



**Joint Meeting of the Bern Convention Network of Special Focal Points (SFPs) on
Eradication of Illegal Killing, Trapping and Trade in Wild Birds and the CMS
Intergovernmental Task Force on Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory
Birds in the Mediterranean (MIKT)**

(Bonn, Germany, 13-15 May 2025)

UNEP/CMS/MIKT6/Report
T-PVS(2025)09

MEETING REPORT



The European Union was recognized as Champion Plus for their generous support and commitment towards addressing Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds in the Mediterranean for the period 2015 - 2028.



Table of Contents

List of Acronyms	4
Executive Summary	6
Meeting Report	8
Agenda Item 1. Opening of the Meeting and welcoming remarks	8
Agenda Item 2. Election of Officers: Appointment of Chair and vice-Chair of the meeting	9
Agenda Item 3. Document UNEP/CMS/MIKT6/Doc.3.2/Rev.2. Adoption of the Agenda and Schedule	9
Agenda Item 4. Setting the context of the meeting and Reporting by the Secretariats	9
Agenda Item 4.1 Document UNEP/CMS/MIKT6/Doc.4.3.1. CMS IKB priorities and meeting objectives.....	9
Agenda Item 4.2 Bern Convention Secretariat Report.....	10
Agenda Item 4.3 Document UNEP/CMS/MIKT6/Doc.4.3.1. IKB in the Mediterranean: CMS MIKT Report and Rome Strategic Plan priorities	10
Agenda Item 5. Report from Members and Observers	11
Agenda Item 5.1 Reports from MIKT Members and Bern Convention Special Focal Points on IKB.....	11
Agenda Item 5.2 Reports from Observers of MIKT and Bern Convention.....	17
Agenda Item 6. CMS Treaty, relevant CMS initiatives on Taking and the Raptors Memorandum of Understanding	21
Setting the scene	23
Agenda Item 7. Reflections and exchange	23
Agenda Item 8. Scoreboard Reporting and data collection	24
Agenda Item 8.1 Document UNEP/CMS/MIKT6/Doc.8.1. Presentation of updated Scoreboard 2023 analysis and update about Scoreboard exercise 2026	24
Agenda Item 8.2 Document UNEP/CMS/MIKT6/Doc.8.1. National perspective on the Scoreboard exercise: how it has helped organizing action against IKB and lessons learnt....	24
Agenda Item 8.3 NGO perspective: Progress assessment on the eradication of IKB in the Mediterranean and Europe.....	25
Agenda Item 9. Efficient and Effective Enforcement	26
Agenda Item 9.1 Examples of Efficient Enforcement at national and international level	26
Agenda Item 9.2 Species Recovery and the role of IKB	31
Agenda Item 10. Monitoring and Technology	32
Update on technological advances for monitoring IKB	32
Agenda Item 11. Mid-term assessment of the Rome Strategic Plan and next steps for the MIKT Workplan 2026-2030	33
Agenda Item 11.1 Presentation on mid-term assessment of the Rome Strategic Plan and next steps for the MIKT Workplan 2026-2030	33
Agenda Item 11.2 Breakout Groups. Reporting from Breakout groups, discussion and conclusion on way forward	34

Agendas Item 12. National IKB Action Plans	35
Agenda Item 12.1 Document UNEP/CMS/MIKT6/Inf.12.1.2. Report and recommendations from a Workshop on National IKB Action Plans in the Balkans and next steps on National IKB Action Plans	35
Agenda Item 12.2 National perspective on National IKB Action Plans: Montenegro	36
Agenda Item 12.3. NGO perspective on National IKB Action Plans.....	37
Agenda Item 13. Funding and international cooperation	39
Agenda Item 14. Prevention of IKB.....	41
A survey on IKB Motivations	41
Agenda Item 15. Next Joint Meeting, Financial matters and AOB	42
Agenda Item 15.1 Next Joint Meeting in 2026 (online) and next in-person Joint Meeting in 2027	42
Agenda Item 15.2 Communication and networking between meetings.....	42
Agenda Items 15.3 Financial matters and 15.4 Next steps	43
Agenda Item 15.5 Any Other Business.....	43
Agenda Item 16. Closure of the Meeting	43
Annex 1. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS.....	45

List of Acronyms

ABNJ	Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction
AEMLAP	African-Eurasian Migratory Landbirds Action Plan
AEWA	African Eurasian Migratory Waterbird Agreement
AFD	Agence Française de Développement
AMF	Adaptive Management Framework
CEPF	Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund
CINEA	European Climate, Infrastructure and Environment Executive Agency
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora
CMS	Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals
COP	Conference of the Parties
CPEW	Campaign against criminal Poisoning of European Wildlife
CZIP	Centre for Protection and Research of Birds, Montenegro
DG-ENV	Directorate-General for Environment of the EU
EC	European Commission
ENPE	European Network of Prosecutors for the Environment
ESOCC	European Serious and Organised Crime Centre
EU	European Union
EUR	Euros
FACE	European Federation of Associations for Hunting and Conservation
FFEM	French Facility for Global Environment
HOS	Hellenic Ornithological Society
IFAW	International Fund for Animal Welfare
IKB	Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Wild Birds
IMPEL	EU Network for the Implementation and Enforcement of Environmental Law
ISPRA	Italian Institute for Environmental Protection and Research
IRENA	International Renewable Energy Agency
ITTEA	Task Force on Illegal Hunting, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds in the East Asian Australasian Flyway
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
IWC	International Waterbird Census
KBA	Key Biodiversity Area
LIFE	EU funding instrument for the environment and climate action
MASE	Italian Ministry of the Environment and Energy Security
MIKT	CMS Intergovernmental Task Force on Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds in the Mediterranean
MIKT6	Sixth Meeting of the MIKT
MITECO	Ministry for Ecological Transition and Demographic Challenge, Spain
MOOC	Massive Open Online Course
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MPA	Marine Protect Area
MsAP	Multi-species Action Plan
NABU	Nature and Biodiversity Conservation Union, Germany

NAP	National Action Plan
NFP	National Focal Point
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NLP	National Legislation Programme
NSAIDs	Non-Steroidal Anti Inflammatory Drugs
NWCU	National Wildlife Crime Unit, UK
OFB	Office français de la Biodiversité
ORS	Online Reporting System
OTF	Operational Task Force
PAM	Passive Acoustic Monitoring
RIT	Regional Implementation Team
RNOOA	Réseau National des Observateurs Ornithologues Algériens
RSP	Rome Strategic Plan 2020-2030: Eradicating Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade in Wild Birds in Europe and the Mediterranean region
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SBAs	Sovereign Base Areas of Akrotiri and Dhekelia, UK
SEO	Spanish Ornithological Society, BirdLife Partner in Spain
SEPRONA	Servicio de Protección de la Naturaleza de la Guardia Civil (Nature Protection Service of the Civil Guard)
SFPs	Bern Convention Network of Special Focal Points on Eradication of Illegal Killing, Trapping and Trade in Wild Birds
SPA	Special Protection Area
SPMS	Samarkand Strategic Plan for Migratory Species
StC	Standing Committee
SWAITBT	South-West Asia Illegal Taking of Migratory Birds Intergovernmental Task Force
SWMS	State of the World's Migratory Species
TAG	Technical Advisory Group
TAIEX	Technical Assistance and Information Exchange
TdV	Tour du Valat research institute
TFRB	EC Task Force on the Recovery of Birds
TORs	Terms of Reference
UK	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
USD	United States Dollars
VCF	Vulture Conservation Foundation
WAVCAP	West Africa Vulture Conservation Action Plan
WBRU	Wild Birds Regulation Unit, Malta
WCA	Wildlife Crime Academy

Executive Summary

1. The 5th Joint Meeting of the Bern Convention Network of Special Focal Points (SFPs) on Eradication of Illegal Killing, Trapping and Trade in Wild Birds and the CMS Intergovernmental Task Force on Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds in the Mediterranean (MIKT) took place from 13 to 15 May 2025, in Bonn, Germany and online. The meeting was attended by 110 people, 60 in person participants and 50 online.
2. Progress and successes in action against IKB over the period 2022-2025 were shared by members and observers. The following members provided reports at the meeting: Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, France, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Morocco, Poland, Türkiye, Spain, and the United Kingdom (UK).
3. Notable examples on action against IKB from members included an Action Plan for the protection from poisoning of endangered and endemic species of wild fauna 2025-2035 approved in Albania; progress on a national IKB Action Plan in Montenegro; and progress on an Action Plan to Combat Illegal Activities Against Wildlife (2025–2028) in Croatia.
4. The following observers provided reports: the European Federation for Hunting and Conservation (FACE), BirdLife International, the Vulture Conservation Foundation on the Wildlife Crime Academy, Portugal on behalf of the EU Network for the Implementation and Enforcement of Environmental Law (IMPEL), the European Network of Prosecutors for the Environment (ENPE), and the LIFE EUOKITE project. Reports were also presented from the CMS National Legislation Programme and the Raptors MOU.
5. A session on the Scoreboard provided an updated analysis of submissions to the Scoreboard 2023, based on replies submitted by 25 countries. Overall, all countries showed a small improvement from one Scoreboard to the next, highlighting that taking part in the exercise was a good way to build ownership and plan actions on IKB. Greece, a country which had submitted replies to all three Scoreboards, provided a national perspective on the self-assessment exercise.
6. The NGOs BirdLife International and EuroNatur had conducted their own assessment through their NGO partners at the national level, and presented results of 'The Killing 3.0' report, highlighting similar conclusions to the official Scoreboard. The report included key recommendations for the remaining period of the Rome Strategic Plan (RSP).
7. Participants were also informed about examples of Efficient and Effective Enforcement. Europol highlighted the work of AP EnviCrime, which worked, among other environmental issues, on illegal trafficking and trade of wildlife. Four national presentations from Algeria (General Directorate of Forests, Ministry of Agriculture, Rural Development and Fishing), Malta (Wild Bird Regulation Unit), Spain (SEPRONA), and the UK (National Wildlife Crime Unit), generated much interest and questions, due to innovative techniques, smart interventions and thorough approaches presented.
8. The EC Task Force on the Recovery of Birds, presented by the European Commission, considered scientific recommendations on hunting adjustments for huntable species, with the first species targeted for analysis and recommendations on hunting pressure being the European Turtle-dove (*Streptopelia turtur*). The Task Force was expanding to cover other huntable species.
9. BirdLife International presented results of a paper investigating the mortality factors for birds tracked using satellite transmitters. The analysis found that human induced mortality was greater than natural mortality. Other helpful technological advances for monitoring IKB, such as trail

cameras, drones, DNA analysis and acoustic monitoring were also presented.

10. The participants agreed to proceed to a RSP mid-term assessment to assess progress towards the goal of the RSP, according to its 'Section 5.4 Assessments'. Participants agreed the preferred methodology would consist of engaging a consultant to make the assessment using Scoreboard 2023 data, complemented by further information collected from those countries across the Mediterranean and Europe, which had not provided data yet or had provided incomplete data, directly liaising with those countries. Support would be offered in the absence of Baseline, or methodology or trend data to estimate the scale, scope and trend. The CMS Secretariat would proceed with contracting the work for the mid-term assessment.
11. In relation to National IKB Action Plans (IKB NAPs), participants were informed about progress on developing an IKB NAP for Montenegro, which had hosted a CMS Workshop on IKB NAPs in September 2024. The NGO EuroNatur also presented its perspective on IKB NAPs in the Balkans.
12. Participants were also informed about funding opportunities for combating IKB. There were presentations by the European Climate, Infrastructure and Environment Executive Agency (CINEA) on the LIFE programme; by Tour du Valat on funding provided by the Agence Française de Développement (AFD) and the French Facility for Global Environment (FFEM) related to birds and IKB; and by the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) about CEPF Mediterranean priorities.
13. The CMS Secretariat had contracted BirdLife International to conduct a survey on IKB Motivations in the Mediterranean and in Serbia, which would take place in late 2025, with the aim to present results at CMS COP15 in March 2026. Geographical extension of the survey could be considered subject to the contractor's capacity and availability of funding from the Bern Convention.
14. Adoption of the new Council of Europe Convention on the Protection of the Environment through Criminal Law on 14 May 2025 was welcomed as relevant to combatting IKB.
15. Croatia announced that it was ready to host the next Joint Meeting on IKB in 2027.

Meeting Report

Day 1. Tuesday 13 May 2025

Agenda Item 1. Opening of the Meeting and welcoming remarks

16. Mr Ivan Ramírez (Head of Avian Species Team, CMS Secretariat) welcomed participants to the sixth Meeting of the MIKT (MIKT6) and the fifth Joint Meeting of MIKT and the Bern Convention Special Focal Points (SFPs) on Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade in wild birds (IKB), and introduced the speakers making the opening remarks.
17. Ms Amy Fraenkel, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS), welcomed participants to Bonn and applauded the group of people involved in MIKT. She acknowledged the host government of Germany, which was a very strong supporter of CMS, and the collaboration with the Bern Convention. Referring to the State of the World's Migratory Species (SWMS) report, which was launched at CMS COP14, she noted that the exploitation of migratory species for taking was a key threat. COP14 took decisions to strengthen the mandate to prevent IKB and adopted a crosscutting decision on illegal taking of migratory species. Within CMS there were different areas of work on IKB, and it was important to address the drivers of illegal taking of species. CMS had also built on the work of MIKT, with the launch of new initiatives on IKB in the Asia-Pacific, and in South-West Asia. The MIKT Scoreboard pointed to areas where focus was needed, especially enforcement, whilst monitoring was another persistent challenge. She considered that IKB was a key issue for which a real difference could be achieved through a pragmatic approach. Noting the global contribution of MIKT as a springboard for other initiatives, she encouraged participants to use the opportunity of this meeting to share experiences and address challenges together. She thanked all participants, and the team involved in organising and supporting the meeting.
18. Ms Marta Medlinska, Programme Manager of the Bern Convention, welcomed participants to the meeting on behalf of Mr Mikaël Poutiers, Secretary of the Bern Convention. The Convention was a binding international legal instrument in the field of nature conservation, covering most of the natural heritage of the European continent and extending to some States of Africa. She thanked the CMS hosts for preparing and hosting the meeting. She informed that the Council of Europe Committee of Ministers was meeting at the same time as the Joint Meeting on IKB, and were due to adopt the first [Council of Europe Strategy on the Environment](#) and the new [Convention on the Protection of the Environment through Criminal Law](#). The Strategy recognized the triple planetary crisis of climate change, pollution and biodiversity loss, and its impacts on human rights. The purpose of this new Convention was to prevent and combat environmental crime, promote national and international cooperation, and establish minimum legal standards to guide States. The Vision and Strategic Plan for the Bern Convention for 2021-2030 referred to preserving and enhancing ecosystems, improving the conservation status of threatened species and recognition of the important environmental contributions of wild flora and fauna and their natural habitats, thus addressed also IKB. She wished all participants an inspiring and fruitful meeting.
19. Ms Berit Gewert, Policy Advisor, International Species Conservation, Wildlife Trade, Federal Ministry for the Environment, Climate Action, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety, Republic of Germany, welcomed participants to Bonn, where CMS was launched in 1979. Germany had a special connection to CMS as depositary to the Convention and host to the Secretariat. She considered the meeting a great opportunity to advance the Rome Strategic Plan (RSP) and for exchange and discussion. Overexploitation affected 68% of Appendix II species, and preventing unsustainable taking of migratory species was essential. The European Birds Directive was also adopted in 1979, but still populations of many native birds of prey and owl species continued to

decline. Birds of prey were among the most illegally persecuted animal groups in Germany, where still thousands of harriers, Honey buzzards and Lesser-spotted eagles were being killed annually. It was essential to combat such crime, which needed to be detected by authorities, as without regular checks many crimes were not registered. Poaching was widespread in the Mediterranean, which remained a hotspot for IKB. MIKT did great work in tackling this issue along the flyway, with the RSP playing an important part. All countries needed to work together to address this important issue.

