

Strasbourg, 5 December 2007  
[tpvs24e\_2007.doc]

**T-PVS (2007) 24**

CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF EUROPEAN WILDLIFE  
AND NATURAL HABITATS

**Standing Committee**

27<sup>th</sup> meeting  
Strasbourg, 26 - 29 November 2007

---

**REPORT**

*Document prepared by  
the Directorate of Culture and Cultural and Natural Heritage*

## **PART I – OPENING**

### **1. Opening of the meeting and adoption of the agenda**

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2007) 1 rev Revised draft agenda  
T-PVS (2007) 19 rev Revised annotated draft agenda

The Chair, Ms Véronique Herrenschmidt (France), opened the meeting and welcomed participants (see appendix 1).

The delegate of Switzerland informed the Committee of the worrying situation concerning bird hunting and killing in the Mediterranean region, including Cyprus, and asked for this item to be included in the agenda. The delegates from Croatia and Germany supported this and the Committee agreed to consider this issue on Tuesday afternoon if there is time at the end of agenda item 5.4, or otherwise to discuss it under “Any other business” on Thursday morning. The agenda was adopted as set out in appendix 2 to this report.

### **2. Chairman's report and communications from the delegations and from the Secretariat**

Relevant document: T-PVS (2007) 5 and 17 Reports of the Bureau meetings in March and September 2007

The Chair announced that the work programme for 2007 had been completed in conformity with the decisions taken the previous year, and listed the main meetings of Group of Experts and Working Groups held in 2007. She thanked all those who had contributed to the activities and in particular those states which contributed financially, as well as hosting countries and the Secretariat. She informed the Committee of the recent ratification of Serbia, which will become the 46<sup>th</sup> Contracting Party of the Bern Convention in the coming months. She underlined the importance of co-operation and synergies with other biodiversity conventions and partner organisations, such as the European Commission, UNEP, the CMS and its related agreements, and the CBD. The Chair informed the Committee that the signature of the enhanced Memorandum of Co-operation agreed with the Secretariat of the CBD will unfortunately be postponed to next year as the CBD Executive Secretary had a last minute travel problem which prevented him from coming to Strasbourg, hoping that this delay will not affect the implementation of the agreement. She also had a special word of thanks for the work and commitment of Mrs Ilona Jepsena, member of the Bureau of the Standing Committee until September 2007 after having been its Chair, and due to a change of position in the European Commission. Mrs Herrenschmidt expressed her wishes of welcoming more new Contracting Parties to this Convention which continues to be an innovative and useful tool that contributes and reinforces the application of other instruments in the light of the 2010 target and beyond. She also stressed the importance of the mediation work carried out by the Standing Committee in the search of solutions to problems encountered in the implementation of the Convention's objectives.

Mr. Robert Palmer, Director of Culture and Cultural and Natural Heritage, welcomed participants and announced changes resulting from the budgetary discussions of the Council of Europe in 2007 and the setting up of the new Biological Diversity Unit in his Directorate. He stressed the continuing context of budgetary reductions in the Bern Convention, warmly thanked Contracting Parties which have made substantial contributions in 2007, and expressed the need for increased support from Parties in the coming years. The Director explained to Parties that due to the discontinuation of the CODBP in 2007, the Standing Committee could be called to supervise the work of the Group of Specialists on the European Diploma of Protected Areas, if this Committee so agrees. Finally, he highlighted communication and closer institutional links with other biodiversity treaties and the EU as priorities for 2008.

## PART II – MONITORING AND IMPLEMENTATION OF LEGAL ASPECTS

### 3. Monitoring of the implementation of the legal aspects of the Convention

#### 3.1 Implementation of the Convention in Morocco

Relevant document: T-PVS/Inf (2007) 8 Report on the implementation of the Bern Convention in Morocco (in French only)

The consultant, Mr Nicolas De Sadeleer, presented his report on the implementation of the Bern Convention in Morocco. He highlighted the need for coordination across different government departments, as well as for stronger and updated laws, and more resources for their enforcement. He welcomed a draft law on protected areas and further stressed the need for a global approach to habitat protection in Morocco.

