover the full costs of element 8.6 of the programme (eradication of introduced species).

### **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 28 votes for, out of 28 votes cast.

The Committee elected Mr Gerard Boere (Netherlands) Vice-Chairman by 27 votes for, and one invalid vote, out of 28 votes cast.

The Committee elected Mrs Marie-Christine Van Klaveren (Monaco) to form part of the Bureau.

The Standing Committee noted that the Bureau now consisted of Mr Spiridonov (Chairman), Mr Boere (Vice-Chairman), and Mrs Van Klaveren.

### **9. Date and place of the 18th meeting, adoption of the report and other business**

The Committee decided to hold its next meeting in Strasbourg from 30 November to 4 December 1998.

**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 meetings, technical meetings of MedWet, meetings of Barcelona, Biological Diversity, Bonn, Bucharest and Ramsar Conventions, "Habitats" Directive meetings, European Environment Agency meetings, the Aarhus Ministerial Conference, 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 5 December 1997.

### **Other business:**

#### **— Parliamentary Assembly**

Mr Staes (Belgium, PPE), thanking the committee for its invitation, said that he wished to present briefly the main recent activities of the Committee on the Environment, Regional Planning and Local Authorities, and in particular:

- ? activities to promote the new European Charter of Mountain Regions;
- ? activities in connection with regional planning, an area in which greater co-operation between the senior officials in charge of these questions and national elected representatives would be desirable;
- ? drafting of a report on the state of the environment in Russia, on which he had asked the members of the committee for any useful information they might have.

#### **— Progress on the African-Eurasian Waterbird Agreement (AEWA)**

The Dutch delegate made the following statement:

"Mr Chairman,

May I give you an update on the African Eurasian Waterbird Agreement. Further to the information in the new issue of the AEWA Newsletter, distributed yesterday, another two countries have signed the AEWA. Furthermore, we have been informed that South Africa will invite the next (6th) CoP of the Bonn Convention to be held in South Africa at the end of 1999. It is therefore foreseen that the first Meeting of the Parties to the AEWA will be held back to back with the 6th CoP of the Bonn Convention.

Finally, Mr Chairman, at the 5th CoP of the Bonn Convention, in April last, the Netherlands announced that in the next three to five years about four million US \$ will be invested in wetlands and waterbird conservation in West Africa. I am pleased to inform you that in the coming weeks the first contract of about \$ 2.5 million will be signed with Wetlands International to support a large number of activities to develop and implement the AEWA in close cooperation with the countries in the region of West Africa.

I will keep this Committee informed on further progress."

#### **— Agreement on the conservation of cetaceans in the Mediterranean and Black Seas and the adjacent Atlantic zone**

The Secretariat of the Agreement made the following statement:

"The result of a process begun in 1985 in the framework of the Bern Convention, this agreement, signed in Monaco in November 1996 in accordance with Article IV, paragraph 4, of the Bonn Convention, is the translation into practice of joint work carried out by the secretariats of the Bern, Barcelona and Bonn Conventions, joined by the Bucharest Convention because the agreement also covers the Black Sea.

Containing an action plan, the Agreement imposes a total prohibition on the intentional capture of cetaceans, with a special derogation for non-lethal on-site research for the purpose of maintaining conditions favourable to the conservation of these animals.

It also provides for measures related to fishing, which essentially consist in limiting the length of drift nets to 2.5 km.

The agreement is open to states in the species distribution area, ie coastal states and states under whose flag vessels are registered which have activities in the species distribution area likely to affect the living conditions of cetaceans.

To date, 11 states have signed the agreement; Monaco has ratified it, and the ratification process is under way in a number of countries. We would also like to express our gratitude to Turkey, which recently announced that it would sign and ratify the agreement very shortly.

Five Mediterranean countries and two Black Sea countries must ratify the agreement for it to enter into force."

#### — **The monk seal in Mauritania**

The delegate of Monaco asked about the situation of the colony of monk seals in Mauritania, as she was worried about the future of that important population, vital for the long-term conservation of the species.

In the absence of the Spanish delegation, the Secretariat informed the Committee that a high mortality hit that population in 1997, most likely as a result of poisoning by toxic algae. Death of adults had been particularly important, while juveniles had been much less affected.

The LIFE project carried out by the Spanish government on that population would be modified to take account of the new situation. Consultation with the scientific community and the Commission was on-going but no decision had yet been taken on how to redirect the project.

The Committee expressed its concern on the future of that population, took note of the information provided and asked the Bureau to decide on whether to include this issue in the next meeting of the Committee.

#### — **"Journées Européennes du Cortinaire"**

The representative of "Journées Européennes du Cortinaire" wished that the Committee worked more on threatened fungi. He offered lists of threatened European species. The delegate of France supported the idea.

The Committee asked the Secretariat to include the issue in the agenda of the next meeting of the Group of experts on conservation of plants.

## APPENDIX 1

### LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

**Austria/Autriche** Mr Harald GROSS, Amt der Wiener Landesregierung, Magistratsabteilung 22, Ebendorferstrasse 4, A 1082 WIEN (E)  
Tel. +43 1 4000 99 88 344 Fax +43 1 4000 99 88 344

Ms Ing. Irene OBERLEITNER, Federal Environmental Agency (Umweltbundesamt), Spittelauer Lände 5, A -1190 WIEN (E)  
Tel. +43 1 31 304 5452 Fax +41 1 31 304 5400 E-mail: oberleitner@ubavie.gv.at

**Belgium/Belgique** M. Patrick DE WOLF, Direction générale des Ressources naturelles et de l'Environnement, Division de la Nature et des Forêts, Direction de la Conservation de la nature, 15 avenue Prince de Liège, B-5100 JAMBES (F)  
Tel. +32 81 321 322 Fax +32 81 321 260 E-mail: dewolf@ecol.ucl.ac.be

Mr Kris DECLEER, Institute of Nature Conservation, Kliniekstraat 25, B-1070 BRUSSEL  
Tel. +32 2 558 18 47 Fax +32 2 558 18 05 E-mail kris.decleer@instnat.be (E)

*Apologised for absence/excusé*

**\*Bulgaria/Bulgarie** Mme Raina HARDALOVA, Expert, Office national pour la protection de la nature, Ministère de l'Environnement et des Eaux de Bulgarie, 67 W. Gladstone Str., 1000 SOFIA (F)  
Tel. +359 2 8472-2279 Fax +359 2 52 16 34

Mr Geko SPIRIDONOV (Chairman/Président), Chef de la Division biodiversité et aires protégées, Département national des Forêts, 17 rue Antim I, 1040 SOFIA (F)  
Tél. +359 2 875144 Fax +359 2 981 3736 E-mail miramil@mbox.cit.bg

**\*Burkina Faso** Mr Bobodo Blaise SAWADAGO, Ingénieur des Eaux et Forêts, Chef du Service Aménagement et Protection de la Direction de la Faune et des Chasses, Ministère de l'Environnement et de l'Eau, 03 BP 7044 OUAGADOUGOU (F)  
Tél. +226 30 72 94 Fax +226 36 03 53 [E-mail: Delphine @ conages.mee.bf]

**Cyprus/Chypre** Mr Andreas DEMETROPOULOS, Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment, Department of Fisheries, Eolou Street 13, NICOSIA 1416 (E)  
Tel. +357 (0)2 303279 Fax +357 (0)2 775955 E-mail: andrecws@logos.cy.net

**Denmark/Danemark** Ms Karin JENSEN, Biologist, Ministry of the Environment & Energy, National Forest & Nature Agency, Haraldsgade 53, DK 2100 COPENHAGEN Ø (E)  
Tel. +45 39 47 20 00 Fax +45 39 27 98 99 E-mail: kje@sns.dk

Ms Pernille MÅNSSON, Lawyer, Head of Section, Ministry of the Environment & Energy, National Forest & Nature Agency, Haraldsgade 53, DK 2100 COPENHAGEN Ø (E)  
Tel. +45 39 47 20 00 Fax +45 39 27 98 99 E-mail: kje@sns.dk

#### **\*Estonia/Estonie**

**European Community/Communauté européenne** M. Bruno JULIEN, Direction générale environnement, sécurité nucléaire et protection civile (DG XI/D/2), (TRMF 2/89), Commission européenne, 200 rue de la Loi, B 1049 BRUXELLES, Belgique (E/F)

M. Tanino DICORRADO, Administrateur principal, Coordinateur pour la Méditerranée, Direction générale environnement, sécurité nucléaire et protection civile (DG XI/A/4), 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 E-mail: dicorta@dg11.cec.be

M. Olivier DIANA, Directive Habitats, Direction générale environnement, sécurité nucléaire et protection civile (DG XI/D/2), (adr. adm: Triomflaan 174 (2/10), 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. Paolo STANCANELLI, Commission européenne, Service juridique (N-85 2/57), rue de la Loi 200, B-1049 BRUXELLES (E/F) Tel. +32 2 296 1808 Fax+32 2 295 2486

**Finland/Finlande** Mr Antti A.A. HAAPANEN, 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 9588

E-mail Antti.Haapanen@vyh.fi

Mr Christian KROGELL, Inspector General, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Department of Fisheries and Game, Hallituskatu 3A, FIN 00170 HELSINKI (E)

Tel. + 358 9 160 3373 Fax + 358 9 160 22 84 E-mail: christian.krogell@mmm.fi

**France** Mme Véronique HERRENSCHMIDT, chargée de mission internationale, Ministère de l'Aménagement du territoire et de l'Environnement, Direction de la Nature et des paysages, 20 avenue de Ségur, 75302 PARIS 07 SP (F) Tel. +33 (0)1 42 19 19 48

Fax: +33 (0)1 42 19 19 77 E-mail: herrenschmidt@environnement.gouv.fr

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

**Germany/Allemagne** Ms Astrid THYSSEN, Amtsrätin, Bundesministerium für Umwelt, Naturschutz und Reaktorsicherheit, Referat N I 3, Postfach 12 06 29, D 53048 BONN (E/F)

Tel. +49 228 305 2634 Fax +49 228 305 2697 E-mail: n13-3003@wp-gate.bmu.de

**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

**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

Mr Antal SANTA, Senior Counsellor, Ministry for Environment and Regional Policy, National Authority for Nature Conservation, Dept of Wildlife Conservation, K\_Itö utca 21, H 1121 BUDAPEST XII (E)

Tel. 36 1/395 2605 Fax 36 1/175 7857 E-mail: antal.santa@ktm.x400gw.itb.hu

**Iceland/Islande** Dr Jòn Gunnar OTTÓSSON, Director General, Icelandic Institute of Natural History, Hlemmur 3, 125 REYKJAVIK (E)

Tel. 354 562 9822 Fax 354 551 5185 E-mail: jgo@nattfs.is

**Ireland/Irlande**

**Italy/Italie** Prof. Emilio BALLETO, 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-mail: balletto@dm.unito.it (E/F)

**\*Latvia/Lettonie** Ms Ilona LODZINA, Deputy Director, Environmental Protection Department, Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development, 25 Peldu Str., LV-1494 RIGA (E)  
Tel. +371 7 026517 Fax + 371 7 820 442 e-mail: daba@varam.gov.lv

Mr Vilnis BERNARDS, Senior official, Environmental Protection Department, Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development, 25 Peldu Str., LV-1494 RIGA (E)  
Tel. +371 702 6524 Fax +371 782 0442 E-mail: mopsis@varam.gov.lv

**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)

**\*Lithuania/Lituanie** Mr Pranas MIERAUSKAS, Director, Land Management and Biodiversity Department, Ministry of Environment Protection, A. Juozapavi\_iaus 9, 2600 VILNIUS (E)  
Tel. +370 2 72 3432 Fax +370 2 72 8020

**Luxembourg** M. Charles ZIMMER, Chargé de mission, Ministère de l'Environnement, 18 Montée de la Pétrusse, L 2918 LUXEMBOURG-VILLE (F)  
Tel. +352 478 6812 Fax +352 400 410 E-mail:

M. Guy WEISS, Premier Conseiller de Gouvernement, Ministère de l'Environnement, 18 Montée de la Pétrusse, L 2918 LUXEMBOURG-VILLE (F)  
Tel. +352 478 6812 Fax +352 400 410 E-mail:

M. Jean-Marie SINNER, Ing., Administration des Eaux et Forêts, Service de la Conservatoir de la Nature, 67 rue Michel Welter, L 2730 LUXEMBOURG (F)