Agenda Item 2. Election of Officers: Appointment of Chair and vice-Chair of the meeting

20. Mr Ramírez introduced his CMS colleagues at the meeting: Ms Claire Papazoglou, who had been leading MIKT for several years, Ms Ximena Cancino, CMS Secretariat, who was playing a key supportive role, Mr Tilman Schneider, member of the Avian Team, and online Mr Umberto Gallo-Orsi, and Mr Yong June Kim, an intern that would be supporting the meeting. He also introduced Mr Tim Dodman, the meeting reporter and finally, he also presented Mr Aydin Bahramlouian, Head of Communications.
21. In line with normal practice, CMS and the Bern Convention proposed Mr András Schmidt as Chair. Mr Schmidt was working in the Hungarian state nature conservation, and was responsible for coordinating the implementation of the Natura 2000 network in Hungary, and wildlife conservation, with a particular focus on birds. In this capacity, he had been a regular participant of international IKB meetings, and was a member of the Hungarian Environmental Security Task Force.
22. Following normal practice CMS and the Bern Convention proposed Ms Arianna Aradis as vice-Chair of the meeting. Ms Aradis was a senior ornithologist researcher at the Italian Institute for Environmental Protection and Research (ISPRA) and was actively involved in various national and international initiatives aimed at promoting bird conservation and combating IKB. Since 2020 she served as the main respondent for Italy in the IKB Scoreboard assessment process, and since 2022, had been a member of the MIKT Task Force under the CMS framework.
23. The meeting approved the nomination of Mr Schmidt as Chair and Ms Aradis as vice-Chair of the meeting. It was noted that Ms Salome Nozadze, Georgia, would support the meeting online. The Chair thanked everyone for placing their trust in him as Chair and looked forward to exchanging experiences and fruitful discussions to move forwards to put an end to IKB.

Agenda Item 3. Document [UNEP/CMS/MIKT6/Doc.3.2/Rev.2](#). Adoption of the Agenda and Schedule

24. The Chair invited the Meeting to review the provisional annotated agenda and to submit any comments, questions or proposals. There being no requests from the floor, the Meeting agenda was adopted.

Agenda Item 4. Setting the context of the meeting and Reporting by the Secretariats

Agenda Item 4.1 Document [UNEP/CMS/MIKT6/Doc.4.3.1](#). CMS IKB priorities and meeting objectives

25. Mr Ramírez introduced CMS, which entered into force in 1983 as the only Convention that focused on migratory species, and which now had 133 Parties. CMS worked primarily according to its text and appendices focused on endangered species and species with unfavourable conservation status requiring international agreements. He introduced COP14 outcomes relevant to MIKT, including the SWMS, the Samarkand Strategic Plan for Migratory Species (SPMS), the renewed

mandate for global action against IKB and success in expanding the IKB Task Forces beyond the Mediterranean.

26. The SWMS, the new baseline for CMS work, highlighted that 82% of CMS Appendix I species were globally threatened, and provided a detailed situation of migratory species changes in abundance per region. Seven out of ten CMS listed species were impacted by overexploitation, hence the need to keep scientifically strong data against illegal killing. Goals 1-3 of the Samarkand SPMS 2024-2032 were especially relevant to this Task Force, and comments on the plan were welcomed.
27. CMS Resolution 11.16, which guided the work of MIKT, was revised at COP14, with updates including clear mention of the RSP, acknowledgement of the Scoreboard and a request to the Task Force to collect experience from its use. The Resolution also called for expansion and reinforcement of IKB prevention, for strengthening of the Asia-Pacific Intergovernmental Task Force (ITTEA), and for a decision to establish the South-West Asia Illegal Taking of Migratory Birds Intergovernmental Task Force (SWAITB). Both these initiatives were modelled on MIKT.
28. In reference to wildlife crime, CMS Article III (5) required Parties to prohibit taking of Appendix I species, but many Parties had not adequately implemented this at the national level. CMS was holding a dedicated workshop on the National Legislation Programme in June 2025.
29. Mr Ramírez introduced the MIKT6 Meeting Objectives, which included a mid-term assessment of the RSP. By 2025 MIKT has become a recognized framework, with an open platform for sharing data. Like all positive initiatives there was room for improvements, and he encouraged participants to provide a critical view so that these could be identified. The IKB National Action Plans (IKB NAPs) were excellent tools, which were shared during a workshop in Montenegro in 2024. Adapting National Legislation was considered as the best performing area to tackle IKB, whilst establishing a baseline and effective monitoring remained as challenges.
30. The RSP, which was the backbone of MIKT, aimed for a 50% reduction in IKB by 2030, but this required all countries to establish Baselines, so that progress could be measured. Funding was still a big gap, especially in non-EU MIKT countries. The CMS Secretariat offered support for coordinated activities, including funding proposals and events.

Agenda Item 4.2 Bern Convention Secretariat Report

31. Ms Medlinska provided a brief overview of the Bern Convention, which had 50 Parties, mostly European, including the EU; there were also a few Parties in Africa. Although the Secretariat had limited resources and a small team, it could help with setting up guidance documents for the Scoreboard, and for the survey on motivations for IKB. She hoped that the new Convention on the Protection of the Environment through Criminal Law, which was very relevant to combating IKB, would play a key role in dealing with serious offences to environmental crime, even if not termed as ecocide, for which there were usually far-reaching consequences.
32. The Bern Convention did not generally receive complaints concerning IKB, more in terms of other impacts on birds, such as from wind turbines and loss of habitat, for which it sought ways to find solutions and promote good practice.

Agenda Item 4.3 Document [UNEP/CMS/MIKT6/Doc.4.3.1](#). IKB in the Mediterranean: CMS MIKT Report and Rome Strategic Plan priorities

33. Ms Claire Papazoglou, MIKT Coordinator, CMS Secretariat, introduced progress since the last

Joint Meeting in 2022 and the work programme planned over the coming years. Resolution 11.16 (Rev. COP14), the mandate for the work of the MIKT, was updated at COP14, and now had a specific mention of the RSP and acknowledged the work in developing and using the Scoreboard. COP14 had adopted a more flexible approach to amending the Scoreboard, as proposals for amendment could be submitted to the CMS Standing Committee (StC) instead of the COP.

34. The MIKT had been working jointly with the Bern Convention since 2017 covering the Mediterranean and Europe. The last Joint Meeting on IKB was in Valencia, Spain in 2022. The MIKT endorsed the Guidance for Development and Implementation of IKB NAPs in December 2022, and there was a National Action Plans Regional Workshop for the Balkans in Podgorica, Montenegro in September 2024.
35. The MIKT and the Bern Convention had worked on analysis of the Scoreboard in 2023 based on responses from 25 countries, with the updated analysis presented under Agenda Item 8.
36. The Suggested Methodology and Guidance for Conducting Socio-Economic Research into the Motivations Behind IKB was endorsed in June 2023, and would be followed by the Survey on IKB Motivations in MIKT countries 2025-2026 (Agenda Item 14), which would consider the drivers and motivations behind IKB. The new EU funding grant adopted for the period 2024 - 2028 would cover costs for the Coordinator post, organization of meetings and regional workshops, the IKB Survey on Motivations, mid-term assessment of the RSP and outreach materials.
37. The [MIKT Website](#) was kept updated, with new pages dedicated to the RSP.
38. The MIKT and the CMS Secretariats had participated in international meetings to share the MIKT experience, including a Working Group Meeting on Illegal Taking of Migratory birds in South-West Asia, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia (January 2024), a Wildlife Crime Conference, Cyprus (May 2024), and an online workshop for IKB in Lebanon, organized by UNEP Lebanon (May 2024).
39. The overarching objective of the RSP 2020-2030 was to secure IKB NAPs, which would help to understand the scale and scope of IKB through establishing effective monitoring of IKB, establish IKB prevention measures, ensure incorporation of IKB into national legislation, and ensure effective and efficient enforcement of legislation and justice.
40. MIKT plans for 2025 and 2026 included attendance of Level 1 at the Wildlife Crime Academy (WCA) for the MIKT Coordinator, mid-term assessment of the RSP, the survey on IKB Motivations, CMS COP15 (with a side event on IKB Motivations), developing the Scoreboard 2026, outreach materials and a Regional Workshop on National Action Plans. A workshop on enforcement / prosecution was planned for 2027, and an invitation was made to host the next in-person Joint Meeting on IKB.
41. The Chair opened the floor for interventions on Agenda Item 4. There was a request to provide a link to the new Council of Europe Convention, which the Bern Convention would provide.

Agenda Item 5. Report from Members and Observers

Agenda Item 5.1 Reports from MIKT Members and Bern Convention Special Focal Points on IKB

42. The Chair introduced MIKT Members and Bern Convention Special Focal Points on IKB who presented reports.
43. **Albania:** Ms Klodiana Marika, Director of Nature and Forests, Ministry of Tourism and

Environment of Albania, presented the report from Albania, a country with 16 Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas (IBAs) with a total area of 143,879 ha and 125 bird species on Annex I of the Birds Directive, which were subject of special conservation measures. Several training workshops focused on nature protection were implemented between January and March 2025, including one on environmental crime. Albania operated a moratorium on bird hunting from 2014 to July 2025, and was drafting a hunting law, working with stakeholders to protect biodiversity. Hunting would not be allowed in protected areas, whilst hunting by foreigners would be banned. Lawbreakers would be subject to direct fines, court cases and potential compensation payments. Albania's legal and policy framework was good, but a lack of human and financial resources resulted in a lag in law enforcement. Albania had set www.observation.org as its official bird recording portal, with data feeding into the EuroBird Portal. The Action Plan for the protection from poisoning of endangered and endemic species of wild fauna in Albania 2025-2035 had been approved, as well as an action plan for protecting endangered species. An update on the Red List of Albanian Fauna was also underway. Albania aimed to achieve full transposition of the Birds Directive into Albanian legislation and improve bird monitoring and species inventories, which would help to identify where to better develop policies. Albania was planning to increase protected area coverage to 30% by 2030.

44. The Chair congratulated Albania on the moratorium of bird hunting, the alignment with EU regulations, on the plans to increase the protected area coverage and on the anti-poisoning plan.
45. Mr Ramírez enquired about the next steps following the environmental crime workshop organized in Albania. Ms Marika replied that amendments were made to the Albanian Penal Code to integrate the environmental crime Directive already in 2023, and efforts were being made to accommodate the final amendments following the approval of the Directive at EU level.
46. **Bulgaria:** Mr Valeri Georgiev, Ministry of Environment and Water, presented the report from Bulgaria, where projects had been implemented for the past 15 years, especially on birds of prey. Poisoning was found to be more severe than electrocution, including a case in 2019 that involved eight Griffon Vultures (*Gyps fulvus*) and one Golden Eagle (*Aquila chrysaetos*) near Vrachanski Balkan Nature Park in the Northwest. Other cases involved poisoning of a Black Vulture (*Aegypius monachus*) in the Southwest, and two Egyptian Vultures (*Neophron percnopterus*) in the Southeast, for which an investigation was underway. It was challenging to prosecute these cases due to the tough terrain, and the difficulty in reaching perpetrators. The main reason for poisoning noted in the Action Plan to Combat the Illegal Use of Poisons in Wildlife 2021-2030 was human-carnivore conflict. A new unit under the National Police was working on implementation of the penal code for illegal killing of species. A wildlife crime investigation training course was held in November 2024. Combating poison baits remained an important challenge.
47. The Chair thanked and congratulated Bulgaria on having an action plan to combat the illegal use of poisons in wildlife, which it was implementing.
48. **Croatia:** Ms Maja Polić, State Inspectorate, presented the report from Croatia, which had problems with illegal killing of game birds and strictly protected birds. Achievements in combating IKB were that enforcement bodies had improved their work resulting in more inspections and joint anti-poaching actions in the field. Education and protection activities were mostly done by NGOs, which had conducted several workshops, with over ten on lead poisoning and three for public prosecutors and judges on wildlife poisoning. Further workshops and extensive public campaigns were conducted on the prevention of wildlife poisoning and on awareness raising regarding the consumption of game meat in hotspots.
49. Ms Una Mršić, from the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Green Transition, presented

progress in development of the Action Plan to Combat Illegal Activities Against Wildlife (2025–2028), prepared by a Commission working group composed of representatives from the Ministry of the Interior, the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Green Transition, the State Inspectorate of the Republic of Croatia, the State Attorney's Office of the Republic of Croatia, and the NGO Biom. The Ministry of Environmental Protection and Green Transition is the lead institution responsible for drafting the Action Plan. It is expected to be adopted by the Government of the Republic of Croatia upon completion of the necessary governmental procedures.

50. Mr Ramírez questioned when the Action Plan was expected to be approved. Ms Mršić replied that it should be approved in 2025. The Chair congratulated Croatia on this work.
51. **Cyprus:** Mr Panicos Panayides, Game and Fauna Service, Ministry of the Interior, presented the report from Cyprus, which was a migration hotspot for birds and unfortunately also for IKB. Numbers of IKB cases prosecuted were 630 in 2024, up from 453 in 2018. About 30% of court cases were dealing with IKB, numbering about 500-600 cases per year. A key achievement was that higher fines were now imposed for IKB since the introduction of on-the-spot fines in 2017, with average court fines increasing from EUR 780 before 2017 to EUR 1,695 after, and an average on-the-spot fine of EUR 3,381. There were also low levels of trapping in the spring, and forensics were in use in handling wildlife crime. The main obstacle in combating IKB was a lack of human capacity, with too few game wardens, whilst the use of wildlife forensics needed to improve. In addition, the issue of IKB was sometimes being exploited for populist purposes. Wildlife crime needed to be taken seriously, with improved enforcement, especially in complex cases. Raising awareness was also important for the public, prosecutors and judges.
52. The Chair thanked Cyprus for the report, and for informing the Meeting about the use of fines.
53. **Georgia:** Ms Maia Chkhobadze, Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture, presented the report from Georgia, a country with extensive water resources and good habitats for birds. All Birds Directive requirements were in the national legislation, which also had laws on Animals, on Environmental Liability, on the Red List and Red Book (with about 35 bird species listed) and on the System of Protected Areas. Georgia had 100 protected areas and 66 Emerald sites. Draft laws on biodiversity and on hunting were under development. All tools were harmonized with the Bern Convention. The Environmental Supervision Department, with 870 employees over nine territorial divisions (eight land and one sea territorial divisions), controlled all illegal environmental activities such as pollution and illegal use of Natural Resources. New technology in use included drones and night vision binoculars. The number of violations regarding birds identified by the department were around 600 per year in 2023 and 2024. Not all bird species were protected. Obstacles in combating IKB included illegal trade and profits, a lack of international cooperation, online trade, limited awareness, and habitat loss and fragmentation. Priorities were to improve law enforcement, strengthen international cooperation, raise awareness and ensure full compliance with obligations under the Association Agreement.
54. Cyprus asked if it was necessary to make special arrangements for the use of drones in Georgia. Georgia replied that there were national rules and standards on drone use, and that drones were used mainly for protected areas, where access could be hard, especially in mountainous areas.
55. Albania asked how drones could detect if hunting was illegal or not. Georgia replied that it was hard to determine this, but it was possible to follow up by land a hunting site identified by drone.
56. **Greece:** Ms Kalomoira Agapitou, Ministry of Environment and Energy, presented the report from Greece, where the main IKB hotspot was the Ionian Islands, especially for European Turtle-doves

(*Streptopelia turtur*). The Hellenic Ornithological Society (HOS) had helped to bring this serious situation to light. Local Action Plans were implemented every spring (April-May), and there were mixed patrols and stricter penalties, and efforts to inform citizens. Greece also had a problem with songbirds being caught for trade and exported from North Greece. Tackling IKB was difficult because killing birds was steeped in tradition, and many people believed they had a right to conduct these activities. Collaboration with the forest agency was proving successful, with good outcomes, and comprehensive enforcement actions were in place, including aerial patrols in the Aegean and an operation at Schisto market, from where thousands of songbirds were released. Greece used the Scoreboard systematically as a self-assessment tool. Obstacles in combating IKB included the tolerance of the local community in the Ionian islands to killing birds as a tradition and the great economic benefits involved. Overall, there was a lack of unified action against IKB, which was hard to quantify in terms of bird numbers. Greece needed to improve capacity of enforcement authorities, including prosecutors. Priorities were education and awareness, and adoption of an IKB NAP.