The delegate of Morocco thanked the Bern Convention for this initiative and congratulated the expert for his report. She stressed the difficulty to conciliate her country's richness in species with the needs of sustainable development. She further informed of a draft law on international trade of wild flora and fauna which will also provide a global approach to biodiversity conservation.

#### 3.2. Biennial reports 2003-2004 and 2005-2006 concerning exceptions made to Articles 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8, and quadrennial reports 2001-2004

Relevant documents: T-PVS/Inf (2007) 11 Biennial Reports 2003-2004  
T-PVS/Inf (2007) 12 Biennial Reports 2005-2006  
T-PVS/Inf (2007) 15 Four-year reports 2001-2004

In conformity with Article 9, paragraph 2, of the Convention, all Parties having made exceptions to Articles 4, 5, 6, 7 or 8 must present these exceptions in writing.

The Secretariat presented the biennial reports received.

The Committee took note of the reports submitted and invited the Contracting Parties which had not yet fulfilled this obligation to do so as soon as possible.

The Secretariat informed the Committee that it had also received general reports prepared on a voluntary basis.

The Secretariat clarified that the 2005-2006 report from the Czech Republic had been received and will be included in the compendium. The delegate of the Czech Republic added that their 2001-2002 report had also been sent and should be reflected in the list.

The delegate of Norway informed the Committee of the withdrawal of reservations concerning *Dracocephalum ruyschiana* (Appendix I) and Bryophytes (Appendix I), as these species are now protected in Norway. The official communication will shortly be sent to the Secretary General of the Council of Europe.

## PART III – MONITORING OF SPECIES AND HABITATS

### 4. Monitoring of Species and Habitats

#### 4.1 Implementation of the European Strategy on Invasive Alien Species

Relevant documents T-PVS (2007) 9 Report of the meeting of the Group of Experts on Invasive Alien Species  
T-PVS (2007) 14 Draft recommendations  
T-PVS/Inf (2007) 2 Assessment of existing lists of invasive alien species for Europe, with particular focus on species entering Europe through trade, and proposed responses (P. Genovesi)  
T-PVS/Inf (2006) 8 Overview of existing international/regional mechanisms to ban or restrict trade in potentially invasive alien species (C. Shine)  
T-PVS/Inf (2007) 5 Bern Convention action on invasive alien species in Europe  
T-PVS/Inf (2007) 1 and addendum Implementation of recommendations on Invasive Alien Species (national reports)

The Group of Experts met in Iceland on 22-24 May 2007.

The Secretariat presented the conclusions and results of the expert Group on Invasive Alien Species which met in Reykjavik (Iceland) from 22 to 24 May 2007. This group meets every two years and has become the major European forum to follow progress on IAS work by states and international organisations and to launch new ideas and projects under the Convention. These include, for the coming years, the elaboration of manuals on best practice and codes of conduct, and guidelines for eradication.

The delegate of EPPO informed the Committee on the progress of a Bern Convention – EPPO “code of conduct on horticulture and invasive alien plants” which was in an advanced state of elaboration and would be presented to the Committee for possible endorsement at its next meeting.

The Secretariat informed on a side event on the implementation of the European Strategy on IAS to be carried out at the next SBSTTA in Rome.

The delegate of Portugal, on behalf of the European Union and its member States; explained that the Union is giving much attention to the topic after the adoption of the European Strategy on IAS. Although some regulation exists, there are still gaps in the control of IAS. This problem has been identified as a priority issue and an EU strategy is being developed, apart from important work on the scientific information front through a number of precise initiatives. The Union appreciates the work carried out by the Convention and sees collaboration develop with planned activities as appropriate.

The Committee took note of the report of the meeting and warmly thanked the Icelandic Institute of Nature Conservation for the excellent preparation of the meeting and hospitality.

The delegate of Hungary indicated that some of the species included in the metalist are native in some parts of Europe, which can cause problems. As an example, *Phoxinus phoxinus* is protected in Hungary.

The delegate of Slovakia raised the issue of possible use of invasive plant species as biofuels (alternative energy resource) and supported the idea to have it included in the 2008 work plan.