**Malta/Malte** Mr Darrin T. STEVENS, Environment Officer Biodiversity, Biodiversity Protection Section, Environment Protection Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Environment, FLORIANA CMR 02 (E) Tel. +356 231506, 231557, 232022 Fax +356 241378

**\*Moldova** Dr Ion BEJENARU, Head of Protected Areas and Biodiversity Division; Department for Environmental Protection, 73 Stefan cel Mare Bd., 2001 CHI\_IN\_U  
Tel. +373 2 22 33 36 Fax +373 2 233806 (F)

**Monaco** Mme Marie-Christine VAN KLAVEREN, Chef de Division du 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 89 63 / 93 15 81 48 Fax (377) 92 05 28 91 E-mail pvk@mcn.mc

**Netherlands/Pays-Bas** Dr Gerard C. BOERE, Senior Executive Officer International Affairs, Directorate for Nature Management, Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries, (Bezuidenhoutseweg 73) PO Box 20401, NL 2500 EK 's-GRAVENHAGE (E)  
Tel. +31 70 378 55 91 Telex 32040 LAVI NL  
Fax +31 70 378 61 46 E-mail G.C.Boere@N.agro.nl

Drs Jan-Willem SNEEP, Staff Officer International Affairs, Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries, Department for Nature Management, PO Box 20401, NL 2500 EK THE HAGUE (E) E-mail: jwsneep@v.agro.nl  
Tel. +31 70 378 5255 Telex 32040 LAVI NL Fax +31 70 3351 485/3478 228

**Norway/Norvège** Mr Jan ABRAHAMSEN, Director General, Ministry of Environment, Department for Nature Conservation, Myntgt. 2, P.O. Box 8013 Dep., N-0030 OSLO (E)  
Tel. +47 22 24 58 54 Fax +47 22 24 27 56

Mr Øystein STØRKERSEN, Directorate for Nature Management, Tungasletta 2, N 7005 TRONDHEIM (E) Tel. +47 73-580500/580833 Fax +47 73 91 54 33  
E-mail: oystein.storkersen@dnpost.md.dep.telemax.no

### **Poland/Pologne**

*Apologised for absence/excusé*

**Portugal** Mrs Ana Isabel QUEIROZ, Instituto da Conservação da Natureza, DSCN/DEP, Rua Filipe Folque 46-1º, P-1050 LISBOA (F)  
Tel. +351 1 352 3018 ext. 205 Fax +351 1 357 4771

**\*Romania/Roumaine** Mme Adriana BAZ, Expert biologiste, Ministère des Eaux, Forêts et de la Protection de l'Environnement, Direction pour la Conservation de la Nature, Libertatii 12, Sector 5, RO-BUCHAREST (F)  
Tél. +40 1 410 02 15 Fax +40 1 410 02 17 / +40 1 411 14 36

**\*Senegal/Sénégal** M. Souleye NDIAYE, Directeur adjoint des Parc nationaux, Direction des Parcs nationaux, Ministère de l'Environnement et de la Protection de la Nature, BP 5135, DAKAR-FANN (F) Tél. +221 824 42 21 Fax +221 825 23 99

**Slovakia/Slovaquie** Mme Jana ZACHAROVÁ, Ministry of Environment of the Slovak Republic, Department of Nature and Landscape Protection, Námestie Ľ. Štúra 1, 812 35 BRATISLAVA (E)  
Tel. +421 7 516 22 11 Fax +421 7 516 20 31

**Spain/Espagne** M. Luis Mariano GONZALEZ, ICONA, Gran Via de San Francisco 4, E-28005 MADRID tel. +34 1 5754 552 Fax +34 1 5754 152 (E)

**Sweden/Suède** Ms Lena BERG, Conservation officer, Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, Blekhölmsterrassen 36, S-10648 STOCKHOLM  
Tel. +46 8 698 12 63 Fax +46 8 698 14 02 E-mail. lena.berg@environ.se (E)

**Switzerland/Suisse** M. Raymond-Pierre LEBEAU, Chef de la Section compensation écologique, Division protection de la nature, (Département de l'Environnement, Transports, Energie et Communications), Office fédéral de l'Environnement, des Forêts et du Paysage (OFEFP), Hallwylstrasse 4, CH 3003 BERNE Tel. +41 31 322 80 64 Fax +41 31 324 75 79 (F)

**\*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, 1004 TUNIS (F) Tél. +216 1 704 000/216 1 703 770 Fax +216 1 704 340

**Turkey/Turquie** Mr Güner ERGÜN, T.C., Çevre Bakanlı\_ı Özel Çevre Koruma Kurumu Ba\_kanli\_i, Ministry of Environment, The Authority for the Protection of Special Areas, Koza Sokak 32, G.O.P. TR-06700 ANKARA (E)  
Tel. +90 312 438 1496/441 2304 Fax +90 312 440 85 53 E-mail: ockkb@tr-net.net.tr

Mr Haydar Sadi HALAT, Section Chief, Ministry of Environment, General Directorate of Environmental Protection, Eskisehir Yolu 8 Km, TR-06530 ANKARA  
Tel. +90 (312) 287 99 63/2010 Fax +90 (312) 286 22 71 (E)

Mrs Hanife KUTLU, Expert, Ministry of Environment, General Directorate of Environmental Protection, Eskisehir Yolu 8 Km, TR-06530 ANKARA  
Tel. +90 (312) 287 99 63/2008 Fax +90 (312) 286 22 71 (E)

**United Kingdom/Royaume-Uni** Mr Roger PRITCHARD, Head, European Wildlife Division, Department of the Environment, Transport & the Regions, Room 907, Tollgate House, Houlton Street, GB BRISTOL BS2 9DJ (E) E-mail: european.wildlife.doe@gtnet.gov.uk  
Tel. +44 117 987 8233 Telex 449321 Tolgte G Fax +44 117 987 8182

Mr John L. ANGELL, Senior Executive Officer, Biodiversity Secretariat, European Wildlife Division, Department of the Environment, Transport & the Regions, Room 902E, Tollgate House, Houlton Street, GB-BRISTOL BS2 9DJ E-mail: european.wildlife.doe@gtnet.gov.uk  
Tel. +44 117 987 8138 Telex 449321 Tolgte G Fax +44 117 987 8182 (E)

Ms Deborah PROCTER, International Coordinator, Joint Nature Conservation Committee, Monkstone House, City Road, GB PETERBOROUGH PE1 1JY (E)  
Tel. +44 1733 866 809 Fax +44 1733 555 948 E-mail: procte\_d@jncc.gov.uk

## OBSERVER STATES / ETATS OBSERVATEURS

### **Albania/Albanie**

### **Andorra/Andorre**

**Croatia/Croatie** Prof. Eugen DRAGANOVI\_, Biologist, Senior Adviser, Ministry of Culture, Directorate for the Protection of Cultural and Natural Heritage, Ilica 44, 10000 ZAGREB. (E)  
Tel : (385) 1 43 20 22. Fax : (385) 1 43 15 15

**Czech Republic/République Tchèque** Dr Jan PLESNÍK, Chief Researcher, Head of Division, Agency for Nature Conservation and Landscape Protection, Kališnická 4-6, CZ 130 00 PRAHA 3 - I\_KOV (E) E-mail: plesnik@nature.cz  
Tel. +420 2 697 0013, 697 59 38, 697 4928, 697 5938 Fax +420 2 697 59 38, 697 00 12

### **Russia/Russie**

### **San Marino/Saint-Marin**

### **Slovenia/Slovénie**

**The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia/L'Ex-République yougoslave de Macedoine**  
Mme Antoaneta BUKLESKA-RALEVSKA, Ministry of Urban Planning, Construction and Environment, Str. Damegruev 14, MK-91000 SKOPJE-FYROM (E)  
Tel. +389 91 117 288 / 226 134 Fax +389 91 117 163 *Absent/absente*

**Ukraine** Mr Yaroslav MOVCHAN, Deputy Minister for Environmental Protection & Nuclear Safety of Ukraine, 5 Khreshchatyk str., 252601 KYIV - 1 (E) *Absent*  
Tel. +380 44 226 2430 Fax +380 44 229 83 83 E-mail: movchan@mep.FreeNet.Kiev.UA

Mr Grygoriy PARCHUK, Chief Expert, Central board of National Nature Parks & Preservation,  
Ministry for Environmental Protection & Nuclear Safety, 5 Khreshchatyk str.,  
252601 KYIV 1 (E)  
Tel. +380 44 295 2647 Fax +380 44 228 77 98 E-mail: biodiv@mep.freenet.kiev.ua

**Algeria/Algérie**

**Azerbaijan/Azerbaïdjan**

**Belarus/Bélarus**

**Bosnia Herzegovina**

**Cape Verde**

**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*

**UN/ECE**

**UNEP**

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

Mr A. IACCARINO, Assistant Director-General for Science, Unesco, 7 place de Fontenoy, F 75352 PARIS 17 SP, France

**European Environment Agency** M. François BOILLOT, Centre Thématique Européen pour la Conservation de la Nature, Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 57 rue Cuvier, F-75231 PARIS cedex 05, France (F)

Tel. +33 (0)1 40 79 38 70 Fax +33 (0)1 40 79 38 67 E-mail: ctecninf@mnhn.fr

Ms Ulla PINBORG, Project Manager, The European Environment Agency, Kongens Nytorv 6, DK-1050 KØBENHAVN K, Danemark (E) *Absent/absente*

Tel. +45 33 36 71 00 Fax +454 33 36 71 99 E-mail: ulla.pinborg@EEA.EU.INT

**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 Eric BLENCOWE, Special Projects Officer/Executive Secretary, UNEP/CMS Secretariat, United Nations Premises in Bonn, Martin-Luther-King Str. 8, D 53175 BONN, Allemagne Tel. +49 228 8152420/1 Fax +49 228 815 2445 E-mail: blencowe@uno.de (E)

Tel. +49 228 815 2401/2 Fax +49 228 815 2449 E-mail cms@unep.de

**Agreement on the Conservation of Bats in Europe (Eurobats - CMS)**

Mr Eric BLENCOWE (see UNEP/CMS ; voir PNUE/CMS)



**Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans of the Mediterranean and Black Seas and the adjacent Atlantic Zone / Accord sur la Conservation des Cétacés de la mer Noire, la mer Méditerranée et de la zone Atlantique adjacente (ACCOBAMS)**

Mme M-C. VAN KLAVEREN, ACCOBAMS, Secrétariat intérimaire, c/o Service de l'Environnement, 3 av de Fontvieille, MC 98000 MONACO (F)

Tel. +377 93 15 81 49 Fax +377 92 05 28 91 E-mail: pvk@mcn.mc

**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)**

Ms Maryse MAHY, Ramsar, Rue Mauverney 28, CH 1196 GLAND, Suisse (E/F)

Tel. +41 22 999 01 70 Fax +41 22 999 01 69 Telex 41 96 24 E-mail: ramsar@hq.iucn.org or mhm@hq.iucn.org

**CITES Convention**

**Barcelona Convention protection Mediterranean**

**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, Expert in Marine Biology, Regional Activity Centre for Specially Protected Areas (RAC/SPA) (Geneva Protocole), B.P. 337, 1080 TUNIS CEDEX, Tunisie (F) Tel. +216 1 795 760 Fax +216 1 797 349 E-mail: car-asp@rac-spa.org.tn

**Convention Bio-Diversity (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

**WWF - International (WWF)** Mr Chris TYDEMAN, Chief Scientist, Panda House, Weyside Park, Catteshall Lane, GODALMING SURREY GU7 1XR, United Kingdom (E)

Tel: + 44 1483 426444 Fax: + 44 1483 426409 E-mail: ctydeman@wwfnet.org

**WCMC**

**BirdLife International** Mr John Michael O'SULLIVAN, RSPB Global 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 680551 Telex 82469 Fax +44 1767 683211 E-mail john.osullivan @rspb.org.uk

Ms Nicola Jane CROCKFORD, RSPB European Treaties Officer, The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB), The Lodge, GB SANDY Beds. SG19 2DL, Grande-Bretagne (E)

Tel.+44 1767 680551 ext.2072 Fax +44 1767 683211 E-mail nicola.crockford @rspb.lodge.uk

Mr Juan CRIADO, SEO/BirdLife, Species and Habitats Conservation Department, Carretera de Húmera nº 63-1, E-28224 POZUELO DE ALARCÓN, Espagne (E)

Tel. +34 1 351 1045 Fax +34 1 351 1386 E-mail: seo@quercus.es

**Federation of Field Sports Associations of the EU/Fédération des Associations de Chasseurs de l'UE (FACE)** Mme Karin MEINE, Research Assistant, FACE, Rue F. Pelletier 82, B-1030 BRUXELLES Belgique (E)

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

Mme Caroline de BOVIS, Assistante juridique, 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.europ@infoboard.be

**International Association for Falconry and Conservation of Birds of Prey**

Mr Christian de COUNE, President of The International Association for Falconry and Conservation of Birds of Prey (IUCN Member), Le Cochetay, Thier des Forges, 85, B-4140 GOMZÉ-ANDOUMONT, Belgique (E/F) Tel. ++32 4 368 40 21 Fax ++32 4 368 40 15

E-mail: c.decoune@infoboard.be

(F/E)

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

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

MEDASSET/GR, 1c Licavitou St., GR-106 72 ATHENS, Greece

Tel. (Athens) +301 3613572 Fax+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)

Mrs Noullie SCOTT, Secretariat of MEDASSET (E)

**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

Mr Claes ANDRÉN, Göteborg University, Department of Zoology, Medicinaregatan 18, S-413 90 GÖTEBORG, Suède.