57. **Hungary:** Mr Schmidt, Ministry of Agriculture, presented the report from Hungary, where a key achievement was the establishment of the Hungarian Environmental Security Task Force in 2020, which coordinated work with relevant ministries and BirdLife Hungary. Building on expired LIFE projects, Hungary maintained a dog unit, with very good detection rates, and several birds were satellite-tracked. These activities and campaigns led to a long-term decline in illegal poisoning, despite a rise in 2025. However, there was a greater effort in investigating poisoning cases, and some poachers were recently sentenced. Obstacles in combating IKB were difficulties in enforcement and justice, whilst slow forensic lab examinations impeded investigation and reduced motivation for surveillance. A new threat was the inappropriate setting of fox traps with exposed bait, which could lure birds of prey. Another issue was a decline in tolerance to the natural environment, and sometimes birds such as White Storks (*Ciconia ciconia*) were killed due to their nests. Awareness raising was needed, also training, including for law enforcement authorities. Existing protocols needed updating, and Hungary aimed to achieve exemplary verdicts.
58. In reply to Italy's question about the number of dog units, Hungary replied there was only one at BirdLife Hungary, although there used to be several.
59. Albania requested Hungary to share the site protocols. Hungary indicated that they were publicly available, but only in Hungarian.
60. **Italy:** Ms Aradis, ISPRA/MASE, presented the report from Italy, which sat midway on important flyways, and birds coming twice a year through Italy were widely considered as a long-term resource for exploitation. Italy's IKB NAP (2017–2020) had identified seven IKB black spots, and Italy had set up a special police unit to tackle IKB, plus 17 anti-poaching / poisoning dog units. A database and map of illegal poisoning was also established, and was regularly updated, enabling positions of incidences to be seen. This work led to the publication of a technical report in 2022 'Crimes against wild birds. Thematic insights to tackle the illegal killing of birds – IKB', which linked the work of the prosecutors, judges and scientists, and which highlighted the need for a tool to address IKB for those working on the issue. Common obstacles were the issues of cultural heritage, poor engagement of stakeholders, a lack of commitment by some administrations, inadequate deployment of anti-poaching surveillance in some regions, and the absence of a national IKB database. Italy aimed to adopt actions to implement the RSP by 2025 and to enhance provisions relating to IKB through a new EU Directive for protection of the environment through criminal law.
61. **Morocco:** Mr Mohamed Noaman, from the National Agency for Water and Forests, which is National Focal Point (NFP) for CMS, the Bern Convention and CITES, presented the report from

Morocco, which was located on the East Atlantic Flyway, supporting numerous migratory birds. Morocco had 154 sites of biological and ecological interest, including 84 designated wetlands and ten national parks. Morocco's main achievements in combating IKB were strengthening the legal framework, with the designation of protected bird species; capacity building and institutional cooperation; the establishment of Wildlife Monitoring and Control Units; and public awareness. The obstacles in combating IKB included limited resources for monitoring and control across the large area; the presence of organized poaching networks using new technologies to communicate with one another; and low public community engagement in monitoring and combating IKB. Human and financial resources were also limited, and economic and environmental impacts were not sufficiently taken into account. It was a priority to enhance human and financial capacity through new staff, training, and field equipment for monitoring effectiveness. It was also important to raise awareness at all levels, advocating stricter enforcement and higher penalties; to improve data analysis, especially for IKB high risk areas; and to strengthen international cooperation.

62. Noting that many birds migrated through Morocco, the Chair thanked Morocco for their efforts.
63. **Türkiye:** Mr Cengiz Öğünç, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, presented the report from Türkiye, a country with a rich biodiversity that was crossed by many bird migratory routes. He showed a short film of numerous European Goldfinches (*Carduelis carduelis*) in boxes, intended for illegal trade, that were captured at customs and released back to the wild. Surveillance missions were conducted, and monitoring took place in hunting areas, including the inspection of hunting permits. Türkiye has dedicated experts in combating IKB, especially in rural areas, where there were sometimes strong traditions, including the hunting of migratory raptors, which some considered to be a cure for cancer or carrying aphrodisiac properties. Perpetrators captured raptors at sites with warm air currents, where they descended. The number of licensed hunters was relatively low compared to the country's population, complicating regulation and hunting activities. Priorities were to raise awareness about the consequences of IKB, increase training, and support enforcement teams with state-of-the-art technology, which would significantly improve detection. It was also necessary to promote cross-border cooperation, reinforce legal frameworks, and work closely with national partners.
64. The Chair highlighted the importance of Türkiye for migratory birds and appreciated their efforts.
65. **Spain:** Mr Ruben Moreno-Opo presented the report for Spain, where about 40 rescue centres were operating, indicating that the trend in IKB numbers was more-or-less stable. Poisoning cases decreased from 2008 to 2023, with prosecution levels rising, e.g. from 215 persons involving 6,111 birds in 2020 to 822 persons in 2022 involving 4,301 birds. Spain had a strict legal framework following the Birds Directive, and although there was no specific IKB NAP, other plans relevant to IKB had been adopted, including a strategy against illegal killing and poison baits; guidelines to adapt finch trapping to the Birds Directive; and a plan against illegal trafficking and poaching. Regional authorities were making important efforts against IKB, and a large number of rangers and police provided good results, whilst there were successful prosecutions. Training was important, including for the nature protection service, and NGOs played a key role, especially through the WCA, with experience of Spanish teams. Obstacles in combating IKB included the large number of birds being trafficked, especially through the Internet, presenting control challenges; the need for training of judicial bodies; and low political will in some regions to commit for prosecutions. Priorities for the future included a higher involvement of judicial bodies on IKB penal cases; optimizing the compilation of data and statistics from the different regions; financial resources; increasing awareness; improved control of online wildlife trade; and addressing illegal activities that remained in some black spots.
66. The Chair thanked Spain for the important work, including the international training and rescue

centres.

67. **UK:** Ms Kate Brickett presented the report of the UK, where tackling bird of prey persecution remained a priority. There were strong sentences for perpetrators, such as a six-month custodial sentence and/or an unlimited fine. Groups worked together to detect and counter raptor persecution and share experiences. Funding was provided for forensic analysis by the police, and for the UK National Wildlife Crime Unit (NWCU), which helped to protect wildlife, detect crime, and assist law enforcement. Set up to protect Hen Harrier (*Circus cyaneus*), which suffered persecution, the Harrier Task Force used innovative technology to detect, deter and apprehend offenders. The NWCU facilitated an initiative to target egg thieves by sharing intelligence. New legislation rendered it illegal to use second generation anticoagulant rodenticides in outdoor locations unless connected to a building since January 2025, which should make enforcement of improper rodenticide use easier and in turn see a reduction in illegal poisoning of wild birds of prey.
68. Across the devolved governments of the UK there was a raft of targeted activity. In Wales, the Welsh Wildlife and Rural Crime Strategy continued to enable effective planning and action through the Wales Bird Delivery Group, which comprised government, policing and environmental NGOs. Whilst raptor persecution remained a critical concern, the group also focused on gull killing and urban nest disturbance. In Scotland, where there was a programme to strengthen protection through trained police officers and a specialized wildlife crime partnership, wildlife crime records decreased by 23% in 2022-2023, linked largely to a targeted effort on theft and illegal sale of Peregrine Falcon (*Falco peregrinus*). Several of the recommendations, from a UN assessment of the UK's response to wildlife crime in 2021, related to raptor persecution, and those were informing the UK's strategy. Persecution of birds of prey mostly took place in remote rural areas and was likely to remain a priority for the future.
69. **UK, Sovereign Base Areas of Akrotiri and Dhekelia (SBA) on island of Cyprus:** Ms Brickett informed that there was a clear strategic approach to IKB in the SBA, with a 98% decrease in IKB recorded since 2016. It was vital to maintain experienced officers in combat teams with new technology such as drones, to continue awareness raising and to manage invasive Acacia trees, around which mist nets were set.
70. **France:** Mr Charles-Henri de Barsac, Head of International Wildlife Agreements Department, Ministry of Ecological Transition, presented the report from France. He explained that the Office Français de la Biodiversité (OFB) was mainly in charge of controlling IKB in France, where there were around 20,000 checks each year by field agents of wildlife enforcement services, resulting in about 4,000 fines per year. In 2025 OFB targeted operations to showcase their services and to limit trafficking in France, which mainly concerned songbirds. In 2023, OFB noticed some irregular online sales of European Goldfinches and European Greenfinches (*Chloris chloris*), which were considered as organized crime. Through physical monitoring of criminals, OFB identified the perpetrators, and resulting sentences were severe, with the main hunter's goods seized. Poaching of songbirds and raptors was still taking place, with a recent case in the Ardennes, where a fish farm was shooting raptors. Although raptor poaching had decreased, some conflicts with other wildlife species remained, including wolves, and preventative measures were needed at the regional level.
71. Georgia noted that it also experienced organised crime, and questioned how this terminology was defined according to France's legislation and which bodies coordinated to reveal these crimes. France replied that the means were available for investigation of protected species incidents, while qualification of the incrimination depended on the prosecutors, with potentially more than three years' imprisonment. Organized crime was when two or more people got together to

coordinate the crime, which was considered as more severe.

72. Morocco noted that it also suffered from organized criminal networks, which had started to traffic birds, including European Goldfinch. According to the legislation, a judicial investigation was triggered when more than three people were involved. Morocco had targeted actions to protect this species, and conducted investigations to uncover networks.
73. Algeria added that they also conducted intensive investigations of infractions, and the Ministry had a signed agreement with the national gendarmerie and customs services, and worked in collaboration to sanction, implement and enforce the law.
74. **Poland:** Mr Wiktor Wyżyński, General Directorate for Environmental Protection, presented the report for Poland, which remained fully committed to combating IKB. All bird species naturally occurring in Poland were protected through an established legal framework, with services established to investigate crimes and to deal with violators. Training had been conducted, including in the process of criminal investigations. NGOs played an important role in reporting crimes to the authorities and in cooperating with the police in relation to species protection laws. The trapping of passerines for export to Mediterranean countries had been exposed, thanks to NGOs. Such illegal activities were not known in Poland until recently, and further training for law enforcement officers was needed, with an emphasis on exploring different types of cases, both familiar and unfamiliar.

Agenda Item 5.2 Reports from Observers of MIKT and Bern Convention

75. The Chair introduced the Observers of MIKT and the Bern Convention who presented reports.
76. **European Federation for Hunting and Conservation (FACE):** Mr Cy Griffin, Senior Conservation Manager, presented an update on the improved compliance and control mechanisms surrounding European Turtle-dove hunting across the Western, Central and Eastern Flyways, based on replies to the European Commission's (EC) questionnaire linked to adaptive management of this species and the EU/CMS Action Plan. There were encouraging results, with the number of detected infractions or breaches of law close to zero, e.g. 0.05% for Greece, 0.04% for France, and 1.78% for Cyprus. The countries of the Western Flyway (Portugal, Spain, France and Northwest Italy) agreed to uphold a moratorium for this species in 2024, and doubled their enforcement efforts, with 6,500 inspections conducted in Spain, and 8,000 in France. Spain detected 34 violations and 90 illegally killed doves, France reported three detected infractions, Portugal noted one detected case involving seven doves, whilst Italy reported no detected infractions from 950 inspections. Spain engaged in campaigns, including social media and TV, and Spain and France achieved outreach through hunting organizations.
77. For the Central and Eastern Flyway involving seven countries, hunting continued at a low level, but large scale inspection efforts were made, including 112,000 in Greece, >38,000 in Bulgaria, >4,300 in Malta and 1,600 in Cyprus. Greece's Ionian Islands remained a hotspot. In Cyprus, 250 doves were detected to be killed illegally outside the hunting season. Some progressive penalties were in place and outreach efforts were made in most countries. It was estimated that >600,000 European Turtle-doves were illegally killed in the Mediterranean in 2016, with highest numbers in Libya, Syria and Greece. Since compliance and control, the overall trend has significantly improved, with a flyway-wide reduction in illegal activity driven by inspections, transparent reporting of data, and a growing culture of peer-pressure and stewardship. While challenges remained, there was strong evidence that coordinated compliance mechanisms, backed by public education and robust monitoring, could deliver real results.

78. Mr Griffin shared a link to [CIRCABC online Library](#), where two source reports were available: documents TFRB 25-03-02 and TFRB 25-03-01.
79. The Chair agreed that efforts needed to be stepped up for the European Turtle-dove, especially in its Central and Eastern flyway.
80. Mr Willem van den Bossche (BirdLife International) highlighted some reports of illegal killing of European Turtle-doves, with an illegal spring derogation in Malta, around 3000 doves illegally killed in Murcia, Spain in 2023, and about 50,000 doves illegally killed annually in the Ionian Islands in spring, especially on Zakynthos. He concurred that Spain had the best practice in tackling illegal killing. FACE replied that it recognized the Ionian Islands as an IKB hotspot, but stated that in general FACE saw regulations for good compliance, despite a recommendation for zero harvest. There had been a large reduction in the number of doves that could be shot per day and for less days in some countries.
81. Mr Olivier Biber (African Eurasian Migratory Landbirds Action Plan, AEMLAP) asked whether there were bases for monitoring the breeding population in the Central and Eastern Flyway, and how the effect of the moratorium had led to an increase in the size of the Western population. FACE replied that monitoring efforts had shown a good recovery of European Turtle-doves in the Western Flyway, and more efforts were being made to look at the Central and Eastern Flyway, where they did not have trends at the national level.
82. In relation to hunting tourism, following the workshop on National Action Plans in Montenegro in September 2024, MIKT asked if there had been an update in the FACE policy on hunting tourism, as this had been identified as an issue especially for the Balkan countries. FACE replied that its position papers needed to be adopted by the FACE general assembly, which would take place in September 2025.
83. BirdLife Malta requested the source of information, especially for Malta. FACE replied that the information was made available by the Range States, such as the government of Malta, to the EC.
84. The Chair commended the positive results, despite some ongoing issues.
85. **BirdLife International:** Ms Samantha Lee, Senior Conservation Officer - Global Flyways Programme, presented the progress of BirdLife International, EuroNatur and their partners in tackling IKB, which they had been addressing for over 100 years. The work needed to be robust and evidence based to increase and strengthen impact, and to educate, inform and change behaviours. BirdLife International worked globally in tackling IKB, and was committed to supporting national authorities to achieve zero tolerance of IKB. Sharing knowledge with partners was instrumental in raising awareness. Substantial funds had been raised and spent on tackling IKB using a multi-disciplinary approach. BirdLife Partners were working effectively to tackle IKB across the Mediterranean.
86. Key achievements included delivery of the Safe Flyways project underway in 21 countries, co-hosting a workshop on 'Global Illegal Taking of Birds' in 2024 and an IKB Conservation Standards workshop, which helped to increase capacity in 15 Partners, publication of 'The Killing 3.0' report in 2025, and using the Mediterranean model to help tackle IKB in Asia. Progress was made across the BirdLife Partnership, with a reduced scale of IKB reported in Turkey and Slovenia, a 50% reduction in illegal quail poaching in Croatia, and ongoing monitoring of trapping sites in Cyprus, with a 91% reduction from 2002. The Partners' awareness activities and collaboration with enforcement agencies had contributed to large reductions in bird trapping.

87. Capacity building remained crucial, equipping Partners for action from local to international levels, including sharing experiences beyond national boundaries. BirdLife Partners were working to improve legislation, enforcement and justice, including at Lake Nasser, Egypt, where working with authorities and piloting alternative livelihoods was changing the lake from a site known for hunting to one known for ecotourism. A hunting ban was also introduced there, new legislation was adopted in Syria and Scotland, and Montenegro banned the use of lead ammunition for hunting in wetland areas. A Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) was launched in France for the School of Magistrates. Awareness, using novel techniques, mainly in Croatia, reached out to over one million people, including a new education centre in Cyprus in a high IKB area.
88. BirdLife Partners provided ongoing support to IKB NAPs, which were a critical foundation for coordinated efforts, though governments needed to prioritize actions and ensure adequate resourcing for their implementation. Investing in improved monitoring and data collection systems would help to measure progress and inform evidence based and targeted interventions. A lack of sustained political will among authorities was a key issue. BirdLife International and its Partners were committed to support progress in tackling IKB. Actions needed included IKB NAPs developed for all countries and implemented, fundraising, cross-border collaboration, knowledge exchange, addressing the root causes of IKB, and improving monitoring. NGOs were key stakeholders vital for helping to address IKB and were well placed with expertise, strong community connections and feet on the ground.
89. Morocco noted that hunting tourism was valuable to some countries. Algeria added that hunting tourism brought important income to Algeria, and was covered by the law, with conditions and quotas in place and a management framework. It was only allowed for foreigners, who had to rent land for hunting, while huntable species were clearly defined, some raised in breeding facilities. BirdLife International acknowledged there were many issues in relation to hunting tourism, and it was important for NGOs to work with governments to improve it and keep it within the legal sphere. Often it was not easy for foreign hunters to follow the legislation, and in Azerbaijan for example it was a challenge to find the legislation online, and it was not available in English. BirdLife International highlighted that cross-border collaboration was important to make progress, as positive work in one country could be undermined by a lack of progress in another; for example, some IKB perpetrators travelled to areas with low enforcement/ legislation to exploit weaker deterrents.
90. **Wildlife Crime Academy (WCA):** Mr Jovan Andevski, Programmes Manager, Vulture Conservation Foundation (VCF), introduced the WCA, an initiative that aimed to increase capacity for fighting wildlife crime and improving enforcement, which was the main issue requiring strong government commitment. VCF had contributed to make Europe the 'best continent' for vultures, although vultures were still illegally killed. Poisoning was a major threat to vultures, and despite being illegal in most countries, it still occurred in the Mediterranean and Central Europe. WCA conducted five training courses during 2021 to 2023, with topics in the academic programme over different levels on police investigations, analysis, intelligence, and forensics, for tackling IKB, targeting police offices and judicial agents. The training also covered the topic of electrocution, which could be prosecuted by law in Spain. Key teaching staff were from Spain, which had achieved about 90% reduction in poisoning incidents over 20 years, and trainees all signed a manifesto of commitment. Investigations in wildlife crime were conducted in the countries involved. Governments had agreed to collaborate with international partners in a new EUR 2 million LIFE project with a schedule of courses from 2025 to 2029 to train 100 experts. Trainees were obliged to carry out training courses in their own country on their return, extending capacity to save many animals from persecution. Through national training programmes over 1,000 people were planned to be trained.

