

Strasbourg, 28 October 2015

CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF EUROPEAN WILDLIFE
AND NATURAL HABITATS

Standing Committee

35th meeting
Strasbourg, 1-4 December 2015

BIENNIAL REPORT (2009-2010)

- ESTONIA -

*Memorandum drawn up by
the Directorate of Democratic Governance
The document is being circulated in the form and the languages in which it was received by the Secretariat*

BIENNIAL REPORT 2009 -2010

ESTONIA

1. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING STRICTLY PROTECTED FLORA SPECIES (ART. 5 - APPENDIX I)

Name of the species	No. of specimens involved (when practical)	No. of licences	Reasons for issuing of licences (art. 9, i. to v.) ¹	Impact on population

Where appropriate, please add a text providing information on:

Information on the conservation status of the derogated species
The authority empowered to declare that the conditions have been fulfilled
Conditions of risk and the circumstances and the time and place under which exception where granted
The controls involved
Justification for derogation for a species in an unfavourable conservation status
Alternative solutions considered and scientific data to compare them
Results of derogations (e.g. Cumulative effects and compensation measures where relevant)
Comments/notes

¹ i.: protection of flora /fauna
ii.: prevention of serious damage to crops, livestock, forests, fisheries, water and other forms of property
iii.: in the interests of public health and safety, air safety or other overriding public interests (which?)
iv.: for research / education / repopulation / reintroduction / necessary breeding
v.: judicious exploitation of certain wild plants in small numbers and under certain conditions

2. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING STRICTLY PROTECTED FAUNA SPECIES (ART. 6 - APPENDIX II)

Name of the species	No. of specimens involved (when practical)	Authorised action (art. 6, a. to f.) ²	No. of licences	Reasons for issuing of licences (art. 9, i. to v.) ³	Impact on population
Bufo calamita 2010	20	c	1	iv	none
Canis lupus 2009	108	a	140	ii, iii	Population slightly decreasing
Canis lupus 2010	125	a	135	ii, iii	Population stable
Ursus arctos 2009	45	a	60	ii	Population stable
Ursus arctos 2010	57	a	60	ii	Population stable
Branta leucopsis 2009	1085	a	1085	ii	none
Branta leucopsis 2010	2887	a	2887	ii	

Where appropriate, please add a text providing information on:

Information on the conservation status of the derogated species	<p>Bufo calamita is in II protective category in Estonia. Species is in unfavourable conservation status.</p> <p>Canis lupus and Ursus arctos – species are not protected but population is closely surveyed and managed according to large carnivore management plans. Populations are in favourable conservation status.</p> <p>Branta leucopsis is in III protective category in Estonia. Population is increasing.</p>
The authority empowered to declare that the conditions have been fulfilled	Environmental Board
Conditions of risk and the circumstances and the time and place under which exception where granted	<p>Bufo calamita – 20 juveniles were captured to create reserve population to maintain genetic variability, carry out breeding in artificial conditions and get material for future reintroductions to increase population number.</p> <p>Canis lupus – derogation is granted to decrease damage to livestock and in the interests of public health and safety</p> <p>Ursus arctos – derogation is granted to decrease damage to crops, livestock and other forms of property.</p> <p>Branta leucopsis – derogation is granted to decrease damage to crops.</p>

² A: Deliberate killing
 B: Deliberate damage to or destruction of breeding or resting sites
 C: Deliberate capture and keeping
 D: Deliberate disturbance of wild fauna
 E: Deliberate destruction or taking of eggs
 F: Possession and internal trade

³ i.: protection of flora /fauna
 ii.: prevention of serious damage to crops, livestock, forests, fisheries, water and other forms of property
 iii.: in the interests of public health and safety, air safety or other overriding public interests (which?)
 iv.: for research / education / repopulation / reintroduction / necessary breeding
 v.: judicious exploitation of certain wild plants in small numbers and under certain conditions

The controls involved	Surveillance is carried out by Environmental Inspectorate.
Justification for derogation for a species in an unfavourable conservation status	B. calamita – derogation is granted to create reserve population and increase population size in source population.
Alternative solutions considered and scientific data to compare them	Damage to crops by B. leucopsis, damage to livestock by C. lupus and U. arctos and damage to beehives by U. arctos is compensated by state. B. calamita egg-strings are hatched and tadpoles grown to metamorphosis in semi artificial conditions in wild (in predation free cages), this has been not sufficient to increase the population, so reserve population in artificial conditions was created.
Results of derogations (e.g. Cumulative effects and compensation measures where relevant)	Canis lupus, Ursus arctos, Branta leucopsis – no effect on population size. Trouble specimens are removed, compensations reduce the conflict between farmers and these species.
Comments/notes	

3. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING FALCONRY

For each species used in falconry, state (use a separate sheet for each species):

Name of species:	
No. of birds in captivity (after entry force of the Convention)	
Origin of birds:	
% captured from the wild in the State	
% imported	
% reared in captivity	
Estimated population in the wild (in the State)	
No. of birds captured from the wild each year	
No. of birds imported (specify country of origin)	
Means authorised for capture	
Controls involved	

4. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING PROTECTED FAUNA SPECIES (ART. 7 APPENDIX III)⁴

Name of the species	No. of individuals involved (when practical)	Exception made	Reasons for issuing of licences (art. 9, i. to v.) ⁵	Impact on the population

Where appropriate, please add a text providing information on:

Information on the conservation status of the derogated species
The authority empowered to declare that the conditions have been fulfilled
Conditions of risk and the circumstances and the time and place under which exception where granted
The controls involved
Justification for derogation for a species in an unfavourable conservation status
Alternative solutions considered and scientific data to compare them
Results of derogations (e.g. Cumulative effects and compensation measures where relevant)
Comments/notes

5. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING THE USE OF MEANS OF CAPTURE AND KILLING SPECIFIED IN APPENDIX IV

Name of the species	No. of specimens (when practical)	No. of licences	Reasons (art. 8, a. to e.) ⁶	Method used ⁷	Impact on the population

⁴ Kindly note that exceptions to species listed in Appendix III concern only those captured or killed using indiscriminate means of capture or killing and in particular methods specified in Appendix IV.

⁵ i.: protection of flora /fauna
 ii.: prevention of serious damage to crops, livestock, forests, fisheries, water and other forms of property
 iii.: in the interests of public health and safety, air safety or other overriding public interests (which?)
 iv.: for research / education / repopulation / reintroduction / necessary breeding
 v.: judicious exploitation of certain wild plants in small numbers and under certain conditions

⁶ A. Protection of flora and fauna
 B. To prevent serious damage to crops, livestock, forests, fisheries, water and other forms of property
 C. In the interests of public health and safety / air safety / overriding public interests
 D. For research / education / repopulation / reintroduction / necessary breeding
 E. Taking, keeping or other judicious exploitation of certain wild animals and plants in small numbers and under certain conditions (see art. 8)

⁷ Choose from article 8 : 1 to 18 – See for reference pages 6-7 of this document