

Strasbourg, 25 November 2015

CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF EUROPEAN WILDLIFE
AND NATURAL HABITATS

Standing Committee

35th meeting
Strasbourg, 1-4 December 2015

BIENNIAL REPORT (2011-2012)

- REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA -

*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*

REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA
2011- 2012

**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 |
|---------------------|--|-----------------|---|----------------------|
| | | | | |

During the period of 2011 – 2012 by the inspectors of the State Ecological Inspectorate was not identified the exceptions concerning strictly protected flora species

| |
|---|
| 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 |
|---------------------|--|---|-----------------|---|----------------------|
| | | | | | |

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 |

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

3. EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING FALCONRY

The Falconry species in the Republic of Moldova are protected by state.

The Falconry in Moldova is not practiced.

| | |
|--|--|
| 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 | |

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 |
|---------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------|
| Meles meles | - | Government Decision nr. 606 of 15.08.2012 | iv | No |

Where appropriate, please add a text providing information on:

| | |
|---|---|
| Information on the conservation status of the derogated species | The species Meles meles is included in Annex 3 to the Law no. 1538 -XIII of 1998 of State Natural Protected Areas Fund Category monuments of nature, strictly protected fauna, not endangered species. In Moldova were signaled 800-1000 of specimens of Melis melis |
|---|---|

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 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 | It was allowed to harvest a specimen of <i>Melis melis</i> (male) in order to complete the fauna collections of the National Museum of Ethnography and Natural History |
| Alternative solutions considered and scientific data to compare them | |
| Results of derogations (e.g. Cumulative effects and compensation measures where relevant) | Failed to extract one specimen of <i>Melis melis</i> from the environment |
| 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 |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | | | | | |

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