91. An online participant questioned why there were no trainees from Tunisia and Morocco. Mr Andevski replied that these countries would be included from 2026, after conclusion of formalities.
92. **EU Network for the Implementation and Enforcement of Environmental Law (IMPEL):** Mr João Loureiro, Institute of Nature Conservation and Forests (ICNF), Portugal, presented an evaluation of the application of the EU Action Plan against Wildlife Trafficking of non-CITES species on behalf of IMPEL. Most European countries were members of IMPEL, and it was possible for North African countries to join. The plan aimed to strengthen the legal and policy framework against wildlife trafficking, and covered all species of relevance to MIKT. There were two main types of actions – joint inspections, when a country offered to host an enforcement activity then organised a team to review best practice and work with enforcement authorities, and workshops for sharing experiences. Joint inspections were important in identifying practical problems in the field, whilst providing guidance on implementation was the main issue. Even within the EU there were many loopholes for the prevention and control of wildlife trafficking, and a lack of knowledge of the provisions of regulations was a key issue. There were also difficulties in identifying species, finding solutions, implementing regulations and cooperation. Proposals were provided to solve problems encountered in the joint inspections, which tested and improved the reference guide and promoted cooperation between enforcement authorities of the different IMPEL Members. Meeting participants were encouraged to be a part of this project, for which the first step was to contact the IMPEL NFP.
93. The Chair reflected that there were important synergies to build on between IMPEL, CMS/MIKT and the Bern Convention.
94. Morocco suggested that IMPEL should include all threatened species, including those listed in CITES, and questioned how IMPEL would deal with non-CITES species that were not protected by legislation. Mr Loureiro replied that the first six years of the project focused on CITES-listed species, for which the EU had special legislation, but implementation in other countries was not regulated by the EU. So the project started to address species that were not listed on CITES for three years, after which it would address all species. He added that legislation differed between countries, for instance all species were protected in Portugal. Problems arose when unprotected species were captured, requiring liaison with hunting legislations to address illegal activities.
95. Mr Ramírez considered that it could be useful to provide advice to some countries to adapt legislation in relation to huntable species. Mr Loureiro indicated that there was a small budget linked to workshops to other meetings, and IMPEL workshops usually had up to 40 participants. He welcomed interested parties to make contact if they wished to join one of the meetings.
96. **European Network of Prosecutors for the Environment (ENPE):** Mr Bart van Fossel, a prosecutor from Belgium, introduced ENPE, which was established to put environmental crimes on the map. ENPE had a Working Group on wildlife crimes, and aimed to train prosecutors and organize seminars in this specialist area. ENPE prosecutors raised awareness through court hearings, which included IKB, and which could garner extensive coverage through radio, TV and the press about the importance of prosecuting such crimes. ENPE tried to share information and best practices with prosecutors across Europe and for this purpose they created a database of Court rulings from across Europe. They also disseminated the [Bioval Tool](#), an indicative tool for compensating nature damage. He announced that they had the first conviction using the Bioval Tool, convicting a man for illegally capturing 77 starlings, who, as well as receiving a fine for the illegal activity, was ordered to pay EUR 200 per starling as nature compensation into a nature fund. The trend was for crimes to be taken more seriously than in the past. It was the prosecutors themselves who took cases to court.

97. Emphasizing respect for the judiciary, Morocco noted that enforcement of fines was sometimes insufficient, and questioned how fines were structured in Europe. ENPE replied that judges had a certain liberty to reduce fines if they knew that the perpetrator could not pay it.
98. **LIFE EUROKITE project:** Mr Rainer Raab introduced the LIFE EUROKITE Crime Report for the project, which aimed for cross-border protection of the Red Kite (*Milvus milvus*) in Europe by reducing human-caused mortality. The project used telemetry data from raptors across Europe, including over 3,000 Red Kites, especially to quantify the causes of mortality. Initial results showed that illegal persecution was a major threat, and over eight per cent of raptors tagged between 2013 and 2025 had died through illegal activities, with highest numbers in Spain, France, Austria and Germany. Carbofuran poisoning was a major problem. Despite many cases, only a few perpetrators had been convicted. The project ran the [Campaign against criminal Poisoning of European Wildlife \(CPEW\)](#), and has over 75 partners. Wildlife crime was still ongoing, even in Central Europe.

Agenda Item 6. CMS Treaty, relevant CMS initiatives on Taking and the Raptors Memorandum of Understanding

99. Ms Maria José Ortiz, Legal Officer, CMS Secretariat, introduced the CMS National Legislation Programme (NLP), which was supported by decisions made at COPs. The programme aimed to strengthen the implementation of the Convention through national legislation and to support Parties in developing or improving relevant national legislation. NLP implementation was a facilitative process aiming for long-term compliance, requiring assessments, knowledge exchange and capacity building through its workstreams on national legislation profiles, legislative guidance and technical assistance. There was a recent guidance document on connectivity. Capacity-building was provided through workshops, including a [Global Workshop on CMS Legislation](#), which was to take place in June 2025. There were 70 NLP-participating CMS Parties, including 11 of the 22 MIKT members, plus observers Germany and Portugal.
100. Mr Nikola Besek, NLP Coordinator, presented the NLP findings based on four calls to Parties with a questionnaire on the implementation of Articles III.4 a) & b) and III.5, focused on the “taking” definition, and on the table of CMS Appendix I species. The Secretariat prepared a profile for each country, with actions and aims to strengthen legislation. Only eight of the 70 participating countries had an adequate definition of ‘taking’, although national legislations should prohibit measures as defined by the Convention. There were often gaps in national legislation; 40 countries did not have legislation that attempted to prohibit taking attempts, while 27 had none for harassing animals. 22 Parties had well-regulated exceptions to the ‘taking’ prohibition, and 11 had an exception for public display. Taking of Appendix I species in self-defence could qualify as an exception under extraordinary cases in 29 Parties. In terms of geographical coverage of the application of Article III.5 prohibiting taking of Appendix I species, there was 60% coverage in land-based territory, decreasing to 48% in territorial seas, and to 33% for flagged vessels operating in marine Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ). Article III.7 required Parties to inform the Secretariat of any exceptions made. Overall, there were legislative aspects that could be strengthened and in need of further support.
101. Mr Ramírez noted that although national legislation was considered the most effective tool, there were gaps in information, and he encouraged Parties to contact CMS to help fill them.
102. Morocco noted that national legislation could be limited by national frameworks, and definitions were not always identical to the CMS definitions. Transposing the definitions of Conventions into national legislation could take a long time in some countries, and not all clauses would be within

national law. In terms of exceptions, Parties needed to take into consideration the limitations of the national legislation and translations. The definition of 'taking' in Arabic covered all modes of harvesting, but the translation in Arabic, for example, could have a different meaning. Thus, the Convention needed to take into account the difficulty in transposing an international Convention to national laws.

103. Ms Ortiz concurred that the language issue was hard to address, while exceptions would be broader than the Convention definitions. There were sometimes notifications for exceptions in national reports. CMS worked as much as possible with regional languages, but some issues were regulated regardless. Mr Ramirez added that it was important to understand the limitations at the national level. Morocco noted that every country should submit reports including the exceptions. The Chair requested Morocco and the CMS Secretariat to discuss bilaterally.
104. **CMS Raptors MOU:** Mr Umberto Gallo Orsi, Programme Management Officer (Raptors), indicated that most activities of the Raptors MOU targeted vultures, as the most threatened group of raptors, including through the Vulture Multi-species Action Plan (MsAP), the West Africa Vulture Conservation Action Plan (WAVCAP) and the Southern African Development Community (SADC) Vulture Conservation Strategy. The Raptors MOU engaged with other institutions to deliver regional conservation strategies, building on SADC experience. There had been good progress for the Saker Falcon (*Falco cherrug*) since development of an Adaptive Management Framework (AMF), including questionnaires for falconers and on electrocution, and in developing guidance for monitoring. The Raptors MOU had developed the International Single Species Action Plan for Sooty Falcon (*Falco concolor*), endorsed by the CMS StC, which investigated solutions on how to protect breeding pairs on islands in the Red Sea. An expert workshop had been held the week before in Kazakhstan for the Steppe Eagle (*Aquila nipalensis*), a priority species, and a Working Group had been established, which was expected to lead to the development of an action plan to submit to CMS COP15.
105. Electrocution was a key threat to large raptors in particular, whilst also causing damage and cost to electricity distribution companies, and presented them with a liability issue. The MOU engaged with the International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA). Non-Steroidal Anti Inflammatory Drugs (NSAIDs) was also an area that the MOU worked on, as despite CMS Resolution 11.15 (Rev. COP14), drugs were still widely used. India had recently banned the use of Nimesulide, but diclofenac remained a problem in Africa and Southwest Asia. The Raptors MOU had started cooperation with the World Organization on Animal Health. Uganda became the 65th Raptors MOU Signatory in March 2025, and held a workshop focused on developing a national strategy. Expected Signatories were Zimbabwe and Bahrain, whilst there was still ample room for Signatory expansion in the Mediterranean region, North Africa and the Levant, where trapping of falcons still occurred, driven mostly by demand for falconry and by a new desire to appear on social media while holding a raptor.
106. Ms Medlinska asked if there had been attempts to raise awareness of the negative influence of fashion on falcons, such as online video platform influencers. The Raptors MOU acknowledged that it needed to tackle this issue.
107. Mr Oliver Schall introduced the field trip on the last day of the meeting, and also informed about the efforts of the Nature and Biodiversity Conservation Union (NABU) to reduce hunting of European Honey Buzzards (*Pernis apivorus*) in Sicily in the 1990s, in which he had been personally involved.
108. The Chair thanked Mr Schall for the information and announced the end of Day 1 of the meeting.

Day 2. Wednesday 14 May 2025

109. The Chair introduced the agenda for Day 2 and invited any proposals for amendment or questions.
110. EuroNatur questioned how comments would be brought together during the mid-term assessment of the RSP. MIKT indicated that participants join breakout groups and discuss the different options. Each group would decide the preferred process and present their options in plenary, the aim being to find agreement before the end of the meeting.

Setting the scene

111. Ms Aradis presented a summary of discussions from Day 1. She noted some positive steps, with a number of countries having IKB NAPs to take on the issue of poisoning, whilst others had taken steps to improve IKB legislation, despite obstacles such as a lack of funds and deep-rooted cultural traditions. Education from an early age and strong educational awareness campaigns were important, as well as the need for proper enforcement. Embracing new technology was important, including in field surveillance. In terms of raising awareness, engaging influencers and ambassadors was important, and recently discussed by the Raptors MOU Technical Advisory Group (TAG). The important work of NGOs to maintain the level of control, to check acquisition and provide advice was highlighted, and tools like the WCA that delivered training were vital.
112. In terms of Day 2 discussions, Mr Ramírez highlighted the importance of agenda point 11, the mid-term assessment of the RSP, as decisions made during the meeting would be taken forward for adoption. There were key discussions on hunting tourism in connection to the MIKT. Poisoning remained a complex issue, for which plans were needed to present to CMS COP15. Whilst the CMS Preventing Poisoning of Migratory Birds Working Group had not proven to be effective, CMS planned to develop fully the Lead Task Force, and regional groups could play leading roles in preventing poisoning. It was important to assess whether enough was being done through MIKT on poisoning. There were also reflections on law enforcement and law adaptation. This meeting thus presented an opportunity to bring specific measures into the RSP. Any proposals to submit to CMS COP15 should be ready in mid-2025, as they would need to be translated.

Agenda Item 7. Reflections and exchange

113. The Secretariats invited a reflection on the day's proceedings and networking with other participants. Ms Medlinska invited participants to share with each other a practical focused priority for building capacity and follow-up action, and to then raise in plenary.
114. Greece highlighted the need for improved public awareness, in which professionals must approach different types of people in different ways, an example being the Ionian Islands, where HOS had built a good local rapport.
115. Portugal noted that negative public awareness, for instance where influencers promoted the catching of wild birds, was an issue. It was necessary to go beyond informational websites and reach social media influencers.
116. Hungary informed that they had approached actors as ambassadors, though not specifically for IKB, and this approach could be effective for nature conservation.
117. An online contributor from Italy agreed with the need to raise awareness on the key threats, and to highlight the role of NGOs in combating IKB.

118. An online contributor suggested to use the legislative framework in each country to increase surveillance for conservation, and to monitor and motivate rangers in focused IKB surveillance of protected areas and their buffer zones, which could bring about positive change at the local level, and cover a significant part of a national territory.

Agenda Item 8. Scoreboard Reporting and data collection

Agenda Item 8.1 Document [UNEP/CMS/MIKT6/Doc.8.1](#). Presentation of updated Scoreboard 2023 analysis and update about Scoreboard exercise 2026

119. Ms Papazoglou presented the updated results and next steps of the Scoreboard 2023. The Scoreboard to assess the progress in combatting IKB was adopted in 2017 by CMS COP12 and the Bern Convention as a self-assessment tool that countries could use to assess themselves in relation to 28 scores under five categories on national monitoring, comprehensiveness of national legislation, enforcement response, prosecution and sentencing, and prevention. The Scoreboard was amended in 2022 to be in line with the RSP, and the resolution was amended at COP14 to give the right to the CMS StC to amend the Scoreboard in future. The overall goal of the RSP was to reduce the scope and scale of IKB by 50% by 2030, with milestones on assessment of need, methodology for monitoring, survey on IKB motivations, raising funds and building capacity for IKB NAPs, specialized enforcement units, capacity building for prosecutors and judges, awareness raising and national databases. A total of 25 of 54 countries completed the Scoreboard 2023, recording overall a steady increase from previous Scoreboards.
120. Legislation was recorded as the best scoring area, although some countries in the Middle East and North Africa requested support. For monitoring IKB, there was an opportunity for sharing between countries, while the number of countries with Baselines, with clear methodologies and with motivation surveys were very low. Prevention, which showed the greatest improvement from the last Scoreboard, and awareness raising were linked closely to available funding, and EU countries tended to have more funds available than those in North Africa and the Middle East. Enforcement and penalties were the lowest scoring areas, and needed much input, including capacity building and commitment. An emphasis on enforcement was needed, as well as funding. It was also important to address the lack of baseline data and methodologies, which were needed for monitoring progress. Scoreboard 2026 would use the new CMS Online Reporting System (ORS) and questionnaires available in three languages. A priority would be to fill missing information gaps.
121. The Chair thanked MIKT for raising the important question of the Scoreboard Baseline, and encouraged countries that had developed a Baseline to share how they did it, and those that had not done so to consider what the obstacles were.

Agenda Item 8.2 Document [UNEP/CMS/MIKT6/Doc.8.1](#). National perspective on the Scoreboard exercise: how it has helped organizing action against IKB and lessons learnt

122. Ms Agapitou presented on how Greece responded to completion of the Scoreboard. Greece had participated three times, with improvements between years, but with room for further improvement. The Scoreboard was completed by the Section for Wildlife and Game Management of the Ministry of Environment and Energy in collaboration with main stakeholders – Hellenic Hunters Federation and HOS. The Scoreboard proved to be a useful tool against IKB, highlighting important gaps in data collection and enforcement. A new law was adopted that established a stricter framework, which could serve as the basis leading to an IKB NAP - a crucial step at the national level. The Scoreboard substantially strengthened cross-sectoral collaboration and cooperation with environmental organizations.

