



Strasbourg, 21 September 2006
[tpvs16e_2006.doc]

T-PVS (2006) 16

CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF EUROPEAN WILDLIFE AND NATURAL
HABITATS

Standing Committee

Meeting of the Bureau

Strasbourg, 8 September 2006

MEETING REPORT

*Secretariat Memorandum
prepared by
the Directorate of Culture and Cultural and Natural Heritage*

1. Adoption of the agenda

Ms Véronique Herrenscheidt, Chair of the Standing Committee of the Convention, opened the meeting on 8 September 2006 and welcomed the other Bureau members, Mr Jon Gunnar Ottosson, Vice-Chair, and Ms Ilona Jepsena, as well as the Secretariat representatives.

The draft agenda was adopted as reproduced in Appendix 1.

The participants are listed in Appendix 2.

2. General information

Mr Gianluca Silvestrini, Head of the Natural Heritage Division, informed the Bureau of the current budgetary discussions, pointing out that the prospective cuts would most likely affect the natural heritage sector.

The Bureau expressed concern about this information, stressing that the environment should be recognised as a human right and that the role of the Convention, as a genuine pan-European biodiversity forum, should be further enhanced.

- Development of the Convention:

Georgia was continuing its preparatory work for accession to the Convention.

Armenia should be ratifying the Convention in the near future.

Serbia was considering accession to the instrument.

Russia had been expressing great interest; the Secretariat has mandated a consultant, Mr Volodymyr Domashlinets (Ukraine), to prepare a study of Russian legalisation with a view to possible accession.

The Bureau encouraged the Secretariat to maintain close contact with these countries in order to assist them in the accession process.

3. Implementation of the 2006 programme of activities

The Secretariat presented the state of progress in the Programme of Activities.

a. Monitoring the legal implementation of the Convention

The report on the legal implementation of the Convention in Spain, prepared by Professor Michel Prieur (France), would be submitted on 1 October 2006.

b. Emerald Network

The next meeting of the Group of Experts of the Emerald Network in Strasbourg on 9-10 October 2006 would be a joint one with the Committee of experts for the development of the Pan-European Ecological Network.

The following main points would be presented and discussed at this meeting:

➤ Forward-looking study on the development of the Emerald Network in Africa and the Mediterranean Basin

Mr Hervé Lethier, consultant, had prepared this study with funding from the French authorities. The proposals set out in the study concerned intensified co-operation between the Bern Convention and the various relevant international institutions and initiatives; development of the Emerald Network methodology in the countries in question; and continuation and intensification of technical co-operation with the Barcelona Convention and the RAC/SPA.

➤ Implementation of the Emerald CARDS Programme in co-operation with the European Environment Agency (EEA)

This programme had been launched at the end of the previous year under a contract concluded by the EEA and the Council of Europe. It covers the following six Balkan countries: Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Montenegro, Serbia and the "Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia".

The programme was to be finalised for December 2006, although it was possible that in the case of Serbia finalisation of this programme would have to be postponed for a few weeks because of the changed political situation, given that the relevant work had previously been assigned to the Montenegrin Ministry of the Environment.

➤ **Expansion of the Emerald CARDS Programme in 2007/2008**

The EEA might be requesting additional funding from the European Commission with a view to definitive finalisation of the Emerald Network identification exercise in the above-mentioned six countries. This would complete the work of identifying the whole Emerald Network in the European region.

➤ **Future procedure for validating Emerald sites**

The Group of Experts should present detailed proposals to the Standing Committee on a procedure for validating Emerald sites in line with the Natura 2000 procedure (though probably in a looser, simplified form).

This work might begin in 2007 or 2008 with the Emerald Network sites in Switzerland and the six Balkan countries.

➤ **Emerald Network pilot projects**

Two pilot projects were mentioned in the 2007 draft budget, namely in Armenia and Tunisia. The two pilot projects which had been launched in Senegal and Burkina Faso in 2003 and 2004, respectively, are now scheduled for completion but have not yet been finalised, despite several requests to their team leaders.

c. Invasive alien species

A workshop aimed at helping the authorities develop a national strategy on invasive alien species was held in Croatia from 22 to 24 May 2006.

A further workshop would be run in Kyiv from 2 to 4 October 2006.

d. Group of Experts on the conservation of invertebrates

The Group of Experts met in Strasbourg on 19 and 20 June 2006.