**Eurogroup for Animal Welfare** Dr Bjarne CLAUSEN, 13 rue Boduognat, B-1000 BRUSSELS, Belgique Tel. +32 2 231 1388 Fax +32 2 230 17 00 (E)

**European Habitats Forum**

**European Environmental Bureau (EEB)**

**Migratory Birds of the Western Palaearctic / Oiseaux Migrateurs du Paléarctique Occidental (OMPO)**

M. Hervé LETHIER, Conseiller Scientifique d'OMPO, 5 av. des Chasseurs, F-75017 PARIS, France (F) Tel. +33 01 44 01 05 10

Fax (France) +33 (0)3 84 60 66 70 Fax (Suisse) +41 21 825 4660 E-mail: OMPO@dyadel.net

M. Frédéric CHEVALIER, Coordonnateur d'OMPO, 5 av. des Chasseurs, F-75017 PARIS, France (F) Tel. +33 01 44 01 05 10 Fax +33 01 44 01 05 11 E-mail: OMPO@dyadel.net

**European Anglers Alliance / Alliance européenne des Pêcheurs à la Ligne (EAA)**

M. Jacques ARRIGNON, Vice-Président Exécutif, 24 rue de la 8e Division, F-60200 COMPIEGNE, France Tel. +33 1 48 24 96 00 Fax +33 1 48 01 00 65(F)

Mlle Gabriella BIANCA, Consultant, European Anglers Alliance, Postbus 288, NL-3800 AG AMERSFOORT, The Netherlands

30 rue de Vergnies, B-1050 BRUXELLES, Belgique (E)

Tel. +32 2 640 07 68 Fax: +32 2 647 79 47

**Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (UK)** see/voir BirdLife International

**Pro Natura - Swiss League for Nature Protection / Pro Natura - Ligue suisse pour la protection de la nature** Dr Urs TESTER, Pro Natura, Chef de division, Division de la Protection de la Nature, Wartenbergstr. 22, Postfach, CH-4020 BASEL, Suisse (F)  
Tel. +41-61 317 9191 N° direct /317 9136 Fax +41-61 317 9166 e-mail : mailbox@pronatura.ch

**Société française Droit Environnement (SFDE)**

**French Society for Environmental Law / Société française pour le droit de l'environnement (SFDE)** Mme Claude-Hélène LAMBRECHTS, Société française pour le droit de l'environnement, 11 rue Maréchal Juin - BP 68, 67046 STRASBOURG CEDEX, France (F)

Tel. +33 (0)3 88 14 30 42 Fax +33 (0)3 88 14 30 44 *Apologised for absence/excusé*

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

**Union nat. Pêche en France**

**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, 9 rue Cels, F 75014 PARIS, France

Tél. +33 01 43 20 15 39 Fax +33 01 43 20 15 71 (F) *Apologised for absence/excusé*

M. Gilbert SIMON, (observateur - SNPN), Conseil Général des Ponts et Chaussées, 5<sup>e</sup> Section, Tour Pascal B, F 92055 PARIS La Défense, France (F/E)

Tél. +33 01 40 81 68 61 Fax +33 01 40 81 23 95

**Study, Research and Conservation Centre for Environment in Alsace / Centre d'étude, de recherche et de protection de l'environnement en Alsace (CERPEA)**

M. Gérard BAUMGART, Président, Centre d'étude, de recherche et de protection de l'environnement en Alsace, 12 rue de Touraine, 67100 STRASBOURG, France (F)

Tél. +33 (0) 3 88 39 42 74 Fax +33 (0) 3 88 39 24 96 E-mail: baumgart@cybercable.tm.fr

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 (0)3 88 45 52 09

**Zakynthian Ecological Movement (ZOK)** Mr Eleftherios LEVANTIS, Legal Advisor, Salaminos Street 72-74, Kalithea, ATHENS, Grèce (E)

Tel: 301 3231876 Fax: 301 3232320 E-mail: elan@iisfovthnet.gr

**Sea Turtle Protection Society of Greece** Mr Dimitrios DIMOPOULOS, Secretary General, Solomou St. 35, GR 10682 ATHENS, Grèce (E)

Tel/Fax +30 1 3844 146 E-mail: stps@compulink.gr

**France Nature Environnement (FNE)** M. Christian HOSY, chargé de mission du Réseau Nature, France Nature Environnement, Pavillon Chevreuil, Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 57 rue Cuvier, F 75231 PARIS CEDEX 05 (F)

Tel. +33 (0)1 4336 7995 Fax +33 (0)1 4336 8467

**Journées européennes du Cortinaire** M. Jean Paul KOUNE, Secrétaire Général des Journées européennes du Cortinaire, 27 rue du Commandant François, F-67100 STRASBOURG (F/E)

Tel. +33 (0)3 88 39 67 76

**Parliamentary Assembly / Assemblée Parlementaire**

(Commission de l'Environnement, de l'Aménagement du Territoire et des Pouvoirs Locaux)  
M. Paul STAES (Belgique, PPE), Grote Singel 11, B 2120 SCHOTEN, Belgique (F)

**CONSULTANTS**

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

Mr Claes ANDRÉN Göteborg University, Department of Zoology, Medicinaregatan 18, S 413 90 GÖTEBORG, Suède (E)

**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 (0)3 88 41 22 59 Fax +33 (0)3 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 (0)3 88 41 23 98 Fax +33 (0)3 88 41-37 51 / 27 84

Ms Liri KOPAÇI, Environment Conservation and Management Division / Division de la Protection et de la Gestion de l'Environnement

Tel. +33 (0)3 88 41 22 58 Fax +33 (0)3 88 41 37 51 / 27 84 E-mail: liri.kopaci@dela.coe.fr

## APPENDIX 2

### AGENDA

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

1. **Opening of the meeting and adoption of the agenda**
2. **Chairman's report and communications from the delegations and from the Secretariat. Reports from new Contracting Parties**
3. **Development of the Convention**
  - 3.1 Strategic issues. Contribution to the Aarhus Ministerial Conference
  - 3.2 States to be invited as observers to the 18th meeting
4. **Legal aspects**
  - 4.1 Amendment of the Appendices
    - Proposal from Bulgaria concerning plants (Appendix I)
    - Proposal from Monaco on Mediterranean marine species (Appendix III)
    - Criteria on listing of species in the Appendices of the Convention
  - 4.2 Biennial reports (1995-1996)
  - 4.3 Group of experts on introduction and re-introduction of wildlife species. Draft recommendation on introduction of non-indigenous species
  - 4.4 Legal aspects: other items

\* Items for information:

- Comparative analysis of the efficiency of legislation protecting plants
- Report on the introduction of non-native plants into the natural environment

#### PART II ? THREATENED SPECIES AND HABITATS

5. **Threatened species and habitats**
  - ? Fauna and Flora
    - 5.1. Seminar on elaboration of Action Plans for threatened species
    - 5.2. Group of experts on the conservation of birds
    - 5.3. Group of experts on conservation of plants

---

\* Items for information. No decision required. Not to be discussed unless proposed by a Party at the adoption of the agenda (the list is still provisional).

? Habitats

#### 5.4. Development of the Emerald Network

\* Items for information:

- Report on the conservation of hamsters
- European Red List of Threatened Vertebrates
- Guidelines on Action Plans for threatened species
- Action Plan for *Maculinea* butterflies

### PART III ? SPECIFIC SITES

#### 6. Specific sites

##### 6.1. Files:

- ? *Caretta caretta* in Laganas Bay, Zakynthos (Greece)
- ? Construction of a road in the Grünewald forest (Luxembourg)
- ? *Caretta caretta* in Patara (Turkey)
- ? Akamas Peninsula (Cyprus)

##### 6.2. Possible new files:

- ? Rhine-Rhone Grand Canal Project (France)
- ? Conservation of *Oxyura leucocephala* and eradication of *Oxyura jamaicensis* (United Kingdom)
- ? Dorset Heathlands (United Kingdom)

##### 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)
- Reptiles on Totes Moor, Lower Saxony (Germany)
- Missolonghi wetlands (Greece)
- *Vipera lebetina schweizeri* in Milos (Greece)
- *Caretta caretta* in Kaminia (Greece)
- Urbanisation of Porto biotope (Greece)
- *Testudo marginata* (Greece)
- *Lacerta agilis* (Netherlands)
- Wind powered generators in Tarifa (Spain)
- *Trionyx triunguis* (Turkey)
- *Rana holtzi* (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 (the list is still provisional).

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

- 7. Organisation matters and financing of activities. Programme of activities for 1998**
- 8. Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman**
- 9. Date and place of the 18th meeting, adoption of the report and other business**

### APPENDIX 3

#### DECISION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY

The Standing Committee of the Bern Convention (T-PVS), having closely examined Recommendation 1310 (1996) of the Parliamentary Assembly on the results and follow-up to the European Nature Conservation Year 1995 (ENCY 95), fully supports the Parliamentary Assembly and expresses the following opinion addressed to the Committee of Ministers.

The ENCY was a great success in the forty-two European states which participated in the event and now it is important to build on the positive results of the campaign and follow the work started under the Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy adopted in Sofia in 1995, the implementation of which has been entrusted jointly to the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the Council of Europe.

On the one hand, the role of the Council of Europe on the "Sofia process" should be restated:

1. The Bern Convention is becoming one of the cornerstones of the Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy, mainly on the following action themes:

Action Theme 1 ("Establishing the Pan-European Ecological Network"). The Convention is ready to contribute substantially to the establishment of that network through the development of the Emerald Network of Areas of Special Conservation Interest, the characteristics of which are comparable to those of the Natura 2000 Network of the European Union.

Action Theme 11 ("Action for Threatened Species"). The Convention is responsible for the organisation of that action theme, to which it contributes with different technical instruments, but the development of which is limited by the absence of financial means.

2. The EYNC has shown the role of education and communication in environmental policy. Relying on the experience gathered over thirty years, the Naturopa Centre has been designed to implement Action Theme 3 of the Strategy ("Raising awareness and support with policy makers and the public").

It is thus necessary to support the Centre and its activities (in particular those in partnership with NGOs and teachers) so as to show the importance that the Council of Europe attaches to awareness.

3. The Secretariat should actively participate in the preparatory work of the 4th Pan-European Conference of Ministers of Environment to be held in Denmark in 1998.

To that end it is peremptory that measures - particularly financial - are taken to enable the Council of Europe Secretariat to ensure its leading role in this process.

On the other hand, it is convenient to draw the attention of member States to the importance of the full implementation of the Bern Convention, particularly taking into account the Monaco declaration which recognises its role in the implementation of worldwide international instruments for protection of biodiversity and the need to coordinate efficiently with other conventions:

1. More means should be accorded to its Standing Committee, thus proving the will of the Committee of Ministers to make this instrument into one of the major conventions in the field



of nature conservation.

2. Finally, specific projects should be developed to help Central and Eastern European states to implement the convention.

**APPENDIX 4**

**APPENDIX I (STRICTLY PROTECTED FLORA SPECIES)**

**NEW SPECIES ADDED**

**CYPERACEAE**

50. *Carex secalina* Willd. ex Wahlenb.