123. In terms of difficulties, there was no official Baseline needed for monitoring, and the number of birds trapped each year was a crude estimation, referring principally to trapped songbirds. Many questions remained unanswered, such as illegal taxidermy, trade, and serving protected birds in restaurants, requiring improved control methods and data. A systematic methodology was needed for collecting data, in cooperation with the Hunting Confederation and others. In terms of national legislation, a new law foresaw increased penalties for IKB, including withdrawal of hunting licenses, confiscation of equipment and cases upgraded to criminal offences. In terms of enforcement, an IKB NAP was needed and recognition of IKB as a high priority, while a relevant platform could be created through the Scoreboard to invite more interested parties. Although local forest agency staff numbered about 1,000, with about 350 wardens, most were not specialized in wildlife crime nor had investigative tasks. Specialized training and a more organized approach were needed for the enforcement bodies. Judiciary training and sentencing guidelines could improve the effectiveness of prosecutions. Noting that IKB had common ground with CITES, Greece considered that joint training seminars could be organized, as the CITES department had different people involved. There had been no examination of the drivers of wildlife crime, and this was an important gap to fill. Although HOS was making good efforts to raise awareness, there was no structured plan for this.
124. Overall, the Scoreboard application had provided a valuable tool for targeted IKB action and for identifying gaps, such as further developing monitoring and data collection systems, deciding about a Baseline study, developing an IKB NAP, providing training, and strengthening cooperation with key stakeholders for improved enforcement.
125. The Chair thanked Greece for an honest summary of the difficulties they faced, for presenting the idea of a joint meeting with CITES, and for highlighting the good cooperation with NGOs.
126. There was an online question about the main barriers to a national IKB Baseline. Greece replied that they had an unofficial baseline and were in discussion with CMS about how to proceed.
127. Mr Ramírez questioned if all stakeholders needed to agree on the Baseline. Greece replied that this would be known at the next step.
128. Morocco posed a question in relation to the source of data and its reliability. As hunters would only declare legal data and not illegal data, fines and penalties were the real source of data and knowledge of what had been seized. Reliable field instruments and methods for collecting reliable data were needed.
129. MIKT replied that monitoring and collecting reliable IKB data guidance had been developed under MIKT, with all possible sources of IKB data outlined in a paper. Taking data from one source only was not enough; reliability was always a challenge but there were ways to improve it.
130. An online contributor questioned if hunting tourism in Greece affected IKB. Greece replied that there were special areas and a season for hunting tourism, which tended to decrease IKB, because in most cases the hunters were accompanied by forest guards, who should report any poachers to the forest agency, which was then responsible for making investigations.

Agenda Item 8.3 NGO perspective: Progress assessment on the eradication of IKB in the Mediterranean and Europe

131. Ms Lilla Barabas, Flyways Conservation Officer, BirdLife Europe and Central Asia, presented on the progress assessment on the eradication of IKB from an NGO perspective, and highlighted a

new publication entitled 'The Killing 3.0' compiled by BirdLife International and EuroNatur, which involved nearly 90 experts from 46 countries and 50 organisations. The study built on two fundamental previous studies that laid the ground for understanding the scale and scope of IKB, with the first report highlighting the magnitude of IKB in the Mediterranean region, and 'The Killing 2.0' expanding to Northern and Central Europe and the Caucasus. 'The Killing 3.0' was a comprehensive assessment of IKB trends, that aimed to assess progress towards achieving 50% reduction in IKB as per the RSP and help authorities and stakeholders implement a zero tolerance approach to IKB. The report included national annexes with recommendations for key countries and best practice case studies and curated a collection of useful online resources. Inspired by the Scoreboard, the report was based on national responses from NGOs to questionnaires sent to 54 range countries in 2024.

132. The assessment aimed to determine if countries were on track to reach at least a 50% reduction in IKB by 2030, either by recording at least a 25% reduction from 2020-2024 or maintaining a very low level of IKB. Of the 46 countries that responded, only eight were found to be on track to reduce IKB by at least 50% by 2030, while 12 showed a slight reduction in IKB, 17 showed no noticeable change and nine showed a deteriorating situation. A worrying result was that none of the countries with the highest levels of IKB were found to be on track to reduce IKB by at least 50% by 2030 - especially concerning since the top ten IKB countries were responsible for 90% of IKB.
133. The study complemented the Scoreboard, with information provided by independent experts, and included data from countries that never or rarely contributed to the official MIKT Scoreboard. The report annex provided country-specific recommendations for 22 Mediterranean countries, based on a more detailed questionnaire, with questions on the main problems, drivers, impacts, and areas of action that would result in greatest progress towards reducing IKB. The main drivers for IKB identified in the Mediterranean were profit, tradition, the pet trade and recreation (shooting for sport). The report included key recommendations to close legal loopholes and strengthen enforcement and monitoring at the national level, and called for more collaboration, knowledge sharing and capacity building at the international level. Implementation needed to accelerate, and countries needed to scale up their efforts to surpass the 50% reduction goal by 2030. There were strong examples, good initiatives and tools and expertise that showed what worked, as well as a clear strategic plan, but combating IKB required increased flyway level efforts.
134. CMS thanked BirdLife International and EuroNatur for sharing this excellent report in advance of the launch and reiterated the importance of working together.
135. France asked if the chart on numbers of birds poached had been updated, as there seemed to be an increase in the estimates of some species that were poached or taken. France also questioned if any figures or colour codes per country were changed in the comparison charts. Ms Barabas replied that no species level estimates were made nor population estimates requested, and that there were some colour code updates for countries with reliable monitoring, and for those countries that provided updated data of the number of birds killed.
136. Cyprus asked if long-term trends were included in the report, and if the estimate of the number of birds killed was for a five-year period or per year. Ms Barabas replied that for Cyprus, IKB data was provided by BirdLife Cyprus, so both long-term and short-term trends were included in the annex. Cyprus had made improvements over the long-term, but not the short-term. The trend estimate was based on the five-year period of 2020-2024 compared to previous five-year periods.

Agenda Item 9. Efficient and Effective Enforcement

Agenda Item 9.1 Examples of Efficient Enforcement at national and international level

137. **Europol:** Ms Amélie Frey, AP Environmental Crime (EnviCrime), presented the state of play of Europol on IKB on behalf of Mr José Antonio Alfaro Moreno, Team Leader, European Serious and Organised Crime Centre (ESOCC). The main result was that illegal crime was not decreasing but moving through digital highways and adapting faster than before. Crime was accelerated by Artificial Intelligence (AI) and emerging technologies. There was a growing online trend for increased endemic wildlife trafficking, especially on marketplace sites, and Europol lacked skilled people used to Cybernet and wildlife vocabulary. AP EnviCrime provided effective and agile operational support to EU Member States, including expert deployments in the field, and wildlife crimes, offering investigators, data exchange capacity, data analysis, travel intelligence, law enforcement advice and financial support. AP EnviCrime had a Virtual Command Post (VCP), a secure message system for law enforcement. Operational support focused mainly on law enforcement, with capacity to mobilise police officers and judges on the ground. AP EnviCrime could advise on ways to enhance operations. Crime organizations funded illegal activities, and Europol had Operational Task Forces (OTFs) with parties to enable coordinated EU wide investigations through a plan-based approach.
138. Europol had a recent successful OTF in relation to bird trafficking in Iberia and Morocco, leading to the arrest of 28 bird traffickers, and operations had also resulted in the rescue of trafficked birds. Despite an increase in cross-border environmental crime investigations, the focus had been more on single incidents than on organized crime, which was more challenging but important to tackle. Europol could provide increased services to support combating IKB. It was necessary to centralize and coordinate expertise.
139. The Chair thanked Europol for offering many ways to provide support, and noted good collaboration with Europol in Hungary.
140. Portugal shared positive experience with Europol in relation to eels, helping to increase political awareness and to work in a cooperative way. A similar approach could be very useful for IKB, especially to address criminal outfits. Ms Frey replied that three major investigations were ongoing with respect to IKB and welcomed the opportunity to work together on IKB cases.
141. Georgia asked what they could do as a non-EU Member State about wildlife crime and IKB and which procedures to follow to receive training by Europol for law enforcement officers. Ms Frey replied that Europol also worked for non-EU countries, and invited Georgia to contact Europol in relation to training, to explain the training needs and discuss practical issues such as language.
142. **Wild Birds Regulation Unit (WBRU), Malta:** Ms Jessica Fenech, Assistant Director, WBRU, Office of the Permanent Secretary, Malta, presented on enforcement against IKB in Malta, which had been a priority for many years. Strong legislation laid the foundation for effective enforcement. Malta now had clear legislation that outlined what was allowed, and provided clarity about reporting obligations and offenses. Specialized enforcement units relating to IKB were the Malta Police Force responsible for patrols, enforcement and prosecution of bird related crime, the WBRU, responsible for the implementation and enforcement of the Birds Directive, and the Environment and Resources Authority responsible for the implementation and enforcement of CITES regulations (amongst other issues). Specialized training was provided for enforcement officers each year ahead of each bird capturing and hunting season, and officers were provided with training three times per year. WBRU provided Enforcement Officers with 24/7 support to provide ornithological and other expertise when needed, and also supported the police with charges and testimony, and could mobilise veterinary support to take care of injured birds and provide necropsies and testimonies. WBRU also provided training for hunters and prospective license holders to increase knowledge about hunting regulations, reporting requirements and

issues that would face enforcement, as well as a pocket-sized guide. WBRU maintained updated hunter ID documents to allow police to see if a person was hunting legally or otherwise. WBRU had invested in new technologies, including a Game Reporting System, which licensees could access via a free telephone number or corresponding application to report their catch, and any report was immediately confirmed via SMS, which hunters could show to an enforcement officer upon inspection. License holders also received an SMS to stop hunting a particular species as soon as the quota for that species had been reached. This system facilitated hunting compliance and law enforcement.

143. Malta had three main islands – Malta, Gozo and Comino, the latter being a bird sanctuary where no hunting was allowed. Enforcement Officers benefited from the small size of the country, and could cover key areas relatively easily through patrols, observation posts, and spot check road blocks. The presence of enforcement personnel was an important deterrent to IKB. Open markets for birds were frequently inspected by ununiformed police officers. NGOs provided day to day information on the presence of birds and monitoring, as well as serving as witnesses and providing video and photographic evidence in court. Records of all IKB incidences were collected by the police, and WBRU collated all data and published seasonal reports on its website. The Law Courts of Malta published all court sentences for public access on its website.
144. Georgia asked how hunters were motivated to report using the Game Reporting System and how they were selected for training. Ms Fenech replied that it was a legal obligation to report, and it was free of charge. The improved system via a mobile app enabled reporting via a couple of clicks on a phone to lodge a report. Training was organized since 2018 for every new hunting license applicant, so it was an obligation. Hunting organizations also provided refresher training for hunters who already had licenses.
145. Georgia also asked how hunters could report by mobile phone in regions without mobile connectivity. Ms Fenech replied that there were some areas with limited connectivity, but mobile reception was available in most places.
146. **SEPRONA, Spain:** Mr Carlos Toledano Zapater, Unidad Central Operativa de Medio Ambiente, Servicio de Protección de la Naturaleza (SEPRONA), Spain, presented an overview of SEPRONA's 37 years protecting nature as a branch investigating nature crimes within the Guardia Civil (Spanish police corps). The Guardia Civil comprised 80,000 officers, with about 1,800 SEPRONA officers focused on and specialized in environmental crime. Every province of Spain had a SEPRONA unit, with some specialized patrol units in national parks. The SEPRONA headquarters had an investigative and intelligence arm, and managed intelligence received from field units to support them. The different groups worked together and the headquarters could launch main investigations to help provincial units to foster their own. The Environmental Central Investigation and Intelligence Unit managed information, investigated the most serious environmental crimes and provided support to SEPRONA units.
147. There were three main action lines in relation to IKB – continuous training of SEPRONA agents, elaboration of technical documents, and national plans and campaigns. It was important to maintain the level of training of agents, as there was continuous renewal of members and new trends and threats. Technical documents were available on the Intranet, including practical guides on how to manage incidents, such as poaching or poisoning. Agents thus had the tools to launch an investigation or operation independently. A tool was also available for launching national plans and campaigns. Successes included arrests and infractions for poaching, poisoning and snares, while judicial cases had been opened for bird electrocution cases. Working together with other agencies and NGOs was important, and there was a good relation in Spain between the Ministry, NGOs and enforcement agencies.

148. The Chair thanked SEPRONA for the excellent example of how to set up environmental security.
149. Cyprus questioned who the judicial cases on electrocution were brought against, as there was a similar problem in Cyprus that they were unsure how to handle, as the grid was national and state-owned. Mr Toledano replied that large companies managed the power lines in Spain, and were required to take bird protection into account. The main issues were against individuals, such as a group of houses that managed their electricity themselves.
150. Europol commended SEPRONA's excellent work, which had benefits for all EU Member States.
151. Georgia asked if SEPRONA had an environmental damage example of illegal killing, if the technical guides were electronic and if procedures were compulsory or voluntary. Mr Toledano replied that a part of their unit provided technical support, while another unit focused on specific purposes, with vets or biologists who could assess and report on ecological ecosystem damage. The unit would investigate and analyse the damage done by an offender, and consider the complete scope of environmental crimes, and potentially put figures to the harm in Euros. Guidance documents were accessible online for the Guardia Civil, and some documents were produced for stakeholders.
152. Portugal had a similar framework built on the image of SEPRONA, and they worked closely together with joint training, including for IKB, but in Portugal enforcement officers needed to ask permission to work on specific cases.
153. There was an online question on how to coordinate with rangers. Mr Toledano informed that small regional units were in charge of relations with rangers and regional authorities. SEPRONA needed to deal with cases in a national not provincial level and was always open to collaborate.
154. **Algeria:** Ms Wassila Djaballah, Head of Hunting Activities, General Directorate of Forests, Ministry of Agriculture, Rural Development and Fishing, Algeria, presented the application of laws in Algeria in relation to IKB. Algeria took an interest in strengthening its legal measures, and had a law on environmental protection in the framework of sustainable development. This provided for the prohibition of destruction or removal of bird nests or eggs, and the requirement of a permit to open a breeding facility for wild species. A permit was required for transit of birds and for those shown to the public, such as in zoos. Infractions carried sentences with fines from about EUR 66 – 660. The law relating to hunting included measures to protect species from being transported, sold or purchased, and infractions could be punished by up to three years imprisonment or a fine, depending on the severity of the crime. There was also a decree on the protection of threatened species, with seven bird species protected from all hunting. Algeria had designated ten protected areas, including Ramsar sites, where the law prohibited any killing or taking, with prison sentences or fines up to EUR 13,200 for offenders. Detailed permits were required to access biological resources, including commercial or research uses, and prior authorization was required for the use, transport or export of animals, also with penalties including imprisonment.
155. For enforcement, Algeria had local networks to monitor wildlife disease in collaboration with veterinary and health services and hunting federations. The national network of Algerian birdwatchers (RNOOA) operated across eleven regions with 745 members, who monitored birds, implemented species action plans and raised awareness. There was also a hunting network, which conducted censuses of game species, and monitored hunting activities. There were measures to protect wild birds and monitor any poaching violations, in collaboration with the national gendarmerie. Training sessions and workshops were organized for forest officers and judicial police in game and bird monitoring and surveillance, also for customs officers in species

identification. Operations to confiscate wild birds were carried out by the police and the gendarmerie, customs and security services, in collaboration with the forestry service, with most cases involving the European Goldfinch, of which over 16,000 were seized between 2020 and 2025. This species was highly regarded in Algerian culture and the most desired bird to keep at home as a pet.