The Committee examined the draft recommendation on limiting the dispersal of the grey squirrel (*Sciurus carolinensis*) in Italy and other contracting parties. Switzerland regretted the lack of progress on the control of this invasive species, which will eventually arrive in the Alps and asked for stronger action by the Convention than just a recommendation. The Committee adopted the recommendation as is presented in appendix 3 and asked the bureau to examine the possibility of opening a file for a possible breach of the Convention by Italy on this issue. Subject to the agreement of Italian authorities, absent from the meeting, the Committee proposed that an on-the-spot appraisal be carried out in collaboration with central and regional conservation authorities.

The Committee examined and adopted a recommendation on progress in the eradication of the ruddy duck (*Oxyura jamaicensis*) (see appendix 4).

The Committee adopted a recommendation on trade in invasive and potentially invasive alien species in Europe (see appendix 5). The Committee wished that the programme of activities include work to see how this recommendation could be implemented by states in a coherent manner.

The Committee examined and adopted a recommendation, presented by EPPO, on the eradication of some invasive alien plants (see appendix 6.). The Committee expressed the wish that the lists of invasive alien plants annexed to the recommendation be subject to a scientific and technical validation mechanism and therefore benefit from new information.

## 4.2 Group of Experts on Plant Conservation

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2007) 18 Report of the meeting of the Group of Experts on the Conservation of plants  
T-PVS (2007) 13 Draft guidance on the conservation of mushrooms  
T-PVS (2007) 14 Draft recommendation on the conservation of fungi in Europe  
T-PVS/Inf (2007) ... Draft European Strategy for Plant Conservation 2008-2014

The Secretariat presented the work of the Group of Experts on Plant Conservation, held in Cluj Napoca (Romania) on 6<sup>th</sup> September 2007, in the Planta Europa Conference. She highlighted the ongoing preparation of a new European Strategy on Plant Conservation and urged Parties and Observers

to participate in the consultation organised by Plantlife before the end of the year. She further stressed the consideration on invasive plants and the impact of climate change as issues for consideration by the Group of Experts in order to increase synergies and co-operation across Groups of Experts under the Bern Convention.

The consultant, Ms Beatrice Senn, presented the draft guidance on the conservation of mushrooms in Europe, an activity that had been decided at the 2006 meeting of the Standing Committee.

The representative of IUCN congratulated the consultant for an excellent document and reminded delegates of the importance of this issue, as there are 45 million amateur fungi pickers in Europe. He proposed an additional paragraph in the draft recommendation to engage those benefiting from fungi in the conservation of these species.

The delegate of Portugal also stressed the importance of this recommendation and informed the Committee of a national working group for preparing legislation on the protection and sustainable use of mushrooms.

The delegate of Croatia supported the draft guidance.

The delegate from the Czech Republic expressed support for the draft guidance and the recommendation and stressed the importance of using fungi pickers as conservationists. He further proposed to add a reference in the draft recommendation to the importance of all sectors in the conservation of fungi habitats.

The Committee agreed on the draft recommendation on the conservation of fungi in Europe, as amended by the Czech Republic and the IUCN. (see appendix 12)

#### **4.3 Draft Action Plan for the Conservation and Restoration of the European sturgeon (*Acipenser sturio*)**

Relevant documents    T-PVS (2007) 10 Report of the meeting of the Working Group on the elaboration of an Action Plan for the conservation and restoration of the European Sturgeon (*Acipenser sturio*)  
T-PVS (2007) 14 Draft recommendation on the conservation and restoration of the European sturgeon (*Acipenser sturio*)  
T-PVS/Inf (2007) 4 revised and Addendum Final draft of the Action Plan for the conservation and restoration of the European Sturgeon (*Acipenser sturio*)

The Secretariat summarised the background and main highlights of meeting of the Working Group held in Berlin (Germany) on 29-30 May 2007, leading to the finalisation of the draft action plan. She thanked the French and German governments for their support to this initiative and for each hosting one of the meetings of the Working Group in the two years of preparation of this action plan.