The draft European Strategy has been finalised. It will be submitted to the Standing Committee for possible adoption in November 2006.

e. Conservation of plants

The next *Planta Europa* Conference will take place in Cluj (Romania) in September 2007.

f. Group of Experts on the conservation of amphibians and reptiles

This Group of Experts met on 4 and 5 May 2006. It considered five draft action plans and put forward proposals on species to be prioritised in the development of further action plans over the next few years.

g. Contribution to the Conference on the monk seal

The Bern Convention was contributing to the Conference to be held in Antalya (Turkey) from 17 to 19 September 2006 by defraying the expenses of several participants.

h. Action plan for the European sturgeon

Thanks to a voluntary contribution from France, a meeting had taken place on 3 and 4 July 2006 in Saint-Seurin-sur-l'Isle and Bordeaux to consider a preliminary draft action plan prepared by the consultants (WWF).

The German Government volunteered to host the subsequent meeting in spring 2007.

i. Wind power and biodiversity

The *Ad hoc* Group met at the European Commission headquarters on 17 January 2006. This activity has been held up by a number of difficulties: the second meeting initially scheduled for 2006 has not yet taken place, and the revised version of the guidelines on wind power and nature conservation are not yet available.

j. European Charter on hunting and biodiversity

The Working Group will hold its second meeting on 11 September 2006. It will consider the preliminary draft Charter prepared by the consultant, Mr Massimo Marracci.

The Standing Committee will receive a progress report on this activity.

k. Climate change

An informal meeting held in Peterborough on 16 May 2006 has facilitated the revision of the draft Recommendation, consideration of which was postponed in 2005 by the Committee in order to give delegations more time to submit their comments.

The new draft recommendation will be presented to the Standing Committee at its next meeting.

A Group of Experts would be set up if the draft was adopted.

The Bureau took note of this information, and congratulated the Secretariat on having successfully carried out all these activities.

The Chair invited the Secretariat to contact the new Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in order to step up co-operation under the CBD's regional thematic programmes.

4. Application of the Convention - Files**4.1. Specific sites – Files open****a. Akamas Peninsula (Cyprus)**

The Secretariat informed the Bureau that it had not yet received the Government's report. Furthermore, the NGOs were requesting that the file remain open as no new information had been supplied on the adoption and implementation of the proposal for managing the Akamas Peninsula.

Ms Ilona Jepsen informed the Bureau that a Bio-geographical Seminar on Cyprus and Malta will take place in Brussels to discuss the designation of Natura 2000 sites.

b. Project to build a motorway through the Kresna gorge (Bulgaria)

The Secretariat informed the Bureau that no report on this subject had yet been forwarded.

c. The Danube-Black Sea canal project in the Bystroe Estuary (Danube delta, Ukraine)

On 15 August 2006, the Ukrainian Court of Auditors published a press release setting out the results of its audit of the efficiency of the environmental protection measures taken in 2004 and 2005 as part of the project (Phase 1). The Court of Auditors concluded that the requisite environmental protection measures had not been taken even though they had been scheduled in the environmental impact assessment conducted during Phase 1; the protective dyke had not been built; and the funds allocated had not been used as programmed.

The report forwarded by the NGOs included information on:

- The Phase 2 environmental impact assessment;
- The report prepared at the request of the Espoo Convention, concluding that the Bystroe project would have transfrontier impacts.

Under the trilateral agreement concluded in 2000 on the creation and management of a transfrontier protected area shared by Moldova, Romania and Ukraine, a meeting was scheduled for autumn in Tulcea (Romania).

4.2. Possible new files

a. Wind farm in the Balchik area – Via Pontica (Bulgaria)

At its previous meeting, the Standing Committee adopted Recommendation No. 117 (2005) on the plan to set up a wind farm near the town of Balchik and other wind farm developments on the Via Pontica route. In this Recommendation, the Bulgarian government had been asked to reconsider its decision to approve the proposed wind farm in Balchik in view of its potential impact on wildlife and Bulgaria's obligations under the Convention.

The Committee had decided to retain this matter on the list of possible new files.

The Bulgarian Government had informed the Secretariat that it did not intend to review the decision to approve the wind farm project.

Also at its previous meeting, the Bureau had been informed of a similar case reported by NGOs involving plans to build a group of 129 windmills 20 km from Balchik, between the town of Kavarna and the Kaliakra Cape.

The Secretariat has received no further information from the Bulgarian authorities.

