Joint Meeting on IKB

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)

(Online 22 October 2026)

UNEP/CMS/MIKT7/Inf.5

SCOREBOARD NARRATIVE 2026

Summary:
The additional narrative for the Scoreboard questions was adopted in 2022 and will be used in the same way in 2026 as in the 2023 Scoreboard exercise.

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.

2023 SCOREBOARD NARRATIVE

Summary:

In order to improve the Contracting Parties' self-assessment of the progress made in the implementation of the *Rome Strategic Plan 2020-2030: Eradicating Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade in Wild Birds in Europe and the Mediterranean region*, in 2022, additional narrative text to support Scoreboard submissions was adopted by the Bern Convention Standing Committee at its 42nd meeting and by MIKT members in Valencia in June 2022 at MIKT5.

This document contains the original Scoreboard text, as well as the additional narrative text which is visible in red.

IKB Scoreboard

Assessment template[1]

Country	
Date of assessment	
Reporting period	
Contact person	
Contact details	

1 Once completed and published, this scoreboard shall not be used in relation to any Treaty compliance process.

A. National monitoring of IKB – data management of scope and scale of IKB.

1. Status and scale of IKB

The extent to which data and information on illegal activities at national level are available.

Question: What is the quality of national data about IKB?

Measurement:

0 □	1 □	2 □	3 □
□ Data and information on number of totals of birds illegally killed or taken due to IKB **are not available.**	□ National estimate of birds illegally killed or taken due to IKB is based **on expert opinion**[2] and anecdotal information.	□ National estimate of birds illegally killed or taken due to IKB is based **partially on quantitative data** and records and partially on estimates and extrapolation.	□ National estimates of birds illegally killed or taken due to IKB is based largely on **quantitative data** and records.

Comments:

2 Expert Opinion is defined as: the knowledge of whom by virtue of special knowledge, skill, training, or experience is qualified to provide information in matters that exceed the common knowledge of ordinary people.

2. Number, distribution and trend of illegally killed, trapped or traded birds

The extent, trend, seasonal and geographic distribution of illegally killed, trapped or traded birds in your country including relevant overseas territories[3].

Question: How many birds and in which season are estimated to be illegally killed, trapped or traded every year in your country including relevant overseas territories? What is the trend?

Measurement: Number of birds estimated to be illegally killed, trapped or traded every year

	March / May	June / August	September / November	December / February	Total
National level					
National level (Baseline)					
(region/area/territory)					
[add lines for each region from which data or estimate is available]					

IKB trend over past 3 years	Increasing	Stable	Decreasing	No clear trend
	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments and explanations for data (recommended):

The Rome Strategic Plan (Obj. 1.1.a) states '[…] *the countries, in consultation with stakeholders decide on an approach for using the Scoreboard to set a baseline and a methodology for assessing progress toward achieving the Rome Strategic Plan, […]'* and (Obj. 1.1.b) and *'[…] IKB hotspots are identified and a monitoring system established in each range state'*. Please provide information on the methodology used, if any, to obtain the estimates above. Additionally, please provide information on any monitoring system that is in place. Have you identified any hotspots? Furthermore, please communicate the baseline used to assess progress as per the Rome Strategic Plan and include that baseline in the excel sheet (or table above). If you already answered this question in a previous report, please report only any changes/updates since.

3 Only Overseas Territories within the area covered by the map in Picture 1 where the Bird Directive applies

3. Extent of IKB cases known to national authorities

The extent to which data on illegal activities at national level are available.

Question: Are data on the status and scale of IKB cases available?

Measurement:

0 □	1 □	2 □	3 □
□ Data on IKB cases number and distribution are **not available**. □ Data on IKB cases number and distribution are available but have **not been used** to assess IKB scale and distribution.	□ National estimate on numbers and distribution of cases of IKB **is based entirely on expert opinion** / modelling / other indirect methods	□ National estimates on the scale and distribution of cases of IKB **are extrapolated** on the basis of **partial** IKB disclosed crime statistics	□ National data on IKB cases are available and is **based on official and comprehensive** IKB crime disclosure statistics.

Comments: Brief written justification of the choice (recommended)

4. Number of IKB cases prosecuted in the reporting period.

The extent of cases of IKB prosecuted in the reporting period.

Question: How many IKB cases have been prosecuted in the reporting period in your country?

Details concerning the number of IKB cases prosecuted in the assessment period.

Category of IKB offence	Number of persons prosecuted in the assessment period	Number of bird specimens involved in the offence (specimens seized)
Illegal killing of protected birds (shooting, poisoning, other methods of killing)		
Illegal taking of protected birds (trapping using any means)		
Illegal possession of live / dead protected birds		
Illegal importation or transport of live / dead protected birds		
Illegal taxidermy of protected birds		
Illegal trade in protected birds (including trafficking for sale, marketing for sale of any live or dead protected birds or their parts)		
Serving / offering of protected species in restaurants		
Use of prohibited methods of hunting (bird callers, snares, nets, lights, gas, etc)		
Hunting outside open season or during unpermitted hours		
Hunting without a license, breach of license conditions (e.g. exceedance in hunting quotas, failure to report birds caught, etc)		
Hunting in prohibited areas (game reserves)		
Removal of eggs		
Totals		

Having regard to the Bern Convention draft reporting format for recording of wild bird crime cases[4], as well as to the following working definition of IKB: "Those unlawful[5] activities committed intentionally resulting in the death, injury or removal of specimens[6] of migratory birds from the wild either dead or alive, including their parts or derivatives", respondents should

4https://wcd.coe.int/com.instranet.InstraServlet?command=com.instranet.CmdBlobGet&InstranetImage=2919703&SecMode=1&DocId=2369656&Usage=2

5 "Unlawful" means for this purpose infringing national, regional or international law.

6 "Specimen" means an animal whether dead or alive

indicate the number of cases of IKB-related offences for each offence category disclosed[7] over the assessment period as well as, wherever applicable, the number of bird specimens involved in the offence.

In case an offence was committed by a group of persons, the number of offences to be reported in the second column of the above table should be multiplied by the number of persons involved / prosecuted for that offence.