Mr Harald Rosenthal presented the draft European Action Plan for the Conservation and the Restoration of the European sturgeon (*Acipenser sturio*), including the conservation and legal protection status of the species, the main threats faced and priority actions needed. He summarised the main components of the draft action plan and urged the Committee to adopt it as the situation for the survival of the species is very critical.

The delegate of France informed the Committee of recent releases of juvenile European sturgeons in the Dordogne and the Garonne and the plans for monitoring and follow-up, as well as the need for information and awareness, as illustrated by incidental captures leading to releases. The delegate of France asked for stronger wording in the draft recommendation so that the Committee adopts the action plan, and also to include a reference to the need for appropriate follow-up to monitor its implementation at the national level.

The delegate of Germany expressed their gratitude to the authors of the action plan and supported its adoption, as well as a mechanism to monitor the implementation of the action plan.

The representative of the World Sturgeon Conservation Society offered the collaboration of his organisation in that task, and will liaise with the Secretariat to this end.

The Committee amended the draft recommendation and adopted it, as well as the Action Plan for the Conservation and Restoration of the European sturgeon (*Acipenser sturio*) (see appendix 7). The

Committee also agreed to the need to follow up this international action plan, which could be carried out in collaboration with the World Sturgeon Conservation Society.

#### **4.4 Draft European Charter on Hunting and Biodiversity**

Relevant documents T-PVS (2007) 8 Report of the meeting of the Working Group on the Elaboration of a European Charter on Hunting and Biodiversity  
T-PVS (2007) 14 Draft recommendation on hunting and biodiversity  
T-PVS (2007) 7 revised Final draft of the European Charter on Hunting and Biodiversity

The Secretariat summarised the background of this activity, including the final meeting of the Working Group held in Strasbourg on 20<sup>th</sup> April 2007.

The delegate of Norway, Chair of the Working Group, stressed the open and participatory work carried out over the last two years. He thanked the consultant and the secretariat for the result achieved in a balanced document.

The consultant, Mr Scott Brainerd, presented the draft European Charter on Hunting and Biodiversity, highlighting its focus on sustainable hunting, tourism hunting, and standards for European hunters, as it had been agreed. He stressed the role of sustainable hunting as a tool for biodiversity conservation and spelt out the principles included in the draft Charter, which applies the CBD principles and guidelines for the sustainable use of biodiversity as well as the ecosystem approach.

The representative of IUCN briefly presented preliminary results from the GEM-CON-BIO project on sustainable use, and expressed his organisation's support to the draft Charter.

The representative of BirdLife International thanked the consultant, the Chair of the Working Group and the Secretariat for an open and transparent process but informed the Committee that lack of resources prevented them from fully contributing to this activity in the last six months. She raised a number of issues for clarification and possible amendment of the draft Charter.

The delegate of Portugal, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, expressed their general support to the draft Charter and their wish to adopt it.

The delegate of Germany informed the Committee of the need to address a few issues before being able to adopt the document, as only their hunting sector was represented in the meetings of the Working Group. Otherwise their position on this issue would be of abstention.

The Chair proposed the formation of a small ad hoc group with interested Parties and Observers to address some concerns regarding the draft Charter. A consensus was found on the issues raised by some Parties and Observers and a final text was adopted by the Committee, together with the draft recommendation on the European Charter on Hunting and Biodiversity (see appendix 8). The German delegation abstained.

#### **4.5 Large carnivores/hervivores: Progress report on the European Bison SAP**

Relevant documents: T-PVS/Inf (2007) 10 Progress report on the European Bison species action plan

The Large Herbivore Foundation presented a report on the progress by states of the Bison Action Plan adopted by the Standing Committee in 2004 (document T-PVS/Inf (2007) 10).

Much action has been taken in Europe since the adoption of the action plan, including introduction in Germany and preparation for reintroduction projects in Latvia and Romania if some problems of lack of genetic continuity occur in the Bialowieża area between Poland and Belarus.