**LABIATAE**

60. *Dracocephalum ruyschiana* L.

**ORCHIDACEAE**

89. *Ophrys oestrifera* Bieb.

90. *Ophrys taurica* (Aggeenko) Nevski

93. *Orchis provincialis* Balb.

**APPENDIX 5**

**APPENDIX II (STRICTLY PROTECTED FAUNA SPECIES)**

**NEW SPECIES ADDED**

**Fish**

*Cetorhinus maximus* (in Mediterranean)

*Acipenser sturio*

*Valencia leutourneuxi*

*Mobula mobular* (in Mediterranean)

**Birds**

*Puffinus yelkouan*

*Phalacrocorax aristotelis* (in Mediterranean)

**APPENDIX 6****APPENDIX III (PROTECTED FAUNA SPECIES)****NEW SPECIES ADDED****PORIFERES**

1. *Hippospongia communis* (in Mediterranean)
2. *Spongia agaricina* (in Mediterranean)
3. *Spongia officinalis* (in Mediterranean)
4. *Spongia zimocca* (in Mediterranean)

**CNIDARIA**

5. *Antipathes sp. plur.* (in Mediterranean)
6. *Corallium rubrum* (in Mediterranean)

**ECHINODERMS**

7. *Paracentrotus lividus* (in Mediterranean)

**CRUSTACEANS**

8. *Homarus gammarus* (in Mediterranean)
9. *Maja squinado* (in Mediterranean)
10. *Palinurus elephas* (in Mediterranean)
11. *Scyllarides latus* (in Mediterranean)
12. *Scyllarides pigmaeus* (in Mediterranean)
13. *Scyllarus arctus* (in Mediterranean)

**FISH**

15. *Epinephelus marginatus* (in Mediterranean)
16. *Isurus oxyrinchus* (in Mediterranean)
17. *Lamna nasus* (in Mediterranean)
18. *Mobula mobular* (in Mediterranean)
19. *Prionace glauca* (in Mediterranean)
20. *Raja alba* (in Mediterranean)
21. *Sciaena umbra* (in Mediterranean)
22. *Squatina squatina* (in Mediterranean)
  
24. *Umbrina cirrosa* (in Mediterranean)

## APPENDIX 7

### Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

#### Standing Committee

#### **Recommendation No. 56 (adopted on 5 December 1997) concerning guidelines to be taken into account while making proposals for amendment of Appendices I and II of the Convention and while adopting amendments**

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 wild flora and fauna constitute a natural heritage of aesthetic, scientific, cultural, recreational, economic and intrinsic value that needs to be preserved and handed on to future generations, as stated in the preamble of the Convention;

Recalling that Article 2 of the Convention asks Contracting Parties to take requisite measures to maintain the population of wild flora and fauna at, or adapt it to, a level which corresponds in particular to ecological, scientific and cultural requirements, while taking account of economic and recreational requirements and the needs of sub-species, varieties or forms at risk locally;

Recalling points 68 to 79 of the explanatory report concerning the convention, which record the agreements reached on the criteria to list species in Appendices I and II when the convention was negotiated;

Conscious that Appendices I and II as adopted in 1979 were the result of a compromise among different states and that the species listed then were not all that would merit strict protection under the convention but only those that were then generally acceptable;

Recalling, however, that much progress has been made in this respect by the successive amendments adopted between 1986 and 1996;

Taking into account that the legal tools of the Bern Convention may add complementary protection to European species protected by other appropriate biodiversity-related Conventions;

Desirous of facilitating further amendment of the appendices in a coherent manner, based on best available science;

Recommends Contracting Parties to take into account the following guidelines while making proposals for amendment of Appendices I and II of the convention and during their adoption:

1. **Threat.** Account will be taken of the category of threat, the vulnerability of the species to changes in its habitat, its particular link with a threatened habitat, the trends and variations in population level and its vulnerability to a possible non sustainable use. Account will be taken of whether the species is declining in the central area of its distribution, or it is only threatened in the

border of its range.

2. Ecological role. Account will be taken of the ecological role of the species, such as their position or role in the food chain (*i.e.* raptors, insectivorous species such as bats), their structural role in ecosystems (*i.e.* corals, heathlands) or the fact that endangered species or endangered ecosystems may be highly dependent on them (*i.e.* marine phanerogams like *Posidonia oceanica*) or risk to become threatened by their exploitation (like the mollusc *Lithophaga lithophaga*).

Contracting Parties are further recommended to:

- confine, as a general rule, the flora and fauna proposed for listing in the appendices to the taxonomic level of the species, excluding mention of subspecies, varieties or other taxonomic subordinate levels, except in cases with very good conservation reasons that must be clearly stated;
- exclude species of dubious or uncertain taxonomy and higher plant groups demonstrating reproductive anomalies;
- exclude species non-native to Europe;
- present a sufficiently informative data sheet with each species they may propose for amendment of the appendices.

## APPENDIX 8

### Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

#### Standing Committee

#### **Recommendation No. 57 (adopted on 5 December 1997) on the Introduction of Organisms belonging to Non-Native Species into the Environment**

The Standing Committee of the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats, in accordance with Article 14 of the Convention,

Having regard to the aim of the Convention which is notably to ensure the conservation of wild flora and fauna, by giving particular attention to species, including migratory species, which are threatened with extinction and vulnerable;

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

Considering that species native to a given territory means a species that has been observed in the form of a naturally occurring and self-sustaining population in historical times; "species" in the sense of this Recommendation refers both to species and to lower taxonomic categories, subspecies, varieties, etc. (thus, for instance, the release of a different non-native subspecies into a given territory should also be considered as an introduction);

Considering that "introduction" means deliberate or accidental release, into the environment of a given territory, of an organism belonging to a non-native taxa (species or lower taxa that has not been observed as a naturally occurring and self-sustaining population in this territory in historical times);

Considering that this Recommendation does not apply to:

- ? genetically modified organisms,
- ? the introduction of non-native plants cultivated in managed agricultural and forest areas or for the purpose of combating soil erosion,
- ? the introduction of non-native organisms belonging to non-native species used for the purposes of biological control, if the introduction has been authorised on the basis of regulations for plant protection and pest control, which comprise an assessment of the impacts on flora and fauna,
- ? the introduction of non-native species maintained into confined space (for example, botanic gardens, greenhouses, arboreta, zoos, aquaculture or animal-breeding establishments or circuses),
- ? or the use of birds of prey in falconry;

Considering that the introduction of organisms belonging to non-native species may initiate a process (competition with native species, predation, transmission of pathogenic agents or parasites) which can cause serious harm to biological diversity, ecological processes or economic activities;

Being aware of the need to set up a system of risk management aimed at forestalling uncontrolled

introductions and at reducing to a minimum the negative consequences of those it has been impossible to prevent;

Believing that the eradication of an established introduced species is very difficult and costly, and in many cases probably impossible;

Desirous of laying down a minimum number of rules, accepted and applied by everyone, aimed at anticipating and repairing the damage caused by inopportune introductions and which should be based essentially on principles of precaution and prevention, and referring to the "polluter-pays" principle;

Noting that there is a need to establish an international information and consultation mechanism to co-ordinate efforts directed at the prevention or eradication of harmful introductions;

Recognising that it is particularly difficult to mobilise the competent authorities and public, whenever an introduction does not endanger human health or major economic interests, and noting the consequent need for a vigorous policy of information and education concerning the problem and the ecological consequences thereof;

Bearing in mind Recommendation No R (84) 14 of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe to Member states on the introduction of non-native species, adopted on 21 June 1984;

Recalling that under Article 8.h of the Convention on Biological Diversity, each Party undertakes to prevent the introduction of, control or eradicate those alien species which threaten ecosystems, habitats or species,

Recommends that Contracting Parties:

1. Prohibit the deliberate introduction within their frontiers or in a part of their territory of organisms belonging to non-native species for the purpose of establishing populations of these species in the wild, except in particular circumstances where they have been granted prior authorisation by a regulatory authority, and only after an impact assessment and consultation with appropriate experts has taken place;
2. Endeavour to prevent the accidental introduction of organisms belonging to non-native species into the environment with the potential to establish populations, where they use anthropogenic routes of dispersal;
3. Draw up a documented national list of non-native species established in the wild, which are known to be invasive and/or cause harm to other species, ecosystems, public health or damage to economic activities;
4. To consider, for the purposes of the application of the Convention, the suggested measures listed in the guidelines set out in the Appendix to the present Recommendation, as appropriate to the specific circumstances in their territory;
5. Communicate to the Secretariat, so that it may in turn inform the other Contracting Parties, any relevant measures adopted or envisaged as well as any information available on the outcome of the measures adopted.



## APPENDIX

### Guidelines

Measures that may be considered as appropriate for controlling introductions of non-native species are listed for consideration by Contracting Parties. Where appropriate, Contracting Parties are invited to take into account the provisions of existing international agreements and recommendations where they already address issues which are listed in these guidelines.

#### 1. Deliberate introductions into the environment

*a.* Establishing, in application of the principles of precaution and prevention, a system for prohibiting deliberate introductions of organisms belonging to non-native species, and not granting exemptions save in exceptional cases. Whatever the circumstances, the prohibition should apply to the deliberate introduction of any organisms belonging to non-native species into the environment. Take particularly into consideration the vulnerability of ecosystems of islands, lakes, enclosed and semi-enclosed seas, or centres of endemism.

*b.* Establishing a system of exemptions, or exceptional authorisations, based on the following provisions:

*i.* the introduction of an organism belonging to a non-native species should only be considered if it benefits man and/or ecosystems;

*ii.* the introduction of an organism belonging to a non-native species should only be considered if no native species is considered suitable for the purpose for which the introduction is being made;

*iii.* no organism belonging to non-native species should be introduced into the environment, except for exceptional reasons and only if the operation has been preceded by a comprehensive and carefully planned impact study, which has reached a favourable conclusion on the proposal.

*c.* Such an impact study should include:

*i.* a taxonomic, ecological and ethological analysis;

*ii.* an analysis of the reproduction, feeding habits, dispersal or migration (if relevant), pathology, predators and competitors of the species to which the organism concerned belongs and of the risks of hybridisation with organisms belonging to native species;

*iii.* an ecological analysis of the proposed host habitat (including, in particular, an assessment of the effects on the surrounding natural or semi-natural habitats of the introduction of any organisms belonging to species, sub-species or varieties of plant to artificial, arable, ley pasture, forest or other monoculture systems);

*iv.* an appropriate assessment of measures to reduce or minimise negative effects;

*v.* an analysis of the risks and dangers and of the means that could be used to eradicate or control the introduced population should unforeseen or harmful consequences of the introduction come to light.

*d.* Defining with precision the statutory quarantine procedures applicable to imported non-native species for each of the main taxonomic groups, and informing the Secretariat of these statutory procedures where they exist.

*e.* Once the introduction has been authorised but before the introduction takes place, carrying out trials in a controlled manner or, where possible, in a confined space.

*f.* Introduction operations should only be carried out by officially recognised establishments and be subject to very strict health and safety requirements.

## **2. Accidental introductions into the environment**

### **2.1. "Fugitives"**

*a.* Defining as "fugitives" organisms belonging to non-native species (or their descendants) that have been imported lawfully and set free, either accidentally or deliberately, but without the deliberate intention to populate.