In case a single person faced multiple charges for different offence categories (for instance illegal killing of a protected bird and using prohibited methods of hunting), such case should be reported under each offence category for which that person has been charged / prosecuted.

Additional Comments (recommended):

The Rome Strategic Plan (Obj.5.4.b) states '*Establish case law databases, including information on the judicial processes and make the data publicly available'*.

Please include information on whether a national wildlife crime (IKB) database (and/or case law database) exists and if this is accessible to the public. Please provide information on whether such a database includes the fields included in the excel sheet (or table above) and if it includes additional information on prosecutions such as: what species were involved in the offence, what was the penalty or sanction applied, the duration of the case from discovery to prosecution. If such a database exists can the following indicators be calculated from it? For example, the ratio of prosecutions to convictions in IKB cases, the number of arrests compared to the number of prosecutions for IKB cases, the ratio of reported incidences over investigated cases of IKB; the relevance of seizures and arrests in relation to enforcement effort; average time to investigate cases. If such a database does not exist, please explain the reasons preventing your authorities from having one. If you already reported on these national mechanisms in the previous scoreboard, please report only any changes/updates since.

7 "Disclosed" implies cases of IKB offences where sufficient material evidence was collected to enable identification of suspects and prosecution of the offence in accordance with the applicable criminal or administrative proceedings.

B. Comprehensiveness of national legislation

5. National wildlife legislation[8]

The comprehensiveness of national legislative provisions in force for wildlife conservation, management and use, including prohibition of IKB

Question: Does comprehensive national legislation[9] for wildlife conservation exist, including provisions to regulate international trade in wildlife or its products?

Measurement:

0 □	1 □	2 □	3 □
National wildlife legislation: □ Has not been enacted	National wildlife legislation: □ Does **not have** adequate provisions to deter and combat IKB □ Is **not** supported by suitable legislation framework and/or regulations	National wildlife legislation: □ **Has** adequate provisions to deter and combat IKB. □ Is **not** supported by suitable legislation framework and/or regulations	National wildlife legislation: □ Has adequate provisions to deter and combat IKB □ **Is supported** by suitable legislation framework and/or regulations

Comments:

8 This indicator corresponds to indicator 28 in the ICCWC Indicator Framework

9 The comprehensiveness of provisions in all relevant national legislation should be considered when answering this question. In general, domestic laws pertaining to the wildlife sector should, at a minimum, set out rules for the following aspects:
• Ownership over wildlife, that is, State-ownership, private property rights, rights of indigenous people or native title;
• Designation of government agencies to oversee and regulate the wildlife sector, administrative processes and so forth;
• Game reserves and hunting areas, including the identification of the areas where subsistence, commercial or leisure hunting is prohibited or permitted;
• Licence systems for leisure and commercial hunting, including conditions for granting, renewing and cancelling hunting licences;
• Transport and import/export rules to control the movement of wildlife, dead or alive, animal parts and products made from wildlife across the country and across international borders; and
• Offences for violations of domestic wildlife laws and enforcement measures

6. Regulated use

The comprehensiveness of national legislation concerning sustainable use of wildlife including hunting.

Question: Through which measures and controls do national legislation regulate the killing and taking of wild birds?

Measurement:

0 □	1 □	2 □	3 □
National legislation: □ Does **not specifically** regulate hunting of birds from conservation / sustainable use points of view. Some legislation concerning hunting of birds may exist, however it mainly addresses the activity from arms control / public safety points of view and does not delve into wildlife conservation issues	National legislation: □ Concerning hunting exists and sets **basic parameters** that apply to various huntable species including birds: □ Establishes and defines hunting seasons □ Lists species that can be hunted □ Regulates methods of hunting	National legislation: □ Concerning hunting exists separately from national legislation concerning conservation of wildlife and lays down **comprehensive provisions** concerning: □ Establishing and defining hunting seasons □ Listing species that can be hunted □ Defining hunting areas. □ Regulating and defining which methods are allowed for hunting □ Providing for effective authorization mechanism and criteria for obtaining a hunting licence □ Establishing bag limits and quotas for huntable species □ Providing for basic hunting bag reporting requirements □ Controls related to implementation	National legislation: □ Concerning hunting is **fully integrated** within national conservation of wildlife legislation therefore ensuring the taking into account of biological and conservation aspects in hunting-related decisions and lays down **comprehensive provisions** concerning: □ Establishment and definition of hunting seasons □ Listing species that can be hunted □ Definition of hunting areas □ Regulation and definition of which methods are allowed for hunting □ Provision for appropriate authorization mechanism and criteria for obtaining a hunting license, including requirements for compulsory examination of hunting license applicants □ Establishment of bag limits and quotas for huntable species on the basis of biological and conservation considerations □ Provision for the timely collection of hunting bag data and reporting mechanisms

			□ Controls related to implementation, including enforcement (for instance providing enforcement powers to game wardens, park rangers, hunting marshals etc)

Comments: Brief written justification of the choice (recommended):

The Rome Strategic Plan (Obj.3.1.a) states '[…] *undertake an expert assessment of national legislation addressing IKB in each range state to identify possible gaps'*. Have you undertaken this assessment and if yes, what is your conclusion? Do you require support to complete the assessment?

7. Prohibitions under national legislation

The extent of activities forbidden under national legislation

Question: To what extent does national legislation make the killing, taking and trade of wild birds illegal?

Measurement:

0 □	1 □	2 □	3 □
National legislation does **not generally**[10] forbid: □ Deliberate killing of wild birds □ Taking of wild birds □ The use of means such as nets, traps, lime sticks, sound-devices, etc for capturing birds □ Possession[11] of live or dead wild birds or their parts □ Importation or transport of wild birds or their derivatives □ Sale of wild birds	National legislation **generally prohibits**: □ Deliberate killing of wild birds □ Taking of wild birds	National legislation **generally prohibits**: □ Deliberate killing of wild birds □ Taking of wild birds □ The use of means such as nets, traps, lime sticks, sound-devices, etc. for capturing birds	National legislation **generally prohibits**: □ Deliberate killing of wild birds □ Taking of wild birds □ The use of means such as nets, traps, lime sticks, sound-devices, etc. for capturing birds □ Possession of live or dead wild birds or their parts □ Importation or transport of wild birds or their derivatives □ Sale of wild birds

Comments:

10 General prohibition may be subject to regulated exemptions that are subject of the next question
11 The legal definition of 'possession' may vary with countries. Please refer to your national legislation.