In their report the NGOs deplored the Government's attitude, stressing that Bulgarian legislation provided for revising decisions that had been taken on the basis of insufficient information.

The NGOs also stressed that:

- the combined effect of the various projects had not been considered;
- the Ministry of the Environment and Water had cancelled a contract concluded with the Bulgarian Society for the Protection of Birds relating to the identification of sensitive sites for migratory birds;
- the Varna Regional Directorate had so far authorised 50 projects in North-East Bulgaria, but some of the smaller-scale ones had been implemented without any prior environmental impact assessment. After the adoption of the Recommendation, the Kaliakra wind farm project had been authorised on the basis of an incomplete environmental impact assessment.

The NGOs ask the Standing Committee to open a joint file on Balchik and Kaliakra. They have forwarded a report on the construction of the wind farm in Kaliakra and another one drawn up by an expert from the Swiss Ornithological Institute, Dr Felix Liechti.

The Bureau once again voiced its serious concern about the developments in this file. It regretted that the revised version of the guidelines on wind power and nature conservation to be produced by the European Commission were not yet available.

The Bureau considered it vital to contribute to the debate on wind farms, and proposed recommending that the Standing Committee invite countries to transmit information on the sites selected for wind farm installations; this information should help develop a more in-depth analysis of the situation at the European level regarding wind farms and migration routes.

Given the lack of additional information from the Bulgarian government, apart its decision to proceed with the project, the Bureau decided to propose that the Standing Committee open a new file on this matter.

b. Conservation of the Hermann tortoise in the Massif and Plaine des Maures (France)

At its previous meeting, the Standing Committee adopted Recommendation No. 118 (2005) on the protection of the Hermann tortoise in the Massif and Plaine des Maures, which included a request to the French Government to use a more global management concept for the areas concerned by the presence of the species and to reject the new application for extension of the Balançan waste storage centre as it stands.

The French authorities have taken action to implement this recommendation, including:

- moving the planned zone for extending the waste storage centre;

- and organising a meeting with all the partners involved to work on an integrated management strategy for the population of the Massif and Plaine des Maures.

The Secretariat has received no additional information beyond this.

The Chair confirmed that the file was progressing and that her Government would be forwarding fresh information in the very near future.

4.3. On-the-spot appraisals

There has been no on-the-spot appraisals in 2006.

4.4 Pending complaints

a. Ski resort in San Glorio (Spain)

This complaint, lodged by the IBA Association (Association for Bear Research and Management), concerned the construction of a ski resort in San Glorio in the Cantabrian mountains, in an area inhabited by brown bears.

The resort project, which had attracted intensive media coverage, was likely to affect two populations which were remnants of the main population of brown bear, once very widespread.

The Secretariat had written for information to the competent authorities, but had not yet received any reply.

The Spanish Environment Ministry had informed the Secretariat that no official project had yet been submitted for approval.

The Bureau decided to take no further action on this complaint for the moment. It nevertheless instructed the Secretariat to monitor this case and, depending on developments, reserved the right to come back to it at a forthcoming meeting.

b. Habitats necessary for the survival of the common hamster in France

The Association “Sauvegarde Faune Sauvage” had complained that insufficient resources were being put into preserving the habitats required for the survival of the common hamster in France.

The Secretariat has written to the French authorities asking for information, but has not yet received a reply.

As requested by the Bureau, the Secretariat had asked the countries mentioned in Recommendation No. 79 (1999) (Belgium, France, Germany and the Netherlands), which house small or decreasing populations, to forward information on the state of hamster populations and the measures implemented to guarantee their sustainable conservation.

The German authorities had forwarded a report on the status of the species by region, highlighting various negative trends.

The Belgian authorities had informed the Secretariat of the measures they had taken to halt the decline of the species. Conservation programmes had been launched in the different regions concerned.

The emergency measures taken in 2005 had led to a significant increase in numbers of hamster nests.

The Bureau considered that if no information was received by the next meeting of the Standing Committee, this complaint could be treated as a possible new file.

c. Protection of the green toad (*Bufo viridis*) in Alsace (France)

The complaint submitted by the BUFO Association (Association for the study and the protection of amphibians and reptiles in Alsace) about the inadequacy of the impact studies carried out in connection with the Oberschaeffolsheim and Wolfisheim bypass project, and the Zénith construction project, the Secretariat had written to the French authorities asking them for their position on these projects.

