

Strasbourg, 26 October 2015

CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF EUROPEAN WILDLIFE  
AND NATURAL HABITATS

**Standing Committee**

35<sup>th</sup> meeting  
Strasbourg, 1-4 December 2015

---

**BIENNIAL REPORT (2011-2012)**

**- 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 2011 -2012

### 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.) <sup>1</sup>	Impact on population
Thesium ebracteatum (2011)	>10 seeds (2-3 seed capsules)	1	IV	none
Angelica palustris (2011)	>10 seeds (seeds from 2 compound umbels)	1	IV	none

Where appropriate, please add a text providing information on:

Information on the conservation status of the derogated species	Thesium ebracteatum – favourable conservation status Angelica palustris – unfavourable, inadequate conservation status
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	Derogations were granted for research and education reasons, seeds will be sown in university botanical garden for research and education reasons.
The controls involved	Surveillance is carried out by Environmental Inspectorate
Justification for derogation for a species in an unfavourable conservation status	Risk of collecting small number of seeds, was assessed to be negligible. Adult plants and habitats were not harmed.

<sup>1</sup> 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

Alternative solutions considered and scientific data to compare them	-
Results of derogations (e.g. Cumulative effects and compensation measures where relevant)	No effect on population size
Comments/notes	

**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.) <sup>2</sup>	No. of licences	Reasons for issuing of licences (art. 9, i. to v.) <sup>3</sup>	Impact on population
Cucujus cinnaberinus 2011	1	A	1	I, IV	none
Graphoderus bilineatus 2011	34	A	1	I, IV	none
Osmoderma eremita 2012	1	A	1	I, IV	none
Canis lupus 2011	154	A	168	II, III	Population increasing
Canis lupus 2012	78	A	99	II, III	Population decreasing
Ursus arctos 2011	53	A	65	II	none
Ursus arctos 2012	55	A	60	II	none
Branta leucopsis 2011	2005	A	2005	II	increasing
Branta leucopsis 2012	1112	A	1112	II	stable

<sup>2</sup> 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

<sup>3</sup> 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

Where appropriate, please add a text providing information on:

Information on the conservation status of the derogated species	<p>Cucujus cinnaberinus – unfavourable inadequate conservation status, species is legally protected</p> <p>Graphoderus bilineatus – favourable conservation status, species is legally protected</p> <p>Osmoderma eremita – unfavourable inadequate conservation status, species is legally protected</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 legally protected 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>Cucujus cinnaberinus: derogations were granted for protection of fauna and for research and education reasons. During species monitoring one specimen was killed in non discriminative trap. Gathered data will be used to improve habitat protection.</p> <p>Graphoderus bilineatus: derogations were granted for protection of fauna and for research and education reasons. During species monitoring specimen were killed in incorrectly placed non discriminative traps. Gathered data will be used to improve habitat protection.</p> <p>Osmoderma eremita: derogations were granted for protection of fauna and for research and education reasons. During species monitoring one specimen was killed in non discriminative trap in previously unknown locality. Gathered data will be used to improve habitat protection.</p> <p>Canis lupus – derogation is granted to decrease damage to livestock and in the 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>
The controls involved	Surveillance is carried out by Environmental Inspectorate
Justification for derogation for a species in an unfavourable conservation status	Cucujus cinnaberinus and Osmoderma eremita: derogation was granted for monitoring protected species with nondiscriminative traps to collect important data for habitat protection and species conservation reasons.
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.
Results of derogations (e.g. Cumulative effects and compensation measures where relevant)	<p>No effect on insects.</p> <p>Canis lupus, Ursus arctos, Branta leucopsis – no effect on population size. Trouble specimens are removed, compensations reduce the conflict between farmers and these species.</p>
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 into 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	

#### Falconry is prohibited in Estonia

(Law on Hunting Management, 2013).

### 4. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING PROTECTED FAUNA SPECIES (ART. 7 APPENDIX III)<sup>4</sup>

Name of the species	No. of individuals involved (when practical)	Exception made	Reasons for issuing of licences (art. 9, i. to v.) <sup>5</sup>	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

<sup>4</sup> 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.

<sup>5</sup> 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

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.) <sup>6</sup>	Method used <sup>7</sup>	Impact on the population

<sup>6</sup> 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)

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