8. Exceptions under national legislation

The extent of regulatory scrutiny concerning any authorisation of exemptions

Question: To what extent does national legislation make it possible to authorize exemptions from the general prohibitions outlined in the answer to previous question?

Measurement:

0 □	1 □	2 □	3 □
National law: □ Makes it possible for authorization of exemptions involving **any or some** activities that are generally prohibited under national legislation □ Does not include specific criteria or processes for granting / monitoring such exemptions	National law: □ Makes it possible for authorization of exemptions involving **some** of the activities generally prohibited under national legislation □ Defines the basic criteria upon which such exemptions can be granted by the responsible authority; however, such criteria for granting exemptions **do not correspond** to the criteria for exemptions stipulated in Bern Convention[12] / CMS[13] / EU Birds Directive[14] (for EU MS only) □ Does not include specific regulatory mechanism for monitoring / reporting upon exemptions granted	National law: □ Makes it possible for authorization of exemptions involving **some** of the activities generally prohibited under national legislation □ Defines **comprehensive criteria** upon which such exemptions can be granted by the responsible authority; such criteria **correspond** to the criteria for exemptions stipulated in Bern Convention / CMS / EU Birds Directive (for EU MS only) □ Does not include specific regulatory mechanism for monitoring / reporting upon exemptions granted	National law: □ Makes it possible for authorization of exemptions involving **some** of the activities generally prohibited under national legislation □ Defines **comprehensive criteria** upon which such exemptions can be granted by the responsible authority; such criteria **correspond** to criteria for exemptions stipulated in Bern Convention / CMS / EU Birds Directive (for EU MS only) □ Establishes, for **each** exemption granted on an annual basis, a specific regulatory mechanism that ensures strict supervision of compliance, monitoring and reporting □ Requires that data on all exemptions granted, is compiled on an annual basis and is publically available including information on affected

12 Article 9 of the Bern Convention states that: "Each Contracting Party may make exceptions from the provisions of Articles 4, 5, 6, 7 and from the prohibition of the use of the means mentioned in Article 8 provided that there is no other satisfactory solution and that the exception will not be detrimental to the survival of the population concerned". An interpretation document of art.9 of the Conventions is available https://wcd.coe.int/com.instranet.InstraServlet?command=com.instranet.CmdBlobGet&InstranetImage=1952251&SecMode=1&DocId=1646536&Usage=2

13 Article III.5 of CMS states that: Parties that are Range States of a migratory species listed in Appendix I shall prohibit the taking of animals belonging to such species. Exceptions may be made to this prohibition" under clearly defined conditions listed in the article.

14 A limited number of activities normally prohibited under the Birds Directive (2009/147/EC) (Articles 5-8) are permissible by way of derogations, where particular problems or situations exist or may arise. The possibilities for use of these derogations are limited. They must be justified in relation to the overall objectives of the Directive and comply with the specific conditions for derogations described in Article 9.

			species, number of specimens, justification, the responsible authorities, permitting and licensing procedures, compliance monitoring and supervision

Comments:

9. Sanctions and penalties

The extent to which penalties for IKB are comprehensive

Question: What penalties and sanctions are imposed by law regarding the illegal killing, taking and trade of wild birds?

Measurement:

0 □	1 □	2 □	3 □
National legislation: □ Does **not specifically** describe IKB-related offences and does not foresee specific penalties for such offences □ Does **not specifically** penalize IKB-related offences unless these are coupled with breaches of other legislation such as arms control laws	National legislation: □Provides **basic description(s)** of IKB-related offences that encompass illegal killing, trapping and trade of wild birds □ Stipulates **maximum** penalties for most IKB-related offences **but does not stipulate a minimum penalty** □ Provides for a **limited spectrum** of criminal and administrative sanctions including: □ Fines □ Imprisonment (usually suspended jail terms in the most severe cases IKB) □ Suspension of license. □ Confiscation of *corpus delicti*	National legislation: □ Provides a **comprehensive description(s)** of specific IKB-related offences that encompass illegal killing, trapping, trade, possession, transport, importation and taxidermy of wild birds □ Stipulates **both the minimum and a maximum penalty** for some categories of offences □ Provides for a **wide spectrum** of criminal and administrative sanctions including: □ Fines □ Imprisonment (usually suspended jail terms in the most severe cases IKB) □ Suspension of license. □ Confiscation of *corpus delicti* □ Permanent revocation of licence □ Community service □ Other sanctions	National legislation: □ Provides a **comprehensive description(s)** of specific IKB-related offences that encompass illegal killing, trapping, trade, possession, transport, importation and taxidermy of wild birds □ Stipulates **both the minimum and a maximum penalty for all offence categories** except those where a level of penalty is fixed permanently in the law □ Provides for a **full spectrum** of criminal and administrative sanctions including: □ Fines □ Imprisonment (both effective and suspended jail terms are usually automatic for the most severe cases of IKB) □ Suspension of license □ Confiscation of *corpus delicti* □ Permanent revocation of license in the case of IKB involving highly protected birds □ Community service □ Other sanctions

Comments:

10. Proportionality of penalties[15]

The extent to which severity of IKB cases is reflected in the relevant national legislation.

Question: Does national legislation adequately penalize IKB offences?