No response has been received so far.

In its Recommendation No. 27 (1991), the Standing Committee had asked the French government to “ensure, by the most appropriate means, protection and management of the few remaining habitats of *Bufo viridis* in the Alsace and Lorraine regions; (and) limit the change of breeding ponds into fish ponds”.

The Bureau deplored that fact that the French authorities had failed to reply to either of these requests for information.

It considered that if no information was received by the next meeting of the Standing Committee, this complaint could be treated as a possible new file.

d. Project on imprinting the Lesser White-fronted Goose (*Anser erythropus*) in Sweden

The Secretariat of the Bern Convention had received a letter from the Greek Director General responsible for Forestry and the Natural Environment, challenging the decision by the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) to approve the *Aktion Zwerggans* project, designed to guide Lesser White-fronted Geese to new, safer wintering grounds in Germany.

In their reply, the Swedish authorities had justified the project on the basis of the fact that the species had suffered a sharp decline in Europe and Russia in recent years, and was expected to decline further over the next ten years.

Pending the adoption of the new international action plan by the African-Eurasian Waterbird Agreement (AEWA), the pilot project should provide important information about ways of restoring populations that have been wiped out and/or rebuilding small populations.

As requested by the Bureau, the Secretariat had transmitted this information to Norway, which was also affected by the project, as well as to the AEWA, requesting a scientific opinion.

The Secretariat has received no reply to date.

The Bureau considered that the Swedish authorities had supplied all the necessary information.

It nonetheless decided to retain this complain pending receipt of replies from the Norwegian authorities and the AEWA.

e. Wind farm project in Volovja Reber (Slovenia)

The Secretariat had received a joint complaint from 24 NGOs concerning the construction of a group of 43 wind turbines in southern Slovenia, in the Alpine and Dinaric region. The chosen site was of vital importance for various species protected under the Bern Convention (Eurasian lynx, wildcat, brown bear, etc), and also acted as a corridor.

The Slovene authorities have not yet answered the Secretariat’s request for information.

The Bureau decided to retain this pending complaint.

f. Planned motorway across the Drava marshlands and hydroelectric power station in Lesce across the river Dobra (Croatia)

A complaint had been lodged by the NGO Friends of the Earth Croatia about the foreseeable negative effects of these two projects on biodiversity, as well as the content of the environmental impact assessments.

In its reply, the competent Ministry of Culture informed the Secretariat that a working group had been set up involving all the authorities concerned by this project with a view to establishing a common position.

The river Dobra houses 36 fish species, 19 of which are included on the Croatian Red List. They include the Danube salmon (*Hucho hucho*), which is listed in Appendix III to the Bern Convention.

The dam would have negative repercussions on fish migration.

Furthermore, local speleological sites provided habitats for many bat species, some of which are included in Appendix II of the Bern Convention.

The project had been authorised for reasons of overriding public interest. The decision had been taken in 1988. The environmental impact studies had been conducted in 1987, as had the public inquiry, and the work on the first two phases had begun in 2003. The nature conservation authorities would be tabling an amendment to limit the period of validity of environmental impact assessments and the consequent environmental protection conditions. The planning permission for the final stage, which comprises the highest risk from a nature conservation viewpoint (dam filling stage), has not yet been issued.

In connection with the planned motorway, which would be part of the Corridor intended to link the Baltic Sea to the Adriatic, current data on existing species and habitats had not been available when the environmental impact assessment was conducted in 2003.

Proposals for the motorway layout had taken account of the Kopacki Rit nature reserve. Works had begun on the southern stretch, and would continue northwards in 2008.

A plan was under consideration for including the whole Drava and Mura river area in the “regional park” category, and the Croatian authorities were to apply for UNESCO biosphere reserve status.

The Bureau took note of this information. It considered that the hydroelectric power station project had already greatly advanced. It intended to propose that the Standing Committee should visit the sites of both projects, prioritising the planned motorway.

4.4. Other information

a. Hunting of the edible dormouse (*Glis glis*) in Slovenia

At its last meeting, the Bureau had been informed of the Slovene Government’s reply on the subject of the trapping that still takes place in Slovenia.

As requested by the Bureau, the Secretariat had written to the complainant to ask whether or not it was the decline in the population of the species that had prompted the complaint. No reply had yet been received to this letter.