*b.* Limiting escapes by a very strict application of rules:

*i.* preventing escape from establishments containing non-native wild plants (botanic gardens, greenhouses, arboreta and other types of plant culture), or where non-native wild animals are held in captivity (zoos, animal-breeding establishments, fish farms, etc.), by adopting measures to prevent such escape, which may include:

? strict standards of security for boxes, cages, enclosures and for the transportation of species,

? the strict control and containment in a confined space of species considered as a potential serious ecological danger in the event of their escape,

? the requirement that all establishments keeping captive organisms belonging to non-native species should be licensed,

? a register of and an appropriate system to mark animals so that their origin can be identified in the event of their escape,

? strict rules in the event of the establishment closing down to prevent organisms from being deliberately or accidentally freed,

? for the breeders of aquatic species, a location that rules out any communication with open water, bearing in mind the risk of flooding; ideally, such installations should never be located in an area liable to storm damage, even very exceptional climate events (in particular, floods every 100 or even 500 years);

*ii.* since special attention must be given to aquariums because of the risks involved when they are emptied, imposing standards and procedures on public aquariums and on dealers in species used in aquariums;

*iii.* since animals, plants or micro-organisms accompanying lawfully introduced organisms constitute another aspect of accidental introductions of organisms, in particular marine organisms, applying strictly the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) Code of Practice on the Introductions and Transfers of Marine Organisms ? 1994, which requires that only species of the first generation be set free, after a period of quarantine, and never species belonging to the stock initially imported; issuing a permit for the transport of captive-bred organisms which should be authorised only if the conditions in question are fulfilled;

*iv.* as the use of live bait for fishing is another source of unintentional introductions, ensuring, by means of appropriate regulations covering the trade in and use of such live bait, that only organisms

belonging to species present in the waters concerned are in fact used. It is important to safeguard the faunal and floral integrity of each drainage basin and thus not to introduce organisms belonging to species that are naturally absent from it, even if they come from neighbouring drainage basins in the same State;

v. drawing up special rules to safeguard certain sensitive areas (protected areas, islands, areas recognised as having great biological diversity or containing endemic species) from escaped species, such as prohibiting establishments from keeping captive species in these areas or in their neighbourhood or subjecting such establishments to even stricter security conditions than elsewhere;

vi. as the setting free of pets belonging to non-native wild species is a development of increasing concern, limiting as appropriate the species that may be offered for sale to ones that could not survive in the environment in the country concerned or, in so far as people travel with their animals, that could not survive anywhere in Europe. Failing or in addition to this, taking as appropriate the following measures: a general prohibition on setting these pets free; an obligation for pet merchants to inform their customers of this prohibition and of the penalties for violation; a recovery system for animals their owners wish to get rid of, which could be financed by a tax on sales; providing an incentive to use this system in the form of a refundable deposit; subjecting as appropriate animal dealers to the same rules as other enterprises keeping captive animals;

vii. taking precautions that organisms belonging to non-native species intended for human consumption do not escape, alive, into the environment;

viii. taking precautions that non-native cultivated forestry species or ornamental plants do not become propagated into the environment;

ix. controlling the possession and transport of organisms belonging to non-native species and, provided that reliable criteria are available, prohibiting the possession of organisms belonging to non-native species liable to reproduce in the environment.

## **2.2. "Stowaways"**

*a.* Defining as "stowaways", organisms belonging to non-native species transported inadvertently from one country to another.

*b.* Identifying all vectors of introductions and adopting effective preventive measures:

*i.* increased inspections and the application of veterinary and plant health measures in regard to consignments of animals and plants and products thereof and the packaging used;

*ii.* taking, as appropriate, preventive measures in respect of aircraft and ships arriving from exotic countries, in view of the fact that they represent another pathway for introductions, paying particular attention to water used as ballast.

### **3. The control of introduced species**

*a.* Abolishing the legal protection enjoyed by certain species introduced without authorisation and giving them a special legal status so that the necessary control and eradication measures can be taken. In particular, steps should be taken to ensure that introduced species are not automatically protected by law when the latter applies to all the species belonging to a particular taxonomic group, in order to make it legally possible to control them (express reference should be made to "indigenous" species in lists of protected species).

*b.* Preventing any consolidation of the genetic base and populations of such species into the environment and, if appropriate, facilitating the taking of any active measures of control or eradication required:

*i.* prohibiting all further releases by publishing a list of animal and plant species already introduced without authorisation which it is forbidden to set free into the environment, and by regulating the possession and transport of such species in order to keep them in a confined area, thus minimising the risk of escape;

*ii.* classifying species introduced without authorisation among those for which hunting or destruction is permitted at all times;

*iii.* introducing an obligation to notify the authorities of the presence in the environment of unauthorised non-native species and attempting to eliminate them;

*iv.* granting the authorities the power to declare an ecosafety emergency in order to attempt to eradicate species introduced without authorisation;

*v.* empowering the administrative authorities to take eradication measures in the event of unlawful introduction;

*vi.* adopting plans to control species introduced without authorisation by requiring landowners, local authorities and the central administration to introduce measures laid down in regulations to eradicate or limit the numbers of certain species or to safeguard natural areas, especially protected areas and their surroundings, from the intrusion of unauthorised non-native species.

*c.* Preventing a species introduced without authorisation from spreading through the introduction of binding preventive measures: inspections, disinfection, the closing of certain areas to traffic, etc.

### **4. Offences, penalties and civil liability**

*a.* Punishing illegal introductions, including those resulting from negligence.

*b.* With a view to making illegal introductions easier to prove: making it compulsory to register and mark large captive animals so that their owner can be easily identified; and, for other species establishing a presumption;

*c.* With regard to penalties:

*i.* establishing criminal penalties for unlawful introductions of organisms belonging to non-native species and, where appropriate, making the authors of these introductions civilly liable (the penalties for unlawful introductions should be as severe as for the most serious offences against legislation on protection of the environment, such as certain types of pollution);

*ii.* applying administrative sanctions against establishments that keep or breed organisms

belonging to non-native species but do not take the necessary precautions to prevent their escape. These could involve the withdrawal of permits and the temporary or even permanent closing of the enterprise, and the confiscation of the organisms.

*d.* With regard to reparation, and with reference to the polluter-pays principle:

*i.* making the person responsible for the offence bear the cost of eradicating the species introduced without authorisation;

*ii.* in the event of an escape, making the person responsible liable for the cost of the preparation and execution of a plan for recapture, control or eradication;

*iii.* instituting a system of reimbursement of the expenses incurred for reparations, as well as the payment of compensation in respect of the damage caused to the environment;

*iv.* setting up guarantee systems and insurance arrangements or compensation funds financed by professional species breeders or traders.

## **5. National policies and institutions**

*a.* Framing a national public policy on the introduction of non-native species.

*b.* Designating a specialised department within each competent authority with appropriate resources to prepare measures indicated in the present appendix and supervise their implementation.

*c.* Consulting clearly identified scientific and other clearly identified competent authorities before decisions are taken on the introduction of organisms belonging to non-native species, reintroductions of organisms belonging to wild species, restocking and reinforcement of populations of organisms belonging to wild species in the environment, and possibly eradication.

*d.* Constituting interministerial machinery to co-ordinate the action taken by the various authorities concerned and drawing up a national programme to reduce the risk of accidental introductions, rapidly identify newly introduced organisms belonging to non-native species and control ones that have become established in the wild without damaging the environment.

With regard to aquatic species, for example, a commission composed of the various authorities concerned with continental waters and the oceans could be responsible for preparing a report identifying and assessing methods of reducing the risks associated with the introduction of organisms belonging to non-native species, which would also cover:

? the identification, description and management of the risks entailed by the various possible types of introduction,

? a decision making process for approving programmes to control introduced species,

? research, in particular on past introductions, education and technical assistance.

## **6. Information and co-operation**

*a.* Informing the general public of the ecological, economic and health hazards associated with introductions of organisms belonging to non-native species, and of the criminal and/or civil liability incurred by infringing the statutory provisions in force.

*b.* Co-operating with neighbouring states or ones sharing a common coastline, whether or not they

are parties to the Bern Convention, directly or through the intermediary of the Secretariat; consulting them on the measures that might be adopted, notifying them of deliberate introductions and informing them of accidental ones.

*c.* Submitting an annual report to the Standing Committee on the application of this recommendation and in particular on introductions creating or liable to create a risk.

## APPENDIX 9

### Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

#### Standing Committee

#### **Recommendation No. 58 (adopted on 5 December 1997) on the reintroduction of organisms belonging to wild species and on restocking and reinforcing populations of such organisms in the environment**

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

Having regard to the purpose of the Convention, which is in particular to ensure the conservation of wild flora and fauna by paying particular attention to endangered and vulnerable species, including migratory species;

Recalling that, under Article 11.2(a) of the Convention, each Contracting Party undertakes to encourage the reintroduction of native species of wild flora and fauna when this would contribute to the conservation of an endangered species, provided that a study is first made in the light of the experiences of other Contracting Parties to establish that such reintroduction would be effective and acceptable;

Wishing to improve the implementation of this provision and to take account of the particular case of population reinforcements;

Specifying that operations to reintroduce organisms belonging to wild species and to restock and reinforce populations of such organisms referred to in this recommendation do not concern species which are not native to a given territory;

Considering that species native to a given territory means a species that has been observed there in the form of a naturally-occurring and self-sustaining population in historical times; "species", for the purposes of this recommendation, refers both to species and to lower taxonomic categories, sub-species, varieties etc (thus, for instance, the release of a non-native sub-species into a given territory should be considered an introduction);

Bearing in mind Recommendation No. R (85) 15 of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe to member States on the reintroduction of wildlife species, adopted on 23 September 1985, the Position Statement on the translocation of living organisms as approved on 4 September 1987 by the Council of the World Conservation Union (IUCN), and the Guidelines on reintroductions approved by the IUCN Council in May 1995;

Bearing in mind the Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy, as approved on 25 October 1995 by the Pan-European Ministerial Conference, "An Environment for Europe", which called in Action Theme 11 on threatened species (paragraph 11.2) for the mobilisation of joint efforts, including zoological and botanic gardens expertise throughout Europe, for *in situ* and *ex situ* conservation and reintroduction/restoration programmes wherever such actions are integrated into species action plans (1995-2000);

Recommends that the Contracting Parties;

1. regulate the procedures and conditions for operations to reintroduce organisms belonging to wild species and to restock and reinforce populations of organisms belonging to wild species in the environment;
2. introduce legislation and regulations to protect species which have been reintroduced and which have been included in operations for restocking and reinforcing populations;
3. consider carefully, for the purposes of implementing the Convention, the suggested measures listed in the Guidelines appended to this Recommendation, in so far as they are appropriate to the specific conditions prevailing in their territory;
4. notify the Secretariat of any relevant measures adopted or envisaged so that it may in turn inform the other Contracting Parties.

## APPENDIX

### Guidelines

Measures which may be considered appropriate for operations to reintroduce organisms belonging to wild species and for operations to restock and reinforce populations of such organisms, for consideration by Contracting Parties. Contracting Parties are also invited to apply the provisions of existing international agreements and recommendations which address issues covered by these guidelines.

#### 1. Reintroductions

*a.* Consider that "reintroduction" means the deliberate or accidental release of an organism belonging to a non-native taxon into the environment of a given territory forming part of the distribution area of a native species to which it belongs (a species or lower taxon which has previously been observed as a naturally occurring and self-sustaining population in historical times, but which has declined or disappeared as a result of human intervention or a natural disaster).

*b.* Regulate the procedures and conditions for reintroduction operations, in particular by providing for:

*i.* the requirement to obtain a permit from the authorities responsible for nature protection for any operation to reintroduce organisms belonging to a wild species into any part of the national territory from which it has disappeared, such permit being granted in accordance with the following procedure:

? a permit should be granted only if the original causes of extinction of the species in question have been eliminated and the habitat requirements of the species are satisfied;

? the organisms reintroduced should belong to a subspecies or type as close as possible to the original stock, and preferably to the subspecies previously occurring in the area;

? the reintroduction envisaged should not cause substantial damage to agriculture or to forestry, to fishing and aquaculture, either marine or inland ;

? the procedure for dealing with applications for permits should include:

- an assessment of the possible effects of the reintroduction on the environment, on other



species and on social and economic interests;

- consultation of a scientific body designated for this purpose;
  - public hearings, where it is shown that the reintroduction may have a social and economic impact or, at least, consultation of the persons concerned, especially local authorities and landowners;
  - consultation neighbouring states where reintroduced organisms are liable to cross borders;
- ii. penalties for any reintroduction carried out without a permit or in violation of the permit conditions;
- iii. recognition of the civil liability of those responsible for unlawful reintroductions for any resulting damage and for the cost of any necessary eradication measures;
- iv. compensation for damage which might be caused by permitted reintroductions.
- c. Adopt legislation and regulations designed to protect reintroduced species. It should be possible to make exceptions when serious damage is caused by the reintroduced organisms, but the capture or killing of such organisms should be carried out only by the nature protection authorities or under their supervision.