Measurement:

0 □	1 □	2 □	3 □
Penalties for IKB: □ Only make provision for **administrative** penalties (e.g. fines, bans, suspensions) □ Are **not proportional** to the nature and severity of IKB □ Are **inadequate** as they do not provide an effective deterrent[16]	Penalties for IKB: □ Are prescribed in legislation and provide for criminal prosecution □ **Do not differentiate** offences on the basis of gravity factors, leaving a wide margin of judiciary discretion in the determination of the magnitude of penalties meted out □ Are **inadequate** as they do not provide an effective deterrent	Penalties for IKB: □ Are prescribed in legislation and provide for criminal prosecution □ Provide a penalty structure that **somewhat** reflects severity of offences on the basis of basic gravity factors; however, leaving a wide margin for judiciary discretion □ Are generally seen as providing an **adequate** and proportionate deterrent for most cases of IKB	Penalties for IKB: □ Are prescribed in legislation and provide for criminal prosecution □ **Fully** reflect severity of offences on the basis of gravity factors recommended as part of Bern Convention Tunis Action Plan[17] □ Are generally seen as providing an **adequate** and **proportionate** deterrent for all IKB cases, as evidenced through sustained IKB crime decline (sustained decline in IKB cases observed over at least 3 years) □ Treat wildlife crime offences involving organized criminal groups as serious crime[18] carrying a minimum term of four years imprisonment

Comments:

15 This indicator is based on indicator 40 of the ICCWC frame work.

16 Measuring and estimating the effects of criminal sanction on subsequent criminal behaviour is very complex and there is no agreement on the deterrence of sanctions on criminal behaviours. Please make sure you assess here the adequacy of the law, not the effectiveness of the judicial system (which has also an impact on the deterrence of a law). It is therefore a matter of expert opinion, but should be backed by facts to be reported in the 'comments' section.

17 Bern Convention Recommendation N° 177 (2015) on the gravity factors and sentencing principles for the evaluation of offences against birds, and in particular the illegal killing, trapping and trade of wild birds

18 The United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime defines serious crime as conduct constituting an offence punishable by imprisonment for at least four years or a more serious penalty.

11. Use of criminal law[19]

The extent to which a combination of relevant national legislation and criminal law are used to prosecute IKB in support of legislation enacted to combat wildlife crime.

Question: Does national prosecution of IKB cases ensure the highest penalties by taking into account the cross-over elements with other crimes via criminal law[20]?

Measurement:

0 □	1 □	2 □	3 □
Relevant criminal law: □ **Cannot** be applied to IKB offences □ IKB cases are either **not penalized** at all or are penalized **only administratively**	Relevant criminal law: □ Is **rarely** applied to IKB crime cases □ Most IKB cases **except the most severe** are penalized administratively □ Wherever criminal law is evoked in the **most severe** IKB cases, this usually stems from laws unrelated to wildlife conservation, such as arms control or public safety laws	Relevant criminal law: □ Is **sometimes** applied to IKB crime cases □ **Generally** describes which IKB-related offence categories are subject to criminal liability and which categories are subject to administrative sanctions	Relevant criminal law: □ Is **usually** applied in most IKB crime cases, as required □ **Clearly** describes offence categories that are subject to criminal as opposed to administrative liability □ Is supported by **mechanisms that harmonize** wildlife and other key domestic legislation such as criminal law

Comments:

19 This indicator is based on indicator 33 of the ICCWC Indicator Framework

20 Because of the high value of some illegally-traded bird specimens and the involvement of organized crime groups in IKB, mandated maximum fines of legislation enacted to combat wildlife crime often bear little relation to the value of Illegally killed, trapped or traded bird specimens or the severity of the offence. It is therefore important that persons arrested for involvement in IKB whenever possible and appropriate, are charged and tried under a combination of relevant laws that carry the highest penalties. It includes legislative provisions for International cooperation, combating corruption and addressing organized crime. Also includes use of general crime laws that relate to offences such as fraud, conspiracy, possession of weapons and other matters as set out in the national criminal code.

12. Organized crime legislation

The extent to which specific legislation to address organized crime[21] is used to combat IKB

Question: How is national legislation to address organized crime being used in the investigation and prosecution of IKB?

Measurement:

0 □	1 □	2 □	3 □	N/A □
National legislation on organized crime: □ Has not been enacted □ Cannot be used for prosecuting IKB	National legislation on organized crime: □ Is in place but is **rarely** used in IKB cases prosecution □ Does **not** have provision for special investigation methods	National legislation on organized crime □ Is in place and is **sometimes** used in IKB cases □ Special investigation methods used for organized crime are **not available** for IKB cases	National legislation on organized crime: □ Is in place and **used as appropriate** in IKB cases □ Special investigation methods used for organized crime are **applied also** to IKB cases	Not Applicable as the country has no known cases of organized crime

Comments:

21 The United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime defines an organized criminal group as a structured group of three or more persons, existing for a period of time and acting in concert with the aim of committing one or more serious crimes or offences established in accordance with the Convention, in order to obtain, directly or indirectly, a financial or other material benefit.

13. Transposition of international law and commitment to national legislation

The comprehensiveness of national legislative provisions to transpose CMS and Bern Convention obligations regarding IKB, where these are applicable.

Question: To what extent national legislation transposes international obligations regarding IKB made by ratifying the Convention of Migratory Species and/or the Bern Convention?

Measurement:

0 □	1 □	2 □	3 □	N/A □
The country: □ Is **not a member** of CMS □ Is **not a member** of Bern	National legislation for CMS: □ Has **not** been enacted. National legislation for Bern Convention: □ Has **not** been enacted	□ CMS commitments regarding the fight against IKB have been **partially** transposed into the existing national legislation □ Bern Convention commitments regarding the fight against IKB have been **partially** transposed into the existing national legislation □ The country **has** pending / unresolved case files / complaints under Bern Convention related to incorrect or incomplete transposition of the provisions of the Convention into national law	□ CMS commitments regarding the fight against IKB have been **fully** transposed into the existing national legislation □ Bern Convention commitments regarding the fight against IKB have been **fully** transposed into the existing national legislation □ The country **has no** pending / unresolved case files / complaints under Bern Convention related to incorrect transposition of the provisions of the Convention into national law	□ The country is not a Party of one or both Treaties

Comments:

C. Enforcement response: preparedness of law enforcement bodies and coordination of national institutions

14. National Action Plan to combat IKB[22]

The existence of a national strategy or action plan for IKB.

Question: Is there a national action plan or equivalent document to tackle IKB?