The Committee welcomed the news and invited Parties and observers to collaborate on Bison conservation. The Secretariat informed the Committee that the Convention was collaborating through The Large Carnivore Initiative for Europe (LCIE), in the EU process to draw guidelines for the management of populations of large carnivores. This was largely the continuation of previous common work of LCIE and the Convention. The conclusions of that work will be presented to the Committee next year for possible endorsement.

The Secretariat announced that the "group for the follow-up of conservation work on Iberian lynx" (made up of the Convention, IUCN, SSC (cat specialist group) and LCIE) would be visiting

Spain and Portugal to check progress. Spain and Portugal welcomed this news and would be happy to facilitate the expert visit.

The Committee took note of the information presented.

#### **4.6 Biological diversity and climate change**

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2007) 11 Report of the meeting of the Group of Experts on Biodiversity and Climate change  
T-PVS (2007) 21 Report of the meeting of a Select Committee from the Group of Experts on Biodiversity and Climate Change  
T-PVS/Inf (2007) 3 "Climatic change and the conservation of European biodiversity: Towards the development of adaptation strategies" by Professor R Huntley

The Chair of the Group of Experts, Ms Caroline Cowan, UK, presented the work of the Group of Experts on Biodiversity and Climate Change, including the report of its first meeting, held in June 2007, and the work plan agreed for next year. She recalled the mandate of the Group of Experts to make proposals to the Standing Committee in 2008 and the work plan agreed by the Group to carry out this task, included as an annex in the report of the meeting of the select committee held in October 2007. She highlighted critical issues such as protected areas; the need for a multi-scale approach; dealing with the uncertainty presented by climate change; mitigation and response strategies; socio-economic drivers; and communication. The Chair of the Group of Experts stressed that the Group will strive to provide Contracting Parties with information to help them comply with their obligations under the Convention, in the light of climate change.

The Committee welcomed the work carried out in 2007 and looked forward to the proposals from the Group of Experts to be received next year.

#### **4.7 Habitats: Setting up of ecological networks: Emerald Network progress, PEEN**

##### **- Emerald Network: progress**

Relevant document: T-PVS (2007) 22 Report of the meeting of the Group of Experts on the Emerald Network

The Secretariat and the Chair of the Group of Experts reported on progress made with the work of the Emerald Network, and on the results of the joint meeting which the Working Party had held in Strasbourg on 18-19 October 2007 with the Committee of Experts for establishment of the Pan-European Ecological Network (PEEN). Specifically, the Chair presented :

- the results obtained at the end of the first phase of the development programme conducted in six countries in south-east Europe with financial help from the EEA, aimed at identifying 80 % of the potential Emerald Network sites in that part of Europe;
- launching of the second phase of the programme, aimed at identifying all the potential Emerald Network sites in that part of Europe;
- the project for extension of the Emerald Network (after the pilot projects completed, under way or planned), in the following countries : Armenia, Belarus, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova, Federation of Russia and Ukraine ;
- the launching of a pilot project in Armenia;
- the results of the Emerald pilot project in Norway, and minor adjustments to the map of biogeographical regions proposed by the Norwegian authorities;
- the proposals by the Group of Experts on criteria for sites of special conservation interest put forward by states participating in the Emerald Network, with a view to the procedure for assessment and approval by the Standing Committee.

The Chair thanked the European Environment Agency for the financial support it had given the development programme in South-East Europe and hoped that the European Commission would be able to help fund the extension programme planned in the South Caucasus, Central and Eastern Europe, and the Federation of Russia.

The representative of the European Commission confirmed that it was interested in the project mentioned by Mr Plesnik, and said that examination of the matter was already under way and might be concluded in spring 2008.

The Norwegian delegate confirmed the information given the Group of Experts by the Chair, and said that 11 sites had already been identified. Her country hoped that the Emerald and Natura 2000 lists of species and habitats could be harmonised.

The Moroccan delegate told the Secretariat of his country's interest in possibly joining the Emerald Network and invited it to contact the national authorities for that purpose.

The Belarus delegate said that his country was also interested in joining the Emerald Network and attending future meetings of the Group of Experts.

The Albanian and Serbian delegates provided information on the results achieved with the programme, which they thought very useful, in South-East Europe.