## **2. Restocking and reinforcement of populations**

- a. Consider that an operation to restock or reinforce a population entails releasing a plant or animal species into an area where it is already present, whether this refers to boosting the numbers of an endangered species (as part of a recovery project, for example) or releasing members of game or fish species with a view to reconstituting a sufficiently abundant population or reinforcing it so that hunters or anglers may practise their sports.
- b. Subject operations to restock and reinforce populations of endangered animal and plant species from an authorised enclosure (since special provisions prohibit or restrict their possession, transport or sale) to the same rules as are applicable to reintroduction operations.
- c. Require a permit to be obtained for any release of indigenous game animals or fish and for all breeding establishments for such animals or fish, in accordance with the following criteria:
- i. permits should be granted only for the release of animals of the same subspecies as the population which is to be restocked or reinforced;
  - ii. permits should be granted only for the release of animals which are not carriers of pathogenic agents;
  - iii. a permit should be required for any importation of game animals with a view to their release.

## **3. Offences, penalties and civil liability**

The reintroduction of organisms belonging to wild species and the unlawful restocking and reinforcement of populations of wild species should be punished.

**4. National policies and institutions**

- a.* Frame a national public policy on the reintroduction, restocking and reinforcement of wild species.
- b.* Designate a specialised department in each competent authority with the necessary resources to prepare the measures referred to in this appendix and to supervise their implementation.

**5. Information and co-operation**

- a.* Provide the Secretariat with information on the reintroduction of organisms belonging to wild species and the restocking and reinforcement of populations of such organisms envisaged or already carried out, so that it may, if appropriate, inform other Contracting Parties.
- b.* Monitor closely operations to restock and reinforce populations of game and fish, so as to be able to determine:
- ? the species concerned and the scale of operations;
  - ? the origin of the man-bred animals used;
  - ? the effects of restocking on the populations concerned and in particular on their population dynamics;
  - ? the precautions taken to avoid the transmission of diseases;
  - ? the possible effects of restocking on other species and the whole of the ecosystems concerned;
  - ? the views of interested parties (hunters, anglers and others) on the effects and success of restocking operations.

## APPENDIX 10

### Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

#### Standing Committee

#### **Recommendation No. 59 (adopted on 5 December 1997) on the Drafting and Implementation of Action Plans of Wild Fauna Species**

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

Noting that integrated ecosystem management and habitat protection have great advantages for the preservation of biodiversity and should go hand in hand with species protection efforts;

Aware that the identification of processes and categories of activities which have or are likely to have significant adverse impact on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity (as stated in Article 7 of the Convention on Biological Diversity) are also of utmost importance for the preservation of threatened species;

Aware that in many instances wild species which have an unfavourable conservation status (particularly those listed in Appendix II of the Convention) may require special conservation efforts to acquire a population level which corresponds to their ecological requirements, as stated in Article 2 of the Convention;

Aware that Species Action Plans (of which Species Recovery Plans are a particular case) may be appropriate conservation tools to restore threatened populations in some circumstances;

Aware that Species Action Plans cannot be considered as the only effective method to preserve species protected under the Convention and that they should be applied selectively and only when very solid measures can be recommended and implemented;

Noting that Species Action Plans often draw on many financial and human resources of Conservation Agencies and that an excess of Species Action Plans may prove difficult to manage and implement for those Agencies;

Recognising that the report on Guidelines for Action Plans for Animal Species (T-PVS (97) 20) prepared by Mr Antonio Machado and the report of the Workshop on Drafting and Implementing Action Plans for Threatened Species held in Navarre, Spain from 5 to 7 June 1997 (T-PVS (97) 35 Bil.) constitute a valuable beginning to the Convention's contribution to the implementation of Action Theme 11 of the Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy;

Noting that, in the framework of this recommendation the term "species" will be understood to cover also subspecies and populations, as Species Action Plans may be designed for a whole species, a subspecies, a meta-population or a population, depending on the biological characteristics of the species concerned and the geographic range where it applies;

Recommends that Contracting Parties and Observer States, as appropriate take into consideration the appended Guidelines while drafting and implementing action plans for wild fauna species:

## **Guidelines on the Drafting and Implementation of Action Plans of Wild Fauna Species**

### **1. Legal aspects and administrative arrangements: finances and long term involvement**

- 1.1 Consider giving an appropriate legal and administrative framework to Species Action Plans;
- 1.2 Provide adequate (short, medium and long term) administrative and financial means for the implementation of Species Action Plans; associate formally the scientific and conservation community, the managers of natural areas of natural interest and, where appropriate, the local and regional authorities and relevant interest groups;

### **2. International co-operation**

- 2.1 Collaborate with other states, in the framework of the Bern Convention, in the framework of the European Action Programme on Threatened Species (Action Theme 11 of the pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy) and in whatever other appropriate framework, in the drafting, implementation and follow-up, as appropriate, of Species Action Plans, especially for those species whose conservation requires the co-operation of several states, and promote such co-operation;
- 2.2 Consult relevant neighbouring states while planning and carrying out Species Action Plans of transboundary populations;

### **3. Identification of species requiring special conservation attention, including, if appropriate, Action Plans**

- 3.1 Assess the conservation status of the species of the main taxonomic groups within their jurisdiction by a thorough process conducted strictly in biological terms. Create a national catalogue (or red list or red book) of threatened species, using, wherever appropriate, the IUCN Categories of Threat; collaborate with relevant scientific institutions and private conservation bodies in that context;
- 3.2 Identify species requiring Species Action Plans; define the appropriate geographic area to which the Plan is to apply, depending on the biological characteristic of the species concerned and on other relevant factors, including legal and administrative ones;
- 3.3 While assessing candidate species for Action Plans, use threat (risk of extinction) as main criteria; other additional criteria not related to threat that may be used are the following:
  - responsibility of the state in the global conservation of the species (e.g. the species is endemic or a significant percentage of the world population is in its territory);
  - the species occur mainly in rare or vulnerable habitats, which would also benefit from conservation actions taken in favour of the species;
- 3.4 Consider, if appropriate, drafting and implementing multi-species Action Plans;
- 3.5 Avoid a proliferation of Species Action Plans where it may exceed the management capacity of the Conservation Agencies responsible for their implementation, as it may be counter-productive; avoid, in general, drafting Species Action Plans for species that, although they may be threatened, they are unlikely to benefit significantly from the existence of an Action Plan; avoid "inflation" of Action Plans so that they remain relatively few in number, thus having

greater chances of success, and conservation efforts are not dispersed;

#### **4. Drafting action plans**

##### **4.1 Scientific aspects**

- 4.1.1 Ensure that action plans are based on sound studies on the biology of the population or species concerned, while avoiding unnecessary delays in implementation of the plans and the taking of conservation measures;
- 4.1.2 Ensure that, in order to avoid academically biased or unrealistic recommendations, experienced conservation managers participate in the preparation of the Species Action Plans;

##### **Contents**

##### **4.2 Ensure that the plan takes into consideration the following aspects:**

- 4.2.1 biological data, including distribution, habitat, population size estimates, trend, and other demographic data, migratory and dispersal patterns (if applicable), genetics, taxonomy, and ecological and ethological studies;
- 4.2.2 present and past causes of the decline of a species, and forecast as to how the factors having caused the decline are likely to evolve in the future;
- 4.2.3 evaluation of the habitat requirements of the species, including the assessment of whether present areas occupied by the species are able to support genetically viable populations;
- 4.2.4 habitat conservation and habitat restoration in the natural range of the species (including present sites and those in which the species was present in recent times); while designing areas for conservation, corridor areas permitting genetic flow among neighbouring populations should be taken into account;
- 4.2.5 legal status of the species; IUCN category of threat, presence in lists (including appendices or annexes of International Conventions);
- 4.2.6 need and viability to carry out captive breeding and re-introduction programmes;
- 4.2.7 risk analysis of those factors that could jeopardise the full implementation of the action plan;
- 4.2.8 feasibility of the Action Plan, including social and economic background in which the Species Action Plan is to be implemented; consider impact of measures proposed on economic, cultural or recreational activities or how they may be perceived by affected interest groups; evaluation of the social acceptance of the measures proposed is essential to its ongoing success;

##### **4.3 Goals, setting of priorities and funding**

- 4.3.1 set-up precise and measurable goals that may be used to evaluate the performance of the action plan;
- 4.3.2 set-up a precise time schedule for the different actions to be taken;
- 4.3.3 identify the institutions that are supposed to carry them out;
- 4.3.4 ensure that enough financial resources are available to implement and monitor the Action Plan;

- 4.3.5 prioritise actions and ensure that cost estimates reflect the priorities expressed;
- 4.3.6 avoid, as far as possible, that species recovery efforts for one species become a permanent, ever-lasting activity, favouring in the objectives the maintenance and conservation of the natural processes that ensure a good conservation status of the species;

## **5. Implementation, monitoring, update and follow-up**

- 5.1 Ensure the professional implementation of Species Action Plans, avoiding confusion regarding who hold responsibility for the carrying out of the different tasks involved, and recruiting or training adequate professional staff;
- 5.2 Ensure that monitoring is an integral part of the Species Action Plan and that the funds and means are provided for it;
- 5.3 Update periodically Species Action Plans to integrate the new information obtained during the implementation phase;
- 5.4 Associate international organisations in the follow-up of Species Action Plans, particularly by using more efficiently governing bodies of biodiversity-related Conventions and their technical groups; inform, in particular, relevant expert groups of the Bern Convention on the progress of the implementation of Species Action Plans examined under the framework of the Convention;

## **6. Participation of NGOs; public information and educational aspects**

- 6.1 Ensure that the appropriate public participation mechanisms are set, particularly when Species Action Plans are likely to be cause conflict or have socio-economic impacts of some importance;
- 6.2 Recognise the catalytic role played by non-governmental organisations, and associate them in the implementation and follow-up of Species Action Plans, and, where relevant, in their drafting;
- 6.3 Involve, as appropriate, local and regional authorities in all the process of Species Action Plans;
- 6.4 Use species subject to Action Plans as flagship species in educational campaigns;
- 6.5 Involve traditional or occasional users of the area where the Species Action Plan is to be implemented, in order to avoid, as far as possible, conflicts.

## APPENDIX 11

### Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

#### Standing Committee

#### **Recommendation No. 60 (adopted on 5 December 1997) on the implementation of the action plans for globally threatened birds in Europe**

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

Recalling its Recommendation No. 48 (1996) on the conservation of globally threatened birds in Europe;

Recommends that Contracting Parties and invites observer states as appropriate urgently to:

#### **General**

1. include key sites for the relevant species in their national networks of protected areas; consider (if appropriate) designating appropriate key sites in the European networks of Areas of Special Conservation Interest (Bern Convention Emerald Network) and / or Special Areas of Protection (Natura 2000 Network), and, where relevant, to other international networks, such as the conservation and protected areas network of the Arctic (CPAN) and those under the Ramsar and Barcelona Conventions;
2. promote collaboration with the relevant Non Governmental Organisations and scientific institutions in the implementation of the 23 Action Plans mention in Recommendation No. 48 of the Standing Committee, so as to be able to mobilise all possible available knowledge and energies;
3. promote appropriate agricultural practices in areas supporting internationally numbers of globally threatened species (Red-breasted Goose, Corncrake, Great Bustard, Aquatic Warbler) in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe;
4. enforce existing hunting and conservation regulations so as to stop mortality caused by the use of poison baits and illegal shooting (measures may include the increase of forestry wardens, the strict implementation of legal sanctions for offenders and the setting up of awareness programmes for hunters, farmers and forestry wardens;

#### **Pygmy Cormorant (*Phalacrocorax pygmeus*)**

##### *Albania*

5. carry out the appropriate management for the newly designated Strict Nature Reserve of Velipoja-Buna river outlet);

##### *Albania*

6. improve the conditions for the successful breeding of the species around the Shkodra's lake protecting, by the most appropriate way potential breeding sites;

*Greece*

7. monitor water level fluctuation in Lake Kerkini in order to ensure appropriate water levels during the period March-August (a maximum water level of not more than 35 m a.s.l. was suggested in the relevant Action Plan);

*Turkey*

8. protect by the most appropriate way the Lake Uluabat Güllük Delta and Milas Tuzla area;

**Dalmatian Pelican** (*Pelecanus crispus*)

*Albania*

9. continue wardening the colony at Karavasta Lagoon between February and late July every year;

*Bulgaria*

10. build an artificial island in order to provide nesting sites at Srebarna Lake;

*Greece*

11. monitor water level fluctuation in Lake Kerkini in order to ensure appropriate water levels during the period March-August (a maximum water level of not more than 35 m a.s.l. was suggested in the relevant Action Plan);