Measurement:

0 □	1 □	2 □	3 □
A national IKB action plan: □ Has **not** been developed □ IKB is **not covered** by any other relevant enforcement strategies or action plans	A national IKB action plan: □ is in the process of being developed □ IKB is covered by other relevant enforcement strategies or action plans	A national IKB action plan: □ Has been developed □ Has been adopted by some relevant national enforcement agencies □ Is **not actively** implemented by all relevant enforcement agencies □ Has **not** been regularly updated	A national IKB action plan: □ Has been developed □ Has been adopted by all relevant national enforcement agencies □ Is actively implemented by all relevant enforcement agencies □ Is being monitored and reviewed to ensure it remains up to date

Comments: Brief written justification of the choice (recommended)

Have you undertaken any analysis of existing activities/plans/strategies to determine if and how they deliver against the Rome Strategic Plan objectives and actions?

The Rome Strategic Plan (National IKB Action Plans: action a) states '[…] *develop and adopt National Action Plans on IKB and the mechanism for its implementation when assessed as necessary or develop and adopt other relevant document, implementation tools or mechanisms which includes action to address IKB'*. Have you done an assessment to decide if a National IKB Action Plan or other relevant document, is necessary, and if yes, what is your conclusion? If you are planning to have a NAP on IKB, when do you expect it to be adopted? If you already have an Action Plan or other relevant document, when was it adopted?

Is any dedicated funding allocated to the implementation of a National IKB Action Plan?

22 This indicator corresponds to indicator 3 of the ICCWC framework

15. Enforcement priority[23]

The recognition of combating wildlife crime as a high national level priority.

Question: Is combating IKB identified as a high priority at the national level?

Measurement:

0 □	1 □	2 □	3 □
IKB crime: □ Is **rarely** identified as a high priority among national law enforcement agencies	IKB crime: □ Is **sometimes** identified as a high priority among national law enforcement agencies	IKB crime: □ Is **usually** identified as a high priority among national law enforcement agencies □ Has **not** been formally[24] adopted and/or acknowledged as a high priority	IKB crime: □ Is **usually** identified as a high priority among national law enforcement agencies □ Has been formally adopted and/or acknowledged as a high priority

Comments: Brief written justification of the choice (recommended)

Please also include the list of policing priorities identified to tackle wild bird crimes in your country [following Recommendation No. 171 (2014) if applicable], clarifying by which administrative or legal means the national priorities been established and which bodies and stakeholders were involved in the priority-setting process. If you already reported on policing priorities in the previous scoreboard, please report only any changes/updates since.

23 This indicator is based on indicator 1 of the ICCWC Indicator Framework

24 Formal recognition could include reference to wildlife crime as a priority issue within strategic plan(s), Memoranda of Understanding, public statements by heads of agencies and/or Declarations/Decrees by Heads of State.

16. Stakeholders and policy-making

The level of stakeholder participation to IKB-related policy-making

Question: To what extent and through which means are stakeholders[25] involved in policy-making to address IKB

Measurement:

0 □	1 □	2 □	3 □
Stakeholders' participation **in policy decisions concerning IKB**: □ **Is not envisaged or provided for in the national law** □ **I**s limited and informal, **whenever it may occur on an *ad hoc* basis** □ **Is** largely limited to **provision of basic** information on the policies that **are being** developed	Stakeholders' participation **in policy decisions concerning IKB**: □ **Is envisaged or provided for in the national law, <u>but:</u>** □ Is limited to consultation □ Is achieved through ad hoc meetings as no formal committee is established □ Is achieved via consultation with academics through the national wildlife agency (or similar technical body)	Stakeholders' participation **in policy decisions concerning IKB**: □ **Is envisaged or provided for in the national law, <u>and:</u>** □ Ensures that their inputs are treated as advi**c**e and are taken into consideration in the policy-making process □ Is achieved through formal structures and committees □ **But is however** incomplete as one or more stakeholders' group is not involved or willing to participate	Stakeholders' participation **in policy decisions concerning IKB**: □ **Is envisaged or provided for in the national law, <u>and:</u>** □ Ensures that they are **fully consulted on key policy changes** □ is ensured by formal structures and committees that meet with the appropriate frequency □ Is complete as all **major** stakeholders are involved

Comments: Brief written justification of the choice (recommended). Please also report on existing international networks, platforms and information exchange mechanisms used to maximize cooperation and efficiency in law enforcement, if any. Is there a government committee or other body where stakeholders are invited to participate in decisions and actions against IKB?

25 Stakeholders include the regulated community (i.e. harvesters including hunters, sellers, traders etc. as described in indicator 26), bird conservation NGOs, Academia, and local communities when appropriate

17. Staffing and recruitment[26]

The level of staff resources[27] in national law enforcement agencies to combat wildlife crime.

Question: What staff resources do national law enforcement agencies have to combat IKB?

Measurement:

0 □	1 □	2 □	3 □
Law enforcement agencies: □ Are **significantly** under-staffed □ Are **rarely** able to recruit and/or attract additional staff	Law enforcement agencies: □ **Sometimes** have a full complement of staff □ **Usually** experience staffing[28] and/or skills shortages □ Usually experience recruitment delays and/or difficulties	Law enforcement agencies: □ **Usually** have a full complement of staff, although it has not always kept up with changing wildlife crime trends □ **Sometimes** experience staffing and/or skills shortages □ **Sometimes** experience delays in recruitment and/or difficulties attracting suitably qualified candidates	Law enforcement agencies: □ **Usually** have a full complement of staff, which has generally kept up with changing wildlife crime trends □ **Usually** have an appropriate mix of staff and skills □ **Usually** process recruitment vacancies as they arise with suitably-qualified candidates

Comments: Brief written justification of the choice (recommended)

The Rome Strategic Plan (Obj.4.1.a) states '[…] consult national governments and stakeholders on the existing available enforcement resources […] at the appropriate jurisdictional level' and (Obj. 4.1.c) 'Develop specialised enforcement units dealing with wildlife crime'. Would you consider the available enforcement resources appropriate and adequate? Is there sufficient number of specialised staff for investigating, detecting, carrying out field control, necropsies and other forensic analysis for wildlife crime? Do you have specialised enforcement units dealing with wildlife crime? Are all hotspots in the country controlled?