The Bureau considered that this item should no longer be included on its agenda.

b. Conservation of the Mediterranean horseshoe bat (*Rhinolophus euryale*) in the “Ajdovska jama pri Nemški vasi” cave in Slovenia

The Secretariat has received no further information on this matter.

c. Caves in the Thrace region (Turkey)

The Secretariat has received no updated monitoring report.

In view of the favourable developments and the commitment on the part of the Slovene and Turkish authorities to restricting tourist development in these two cases, the Bureau decided no longer to include these two items on its agenda, unless new elements should emerge.

It invited the governments in question to keep up the good work, and asked the Secretariat to continue co-operating with EUROBATS on any complaints relating to bat conservation.

It instructed the Secretariat to consider the possibility of concluding a Memorandum of Co-operation with EUROBATS in 2007.

d. Proposals from the Bureau to the Standing Committee

The Bureau decided to present the Standing Committee with the complaints pending as “information presented by the Bureau to the Standing Committee”. It requested that this item be added to the Standing Committee’s draft agenda.

It decided to propose that the Standing Committee set a deadline for replies to requests for information, after which failure to reply would have the effect of transforming a pending complaint into a possible new file.

It also suggested studying the possibility of formulating guidelines for processing complaints.

5. Follow-up to the recommendations – Developments in the situation

a. Follow-up to Recommendation No. 95 (2002) on the conservation of marine turtles in Kazanlı (Turkey)

The Turkish authorities had forwarded information on the measures taken to implement the recommendation, and in particular to solve the problems of rehabilitating the beach: two seasonal workers had been recruited to guard the beach during the breeding season; public awareness and beach clean-up campaigns had been organised; the greenhouses had been moved five metres back from the sea; the jetty had been completely demolished; and research was continuing into possible sunlight filtering systems.

In their report the NGOs pointed out that despite the efforts expended the overall situation remained critical; erosion was still a major threat and no final solution had been found to the problem of toxic waste.

The Secretariat recalled that in 2004 the Standing Committee had decided to close the file provisionally.

The Bureau instructed the Secretariat to ask the Turkish Government for a very full report on the implementation of the recommendation before the subsequent meeting of the Standing Committee.

b. Follow-up to Recommendation No. 108 (2003) on the proposed construction of the “Via Baltica” (Poland)

On 28 August 2006, Mr Eckhart Kuijken, the expert who had conducted the on-the-spot appraisal in 2003, and while on a visit to Poland in the framework of the European Diploma for Protected Areas, held talks with the relevant authorities about recent developments, including progress on the Strategic Environmental Assessment.

In their report the NGOs had once again voiced their concern about the project, which represents a serious threat to several habitats of European importance.

The Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) process is being conducted in co-operation with the NGOs and should be completed by the end of 2006.

Without awaiting the results, decisions have already been taken on a large number of individual projects along Road No. 8 (Bialystock).

This “fragmented” approach jeopardises efforts to identify alternative routes, which is the whole point of the Strategic Environmental Assessment. This was the reason for the NGOs’ complaint to the European Commission.

The NGOs request the Government to suspend any decision until the results of the SEA are available and individual EIAs have been conducted on each of the individual projects.

The Bureau took note of this information. He thanked the ministries concerned for having accepted to organise this unformal meeting and instructed the Secretariat to present Mr Kuijken’s conclusions to the Standing Committee, subject to the agreement of the Polish authorities.

c. Follow-up to Recommendation No. 112 (2004) on hydro-electric dams in Kárahnjúkar and Nordlingaalda (Iceland)

In their report to the Secretariat, the NGOs pointed out that there had been little measurable progress in implementing the recommendation, apart from the Government’s announced intention not to conduct any further projects in the Thjorsarver area.

The NGOs highlighted the following in particular:

- the inaction on the part of the Monitoring Board and the lack of transparency;
- the works in Eyjabakkar had been continuing, and numbers of Pink-footed geese during their moulting period had been at their lowest level for the past twenty years. This area should be incorporated in the planned national park north of Vatnajökull;

➤ no measures had been taken to protect the Úthérad IBA.

The Icelandic authorities had forwarded a first report on the implementation of the recommendation, with information on:

- transposition of the SEA Directive into national law in spring 2006;
- the operation of the Monitoring Board set up for the Kárahnjúkar project;
- the planned national park at Vatnajökull and the project to extend the Thjorsarver nature reserve.