*Turkey*

12. consider extending the Ramsar boundaries of the Manyas Lake to include the whole areas of the lake, so as to prevent the pollution coming through the Si\_irci stream;

**Lesser white-fronted Goose** (*Anser erythropus*)

*Relevant Parties*

13. prevent from human disturbance, in particular from accidental shooting of birds and disturbance associated with hunting activities, key staging and wintering areas (eg in the Turgai Depression - Kazakhstan, Kyzyl-Agach-Azerbaijan, Galenbecker See and buffer zone -Germany);

**Red-breasted Goose** (*Branta ruficollis*)

*Bulgaria*

14. provide evening and morning wardening during the hunting season at Shabla and Durankulak;

**Marbled Teal** (*Marmaronetta angustirostris*)

*Spain*

15. continue present policy banning hunting at El Hondo, key breeding and wintering site for the species;

*Turkey*

16. consider declaring Akyatan Lagoon and Tuzla Lake as Ramsar sites;

**White-headed Duck** (*Oxyura leucocephala*)

*Bulgaria*

17. protect by the most appropriate means the Uzungeren Bay;

*Greece*



18. maintain the ecological characteristics of Lake Vistonis, including marshes in the southeast part;

*Turkey*

19. extend the Ramsar boundaries of the Burdur Lake to include the whole wetland area, so as to prevent pollution and secure the sustainability of the natural ecosystem of the lake;

**Imperial Eagle** (*Aquila heliaca*)

*Bulgaria, Hungary, Slovakia*

20. ensure the reduction of mortality from electrocution by power lines through modification/neutralisation of existing dangerous pylons in key areas; prevent further problems through amendments of existing legislation/standards on new pylons' design and avoid constructing power lines at most sensitive breeding and dispersion areas;

*Bulgaria*

21. provide wardening of the nests at Sredna Gora, Eastern Rhodopi, Sakar and Strandzha;

**Spanish Imperial Eagle** (*Aquila adalberti*)

*Spain*

22. ensure the reduction of mortality from electrocution by power lines through modification/neutralisation of existing dangerous pylons in key areas; prevent further problems through amendments of existing legislation/standards on new pylons' design and avoid constructing new power lines at most sensitive breeding and dispersion areas;

**Lesser Kestrel** (*Falco naumanni*)

*Greece*

23. consider launching appropriate programmes on agricultural areas that may improve the habitat of the species in Greece;

*Albania, Bulgaria, Romania, Russia and Ukraine*

24. undertake appropriate actions to identify the last remaining breeding sites;

**Corncrake** (*Crex crex*)

*Poland*

25. develop and implement a management plan for the former Kombinat Wizna aimed at the long term protection of the species;

**Great Bustard** (*Otis tarda*)

*Russia*

26. ensure the conservation of the ecological characteristics and value of the natural reserve of Steponj Saratoarskiy, preventing degradation from oil extraction activities;

*Spain*

27. protect by the most appropriate way key grassland areas and pseudosteppes, specially La Serena, Monegros and Bardenas Reales;

28. search an alternative settlement of the proposed golf course outside the Villafáfila Great Bustard reserve;

*Turkey*

29. take every appropriate measure to protect the species population in Altuntas Plain;

*Ukraine*

30. protect by the most appropriate way key areas for the species in the Kerch Peninsula;

**Aquatic Warbler** (*Acrocephalus paludicola*)

*Ukraine, Belarus*

31. protect by the most appropriate way key areas for the species in Pripyat marshes;

*Ukraine*

32. assess the conservation of the species in this state;

**Houbara Bustard** (*Chlamydotis undulata fuertaventurae*)

*Spain*

33. adopt and implement a formal recovery plan, as required by Spanish Conservation law for endangered species, taking into account, in particular, the Action Plan for Globally Threatened Birds in Europe;

34. protect, by the most appropriate means, key areas for the species, in particular Lajares and Esquinzo in the Island of Fuerteventura and Soo and Playa Quemada in the Island of Lanzarote;

**Canarian Laurel Pigeons** (*Columba bollii*, *Columba junoniae*)

*Spain*

35. draft and implement appropriate plans on both species, as required by the National and Regional conservation laws;

36. implement a programme of alternatives to present commercial forestry practices (applying, for instance the results of the relevant study financed by a LIFE grant);

37. reinforce existing controls on illegal shooting;

**Blue Chaffinch** (*Fringilla teydea*)

*Spain*

38. draft and implement the appropriate plan on the species, as required by National and Regional conservation laws;

39. propose reforestation with Canarian pine, so as to enlarge as far as feasible the very scarce habitat of the species;

40. consider carrying out a captive breeding programme;

Furthermore invites other conventions and governmental international organisations with responsibility for species conservation in Europe (Ramsar Convention, Barcelona Convention, Bonn Convention and its AEWa agreement, Bucarest Convention, Community European, IUCN, etc.) to collaborate with the Standing Committee and the concerned states, as appropriate, in the promotion, review and implementation of the Action Plans.

## APPENDIX 12

### Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

#### Standing Committee

#### **Recommendation No. 61 (adopted on 5 December 1997) on the conservation of the White-headed Duck (*Oxyura leucocephala*)**

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

Having regard to the aims of the convention to conserve wild fauna and its natural habitats;

Recalling that Article 11, paragraph b, of the convention requires parties to strictly control the introduction of non-native species;

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

Noting that the species *Oxyura leucocephala*, listed in Appendix II of the convention, is endangered;

Recognising the efforts of Contracting Parties in preserving the populations of this species;

Noting, however, that the main threat to the long-term survival of the species is its hybridisation with the American Ruddy Duck *Oxyura jamaicensis*;

Conscious of the critical importance of the continued expansion over Europe of the introduced Ruddy Duck *Oxyura jamaicensis* on the future of the native endangered *Oxyura leucocephala*;

Noting the large extent of populations of *Oxyura jamaicensis* in the United Kingdom, where this non-native species was first introduced in Europe;

Conscious that only a very firm control policy by the United Kingdom to halt and reverse the increase in population and range of the non-native *Oxyura jamaicensis* to a level that prevents spread to other countries can result in the long term survival of the endangered *Oxyura leucocephala*;

Desirous to avoid a further loss of biological biodiversity in the continent;

Aware of the obligations under the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Bonn Convention (and article 11 of the Birds Directive) to control and eradicate introduced species in order to prevent damage to threatened species;

Recalling Recommendation R (84) 14 of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, which calls on the member States to prohibit the introduction of non-native species into the natural environment;

Recalling the report of the Group of Experts of the Council of Europe (de Klemm, 1995) on Introductions of non-native organisms into the natural environment;

Recalling Recommendation No. 48 of the Standing Committee, adopted on 26 January 1996, on the conservation of European globally threatened birds;

Recalling the International Action Plan for the White-headed Duck in Europe, prepared by BirdLife International and Wetlands International with the support of the European Commission;

Noting that eradication of *Oxyura jamaicensis* is just one instrument in the conservation of *Oxyura leucocephala* and that other conservation measures need to be taken;

Welcoming the important steps made by the United Kingdom government in undertaking research into the feasibility of control measures for North American Ruddy Duck in the United Kingdom;

Believing, therefore, that international coordination is essential for the conservation of the White-headed Duck;

1. Recommends that Contracting Parties to the convention or observer states, as appropriate, develop and implement without further delay national control programmes which could include eradication of the Ruddy Duck from all the countries in the Western Palaearctic.

## APPENDIX 13

### Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

#### Standing Committee

#### **Recommendation No. 62 (adopted on 5 December 1997) on the conservation of regionally threatened birds in the Macaronesian and Mediterranean regions**

The Standing Committee of the Convention on the conservation of European wildlife and natural habitats, acting under Article 14 of the convention,

Having regard to the aims of the convention to conserve wild fauna and its natural habitats;

Having regard to Article 1, paragraph 2, of the convention which states that particular emphasis is given to endangered and vulnerable species, including endangered and vulnerable migratory species;

Having regard to Article 3 which requires parties to pay particular attention to endemic species;

Noting that its Recommendation No. 48 on the conservation of globally threatened birds in Europe deals only with species which are threatened at world level;

Conscious of the need to promote also the conservation of birds which may be threatened at the regional level and taking into account the conservation needs of subspecies, varieties or forms at risk locally;

Aware that two biogeographical zones in Europe, the Mediterranean region and the Macaronesian region and particularly rich in species and subspecies and that bird conservation in these two regions is of particular relevance to the maintenance of European biodiversity;

Recommends that Portugal and Spain:

1. identify, if they have not already done so, Macaronesian endemic birds which are vulnerable, endangered or critically endangered;
2. consider drawing up and implementing action plans for the species identified in point 1;

3. consider, in the implementation of this recommendation, the following species or subspecies:

a) species in the 23 Action Plans mentioned in its Recommendation No. 48 (1996) which are present in Macaronesia;

b) the other following species

for Portugal:	<i>Columba palumbus azorica</i> <sup>3, 6 *</sup>
for Spain	<i>Calandrella rufescens rufescens</i> <sup>1,5</sup>
	<i>Pelagodroma marina hypoleuca</i> <sup>1,7 *</sup>
	<i>Burhinus oediconemus distinctus</i> <sup>2, 5 *</sup>
	<i>Cursorius cursor bannermani</i> <sup>2, 4 *</sup>
	<i>Calandrella rufescens polatzeki</i> <sup>2,5</sup>
	<i>Parus caeruleus degener</i> <sup>2,5</sup>
	<i>Petronia petronia maderensis</i> <sup>2,7</sup>
	<i>Saxicola dacotiae dacotiae</i> <sup>3,4 *</sup>
	<i>Dendrocopos major canariensis</i> <sup>3,5 *</sup>
	<i>Tyto alba gracilirostris</i> <sup>3,5</sup>
	<i>Puffinus assimilis baroli</i> <sup>3, 7 *</sup>

Recommends that relevant Contracting Parties, and invites Mediterranean observer states as appropriate,

4. Promote the drafting and implementation of Action Plans for Mediterranean most threatened species which are not globally threatened.

---

1 Endangered  
 2 Sensitive to habitat alteration  
 3 Vulnerable  
 4 Canarian endemic species  
 5 Canarian endemic subspecies  
 6 Azores endemic subspecies  
 7 Macaronesian endemic subspecies  
 \* in Appendix I of the Habitats Directive

## **A P P E N D I X 14**

### **TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE GROUP OF EXPERTS ON BIRD CONSERVATION**

Terms of reference:

To review current problems of bird conservation in the Convention's area and to suggest appropriate action.

To advise the Standing Committee and Bureau on matters related to bird conservation, receiving papers and written consultation and responding accordingly.

In particular to monitor the implementation of Bird Action Plans in conjunction with the European Union ORNIS Committee, especially those covered by Recommendation No. 48 of the Standing Committee, by receiving and reviewing reports on their implementation and by informing the Standing Committee on the progress made and the points where urgent action is required. The Group may review results of monitoring activities into the status of globally threatened birds, suggest species that may require Action Plans and propose new monitoring activities. The Group may advise on proposals to the Standing Committee on possible amendment of the appendices and the need for special studies to be included in its working programme and present draft recommendations. Additionally, the Group may liaise with the ORNIS Committee, staff of the Bonn Convention Secretariat and its agreements and other expert groups on threatened species, (linking with them into the Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy Theme 11 processes), disseminate information on threatened birds and propose other measures and activities which might be appropriate for the conservation of threatened birds.

The Secretariat of the Bern Convention will be assisted by BirdLife International [at its own cost] to liaise and secure follow-up actions between meetings of the Group.