26 This indicator corresponds to indicator 8 in the ICCWC Indicator Framework

27 Whether the staff level is sufficient of not is matter of expert opinion. Please provide any evidence and rational in the 'Comments' section. Please note that indicator 19 will be dealing with enforcement effort.

28 Staffing includes factors such as whether there is an appropriate mix of full-time, part-time and casual staff; experienced and less experienced staff; and professional, technical, investigative and administrative staff as needed to discharge the required activities

18. Specialized training

The percentage of enforcement officers receiving regular training in IKB-related aspects.

Question: How many of the enforcement officers[29] have received regular training in IKB-related aspects?

Measurement:

0 □	1 □	2 □	3 □
□ None	□ Less than 10%	□ Between 10% and 50%	□ More than 50%

Comments (recommended): Please provide information on how frequently the trainings are organized, the issue covered the number of people involved, who provided the training, etc. Was the training done at national or international level or both? If at international level, please specify. Do IKB-related aspects figure prominently as part of trainings on combating wildlife crime?

The Bern Convention and CMS Convention aim at facilitating exchange of best practices and expertise across the network, and to provide training depending on available resources. Should you be in need of specialised training or cooperation on specific assistance on sentencing and prosecution, please indicate it here.

29 "Enforcement officers" refers in this case to police officers and any other professional involved in the protection and management of wildlife, national parks and natural areas (e.g. rangers, forest guards, game wardens, field enforcement officers).

19. Field enforcement effort

The intensity of efforts devoted by law enforcement agencies to combat IKB.

Question: Is the surveillance effort put in place to combat IKB considered sufficient?

Measurement: .in a scale 1-5, with 5 being the most positive, score the field enforcement effort of the law enforcement agencies in your country

Insufficient to address IKB				*Sufficient to properly address IKB*
1 ☐	**2** ☐	**3** ☐	**4** ☐	**5** ☐

Comments: Please provide further information if available on specific figures such as the number of staff members or person/days per year invested by law enforcement agencies in combating IKB.

Are you using any leading technologies or innovative solutions to aid your enforcement? Please include relevant examples.

D. Prosecution and sentencing - effectiveness of judicial procedures

20. Quality of judicial processes

Effectiveness and efficiency of administration of sanctions for IKB offences

Question: Are sanctions for IKB-related offences administered effectively and efficiently?

Measurement:

0 □	1 □	2 □	3 □
IKB cases: □ Are **not** prosecuted before criminal courts □ Are **not** subject to sanctions under administrative or other penalty regime □ Are not recorded and not accessible to other prosecutors/judges □ Reports by civil society of illegal bird killing or taking are seldom investigated.	IKB cases: □ Usually take[30] over **two years** to conclude in the case of criminal proceedings □ Usually take[31] over six months to conclude in the case of administrative or other penalty regime □ Generally result in over 50% acquittals[32] □ Are handled by general prosecutors and judges **not** specialized in wildlife crime □ Are recorded but not easily accessible to other prosecutors/judges□ Reports by civil society of illegal bird killing or taking are usually investigated.	IKB cases: □ Usually take over **one year** but under two years to conclude in the case of criminal proceedings □ Usually take over **three months** but under six months to conclude in the case of administrative or other penalty regime □ Generally result in **less than 25%** acquittals □ Are mostly handled by general prosecutors and judges that **tend to** specialize in wildlife crime cases □ Are recorded and are accessible to other prosecutors/judges nationally □ Reports by civil society of illegal bird killing or taking are not only usually investigated but evidence and advice from relevant NGOs is regularly accessed and used.	IKB cases: □ Usually take under **one year** to conclude in the case of criminal proceedings □ Usually take under **three months** to conclude in the case of administrative or other penalty regime □ Generally result **in less than 10%** acquittals □ Are **mostly** handled by specialized prosecutors and judges □ Are recorded and accessible to other prosecutors/judges regionally at the geographic scope of the IKB Scoreboard □ Reports by civil society of illegal bird killing or taking are not only usually investigated but evidence and advice from relevant NGOs is frequently accessed and used.

Comments: Brief written justification of the choice (recommended)

30 Duration of criminal cases is measured as a period between the date of the filing of the charges in court and the date of sentencing, but excludes any potential subsequent appeals that may be filed

31 Duration of administrative cases is measured as a period between the date when the offender is served with a notice of an administrative offence and the date of full settlement of such administrative sanction

32 Excluding acquittals made upon consideration of any appeal where applicable

Is the number/percentage of proceedings resulting in penalties and sanctions known? If yes, what is it?

21. Sentencing guidelines[33]

The existence of national guidelines or other principles for the sentencing of offenders convicted for wildlife crime.

Question: Are there clearly-defined national guidelines or provisions in the national legislation for the sentencing of offenders convicted for IKB?

Measurement:

0 □	1 □	2 □	3 □
There are no sentencing guidelines for IKB cases	Sentencing guidelines for IKB cases are under development	Sentencing guidelines for IKB cases have been finalized but not adopted	Sentencing guidelines for IKB cases have been finalized and adopted

Comments: Brief written justification of the choice (recommended).

The Rome Strategic Plan (Obj.5.1.a) states '[…] adopt national sentencing guidelines for IKB (where the National Criminal Code does not contain the judicial requirements related to IKB cases) based on international guidance and recommendations'. If you have sentencing guidelines, are they based on international guidance and recommendations?

33 This indicator is based on indicator 41 of the ICCWC Indicator Framework

22. Judicial awareness[34]

The extent of awareness of wildlife crime among the prosecutors and judges and the appropriateness of the verdicts handed down.

Question: Are prosecutors and judges aware of the serious nature of IKB and are appropriate sentences imposed?