M. Marc Roekaerts, Emerald Network consultant, said that the proposed criteria for assessment and approval of the Emerald sites, which the Group of Experts had approved, would be tested in 2007 and 2008 when the sites proposed by the six countries participating in the Emerald programme in South-East Europe were being examined.

The Standing Committee approved the results of the work done within the Emerald Network, and also the proposals put to it. The Chair and Secretariat expressed their gratitude to the European Commission and the European Environment Agency.

#### - **Pan-European Ecological Network PEEN**

Relevant documents: Sauvegarde de la nature n° 146  
STRA-REP (2007) 06

The Secretariat presented the results of the meeting held by the Committee of Experts for establishment of the Pan-European Ecological Network (PEEN) on 18 and 19 October 2007, jointly with the meeting of the Group of Experts of the Emerald Network.

It reported on the results of the 6th Ministerial Conference, "An environment for Europe", held in Belgrade from 10 to 12 October 2007. On that occasion, the report prepared by the Committee of Experts "Pan-European Ecological Network: Progress", accompanied by a message to the ministers and political decision-makers, had been presented to the ministers and to the delegations to the Conference. The Final Declaration of the Conference, and the Belgrade Declaration on biodiversity, had expressed the ministers' support for the PEEN process and its development.

On the strength of this support, and of the need for concerted strategies to preserve biodiversity and combat the effects of climate change, the Secretariat presented the project prepared by the STRA-REP Committee of Experts for the holding of an international conference on protected zones and climatic networks. This might be organised in co-operation with the European Commission and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), particularly with a view to implementation at European regional level of its programme of activities for protected zones. A piloting committee would be set up to organise this event. The Standing Committee was invited to appoint representatives to it.

The Chair of the STRA-REP Committee of Experts supported what the Secretariat had said and thought it wise to think about the future development of biodiversity in Europe and the role of the ecological networks in this context. He hoped that regional planners and socio-economic experts would be involved in this process of reflection.

The Netherlands delegate agreed and confirmed the wisdom of deciding on future lines of development for the PEEN, as an instrument for the conservation of biodiversity in Europe, also beyond 2010. It was vital to involve all the interested partners in this process of reflection and create synergies and complementarities between the various initiatives which were developing in Europe.

The Chair agreed with these comments, which would also allow the implementation of commitments included in the MoC, and considered that adequate funding must be found for the conference and related activities.

The Standing Committee supported the proposed conference, and would help to prepare it by appointing representatives to the piloting committee (including the representatives of the Czech Republic, the Netherlands and Serbia). France will confirm its participation.



## **PART IV – MONITORING OF SPECIFIC SITES AND POPULATIONS**

### **5. Specific sites and populations**

#### **5.1 Files opened**

##### **- Ukraine: Building of a navigable waterway in the Bystroe Estuary (Danube delta)**

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2007) 15 rev Summary of case files  
T-PVS/Files (2007) 9 Government report (Ukraine)  
T-PVS/Files (2007) 30 Government report (Romania)

This case concerns the excavation of a shipping canal in Bystroe estuary of the Danube delta in Ukraine, which is likely to affect adversely both the Ukrainian Danube Biosphere Reserve – the most important of Ukraine’s wetlands – and the whole Danube delta dynamics. A first phase of the project was conducted in 2004.

In 2004 the Standing Committee adopted Recommendation No.111 (2004) on the proposed navigable waterway through the Bystroe estuary (Danube Delta), inviting Ukraine to suspend works, except for the completion of phase 1, and not to proceed with phase 2 of the project until certain conditions were met.

In April 2005 Ukrainian authorities organised a workshop on the ecological monitoring of phase 1 of the project, held in Odessa. At the Standing Committee’s meeting in 2005, the Ukrainian delegate reported that the dredging of the delta had been stopped and the environmental impact assessment was being reviewed to make it more comprehensive.