156. France asked about the penalties for IKB including first case violations or scale of the offense. Ms Djaballah replied that the level of the fine depended on the circumstances. After the arrest of a poacher by her administration in partnership with other services, a report was commonly drawn up, the poacher was prosecuted, and the sanction depended on the offense committed and the penalty was defined by the various texts of the law in force depending on the circumstances.
157. **UK National Wildlife Crime Unit:** Mr Mark Harrison, UK National Wildlife Crime Unit, presented information on the unit and the Harrier Task Force. The unit had a staff of 18 covering the UK, with regional responsibility to support all aspects of wildlife crime. The unit was set up to collate and analyse wildlife crime data, but evolved into an operational unit that offered advice and guidance to law enforcement and provided much operational support and surveillance, including the use of drones. It was also involved in financial investigations and searches on the ground and provided training and a phone app for officers. The UK had seven wildlife crime priorities, including poaching and raptor persecution, whilst cybercrimes cut across all. Each priority had a delivery group that created its own '4P plan' – Pursue, Prepare, Protect, Prevent.
158. The Harrier Task Force was set up to protect the Hen Harrier, a rare breeding bird in the UK, with only 32 breeding pairs in England. Driven grouse shooting, which started in the 1800s, was unique to the UK, and its management included burning heather and predator control. Hen Harriers could predate grouse and their chicks or disrupt a shoot, prompting their persecution. Criminality was the main cause of Hen Harrier rarity in the UK and an ongoing problem in 2022-2023 despite consultation with stakeholders and action plans. There had been no successful prosecutions due to difficulties in response and gathering evidence. The unit developed a business plan and pushed innovation and technology, using a model named 'Clear, Hold, Build' to identify issues, build relationships and implement long-term solutions to prevent crime, and use communities to police themselves. Some harriers had been tagged, and tag data were analysed to identify crime hotspots, especially where a tag stopped transmitting. There was an improved reporting system, and response time was usually within a day or two of a tag ceasing to transmit. Sites were analyzed for other threats, such as pylons. A mutual aid system was in place, including a dog and drone team that could locate tags or bird carcasses even when buried under vegetation.
159. A prosecution for killing a harrier had a maximum six-month prison sentence, but theft of a satellite tag carried a higher sentence of up to seven years in prison and a higher fine. Increasing crime figures served as a deterrent for local communities. Data needed to be independent and transparent. In cases where harriers had been shot, landowners were informed that their land was a hotspot for wildlife crime, and that either their staff or a trespasser with a firearm was culpable. This approach put the onus on landowners to work with the unit to stop the crime. Added community pressure on landowners and awareness raising were also effective. Since January 2024, there had been no incidents of a harrier tag losing signal at a hotspot, so the approach was working. However, suspected incidents remained, and dogs were finding carcasses dragged into natural burrows. It was vital that the unit maintained its vigilance and operational capacity.
160. MIKT enquired about the cost of the trained dogs. Mr Harrison replied that the unit did not have to pay for the upkeep of the dogs, as it was a private company that kept the dogs. It cost the company about EUR 3,500 to train a dog; it cost the unit about EUR 800 per day for deployment.

161. Ms Laura Marianna Piussi (Italy) enquired about the size of hotspots, as in Italy these were complete large regions. Mr Harrison replied that hotspots were not whole regions, they usually were estates, but they covered quite large areas, especially in the north of England. It was important to speak to all landowners in a hotspot area, and follow up on the last known fix for a tag. Collaboration was important when covering larger areas, and most incidents were on private land. Ms Piussi added that the main problem in Italy was poaching migratory birds, which was still seen as a tradition and ongoing despite investigative units across the country. There had been success in curbing poaching of European Honey Buzzard in Sicily, but elsewhere there were issues, even when law enforcement was fully on site.

Agenda Item 9.2 Species Recovery and the role of IKB

162. Ms Iva Obretenova, Policy Officer, DG-ENV, Unit D.3 Nature Conservation, gave a presentation on the Birds Directive, the main tool for the EU to maintain or restore the populations of all bird species in the EU at a level which ensured their survival over the long-term. There were two types of protection measures – habitats and species. Over 5,400 Special Protection Areas (SPAs) were designated across the EU to which specific requirements applied, and there were measures also on specific species, including on killing, capture and trade, and the destruction of nests. Some hunting provisions under the directive allowed hunting of 84 species under certain conditions, i.e. in a sustainable manner that did not jeopardise their survival. Unit D.3 monitored and assessed species status, and 42 of the 84 huntable species, of which 33 were migratory, were not in a secure status. Taking into account the declining status of those species, the EU relevant Directives and the precautionary principle, it was decided that the EU had to examine the impacts on those species and a consortium was contracted to support the work of the Commission for their recovery. Hunting was not necessarily the main cause of decline, but it could add additional pressure.
163. Annex II Birds Directive (huntable) species not in a secure status were classified in five different categories. A flowchart was used to achieve this classification and to trigger short and long term actions. The EC Task Force on the Recovery of Birds (TFRB) was set up under an expert group that advised on implementation of the Birds Directive and the Habitats Directive. The TFRB provided support to EU Member States to put in place measures for species not in a secure status, expanding in future to non-huntable species, and provided technical recommendations. The TFRB worked on actions to reduce species mortality, and which benefited non-huntable species. Member States compiled information on the species and on hunting and control to ensure that legislation was respected.
164. The TFRB worked extensively on European Turtle-dove, and recommended a hunting moratorium, with conditions agreed in advance on when hunting could be resumed. The moratorium was implemented in the Western Flyway and had a noticeable effect on doves from 2022 to 2024, with an increase of 40%, resulting in 615,000 adult breeding pairs - the highest number since 2009, as demonstrated by monitoring. In light of this and improved control systems in place, it was considered that hunting could be reopened with a limited quota of 1.5% spread between countries. The impact would be closely monitored, and EU Member States had received recommendations on control efforts, on how to identify the quota being used, and to inform when it was reached, and when the hunting season should close. The TFRB planned to expand adaptive harvest management to Common Pochard (*Aythya ferina*), Eurasian Wigeon (*Mareca penelope*) and Common Quail (*Coturnix coturnix*).
165. Key actions had been identified to address non-habitat and non-hunting related pressures and threats, organized by groups of actions, with IKB included within the Law Enforcement actions group. There were recommendations to tackle IKB for eight huntable species impacted by IKB.

166. AEMLAP asked whether it was possible to have adaptive management projects for the European Turtle-dove Central and Eastern Flyway, and about the main coverage area for the three new species. Ms Obretenova replied that similar recommendations for the European Turtle-dove Central and Eastern Flyway did not lead to a moratorium, although there had been a reduction in legal take. The initial recommendation was to implement the hunting ban across all flyways. The flyway approach would be used for the other species as well, at least for those within the EU.
167. Mr van den Bossche (BirdLife International) added that the scientific recommendation for all EU countries was a zero take for Common Pochard, Eurasian Wigeon, Common Quail and Redwing (*Turdus iliacus*), and a 50% reduction in take of Northern Shoveler (*Spatula clypeata*), Northern Pintail (*Anas acuta*), Common Teal (*Anas crecca*), European Herring Gull (*Larus argentatus*), and Great Black-backed Gull (*Larus marinus*). However, not all EU Member States were responding. BirdLife International's position was that threatened species should not be hunted under Article 7 of the Birds Directive. BirdLife International congratulated the Commission on the processes undertaken with Member States on the huntable species, but requested the Commission to insist that non-complying Member States respond. While Austria had made a great effort on zero take for the European Turtle-dove, allowing other Member States on the Central-Eastern Flyway to continue hunting was not good for cooperation between countries. Ms Obretenova acknowledged the volume of work of the Task Force and encouraged compliance with the recommendations.

Agenda Item 10. Monitoring and Technology

Update on technological advances for monitoring IKB

168. Ms Vicky Jones, Flyways Science Coordinator, BirdLife International, presented an update on technological advances to detect and monitor IKB. Tracking technology was increasingly used in different projects, and could deliver important information on mortality. Tracked birds served as sentinels of threats along flyways, and their cause of death indicated the prevalence of threats. A major collaboration led by BirdLife International with many researchers tracking large migratory birds analyzed 1,704 mortality events of 45 species tagged in 48 countries between 2003 and 2021. Mortality events were recorded in 91 countries, and the causes of mortality mapped. The geographic spread of mortality was likely biased as most birds were tagged before leaving the nest, and young birds were more naïve and prone to mortality. When a tag stopped transmitting or was transmitting from a static location, mortality could be the cause, and the cause of death could be investigated. The research found that human-induced mortality was greater than natural cause of mortality, and overall 38% of cases were assigned to IKB, including 21.7% to illegal killing and 16.3% to poisoning (as a specific type of IKB). Electrocutation and powerlines were the cause of mortality in 40.5% of cases. There were different causes of mortality in different taxonomic groups, with storks and cranes more susceptible to electrocution, raptors to illegal killing and vultures to poisoning. There were also differences per region, with 69% of events attributable to IKB in Africa, compared to 52% in Asia and 27% in Europe. IKB was shown to be an important cause of mortality along flyways. Other uses of tracking information in relation to IKB included research showing for example that rates of Golden Eagle mortality in the UK were higher over managed grouse moors, pointing to illegal killing. Alerts have also led to saving a bird or retrieving a carcass for investigation.
169. Other technologies used in detecting or addressing IKB included drones, which were relatively cheap and could be used to record habitat modification or locate poachers, and be combined with other technology such as thermal image cameras for recording at night. There were also advances in using DNA analysis of bird blood, tissue, feather or faeces to identify cases of IKB, for instance from nests, at restaurants or in trade. DNA analysis was also useful at crime scenes,

including human DNA. Passive Acoustic Monitoring (PAM) was being used in many countries to detect and record gun shots to show when hunting was carried out. Through using PAM in the Ionian Islands, Greece, HOS showed that whilst patrols reported only isolated shots, PAM detected >14,000 shots from one location during one spring. Remote cameras for surveillance could be used covertly to capture evidence that could be used to prosecute perpetrators. BirdLife International had published a [best practice guide for monitoring IKB](#). In general, IKB could be undermining the significant conservation investment made by many projects particularly those focused on threatened species, which were funded by a variety of sources including EU LIFE.

170. Morocco asked how much these methods cost and if the tools were available and could be used in the field. Ms Jones replied that it would be useful to compile information on cost and accessibility. Prices would vary widely, and DNA analysis fees would vary for each situation. MIKT added that there were different DNA techniques, some of which were very expensive, but the example of barcoding from Cyprus was relatively cheap, fast and simple.

171. Cyprus considered that there were challenges in using techniques like cameras and surveillance in court, as there were some restrictions and realities to deal with when using these techniques. There were different regulations for recording equipment between state land and private land.

Agenda Item 11. Mid-term assessment of the Rome Strategic Plan and next steps for the MIKT Workplan 2026-2030

Agenda Item 11.1 Presentation on mid-term assessment of the Rome Strategic Plan and next steps for the MIKT Workplan 2026-2030

172. Ms Papazoglou provided an overview of the RSP and its mid-term assessment procedures. The plan was adopted in 2019 for implementation between 2020 and 2030, with an overall goal to reduce the scale and scope of IKB by 50% by 2030 against 2020 baselines. Objectives were to establish IKB NAPs, to understand the scale and scope of IKB and motivations for it, to establish prevention measures, to build IKB into national legislation, to strengthen enforcement, and to ensure effective and efficient justice. The plan's timeline foresaw a mid-term assessment in 2025 to understand the state of implementation, to determine limiting factors, and to highlight crucial objectives and actions for the remaining period in order to reach the targets. Chapter 5.4 of the plan proposed a mid-term assessment using indicators, national reporting and the Scoreboard, and other relevant information.

173. Some milestones of the plan had already been achieved in some countries, such as assessing the need for an IKB NAP, adopting methodology for monitoring, identifying hotspots and conducting surveys of the motivations behind IKB. Of 54 countries, 25 replied to the periodic assessment using the Scoreboard in 2023, of which only six provided a Baseline and only four adopted monitoring methodology. Some countries even reported an increasing trend of IKB. Assessing progress against the overall goal was impossible with the data available, whilst information was also incomplete for assessing progress against milestones and indicators. The MIKT Workplan closely followed the Rome Strategic Plan, so the 2026-2030 Workplan would be developed in parallel to the plan's mid-term assessment.

174. Ms Medlinska reminded the Meeting about the options proposed in the [Discussion paper on the mid-term assessment of the Rome Strategic Plan, Document UNEP/CMS/MIKT6/Doc.11](#), which would be addressed in breakout groups: Each group would review the discussion paper and decide favoured options, analysing them to identify the best scenario and prepare a consensus proposal. Groups could also consider alternative or additional proposals. Each group would report back in plenary, when a consensus would be reached. The three options were:

- A. Engage a consultant or academic institution to conduct a survey across the board, covering all countries of the Mediterranean and Europe;
- B. Engage a consultant to use Scoreboard 2023 data and complement it by directly liaising with the countries that did not contribute; support countries with no Baseline, or methodology or trend data to estimate the scale, scope and trend in their country;
- C. Adopt an NGO assessment as an independent assessment of the state on play.

Agenda Item 11.2 Breakout Groups. Reporting from Breakout groups, discussion and conclusion on way forward

175. Ms Nozadze presented results from the online group, which chose option B, to engage a consultant who would use existing data available from Scoreboard 2023 (noting that Scoreboard 2026 results would not be available in time), and conduct interviews or send questionnaires to countries that did not respond to Scoreboard 2023. There was some discussion about combining options A and B, resulting in the recommendation to support countries that had submitted incomplete reports to Scoreboard 2023 (including but not limited to Baseline, or methodology or trend data, including actions and indicators) to estimate the scale, scope and trend of IKB. A report should also be prepared using Scoreboard 2023 (including gaps filled by countries that had not completed their reports) on implementation of the RSP on a range countries scale, to give an evidence-based analysis. The consultant should engage with NGOs in each country and with Contracting Parties that provided only partial reports that had large gaps, to complement data and additional information. Parties should have the possibility to update their 2023 reports, and an overall report on implementation of the RSP by 2025 should be delivered, including data from countries with gaps and those that completed Scoreboard 2023.
176. Ms Aradis presented results from one of the in-person groups. There were different experiences within the group, which, after analysing the three options in detail, arrived at a mix of options A and B, which would be more appropriate as not all countries had submitted Scoreboard 2023, while others had gaps in information. An in-depth questionnaire could be sent to those countries that did not reply.
177. Mr Loureiro presented results from the other in-person group, which preferred option B, but with elements of option A. The data available from Scoreboard 2023 were in principle good enough and could be updated with new data each year. The consultant should elaborate from Scoreboard 2023 results and use best practices raised in available data, approach countries that did not contribute, support a methodology definition that would serve for further iterations, and identify trends for all countries, including those that had not determined a Baseline. The consultant should also use other available data from different stakeholders, especially through collaboration with NGOs.
178. The Chair considered that the proposals from each group were similar, with a preference for option B but with some elements of option A, with recommendations to build on and update Scoreboard 2023, even for those countries that completed that assessment, whilst the consultant should engage more thoroughly with those that did not. Option C was not selected by any groups.
179. Ms Papazoglou welcomed the very constructive group discussions, the results of which provided enough to understand what was needed to formulate Terms of Reference (TORs) for a consultant of CMS. Volunteers to be involved in the process and who could look at the proposed TORs were the UK, Portugal, France, the Bern Convention and BirdLife International. The call for work would likely be made in autumn 2025.

180. Mr Stefan Ferger (EuroNatur) asked how the development of the new Workplan would be conducted. MIKT replied that it would first take on board the conclusions of the mid-term assessment for the MIKT Workplan, present proposals during the Joint online meeting in 2026, and then present a proposal for the MIKT Workplan, when results of the mid-term assessment should be available. It would be adopted either through online consultation or through the meeting.

Day 3. Thursday 15 May 2025

Opening of the third day of the meeting

181. The Chair commended the achievements during Day 2 with rich discussions and presentations on the Scoreboard and other issues. He introduced the agenda for the last day of the meeting.

Agendas Item 12. National IKB Action Plans

Agenda Item 12.1 Document [UNEP/CMS/MIKT6/Inf.12.1.2](#). Report and recommendations from a Workshop on National IKB Action Plans in the Balkans and next steps on National IKB Action Plans

182. Ms Aradis assumed the role of Chair for this agenda item.
183. Ms Papazoglou presented the recommendations from the Regional Workshop on IKB NAPs for the Balkans, which was held in Podgorica, Montenegro, 2-4 September 2024. There was a recommendation in the RSP to hold regional workshops to promote development and implementation of IKB NAPs. The guidance for development and implementation of IKB NAPs was endorsed in December 2022 by members of MIKT and the Bern Convention. IKB NAPs were intended to identify and prioritize the strategies and actions of the RSP most relevant to a country, aligning or enhancing its policies and tools to the RSP based on a zero-tolerance approach to IKB. Not every country had to have an IKB NAP, as it could have a relevant alternative policy document. The workshop, co-organized by MIKT and the Ministry of Ecology, Sustainable Development and Northern Region Development of Montenegro had 38 participants from the Balkan region, including NGOs and support from Italy to share experience of having an IKB NAP.
184. The workshop identified common challenges and IKB threats and priorities, and reached conclusions on how to develop an IKB NAP and ascertain the role of stakeholders. Threats identified included illegal shooting and trapping using nets and decoy devices, hunting tourism (an issue all governments were worried about and wanted to tackle), and poisoning, which the workshop considered as a form of IKB. The workshop identified key challenges as a lack of political will, enforcement, funding and commitment for implementation. Important priorities were: the need to invest in training of enforcers, prosecutors and judges; the availability of funds that could magnify impact and enable more actions; taking advantage of opportunities through the WCA; and to maintain an unofficial regional network. All participants agreed that in order to develop an IKB NAP, a multi-stakeholder committee with different ministries, NGOs, hunters and other stakeholders was needed, but the initiative should be led by the government to make it official. This committee could help to complete the Scoreboard. Developing a plan together would promote improved coordination between stakeholders. The legal basis of an IKB NAP was an important consideration, and for some countries, adopting it as CMS ratifying legislation could be an opportunity. A Theory of Change was useful for project management, and other aspects to consider which were key to combating IKB, were the role of NGOs, allocating a budget, and the need to implement and monitor the IKB NAP. MIKT hoped to conduct a regional workshop for North Africa probably in 2026, and would welcome a host for this.