Measurement:

0 □	1 □	2 □	3 □
The prosecutors and judges □ Have **no awareness** of the nature and prevalence of IKB, and the impact and potential profits of wildlife crime □ Have **no awareness** of IKB-related charges □ Usually treat IKB as a **minor offence** □ Do **not** adhere to sentencing guidelines where they exist	The prosecutors and judges: □ Have **limited** awareness of the nature and prevalence of wildlife crime, and the impact and potential profits of wildlife crime □ Have **limited** awareness of wildlife crime-related charges □ Collaborate to deliver verdicts that are **sometimes** appropriate to the nature and severity of the crime □ **Rarely** adhere to sentencing guidelines where they exist	The prosecutors and judges: □ Have **some** awareness of the nature and prevalence of wildlife crime, and the impact and potential profits of wildlife crime □ Have **some** awareness of wildlife crime-related charges □ Collaborate to deliver verdicts that are **usually** appropriate to the nature and severity of the crime □ **Sometimes** adhere to sentencing guidelines where they exist	The prosecutors and judges: □ Are aware of the nature and prevalence of wildlife crime, and the impact and potential profits of wildlife crime □ Have a **high level** of awareness of wildlife crime-related charges □ Collaborate to deliver verdicts that are appropriate to the nature and severity of the crime □ **Routinely** adhere to sentencing guidelines where they exist

Comments: Brief written justification of the choice (recommended).

The Rome Strategic Plan (Obj.5.3.b) states 'Develop and enact a programme to support experience sharing, and capacity-building among prosecutors and judges involved in IKB cases'.

Please also specify if your country put in place the necessary mechanisms for encouraging and facilitating networking, cooperation, and exchanges of information between the investigators and the advisers/prosecutors. Has the cooperation between judiciary and law enforcement official been strengthened at pan-Mediterranean level? If not, please list the reasons/challenges that prevented your authorities from action in this respect. If you already reported on these issues in the previous scoreboard, please report only any changes/updates since your last report.

34 This indicator corresponds to indicator 42 of the ICCWC Indicator Framework

23. Judiciary training

The percentage of environmental prosecutors and judges trained in IKB-related aspects.

Question: How many environmental prosecutors and judges who deal with wildlife crime have received training in IKB-related aspects?

Measurement:

0 □	**1** □	**2** □	**3** □
□ None	□ Less than **10%**	□ Between **10%** and **50%**	□ More than **50%**

Comments: Please provide information on how frequently the trainings are organized, the issue covered the number of people involved, who provided the training, etc

E. Prevention - other instruments used to address IKB

24. International cooperation

The extent to which national governmental institutions take advantage of the international initiatives and working groups on IKB

Question: Do national governmental institutions participate actively in IKB-related international initiatives?

Measurement:

0 □	1 □	2 □	3 □
National government **does not** participate in: □ Meetings of the CMS Intergovernmental Task Force on Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds in the Mediterranean □ Meetings of the Bern Network of Special Focal Points on Eradication of Illegal Killing, Trapping and Trade in Wild Birds □ CITES IKB initiatives □ EU IKB Initiatives □ Any bilateral IKB initiatives	National government participates (less than 50% of meetings in the last 3 years) in: □ Meetings of the CMS Intergovernmental Task Force on Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds in the Mediterranean □ Meetings of the Bern Network of Special Focal Points on Eradication of Illegal Killing, Trapping and Trade in Wild Birds □ CITES IKB initiatives □ EU IKB Initiatives □ Any bilateral IKB initiatives	National government participates (more than 50% of the meeting in the last three years) in: □ Meetings of the CMS Intergovernmental Task Force on Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds in the Mediterranean □ Meetings of the Bern Network of Special Focal Points on Eradication of Illegal Killing, Trapping and Trade in Wild Birds □ CITES IKB initiatives □ EU IKB Initiatives □ Any bilateral IKB initiatives	National government takes an active role[35] in: □ Meetings of the CMS Intergovernmental Task Force on Illegal Killing, Taking and Trade of Migratory Birds in the Mediterranean □ Meetings of the Bern network of Special Focal Points on Eradication of Illegal Killing, Trapping and Trade in Wild Birds □ CITES IKB initiatives □ EU IKB Initiatives □ Any bilateral IKB initiatives

Comments: Brief written justification of the choice (recommended). Please also include information on whether your country liaised (bilateral meetings, mutual traineeship programme, training visits to another country, etc.) with one or more parties to the Bern Convention and/or MIKT members and observers since the submission of the last Scoreboard.

35 Active role includes actions such as participating to all meetings, replying to questionnaires and implementing initiatives at national level.

25. Drivers of wildlife crime[36]

The extent to which the drivers of IKB in the country are known and understood.

Question: What is the level of awareness of the drivers[37] of IKB in your country, including those relating to the supply and consumer demand for illicit products?

Measurement:

0 □	1 □	2 □	3 □
The drivers of IKB are unknown	Knowledge of the drivers of IKB: □ Is **basic** □ Is **anecdotal** □ Is based on **limited** sources	Knowledge of the drivers of IKB: □ Is **moderate** □ Involves **gaps** in knowledge	Knowledge of the drivers of IKB: □ Is **good** □ Is reasonably **comprehensive** □ Is based on information from a variety of sources **including scientific research**

Comments: Brief written justification of the choice (recommended)

The Rome Strategic Plan (Obj.1.2.b) states '[…] national surveys are completed based on agreed methodology and guidance in countries with greatest needs further refining understanding of IKB motivations, […]'. Have you undertaken such a survey, if yes, what are the results? If published, please provide a link.

36 This indicator corresponds to indicator 45 in the ICCWC Indicator Framework

37 ''Drivers' are the underlying factors that are behind IKB. It can be driven by multiple factors, including (but not limited to) rural poverty, food insecurity, economic interests, poor law enforcement, unclear legislation, penalties too low to deter crime, perceived legitimacy, tradition, etc.'

26. Demand-side activities[38]

The extent to which activities to address the demand of illegal wildlife products are implemented.

Question: Are activities implemented to address the demand*39 for illegally obtained wild birds?

Measurement:

0 □	1 □	2 □	3 □
Demand-side activities: □ Have **neither** been developed nor Implemented □ There is **no** information available on the demand for illegally obtained wild birds in the country.	Demand-side activities: □ Have been **developed** □ Are **rarely** implemented in full due to a lack of available resources (e.g. technical, human, financial) □ Are based on information on demand for illegally obtained wild birds in the country	Demand-side activities: □ Have been developed and implemented □ Are **regularly** reviewed to identify the outcomes achieved □ Are based on information on demand for illegally obtained wild birds in the country	Demand-side activities: □ Have been developed and implemented □ Are **regularly** reviewed to identify the outcomes achieved □ Are **not needed** as data confirms that there is very little demand for illegally obtained wild birds in the country

Comments:

38 This indicator corresponds to indicator 46 in the ICCWC Indicator Framework

39 Demand-side activities are activities developed and implemented to reduce the demand for a particular illegally-traded bird product, or for illegally-traded wildlife more general. In many instances, these activities may be closely associated with awareness-raising activities to build public awareness of the legal requirements that applies to trade in wildlife. When answering this question please consider activities that the government has conducted and/or participated in, including activities which may have been developed or implemented in partnership with other countries and/or non-government organizations.

