

**BIENNIAL REPORT
(2015 - 2016)**

REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA

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 2015 – 2016 the inspectors of the State Ecological Inspectorate did not identify 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, circumstances, time and place under which exception is 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

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

relevant)
Comments/notes

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, circumstances, time and place under which exception is granted
The controls involved
Justification for derogation for a species in an unfavourable conservation status
Alternative solutions considered

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

and scientific data to compare them
Results of derogations (e.g. Cumulative effects and compensation measures where relevant)
Comments/notes

EXCEPTIONS CONCERNING FALCONRY

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

Falconry in Moldova is not practiced.

The Draft of the Hunting and Hunting Fund Law, approved by Parliament on 12 October 2018, in the first reading, contains the provisions that will allow the use of predatory birds in hunting

Name of species:	
No. of birds in captivity (after the Convention takes effect)	
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 L	-	Government Decision nr.655 of 15.08.2014	iv	No
Capreolus capreolus	1	Government Decision nr.495 of 12.08.2015	iv	No
Meles meles L.	1		iv	No

Where appropriate, please add a text providing information on:

Information on the conservation status of the derogated species	<p>The species Meles meles is included in Annex 3 to the Law no. nr. 1538 -XIII of 1998 of State Natural Protected Areas Fund Category monuments of nature, strictly protected fauna, not endangered species.</p> <p>In Moldova were signaled 800-1000 specimens of Meles meles</p> <p>Capreolus capreolus is not protected by Law 1538/1998. However, pursuant to point 34 of the Hunting Regulation, Annex 1 to the Animal Kingdom Law No.439-XIII of April 27, 1995, Government annual sets hunting terms. Thus, for the hunting seasons 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 it was forbidden to hunt for the</p>
---	--

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

	entire hunting season for the Cervidae and in the background of state-protected natural areas.
The authority empowered to declare that the conditions have been fulfilled	The Ministry of Agriculture, Regional Development and Environment Agency „MOLDSILVA”
Conditions of risk, circumstances, time and place under which exception is granted	
The controls involved	The State Ecological Inspectorate
Justification for derogation for a species in an unfavourable conservation status	Extracting of one single specimen of <i>Meles meles</i> L. and <i>Capreolus capreolus</i> was performed in order to complete the animal 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>Meles meles</i> from the environment on 2015
Comments/notes	<p>In Moldova the <i>Meles meles</i> inhabits almost all the forests, mainly the center zone of the Codri with hilly relief, as well as the meadow forests in the Nistru river and the Prut river. Average density - 0.3 individuals per km². In the Plaiul Fagului reserve - 0.5-0.6 individuals per km².</p> <p>In 2015, it was not possible to harvest a specimen of <i>Meles meles</i>. For these reasons in 2016 by the Government Decision No. 495 of 12.08.2015 it was allowed to extract a badger.</p> <p>The <i>Capreolus capreolus</i> in the Republic of Moldova is present in all the forests in the northern and central areas, partly in the south, including the wet valleys of the Prut and Nistru. There are territories, especially in the northern part of Moldavia, where small populations of <i>Capreolus capreolus</i> are encountered, usually in the old forests.</p> <p>It is a common species, but under current conditions it becomes a rarity. Causes of diminished herd are: poaching, heavy winters, stray dogs, human disturbance.</p>

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