185. Ms Aradis commended the strong teamwork at the 2024 workshop, and considered that such workshops were important tools needed for other regions.
186. Morocco considered that CMS Parties could be encouraged to adopt an IKB NAP by building IKB NAPs clearly into a CMS resolution, which could convince decision makers. A clear CMS resolution could also encourage governments to adopt regional workshops. Decision makers need to be convinced that the development and implementation of NAPs was a good idea.
187. MIKT replied that the RSP was referenced in CMS Resolution 11.16, which served as the mandate for IKB NAPs, but it was possible to have a more specific mandate for IKB NAPs within the resolution for COP15. Mr Ramírez concurred that it would be good to make a revised version of CMS Resolution 11.6 so that it specifically mentioned IKB NAPs.
188. There was an online question addressed to Italy asking if the Ministry of External Affairs was involved in the development. Ms Aradis replied that the Ministry of Environment asked ISPRA to prepare the technical draft of the document, which was then shared with several ministries, Europol, and other relevant stakeholders.
189. Morocco questioned if electrocution was a threat for birds in the Balkans. MIKT replied that electrocution was a serious threat, but it was not clearly adopted as a threat under IKB, as not all countries considered electrocution as IKB. Ms Medlinska added that electrocution was a widespread issue, and would be discussed in the Bern Convention meeting.

Agenda Item 12.2 National perspective on National IKB Action Plans: Montenegro

190. Ms Anela Sijarić Dečević, Head of Department for Freshwater and Terrestrial Ecosystems Directorate for Nature Protection, Ministry of Ecology, Sustainable Development and Northern Region Development, Montenegro, acknowledged the support of the CMS Secretariat to conduct an assessment of national legislation in 2021. Adding that the national legislation support was the first step, she presented a case study on the IKB NAP for Montenegro, which needed further support from the CMS Secretariat to complete the assessment. The national Law on Nature Protection had a section dedicated to the protection of wild birds, which required implementation of measures to preserve, manage, maintain, or restore diversity and habitats for all bird species. Montenegro drew inspiration from the EU Birds Directive in developing provisions of this law.
191. During the Regional Workshop on IKB NAPs for the Balkans, Italy showed how an IKB NAP could look if adopted and provided guidance. The IKB NAP for Montenegro was then drafted according to the RSP and to relevant national laws and strategies. In the second phase, a Working Group was formed by her Ministry to improve the draft plan, and comments were provided in weekly meetings by relevant institutions, with NGO support. The IKB NAP had four sections:
- a. education and capacity-building for institutions, police, customs officials, veterinarians and prosecutors;
 - b. strengthening direct law enforcement to improve the record-keeping system and legal framework, to prepare a guide, to improve cooperation between institutions, and to ensure adequate facilities for treating confiscated wild birds;
 - c. prevention of IKB, for which strengthening political will and capacity of decision makers and building awareness were crucial;
 - d. monitoring and data collection, with a system for collecting, processing and analysing IKB data. Monitoring would be led by national institutes, and maps of the most prevalent IKB hotspots, including for poisoning were planned, as well as an app to facilitate data entry by volunteers.

192. The Minister had approved the draft version of the plan, after which all institutions had a two-week opportunity to comment, before the plan was to be submitted to the Government for adoption. The IKB NAP should be adopted by the end of June 2025. Every objective had four goals and several activities, and the first steps would be the formation of a coordination body, delegation of police officers, and planning a school awareness programme.
193. The Chair thanked Ms Sijarić for the insightful update from Montenegro, with very positive news about the draft IKB NAP approval, and looked forward to its publication.
194. Ms Marija Lekic, Centre for Protection and Research of Birds (CZIP), Montenegro, hoped that with the strong political will that was shown, this IKP NAP would be inserted into Montenegro's mid-term government programme of 2025-2027, and that strong words would lead to action. The regional workshop of September 2024 and the MIKT6 meeting had been catalysts for this achievement, with a committee formed just before MIKT6 that provided a push to work on establishing the IKB NAP. These positive developments were in contrast to past weak cooperation between different institutions, and could help to engage crucial bodies like the police in the IKB NAP committee. After adoption, implementation of the IKB NAP should be done by a coordination body that would work on the goals and activities in the document, for which additional funding would be secured as well as government commitment. CZIP aligned with the plan to develop the next actions, and hoped that Montenegro would in future be an example of best practice in tackling IKB.
195. Cyprus asked whether during discussions with stakeholders there were any difficult issues, and if any stakeholders had substantial views on any topic. Ms Sijarić replied that including the Birds Directive in the Law of Nature Protection provided the baseline to adopt it. Also, Montenegro was an EU candidate and had opened Chapter 27 on the environment and climate change, so the work on IKB supported this legal framework. Montenegro had a hunting department in the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water management responsible for providing hunting grounds to including for wild migratory birds, and it had been difficult to initiate the IKB NAP. There was widespread lack of knowledge about IKB, so her Ministry planned to engage a representative of every institution with relevance to IKB, then revise the IKB NAP after some years with more detail on difficult issues. Capacity building and awareness raising were needed so that everyone in Montenegro was familiar with wild bird issues, and regular monitoring needed to be in place to know the status of birds and establish a Baseline.
196. Ms Papazoglou remarked that it was very important that someone committed like Ms Sijarić was working within a Ministry and taking on a subject and following it through to completion with dedication and passion. Without this kind of champion, it was very difficult to achieve good results. Further, Ms Sijarić had been very open along the way to receive support from anyone who offered it, and her strategy of starting with something simple and gradually building on it in detail was strong and successful.
197. Ms Sijarić noted that she was the only one in her Ministry dealing with biodiversity, so it was a tough process and she appreciated the support of the Secretariat. She planned to build inter-governmental networks with states around Montenegro, and this IKB NAP would be shared once adopted.

Agenda Item 12.3. NGO perspective on National IKB Action Plans

198. Ms Justine Vansynghel, Project Manager, Conservation of Migratory Birds, EuroNatur shared an NGO perspective of IKB NAPS in the Balkans. As in the RSP, there were six indicators for

verification of IKB NAP development, adoption and implementation. Two were quantitative, on the number of IKB NAPs and the degree of implementation, and four were qualitative, with indicators on comprehensiveness, presence of a committee and funding, and the scale of IKB, which would denote if an IKB NAP was realistic. A relative scoring scale was set through colour coding from most progress to potential for development. In terms of the number of IKB NAPs or other documents, there were no IKB NAPs, but Albania had adopted an action plan against poisoning for the period 2025-2035. In terms of degree of implementation, Croatia and Montenegro were making good progress towards having IKB NAPs adopted and then implemented, though development had not started in other Balkan states. In terms of comprehensiveness, progress was most advanced for Croatia and Montenegro, whose IKB NAPs included some parts of the roadmap against wildlife crime, and which could be used as a blueprint for other states. Croatia and Montenegro had established a multi-stakeholder committee, but only in Croatia were all relevant stakeholders involved, including NGOs, whilst there was a lack of dedicated and/or secured funding to implement IKB NAPs across all countries. Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia had realistic scales (number and severity of IKB) that included species impacted by IKB.

199. The workshop had a catalysing effect, promoting a number of developments, though there was overall only a slight improvement in terms of clarity on the next steps to take. One country reported minor progress since the workshop, and two reported considerable progress, whilst three countries reported improved know-how and one country reported an improved support network. There were also improvements in motivation to take IKB NAPs forward. Similar workshops were recommended for other regions, as well as different workshops for the Balkans on other topics. Cooperation between NGOs and governments was considered important, as well as understanding the drivers for IKB, cross-border cooperation and intelligence, funding, judicial follow-up and law enforcement training.
200. Mr Ramírez considered these analyses to be very positive, and invited countries considering or not planning an IKB NAP to reach out to the CMS Secretariat, which had capacity to provide support. An IKB NAP was a key milestone for implementation of MIKT.
201. Ms Papazoglou thanked EuroNatur for their role in supporting the workshop for the Balkans and for their instructive analysis of the workshop.
202. Mr Ferger recommended that the CMS Secretariat could lead the identification of champions like Ms Sijarić, as someone who could move things forward. NGOs could help and provide contacts for this.
203. Noting that there was no prerequisite for a country to have an IKB NAP if it had alternatives in place that could positively combat IKB, Albania indicated that it had a committee for the protection of wild birds, with representatives of NGOs and hunting federations, which could be used rather than creating new bodies. The anti-poisoning Action Plan started with provisions to prevent poisoning of vultures in Albania, and was then expanded to cover all protected fauna. The Action Plan was a good example of government-NGO cooperation.
204. Ms Vansynghel replied that all countries could assess if an IKB NAP was necessary for implementing the RSP, and commended Albania's anti-poisoning plan and the involvement of NGOs. Ms Papazoglou added that the RSP mentioned other policy documents that could serve instead of IKB NAPs, but countries had to assess the need for an IKB NAP, and if not considered required, for example because all key actions to combat IKB in the country were already covered by an existing plan, then they would just need to clarify the reasons why one was not needed.

Agenda Item 13. Funding and international cooperation

205. Mr Schmidt resumed his role as Chair.

206. **The LIFE Instrument:** Ms Simona Bacchereti, Project Manager, European Climate, Infrastructure and Environment Executive Agency (CINEA) informed that the LIFE Programme was the EU Programme for Environment and Climate Action. Its sub-programme on nature and biodiversity covered two topics: Nature and Biodiversity, for projects that led to implementation of the EU nature and biodiversity legislation and the EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030; and Nature Governance and Information, for awareness raising, compliance assurance and access to justice related to nature and biodiversity legislation. The bulk of the funding was for Nature and Biodiversity projects, with a usual funding rate of 60% of a project budget (75% for Nature and Biodiversity projects targeting exclusively priority habitats and species). Priority was given to proposals for improving the conservation status or trends of species and habitats of EU interest, notably where their activities focused on reducing killing of the species, such as by poisoning. Eligible participants were legal entities established in an eligible country, i.e. an EU Member State or a non-EU country associated to the LIFE Programme. Activities outside eligible countries needed to achieve EU objectives, such as those aimed at conservation of migratory birds in their wintering areas or transboundary rivers. Some example projects included:

- a. The LIFE for Safe Flight project on the conservation of the Red-breasted Goose (*Branta ruficollis*) involving Bulgaria, Romania, Ukraine, Russia and Kazakhstan.
- b. The Egyptian Vulture New LIFE project on urgent action to strengthen the Balkan population of the Egyptian Vulture and secure its flyway, which included countries in the Middle East and Africa.
- c. The BalkanDetoxLife project, which aimed to strengthen national capacities to fight wildlife poisoning and raise awareness about the problem in the Balkan countries.
- d. The WildLIFE Crime Academy project, which aimed to strengthen national capacities to combat wildlife crime and raise awareness about the problem in Europe and North Africa.
- e. The LIFE Godwit Flyway project, for conservation of the Black-tailed Godwit (*Limosa limosa*) along the flyway, with activities in The Gambia.
- f. The Aquatic Warblers on the Move project, with activities at key wintering sites of Aquatic Warbler (*Acrocephalus paludicola*) in Senegal.

207. A call for LIFE Nature and Biodiversity projects was open between 24 April and 23 September 2025, with a total budget for all projects of EUR 156,500,000. Successful applicants would be notified in February 2026. Further information and advice were available from [#EULife25 Info Days](#). Information on ongoing projects could be useful for preparing applications, and was available on the [Basic Search on LIFE Public Database](#). Questions on clarifications could be sent to CINEA-LIFE-ENQUIRIES@ec.europa.eu.

208. The Chair welcomed this important information and guidance, and advised that there was a LIFE National Contact Point (NCP) in each EU member state. Ms Bacchereti recommended non-EU Member States should seek collaboration with experienced partners established in an eligible country, which could in turn seek support from their NCP.

209. Morocco asked if it was possible for a country to connect to a project already submitted or underway, for instance to help address Egyptian Vulture conservation in North Africa. Ms Bacchereti clarified that this project was already concluded. Partners were already established before projects started, but new projects could be submitted under the 2025 call for projects. Any activities in Africa would need to be useful and necessary for species and habitats within the EU, targeting migratory birds for example, whilst actions taken within Europe needed to show how

actions in Africa complemented them.

210. **Agence Française de Développement (AFD) and the French Facility for Global Environment (FFEM):** Ms Laura Dami, Project Leader of the Mediterranean Waterbird Network, Tour du Valat research institute (TdV), gave an overview of international cooperation and funding opportunities related to the network. The International Waterbird Census (IWC) was an important long-term monitoring tool used in many countries, which strongly supported the African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbird Agreement (AEWA). The AEWA Plan of Action for Africa included an objective to improve the IWC data quality and quantity, highlighting the low quality of data from parts of Africa. In order to help address this, the Medwaterbirds Network was established in 2012, coordinated by TdV in collaboration with OFB to improve capacity building for IWC data collection, management and use. The network delivered annual training sessions to which all North African countries were invited and published IWC reports. It also provided optical equipment, financed bird counts, and developed some training tools and a web platform to share data between partners. Activities were extended to European Mediterranean countries. IKB monitoring was added to the programme on capacity-building in IWC data use and analysis, which involved eight countries working together on topics such as legislation.
211. International support came from different sources, with the French Ministry of Environment supporting all activities linked to AEWA from the beginning. Other funders included the MAVA Foundation (2013-2015), the CEPF (2014-2016), the Albert II Foundation (2016-2018), the TOTAL foundation (2015-2017), the French Facility for Global Environment (FFEM, 2019-2023) and the international division of the French Agency of Development (AFD, 2018-2026). FFEM supported a range of stakeholders, preferring innovative projects of three to five year duration that were impactful and replicable, with five areas of intervention including biodiversity conservation and improvement, and with budget up to EUR 2 million, but needed solid co-funding. AFD projects targeted Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), were led by a French organization or a CSO from another country previously supported by AFD, and focused on strengthening civil society, and had budgets up to EUR 2 million and duration up to three years. TdV was in the process of trying to obtain a strategic collaboration with AFD.
212. The Chair asked if it was possible to submit an application to AFD in English or only in French. Ms Dami replied that it was now possible to submit applications in English.
213. **Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF):** Mr Vedran Lucić, Manager, CEPF Mediterranean Regional Implementation Team (RIT), introduced the CEPF, which was a funding mechanism created by AFD, Conservation International, the EU and others. It operated largely through RITs, and the RIT in the Mediterranean was run by BirdLife International Europe and DOPPS - BirdLife Slovenia. CEPF supported CSOs to protect the world's biodiversity hotspots where there were major threats, including the Mediterranean and Cabo Verde, focused on Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) within the biodiversity hotspot border. Support was available in most local languages of the region.
214. CEPF projects focused on improving the status of threatened species listed on the global IUCN Red List and/or the status of KBAs, including the creation of new KBAs, and the practices within production landscapes through strengthening civil society, in cooperation with governments and communities. There were over 230 grantees in the Mediterranean, where about USD 25 million had been spent to date. CEPF expected to grant a further USD 14.4 million between 2025 and 2030 in the region through five strategic directions, as summarized at www.cepf.net. Although there was no specific focus on IKB, there was scope to include activities to reduce IKB, such as through ranger patrols, equipment purchases for rangers, or border police. CEPF invited proposals for large grants of up to USD 250,000 for two to four years or small grants of up to USD

50,000 for one to two years. Small grants could be submitted in local languages, large ones in either French or English. Support was available during the application process. Funds could also be accessed for crises and delivered within two weeks. Institutions founded by governments were only eligible if they were legally independent of any government agency or actor. Proposals in or involving Libya should become eligible in 2026. CEPF had supported a project in Lebanon on sustainable hunting areas, which was very relevant to IKB.

215. Morocco asked for clarification on the focus of CEPF strategies in relation to IKB objectives. As Ms Awatef Abiadh, CEPF programme officer for North Africa, was unable to answer due to a poor online connection, Mr Lucić replied that CEPF was not the best funding mechanism to fit combating IKB, but there were ways that IKB could be included within a project, if it was a priority. For example, one strategic direction was on Marine Protect Areas (MPAs) and coastal wetlands, and raising awareness and improving enforcement in relation to IKB were eligible for coastal wetlands where IKB occurred. In the past, CEPF had supported equipment purchase for Montenegro-Albania border police, which was linked to combating IKB.
216. Mr Loureiro recommended workshops with expert missions and study visits to review legal texts, based on good experience of this in Albania and Turkey, sharing experience and expertise. Twinning projects could be very beneficial, and were also supported by other EU instruments, such as TAIEX. There were focal points for these projects. Hungary added that it had developed some twinning projects.