27. Regulated community[40]

The extent to which awareness-raising materials and/or programmes are in place to increase the awareness of the regulated community, of the laws that apply to the sustainable use of wild birds.

Question: Are efforts taken to increase the awareness of the regulated community[41], of the legislative requirements concerning sustainable use of wildlife and the penalties for non-compliance?

Measurement:

0 □	1 □	2 □	3 □
Efforts to increase awareness of the regulated community: □ Are **not** undertaken	Efforts to increase awareness of the regulated community: □ Are usually informal and reactive □ Are **not** comprehensive or widespread	Efforts to increase awareness of the regulated community: □ Are based on awareness raising materials that have been developed □ Are **relatively** up-to-date □ Are **sometimes** comprehensive or widespread	Efforts to increase awareness of the regulated community: □ Are based on **well-developed** and up-to-date awareness raising materials □ **Comprehensively** target the different types of user and permit holder(s)

Comments: Brief written justification of the choice (recommended).

The Rome Strategic Plan (Obj.2.2.b) states '[…] raise awareness on and use of the European Charter on Hunting and Biodiversity adopted by the Bern Convention and other relevant codes of Conduct.'. Is a Code of Conduct promoted and used by the Regulated Community, and if yes, which one? Has any NGO/stakeholder implemented codes of conduct targeting the Regulated Community?

Have you implemented any training sessions for the hunting community where IKB, including prevention and eradication, is included? If yes, how many?

40 This indicator corresponds to indicator 47 in the ICCWC Indicator Framework

41 The regulated community could include harvesters (including hunters), sellers, traders (including on-line traders) and/or any individual or group that is issued a permit and/or licence to take, use and/or trade in wild birds and their products, and/or that conducts business activities related to the trade in wild birds.

28. Public awareness actions[42]

The extent to which awareness-raising materials and/or programmes are in place to increase public awareness of IKB.

Question: Are efforts taken to increase public awareness[43] of the environmental, social and economic impacts of IKB?

Measurement:

0 □	1 □	2 □	3 □
Efforts to increase public awareness: □ Are **not** undertaken. □ Sentences of IKB cases are n**ever** publicized	Efforts to increase public awareness: □ Are usually **informal** and **reactive** □ Are **neither** comprehensive nor widespread □ There is **no national** communication strategy on IKB. □ Sentences of IKB cases are **seldom** publicized	Efforts to increase public awareness: □ Are based on awareness raising materials that have been developed by conservation NGOs □ Are **locally** implemented by governmental bodies □ Are **sometimes** comprehensive or widespread □ Implement **only partially** a national communication strategy on IKB. □ Sentences of IKB cases are **often** publicized	Efforts to increase public awareness: □ Are based on well-developed and up-to-date awareness raising materials developed by governmental bodies □ **Comprehensively** target the different types of stakeholders □ **Fully undertake** a national communication strategy on IKB. □ Sentences of IKB cases are **always** publicized

Comments: Brief written justification of the choice and additional comments (recommended). Please also indicate if there is an operational platform in place to raise awareness of the wider public on the consequences and biological impact of illegal killing of birds and if there is any communication strategy adopted by the government, or guidance distributed to policy makers on how to react publicly against illegal killing of birds.

Please also indicate whether you have conducted any opinion surveys, including among youth, to estimate the % of respondents aware and concerned about IKB in your country? Have there been any communication campaigns targeting IKB in your country? If yes, when? This can also include a reflection on activities promoted by civil society organisations in your country.

Is there any funding dedicated for communications campaigns to combat IKB? This can also include a reflection on activities promoted by civil society organisations in your country.

If you already reported on these issues in the previous scoreboard, please report only any changes/updates since your last report.

42 This indicator is based on indicator 50 in the ICCWC Indicator Framework

43 Awareness-raising activities may include public campaigns, awareness-raising materials, public meetings, and/or the promotion of crime notification hotlines. When answering this question please include activities that the government has conducted and/or participated in, including activities which may have been developed or implemented in partnership with other countries and/or non-government organizations.

Summary of scores

Indicator	*Indicator score*	*Indicator Group*	*Group score*[44]
1. Status and scale of IKB		A. National monitoring of IKB (data management of scope and scale of IKB)	
2. Number and distribution of illegally killed or trapped birds	data		
3. Number of IKB cases			
4. Number of IKB cases in the last year	data		
5. National wildlife legislation		B. Comprehensiveness of national legislation	
6. Regulated use			
7. Prohibitions under national legislation			
8. Exceptions under national legislation			
9. Sanctions and penalties			
10. Proportionality of penalties			
11. Use of criminal law			
12. Organized crime.			
13. Transposition of international law and commitment and national legislation			
14. National Action Plan for combating IKB		C. Enforcement response (preparedness of law enforcement bodies and coordination of national institutions)	
15. Enforcement priority			
16. Stakeholders and Policy-making			
17. Staffing and recruitment			
18. Specialized training			
19. Field enforcement effort	data		
20. Quality of judiciary processes		D. Prosecution and sentencing (effectiveness of judicial procedures)	
21. Sentencing guidelines			
22. Judicial awareness			
23. Judiciary training			
24. International cooperation		E. Prevention (other instruments used to address IKB)	
25. Drivers of wildlife crime			
26. Demand-side activities			
27. Regulated community			
28. Public awareness actions			
TOTAL SCORE			

44 *Sum of the score of all indicators of the same group excluding those for which numerical data are requested (i.e. indicators No. 2, 4 and 19) and those considered 'not applicable' (i.e. 12 and/or 16) by the respondent.*