In 2006, the Ukrainian government informed the Secretariat that all work carried out was part of phase 1 and that the extent of the work under phase 2 would be adjusted on the basis of a new plan and environmental monitoring data. An international meeting concerning the sustainable development and management of the Danube delta was held in Odessa in February 2006, with the participation of ICPDR, UNESCO, the Ramsar Convention, the Bern Convention Secretariat and the European Commission. A follow-up meeting to be held in Tulcea (Romania), was announced but no further information has been received.

In 2006, the Ukrainian Court of Auditors concluded that the requisite environmental protection measures had not been taken regarding this project, even though they had been scheduled in the EIA conducted during phase 1. A report by the Espoo Convention’s commission of inquiry was also published noting the existence of transboundary impacts in connection with the Bystroe project

The Standing Committee meeting in 2006 asked Ukraine to provide to the Committee the EIA, including the compensatory measures foreseen. The Committee decided to leave the file open.

The delegate from Ukraine presented information concerning the implementation of Recommendation No. 111 (2004) and including project works; EIA; compensation and mitigation measures; monitoring; public participation; and international co-operation. The Ukrainian authorities had submitted to the Secretariat a report listing the activities undertaken by Ukraine during 2007 in the framework of the Ukrainian Danube-Black Sea Navigation Route Restoration Project.

The Secretariat regretted that it had not received the documents and scientific reports mentioned in the presentation by the delegate from Ukraine, nor had it been invited to the meetings hosted by Ukraine on this issue. He asked to receive complete documentation to assess this case and stressed that the Bystroe channel is not a bilateral issue between Ukraine and Romania, but a very important case file open for possible breach of the Bern Convention in one of Europe’s most important wetlands.

The delegate from Romania stated that Phase 2 of the project has already started and that the EIA does not include compensatory measures or measures to limit the environmental damage. The delegate from Romania also mentioned the fact that the work progress harms the consultation process. She further regretted that no alternatives have been examined and asked for an on-the-spot visit to be conducted next year.

The delegate of Portugal, on behalf of the European Union and its member States, supported keeping the case file open and making an on-the-spot appraisal visit.

The representative of WWF contested the position of the Ukrainian government regarding the lack of transborder impacts of the project and its conformity to international regulations. She stressed that the Biosphere Reserve of the Danube Delta has established negative impacts of the project and asked for the works to be stopped. She asked for the Standing Committee to keep the file open in the hope that there will be real transborder co-operation to address the impacts of the project and the sustainable management of the whole Danube delta.

The Chair thanked the Ukrainian delegation for the information presented.

The Committee agreed to request all the documentation mentioned by the delegate of Ukraine, including the EIA and compensatory measures, in order to be examined by a group of independent experts. It further decided to keep the file open and carry out an on-the-spot visit in 2008. This case will be re-examined by the Committee next year.

The delegate of Ukraine agreed to the on-the-spot visit and to keeping the file open.

#### **- Cyprus: Akamas Peninsula**

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2007) 15 rev Summary of case files  
T-PVS/Files (2007) 13 Report by Government  
T-PVS/Files (2007) 19 Report by the NGOs

This case concerns plans for tourist development in the Peninsula of Akamas, with detrimental effect on an ecologically valuable area with many rare plant and animal species protected under the Convention.

This case was first discussed at the 16<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Standing Committee in 1996. Two on-the-spot appraisals were carried out in 1997 and 2002 and a recommendation adopted in 1997 (Recommendation No. 63 (1997) on the conservation of the Akamas peninsula in Cyprus and, in particular, of the nesting beaches of *Caretta caretta* and *Chelonia mydas*).

In 2005, the Cyprus delegate informed the Standing Committee that the Council of Ministers had taken a decision on a proposal regarding the management of the Akamas Peninsula, which needed to be debated at further official level. The Standing Committee decided to keep the file open so that the final approval of that government proposal and the implementation of protection measures for the area could be verified.

In 2007, the Bureau took note of the informations received from Cyprus concerning the adoption of a Management Plan for the Akamas peninsula, and asked the Cyprus government to submit updated and more detailed information on the declaration of part of Akamas as a national park and the protection of sensitive fauna and flora species and habitat types in the Akamas area.