Mr Jon Gunnar Ottosson informed the Bureau that the Secretariat would be receiving a revised version of the Government's report.

d. Follow-up to Recommendation No. 113 (2004) on the installation of a new antenna (Pluto II) in the Sovereign Base Areas (Akrotiri, Cyprus)

The Secretariat informed the Bureau that the British Government would be submitting an updated report to the next meeting of the Standing Committee.

In the report which it had transmitted to the Secretariat, BirdLife Cyprus mentioned their regular constructive dialogue with experts from the Base. Nevertheless, given the lack of progress on the ground, this NGO was advocating urgent action in consultation with all the partners concerned to establish and implement detailed monitoring of bird collisions, mitigation measures, integrated protection, and a management plan for the Akrotiri area.

6. Draft agenda for the 26th meeting of the Standing Committee

The Bureau examined the draft agenda of the 26th meeting of the Standing Committee as tabled by the Secretariat, and made a number of amendments before approving it.

It hoped that information would be presented to the Standing Committee on preparations for the 6th Ministerial Conference on "An Environment for Europe", which was to take place in Belgrade from 10 to 12 October 2007.

7. Proposed programme of activities for 2007

The Bureau approved the draft programme of activities for 2007.

In view of the budget cuts that were liable to affect this sector, the Chair recalled the importance of voluntary contributions from the Contracting Parties for the work of the Committee as well as the search for external support.

8. Amendment to the Rules of Procedure

The Secretariat presented the memorandum which it had prepared on the functioning of the Bureau, and mentioned a number of options relating to enlarging the membership of the Bureau, their status and decision-making procedures.

The Bureau congratulated the Secretariat on this analysis, and instructed it to present the memorandum to the Standing Committee, adding an item on geographical distribution.

9. Follow-up to decisions

The Bureau stressed that some of the themes to which the last Conference of the Parties (CoP) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) gave priority status directly concerned the Bern Convention. The role played by the convention in implementing CBD CoP decisions should be more clearly highlighted.

It suggested to update the 2001 Memorandum of Co-operation with the Executive Secretary of the CBD.

10. Other business

✓ **Bird flu**

The Bureau took note of the updated document prepared by the Secretariat on the steps taken by the various international organisations.

In view of the number of players involved in this issue, the Bureau felt that it should simply endeavour to keep abreast of the action undertaken.

✓ **Biodiversity conservation in the Azov-Black-Sea Corridor**

The Secretariat had prepared a letter to be signed by the Chair, following the decision by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) to suspend work on the eco-corridor project presented by the Ukrainian delegate at the previous meeting of the Standing Committee.

The Bureau asked for additional information on the parties responsible for the project before dispatching the letter.

It instructed the Secretariat to write to the Ukrainian authorities.

* * *

The Chair thanked the participants and closed the meeting.



APPENDIX 1
CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF EUROPEAN WILDLIFE
AND NATURAL HABITATS

Strasbourg, 7 July 2006

Standing Committee
Bureau meeting

Strasbourg, 8 September 2006
(Room 15, opening: 9.30 am)

AGENDA

- 1. Adoption of the agenda**
- 2. General information**
- 3. Implementation of the 2006 Programme of activities**
- 4. Implementation of the Convention: Files**
 - 4.1 Specific Sites - Files open**
 - Cyprus: Akamas peninsula
 - Bulgaria: project to build a motorway through the Kresna Gorge
 - Ukraine: proposed navigable waterway in the Bystroe Estuary (Danube delta)
 - 4.2 Possible files**
 - Bulgaria: Wind farms in the Balchik and Kaliakra areas –Via Pontica-
 - France: Conservation of the Hermann tortoise in the plaine des Maures
 - 4.3 On-the-spot appraisal**
 - 4.4 Complaints in stand-by and other information**
 - Spain: Ski resort in San Glorio
 - France: Habitats for the survival of the common hamster and the green toad
 - Sweden: Project on imprinting Lesser White-fronted goose (*Anser erythropus*) and ultralight planes
 - Slovenia: Wind farm project in Volovja Reber
 - Croatia: (1) Motorway project in Drava wetland and (2) Hydropower plant Lešće on the River Dobra
 - 4.5 Other information**
 - Slovenia: Hunting of edible dormouse (*Glis glis*), and monitoring of the Mediterranean horseshoe bat in the cave “Ajdovska jama pri Newmski vasi”
 - Turkey: Monitoring of bat populations in the caves of Thrace.
- 5. Follow-up of the Recommendations - Evolution of the situation in:**
 - Recommendation No.95 (2002) on the conservation of marine turtles in Kazanlı (Turkey)
 - Recommendation No.108 (2003) on the proposed construction of the “Via Baltica” (Poland)
 - Recommendation No. 112 (2004) on hydro-electric dams in Iceland
 - Recommendation No.113 (2004) on military antenna in the Sovereign Base Area of Akrotiri (Cyprus)