Agenda Item 14. Prevention of IKB

A survey on IKB Motivations

217. Ms Sol Espinosa, Senior Programme Officer, BirdLife International, gave a presentation on exploring drivers and motivations of IKB in MIKT countries. In 2015, BirdLife International estimated that approximately 25 million birds of at least 375 species were killed annually in the Mediterranean, and IKB was a significant and widespread problem. The scale of the problem yielded international responses, with creation of the MIKT in 2016 and adoption of the RSP (2020-2030). A strategic report on the drivers and motivations of IKB was under development aligned with the RSP to highlight the trends and differences across the region and produce recommendations to better design targeted actions for long-term impact. The report aimed to collect comparable data on drivers and motivations of IKB, to pinpoint priority countries, analyse motivations and integrate actions into IKB NAPs. The report aimed to support RSP implementation by addressing Strategic Objective 1.2 on understanding the drivers behind IKB, and agreed actions on motivation surveys. It also aimed to help governments identify trends and close knowledge gaps on motivations, identify key strategies at national and regional level, and offer guidelines for inclusion of actions to assess and respond to drivers and motivations in IKB NAPs.
218. The report elaboration process involved development of a questionnaire for distribution to CMS NFPs and to contacts, for which advice was sought, as well as targeted interviews. Emerging topics to focus on in the questionnaire were:
- a. Enabling conditions for IKB, such as lack of enforcement, easy access to mist nets and habitats, cross-border trade, and a high level of social and cultural tolerance of IKB.
 - b. Drivers of IKB, i.e. the underlying forces and social dynamics shaping behaviour, to consider market demand for birds, subsidies and pressures such as from hunting associations, and cultural or traditional uses of birds.
 - c. Individual motivations of IKB, which could be conscious choices (like earning money) or

unconscious influences (like habits or pressure from others). Reasons could include cheap access to protein, cultural traditions, perceived medicinal benefits or recreational hunting.

- d. Barriers for implementing actions to address IKB, such as a lack of political will, including low budget allocations and poor inter-agency coordination, limited social pressure and government inaction, and cultural resistance, with killing of birds seen as a tradition that rejected outside interference or government regulations.

219. Analyzed results would be shared with MIKT country members for feedback. Recommendations would be developed with evidence-based actions to address IKB at regional and national levels. The report would be presented at a CMS COP15 side event. Expected outcomes of the report included comparable data from the region, understanding the motivations behind IKB, recognizing IKB hotspots and providing recommendations for IKB NAPs and inputs for capacity building. The final report would be submitted in May 2026.

220. Bearing in mind that IKB was an issue beyond the Mediterranean, Ms Medlinska suggested finding human and financial resources to enlarge the geographical scope, provided there was interest from the Parties. Hungary confirmed its interest in this.

221. Cyprus asked whether suggestions for drivers would be country-specific or on a regional scale or both. Ms Espinosa replied that information was expected at both national and regional levels, with recommendations for specific countries as well as regional ones, depending on the information collected.

Agenda Item 15. Next Joint Meeting, Financial matters and AOB

Agenda Item 15.1 Next Joint Meeting in 2026 (online) and next in-person Joint Meeting in 2027

222. Ms Papazoglou informed that it had been agreed previously to have in-person meetings every two years, so the next Joint Meeting planned for 2026 would be online, probably for a full day or two half days. The mid-term assessment would probably be on the agenda as well as results of the motivation survey, the MIKT Workplan and any other new thematic items. An in-person meeting was planned for 2027.

223. Ms Mršić announced on behalf of the Ministry of Environmental Protection of Croatia that Croatia was ready to host the next in-person meeting in 2027.

Agenda Item 15.2 Communication and networking between meetings

224. Whilst presentations were extremely important, Ms Medlinska highlighted that more opportunities were needed for exchange, in particular between meetings, and there had been attempts to set up a means of communication. She asked if there was willingness to devote some time to communication and networking and, if so, how the Secretariats could facilitate this process.

225. Georgia suggested that focal points and others who were interested could use a general chat forum such as WhatsApp to share ideas and for quick responses to questions. Egypt (online) added that a structured way to communicate was good, but it could be difficult to follow through with actions via WhatsApp on a regular basis.

226. Albania mentioned the EU-TWIX tool, which was a networking and information exchange tool to support enforcement agencies, to which Parties subscribed, and where they could pose questions on litigations, notifications or requests relating to the illegal trade of species. It could promote a thorough understanding and be used to post questions or concerns, and could be a good model.

Portugal agreed that the EU-TWIX tool was very useful for seeking information and for quick questions, but it required a network coordinator.

227. Mr Boleslaw Slocinski (Association Biom, Croatia) informed that in 2024 Spain and Croatia organised a useful international exchange, a thematic study visit to institutions responsible for legal framework and coordination of wildlife crime enforcement, which could be organized between countries to help participants learn better than in larger gatherings.

228. Noting that the choice of technological devices to deploy was a constant and evolving topic of interest to many, with many questions, such as which satellite trackers were appropriate for different species, Hungary suggested to hold an online thematic workshop on technology, as there was good potential for sharing information online.

Agenda Items 15.3 Financial matters and 15.4 Next steps

229. MIKT was very grateful for its latest grant from the EU, which would support some of the next steps. Activities for which funding was available in 2025 included the mid-term assessment of the RSP and MIKT Workplan 2026-2030, the survey on IKB motivations (contracted to BirdLife International), preparations for CMS COP15, and outreach materials, for which some funding was available including a video, leaflets and webinars. Additional activities for which funds were available in 2026 were a side event on IKB motivations at CMS COP15, the online Joint Meeting on IKB, the Scoreboard 2026 and a regional workshop on IKB NAPs. Funded activities in 2027 were the Joint Meeting on IKB in Croatia, and a workshop on enforcement / prosecution. At CMS COP15, it would be important to consider any amendments to Resolution 11.16, such as the recommendation from Morocco on specifically including IKB NAPs in the resolution. All documents for CMS COP15 needed to be prepared by August 2025.

230. Ms Medlinska would investigate if the geographical scope of the survey on IKB motivations could be extended to more Bern Convention Parties and if any other suggested follow-up steps could be taken on board such as a workshop on devices. She would inform the Bern Convention Standing Committee in December 2025 about the outcomes of the Joint Meeting, in particular the mid-term assessment of the RSP. She hoped that the new Convention on the Protection of the Environment through Criminal Law could bring useful measures to deal with IKB.

231. Mr Ramírez added that support from the EU was essential to MIKT, especially for this meeting and the IKB NAP workshops, but it was necessary to look for other lines of funding, so he welcomed any suggestions for lines of support. It made a huge difference to the MIKT Task Force having a full-time coordinator in place. Similar to other initiatives, CMS had received voluntary contributions in the past from Parties and observers. Additional resources were more than welcome and could be transferred directly to an implementing partner. The WCA was another great activity. In-kind support for ad-hoc MIKT meetings was also a possibility. MIKT was also involved in sharing experiences from the Mediterranean to guide IKB initiatives in other regions, and exporting tools like the Scoreboard. Australia and Germany were supporting IKB activities in Asia and West Africa. He encouraged participants to consider organizing a side event at CMS COP15. He also thanked Croatia for offering to host the next Joint Meeting in 2027.

Agenda Item 15.5 Any Other Business

232. The Chair invited interventions from the floor, but none were made.

Agenda Item 16. Closure of the Meeting

233. Mr Ramírez thanked participants who came to Bonn or attended online for their high level of enthusiasm and engagement, and thanked Ms Papazoglou for her excellent work in preparing the meeting and all the documents. From the CMS Secretariat, he also thanked Ms Ximena Cancino, who organised the documents and logistics, Mr Tilman Schneider, CMS Avian team, for his active support, and Mr Aydin Bahramlouian, Head of Communications, for coordinating social media communications. He also thanked Mr Yong June Kim and the other interns for their strong support, and Mr Tim Dodman, report writer. He appreciated the close cooperation with the Bern Convention through Ms Medlinska, and commended the roles of Mr Schmidt, Ms Aradis and Ms Nozadze in steering the meeting successfully.
234. Ms Medlinska acknowledged the strong support of all colleagues in preparing and running the Joint Meeting and hoped that this cooperation would continue. She thanked the Chair and vice-Chair for running the meeting very smoothly and Ms Nozadze for her support online. She also thanked the interpreters, with whom she had been in regular direct contact, and the interns.
235. The Chair thanked the CMS and Bern Convention Secretariat staff, who provided significant support before and during the meeting, and commended everyone for their active participation. It had been inspiring to follow the accomplishments and progress in each country against IKB. He thanked Croatia for offering to host the next joint physical meeting. He highlighted that the interpreters deserved gratitude for their hard work, as well as the technical support team. He thanked Ms Nozadze for her support online, and for sharing the online interventions, and Ms Aradis for her support as vice-Chair and in drawing up the conclusions. The Chair also thanked Mr Oliver Schall in advance, who had organised and would lead the meeting field trip. He wished the Bern Convention expert meeting good success and safe travels to everyone for their return home, and declared the 5th Joint Meeting closed.

Annex 1. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Family name	Given name	Organization represented	
MIKT MEMBERS AND/OR SFPs OF THE BERN CONVENTION			
ALBANIA			
Marika	Klodiana	Ministry of Tourism and Environment	
Vardhami	Edit	Ministry of Tourism and Environment	
ALGERIA			
Djaballah	Wassila	Ministry of Agriculture, Rural Development and Fishing	
*Mouhoubi	Fifi	Ministry of Agriculture, Rural Development and Fishing	
BULGARIA			
Georgiev	Valeri	Ministry of Environment and Water	
CROATIA			
Mršić	Una	Ministry of Environmental Protection and Green Transition	
Polić	Maja	State Inspectorate	

Family name	Given name	Organization represented	
CYPRUS			
Panayides	Panicos	Game & Fauna Service, Ministry of the Interior	
EGYPT			
*Zonkle	Luay	Ministry of Environment	
FRANCE			
De Barsac	Charles-Henri	Ministry of Ecological Transition and Territorial Cohesion	
GEORGIA			
Chkhobadze	Maia	Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture	
*Nozadze	Salome	Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture	
GERMANY			
Gewert	Berit	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Climate Action, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety	
GREECE			
Agapitou	Kalomoira	Ministry of Environment and Energy	

Family name	Given name	Organization represented	
*Stergiou	Anastasia	Ministry of Environment and Energy	
Schmidt	András	Ministry of Agriculture	
Aradis	Arianna	ISPRA/MASE	
*Piusi	Laura Marianna	Carabinieri	
ISRAEL			
*Nemtsov	Simon	Nature and Parks Authority	
*Rosenberg	Ben	Nature and Parks Authority	
MALTA			
*Fenech	Jessica	Wild Birds Regulation Unit	
MONTENEGRO			
Sijarić Dečević	Anela	Ministry of Ecology, Sustainable Development and Northern Region Development	

Family name	Given name	Organization represented	
MOROCCO			
Noaman	Mohamed	National Agency for Waters and Forests	
POLAND			
Wyżyński	Wiktor	General Directorate for Environmental Protection	
PORTUGAL			
Arêde	Rui	Institute for Nature Conservation and Forests	
Loureiro	João	Institute of Nature Conservation and Forests	
SLOVENIA			
*Rom	Nastja	Administrative Unit	
*Šoštar Pirš	Nuša	Inspectorate for Natural Resources	
SPAIN			
*Moreno-Opo	Rubén	Ministry for Ecological Transition and Demographic Challenge	
SWEDEN			

Family name	Given name	Organization represented	
*Bednarz	Louise	Swedish Environmental Protection Agency	
TÜRKIYE			
Ogunc	Cengiz	General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks, Ministry of Agriculture and Forest	
*Tatar	Burak	General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks, Ministry of Agriculture and Forest	
UNITED KINGDOM			
Brickett	Kate	Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs	
Wheatley	Hannah	Joint Nature Conservation Committee	
OBSERVER ORGANISATION TO MIKT OR BERN CONVENTION			
*Abdulhamid Sherif	Nadia	Nature Conservation Egypt	
*Al Nouri	Osama	International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW)	
*Al Taq	Muna	BirdLife International – Middle East	
*Andevski	Jovan	Vulture Conservation Foundation	
*Arzel	Celine	Oiseaux Migrateurs du Paléarctique Occidental	

Family name	Given name	Organization represented	
*Atrash	Imad	Palestine Wildlife Society	
Barabas	Lilla	BirdLife International	
*Barbara	Nicholas	BirdLife Malta	
Biber	Olivier	UNEP/CMS/AEMLAP	
Böing	Hannah	LIFE EUROKITE / TB Raab GmbH	
*Bourass	Khadija	GREPOM/BirdLife Morocco	
*Brust	Vera	Nature and Biodiversity Conservation Union	
*Clavero Sousa	Helena	International Union for Conservation of Nature	
*Crockford	Nicola	BirdLife International	
Dami	Laura	Research Institute of Tour du Valat	
*De la Bodega	David	SEO/BirdLife	
Dereliev	Sergey	UNEP/AEWA Secretariat	
*Duro	Klea	Albanian Ornithological Society	

Family name	Given name	Organization represented	
*Espinosa	Sol	BirdLife International	
Ferger	Stefan	EuroNatur Foundation	
*Frey	Amelie	Europol	
*Ghazal Asswad	Nabegh	Syrian Society for the Conservation of Wildlife / International Fund for Animal Welfare-MENA	
*Griffin	Alexander	European Federation for Hunting and Conservation	
*Hussein	Mohamed	Nature Conservation Egypt	
Jones	Vicky	BirdLife International	
Lee	Samantha	BirdLife International	
*Lekic	Justin Marija	Center for Protection and Research of Birds / BirdLife Montenegro	
Lewis	Melissa	AEWA Secretariat	
*Martinko Ivanov	Marija	Association Biom / BirdLife Croatia	
*Mikuska	Tibor	Croatian Society for Birds and Nature Protection	

Family name	Given name	Organization represented	
*Ngari	Alex	BirdLife International	
*Ozsanlav-Harris	Luke	BirdLife International	
*Obretenova	Iva	European Commission	
Raab	Rainer	LIFE EUOKITE / TB Raab GmbH	
*Scallan	David	European Federation for Hunting and Conservation	
*Shialis	Tassos	BirdLife Cyprus	
Słociński	Bolesław	Association Biom / BirdLife Croatia	
Spaar	Reto	AEMLAP, Coordination Unit	
*Tuailon	Elisa	Research Institute of Tour du Valat	
*Van Asch	Edward	CITES Secretariat	
Van den Bossche	Willem	BirdLife International	
Vansynghel	Justine	EuroNatur	
*Van Vossel	Bart	European Network of Prosecutors for the Environment	

Family name	Given name	Organization represented	
*Xhaho	Marina	Protection and Preservation of Natural Environment in Albania	
INVITED EXPERTS			
*Bacchereti	Simona	European Climate, Infrastructure and Environment Executive Agency (CINEA)	
Harrison	Mark	UK National Wildlife Crime Unit	
*Lucić	Vedran	Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund – Mediterranean Regional Implementation Team	
Schall	Oliver	Nature conservation expert	
Toledano Zapater	Carlos	Guardia Civil - SEPRONA	
CMS AND BERN CONVENTION SECRETARIATS			
*Amengual	José (Pep)	Bern Convention-Council of Europe	
Besek	Nikola	CMS Secretariat	
Cancino Ordenes	Ximena	CMS Secretariat	
Dodman	Tim	CMS Secretariat - Report writer	

Family name	Given name	Organization represented	
Doucet	Zakiah Emilie	CMS Secretariat	
*Gallo-Orsi	Umberto	CMS Secretariat – Raptors MOU	
Jahan	Damien	CMS Secretariat	
Kim	Yong June	CMS Secretariat	
Klasen	Nora	CMS Secretariat	
Medlinska	Marta	Bern Convention - Council of Europe	
Monfort	Aude-Valérie	Conference Interpreter - Council of Europe	
Ortiz	Maria Jose	CMS Secretariat	
Papazoglou	Foteini (Claire)	CMS Secretariat	
Ramírez	Fernando Iván	CMS Secretariat	
Rosen	Tanya	CMS Secretariat	
Schneider	Tilman	CMS Secretariat	
Wakenhut	Gillian	Conference Interpreter - Council of Europe	

*Attendance online