**APPENDIX 15**  
**Map of biogeographical regions for the Emerald Network**  
**(Part I: Europe)**



## APPENDIX 16

Convention on the conservation of European wildlife  
and natural habitats

Standing Committee

**Recommendation No. 63 (adopted on 5 December 1997) on the conservation  
of the Akamas peninsula, Cyprus, and, in particular, of the nesting beaches  
of *Caretta caretta* and *Chelonia mydas***

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* and *Chelonia mydas* are strictly protected species listed in Appendix II to the convention;

Drawing attention to Recommendation No. 7 (1987) on the protection of marine turtles and their habitats;

Congratulating the Government of Cyprus for the protection measures taken in the beaches of Lara and Toxeftra, given their high interest as nesting sites for *Caretta caretta* and *Chelonia mydas*;

Noting that the beach of Limni has also an extraordinary value for nesting of *Caretta caretta*;

Referring to the report by Dr Jean Lescure on the visit to Akamas (document T-PVS (97) 21);

Referring to the field study (or conservation management plan) carried out by the World Bank;

Welcoming the willingness of the Government of Cyprus to ensure the long-term conservation of the Akamas peninsula through the protection of the area as a "National Park" or other appropriate designation;

Recognising the high natural value of the Akamas peninsula, both in its terrestrial and marine parts,

specially as a little disturbed coastal area and an excellent nesting area for the marine turtles *Caretta caretta* and *Chelonia mydas*;

Recommends that the Government of Cyprus:

1. Declare the Akamas peninsula a national park, comprising a marine and a terrestrial part following as far as possible the suggestions of the World Bank study and giving to the beach of Limni and its surrounding land a similar status to the Akamas core area;
2. Freeze planning permission in the whole area covered by the World Bank study (and the area around the Limni beach) ? except the villages ? till the appropriate conservation measures have been decided, this to avoid the further degradation of the area which is intended to become a national park;
3. Reinforce the littoral and other relevant laws so as to avoid the establishment of buildings close to the sea line in any part of Akamas and giving priority to development near the villages and "in depth", at suitable distances from the sea in the areas where some development is foreseen by the World Bank report;
4. Give, as a matter of urgency, protection status to the beach of Limni and its surroundings by giving it a similar protection as to the Lara-Toxeftra Reserve and the Akamas core area;
5. Avoid the construction of any new building, road, parking or other facilities in the neighbourhood of the beaches of Lara, Toxeftra or Limni;
6. Abolish the tourist zone near Toxeftra, including it in the neighbouring conservation area, so as to avoid its likely damaging impacts on this area of extraordinary value for green turtle nesting;
7. Regulate access of people and vehicles to the beaches of Lara and Toxeftra, avoiding in particular the disturbance caused by mass tourism through "Safari" tours;
8. Close down illegal restaurants in the neighbourhood of the beaches of Lara and Toxeftra (including Aspros river restaurant);
9. Ensure that lights at the recently built Thanos hotel complex avoid photopollution of the beach; ensure that no chairs or parasols are set in the beach which may disturb turtle nesting; avoid water sports and mechanical cleaning of the beach;
10. Give protection to the seagrass communities in the Akamas-Limni area on which *Chelonia mydas* feeds.

## APPENDIX 17

### Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

#### Standing Committee

#### **Recommendation No. 64 (adopted on 5 December 1997) on the conservation of *Caretta caretta* in Kaminia (Cephalonia, Greece)**

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

Having regard to the objectives of this convention, which aims to conserve wild fauna and flora and their natural habitats, by giving particular attention to vulnerable species, including migratory species threatened by extinction;

Noting that Kaminia beach is the habitat of a colony of *Caretta caretta* sea turtles, a species listed in Appendix II to the convention;

Recalling the provisions of Article 4, paragraphs 1 to 3, and Article 6 of the convention,

Recommends that Greece:

- ? reassess the potential impact of the development of Kaminia beach on the nesting of *Caretta caretta* turtles;
- ? in the event that this impact study shows the likelihood of significant adverse effects, envisage taking appropriate conservation measures;
- ? encourage the participation of the relevant non-governmental organisations

## APPENDIX 18

### BERN CONVENTION PROGRAMME OF ACTIVITIES AND BUDGET FOR 1998

#### 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 ..... 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

##### **Seminar on threatened marine biodiversity**

##### Monaco

4 days (to be held in coordination with the Group of experts of conservation of invertebrates)

Terms of reference:

To analyse the main problems involved in the conservation of threatened marine species, in particular

those in the appendices of the Bern Convention, and to propose solutions for the conservation of their habitats, so that a sounder approach, in particular to invertebrate conservation, may be recommended to Contracting Parties. Contact will be held with other interested international organisations / Conventions / Agreements to look for the best ways and method of cooperation and synergy among the different treaties and programmes

Participants: all Contracting Parties and appropriate observers

Element 6.2

**Seminar on Action Plans for Large Carnivores (in collaboration with WWF)**

Slovakia

4 days

Terms of reference:

To revise current problems on Large Carnivores conservation in Europe and to suggest adequate action. The group shall, in particular, examine the Action Plans for Large Carnivores made within the framework of the Large Carnivore Initiative for Europe led by the WWF. At the seminar, those action plans will be examined and discussed by experts, who will give guidelines to the Standing Committee regarding the possible future use and viability of those plans. The experts may suggest other species requiring Action Plans and propose measures that may be appropriate for the conservation of threatened large carnivores.

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

**Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Finland, Greece, Italy, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russia, Sweden, Ukraine**

Travel and subsistence expenses will be covered for 3 consultants..... 115,000  
Expenses for renting room, bus and other local expenses (lump sum) ..... 15,000

Participants: all Contracting Parties

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

Element 6.3

**PLANTA EUROPA Conference**

Uppsala (Sweden)

5 days

Terms of reference:

The Bern Convention is part of the Steering Committee for the preparation of this seminar, which will be organised in collaboration with the Swedish conservation authorities. The seminar is intended to present current problems in plant conservation in Europe and to propose appropriate strategies to deal with those problems. Several resolutions adopted at the previous PLANTA EUROPA Conference have permitted the Bern Convention to better integrate plant conservation into a wider European perspective. Within the structure of the conference there will be a workshop on the elaboration of a European Red List of Threatened Plants (see element 7.4).

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

Element 6.4**Seminar on implementation of Action Plans for Amphibians and Reptiles (in coordination with the Group of experts on conservation of amphibians and reptiles)**Greece

4 days

Terms of reference:

To examine the IUCN Action Plans on European Amphibians and Reptiles and to see what relevance they may have both for the implementation of the Convention and for the development of the European Action Programme on Threatened Species (Action Theme No. 11 of the pan-European Strategy). At the seminar, those action plans will be examined and discussed by governmental experts, who will give their opinion to the Standing Committee regarding their possible implementation. The experts may suggest other species requiring Action Plans and propose measures that may be appropriate for the conservation of threatened herpetiles.

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

Element 6.5**Seminar CORINE-biotopes/Emerald network (to be organised by the Secretariat in collaboration with the CORINE-biotopes team)**Ljubljana (Slovenia)

3 days

Travel and subsistence expenses of experts from 10 states having taken part in the CORINE-biotopes exercise and travel and subsistence expenses of 1 consultant ..... 60,000

**7. CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARD THE COST OF EXPERT GROUPS**Element 7.1**Group of experts for the setting up of the Emerald Network of Areas of Special Conservation Interest**Strasbourg

3 days

Terms of reference:

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 25 states:

**Albania, Andorra, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Moldova, Monaco, Norway, Poland, Romania, Russia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Switzerland, "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" Turkey, Ukraine** 190,000  
and travel and subsistence expenses of 1 consultant ..... 10,000

Participants: all Contracting Parties

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

Element 7.2

**Group of experts on conservation of invertebrates**

Monaco

4 days

Terms of reference:

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

Travel and subsistence expenses will be covered for 1 expert from each of the following 20 states:

**Belgium, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Lithuania, Monaco, The Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Spain, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom** ..... 140,000

Participants: all Contracting Parties

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

Element 7.3

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

Greece

3 days

Terms of reference:

To revise current problems of herpetile conservation in Europe and to suggest adequate action. Particular attention will be given in this meeting to site management.

Travel and subsistence expenses will be covered for 1 expert from each of the following 17 states:

**Austria, Bulgaria, France, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom** ..... 120,000

Participants: all Contracting Parties

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

Element 7.4

**Group of experts to review the European Red List of Threatened Plants**

Uppsala (Sweden)

1 day

Terms of reference:

To revise the Draft European Red List of Threatened Plants and to propose eventual modifications. This group will be organised in the form of a workshop during the PLANTA EUROPA Conference.

Subsistence expenses for 1 day will be covered for 1 rapporteur from each of the following 8 states:

**Austria, Bulgaria, France, Germany, Ireland, Norway, Spain, Switzerland** ..... 8,000

Travel and subsistence expenses for the consultant..... 8,000

## 8. CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARDS THE COSTS OF CONSULTANTS

### Element 8.1

#### **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 (part II)

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

### Element 8.2

#### **Elaboration of an action plan on the wolverine (*Gulo gulo*)**

Terms of reference:

To compile an action plan on the wolverine *Gulo gulo* following as much as possible the guidelines of Recommendation No. 59 of the Standing Committee.

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

### Element 8.3

#### **Plants protected by international or national legislation in Europe**

Terms of reference:

To compile a list of plant species protected by national or international legislation in Europe. The report will include a list of species of Appendix I that remain unprotected by the different Contracting Parties.

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

### Element 8.4

#### **Elaboration of European action plans for two bat species (to be decided in collaboration with the Secretariat of the EUROBATS agreement)**

Fixed appropriation for consultant ..... 80,000



Element 8.5

**European Red List of Threatened Plants**

Terms of reference:

To compile a Red List of Threatened Plants for Europe, using as a base the Regional Red Lists that are being made for different parts of Europe. The project will be developed in three years. During the first phase the expert will be asked to compile existing Red Lists, create a reduced network of experts with knowledge in different biogeographical regions of Europe and produce a first (very provisional draft List), as well as to present a report on the criteria and methods used. The purpose of the activity is to check to which point the present Appendix I of the Convention covers species threatened throughout all or most of their European range, and the particular responsibility that Europe has in the protection of those species. (First Phase: 1998)

Fixed appropriation for consultant..... 70,000

Element 8.6

**Methods to eradicate non native species**

Terms of reference:

To collect information on the experiences and initiatives of different states to eradicate introduced non native species in their territories. To propose to Contracting Parties appropriate strategies to eradicate non native species in their territories.

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

Element 8.7

**Initiatives for Plant Protection in Europe**

Terms of reference:

To compile the initiatives both national and, particularly, international that are being carried out in Europe by governments, scientific institutions (such as Botanic Gardens and "Conservatoires", arboreta, etc) in the field of plant conservation, in particular action plans and ex-situ conservation programmes. The compilation will include a list of contacts, institutions and governments and an analysis of the impact on plant conservation of international programmes.

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

Element 8.8

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

Terms of reference:

To study the value of micro reserves in protecting very localised populations of endangered species; to analyse how the system of micro reserves works in the different states or regions where it has been applied and to make recommendations as to its improvement and extension.

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

**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. PART-TIME SECRETARY**

Element 10

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

**11. CONSULTANTS FOR EMERALD NETWORK**

Element 11

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. .... 180,000

Bern Convention Programme of Activities and Budget for 1998 (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 threatened marine biodiversity	
6.2 Seminar on Action Plans for Large Carnivores (in collaboration with WWF) .....	130,000
6.3 PLANTA-EUROPA Conference.....	10,000
6.4 Seminar on implementation of Action Plans for Amphibians and reptiles (in coordination with Group of experts on conservation of amphibians and reptiles) .....	10,000
6.5 Seminar CORINE-biotopes/Emerald network.....	60,000
7. Expert groups	
7.1 Group of experts for the setting up of the Emerald Network of Areas of Special Conservation Interest.....	200,000
7.2 Group of experts on conservation of invertebrates .....	140,000
7.3 Group of experts on conservation of amphibians and reptiles.....	120,000
7.4 Group of experts to review the European Red List of Threatened Plants .....	16,000
8. Consultants	
8.1 Red Book on Threatened butterflies.....	60,000
8.2 Action Plan for the wolverine ( <i>Gulo gulo</i> ).....	60,000
8.3 Plants protected by international or national legislation in Europe.....	40,000
8.4 Elaboration of European action plans for two bat species (to be decided in collaboration with the Secretariat of the EUROBATS agreement) .....	80,000
8.5 European Red List of Threatened Plants .....	70,000
8.6 Methods to eradicate non native species .....	40,000
8.7 Initiatives for Plant Protection in Europe.....	40,000
8.8 Microreserves as a tool for Plant conservation.....	40,000
9. Publications.....	70,000
10. Part-time secretary.....	130,000
11. Consultants for Emerald Network .....	180,000
	1,806,000

The Bern Convention Special Account will be used to cover expenses that cannot be covered by the ordinary budget (Activity II.9, Article 2217) of the Council of Europe.