- 6. Draft agenda of the 26th meeting of the Standing Committee**
- 7. Proposals for the programme of activities in 2007**
- 8. Amendment of the Rules of Procedure of the Standing Committee to enlarge its Bureau**
- 9. Follow-up to CBD COP-8 Decisions**
- 10. Any other business**



APPENDIX 2

Strasbourg, le 31 août 2006
[list part Bureau sept2006.doc]

CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF EUROPEAN WILDLIFE
AND NATURAL HABITATS
CONVENTION RELATIVE A LA CONSERVATION DE LA VIE SAUVAGE
ET DU MILIEU NATUREL

Standing Committee / Comité permanent

Meeting of the Bureau / Réunion du Bureau

Strasbourg, le 8 septembre 2006
Palais de l'Europe, Salle 15

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS /

LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS

FRANCE / FRANCE Mrs Véronique HERRENSCHMIDT, Responsable de la mission internationale, Direction de la nature et des paysages, Ministère de l'écologie et du développement durable, 20, avenue de Ségur, F-75302 PARIS 07 SP
Tel : +33 1 42 19 19 48. Fax : +33 1 42 19 19 06
E-mail : veronique.herrenschmidt@ecologie.gouv.fr (E) (F)

ICELAND / ISLANDE Dr Jón Gunnar OTTÓSSON, Director General, Icelandic Institute of Natural History, Hlemmur 3, 125 REYKJAVIK
Tel: +354 590 0500. Fax: +354 590 0595. E-mail: jgo@ni.is (E)

LATVIA/LETTONIE Ms Ilona JEPSEN, European Commission, Environment Directorate General B2, B2 Nature and Biodiversity, Avenue de Beaulieu 5, B-1160 BRUXELLES / Belgium.
Tel : +32 2 296 91 49. Fax: +32 2 299 08 95. E-mail : Ilona.jepsena@cec.eu.int (E)

INTERPRETERS / INTERPRETES

Mr William VALK, 2, rue des Jardins, Duntzenheim, F-67270 HOCHFELDEN, France.
Tel: +33 3 88 70 59 02. Fax: +33 3 88 70 50 98. E-mail: william.valk@wanadoo.fr

Mr Robert SZYMANSKI

Mrs Christine FARCOT

SECRETARIAT / SECRÉTARIAT

Council of Europe / Conseil de l'Europe, Directorate of Culture and Cultural and Natural Heritage / Direction de la Culture et du Patrimoine culturel et naturel, F-67075 STRASBOURG CEDEX, France

Tel : +33 3 88 41 20 00. Fax : +33 3 88 41 37 51

Mr Eladio FERNÁNDEZ-GALIANO

Tel : +33 3 88 41 22 59. Fax : +33 3 88 41 37 51. E-mail : eladio.fernandez-galiano@coe.int

Ms Carolina LASÉN-DÍAZ, Administrator of the Natural Heritage and Biological Diversity Division / Administrateur de la Division du Patrimoine naturel et de la Diversité biologique

Tel : +33 390 21 56 79. Fax : +33 388 41 37 51. E-mail : carolina.lasen-diaz@coe.int

Mrs Françoise BAUER, Principal administrative assistant / Assistante administrative principale, Natural Heritage Division / Division du Patrimoine naturel

Tel : +33 3 88 41 22 61. Fax : +33 3 88 41 37 51. E-mail : francoise.bauer@coe.int

Mrs Hélène BOUGUessa, Principal administrative assistant / Assistante administrative principale, Natural Heritage Division / Division du Patrimoine naturel

Tel : +33 3 88 41 22 64. Fax : +33 3 88 41 37 51. E-mail : helene.bouguessa@coe.int

Mrs Véronique de CUSSAC, Natural Heritage Division / Division du Patrimoine naturel

Tel : +33 3 88 41 34 76 Fax : +33 3 88 41 37 51. E-mail : veronique.decusac@coe.int