The delegate from Cyprus confirmed that the Council of Ministers had approved a Management Plan for the Akamas Peninsula to protect nesting beaches of the two turtle species. He stressed the need to take account of social concerns and the difficulties of ongoing discussions with local communities resulting on not having official boundaries for the area yet. He noted that no developments are permitted on coastal areas and that there is a programme to exchange private property in this area for public land. He added that permits for safaris have been frozen and that the species to be protected are those to be in designated areas under the Birds and Habitats Directives. He added that the Limni site is included in an area approved by their Council of Ministers to be proposed as a Natura 2000 site and therefore does not need to be discussed with Akamas.

The representative of Terra Cypria regretted that the management plan referred to by the delegate from Cyprus has not been officially published and therefore it is not publicly available yet. She distributed copies of two maps of Akamas showing the recommended boundaries and the current ones. She stressed that Recommendation No. 63 (1997) has not been complied with concerning the boundaries of the national park. She also stated that there is yet no management plan for Limni and that buildings were being allowed so near the coast that management would be problematic.

The delegate of the European Commission informed the Committee that officially maps and the required data of the proposed area in question have not been received from Cyprus yet, and that they will be examined in accordance with the scientific criteria used to assess proposals for Natura 2000 sites.

The representative of RAC/SPA offered the collaboration of the Barcelona Convention and RAC/SPA to solve this issue, and invited the Secretariat of the Bern Convention to develop a Memorandum of Co-operation.

The representative of MEDASSET referred to previous similar cases that did not progress after their file had been closed, and asked for the file to be kept open.

The Committee decided to keep the file open and urged the Cyprus government to fully implement the Recommendation from the Standing Committee and not to take hasty decisions in the current electoral climate.

**- Bulgaria: Project to build a motorway through the Kresna Gorge**

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2007) 15 rev Summary of case files

This case concerns a motorway crossing an area of high biological diversity. It was examined by the Standing Committee in 2002, when it adopted a recommendation inviting the Bulgarian government to abandon the plans to enlarge the current road and look for more suitable alternatives, compatible with Bern Convention obligations. In 2004, the Bulgarian Ministry of the Environment informed the Secretariat that there was no further information concerning the state of progress of the project or the procedure for establishing a new protected area around the gorge.

At its 24<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Standing Committee decided to open a file in order to stimulate the Bulgarian government to further implement the Recommendation No. 98 (2002).

In 2005, a decision was taken by the Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works (MRDPW) to prepare a new detailed EIA report. A decree of the Ministry of the Environment and Water (MoEW) was approved on 14 November 2005, prohibiting certain activities which could have adverse consequences for the site, such as the building of hydro-electric power stations. At its meeting in 2005, the Standing Committee welcomed the adoption of this decree and decided to keep the file open.

At the 2006 Standing Committee meeting, the Bulgarian Delegate informed the Committee that a new EIA had been initiated. The Standing Committee welcomed the positive advances that had been made on this file, which it decided to keep open.

In 2007, the Bulgarian authorities informed the Bureau that the EIA report was being prepared and would be publicly discussed, including consideration by Bulgaria's High Ecological Expert Council.

The Secretariat regretted that due to the late arrival of both the government and the NGO report, there were no official documents concerning this open case file. She took the opportunity to urge Contracting Parties and Observers to submit their reports and information within the set deadlines.

The delegate from BirdLife International informed the Committee that the EIA procedure would be soon completed and that two alternatives were under consideration as the official decision on the route has not been finally taken. She urged the Committee to keep the case file open until the EIA decision is taken and the construction of the motorway is completed.

The Chair welcomed the forthcoming finalisation of the EIA. The Committee agreed to keep the file open until the final decision is taken on this project, with positive encouragements for the Bulgarian government. It therefore agreed to keep this issue in the agenda of its next meeting.

## **5.2 Possible Files**

**- France: Conservation of the Hermann tortoise in the plaine des Maures**

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2007) 15 rev Summary of case files  
T-PVS/Files (2007) 6 Government report

This case concerns conservation of the Hermann tortoise (*Testudo hermanni*) and of its habitat in the Plaine des Maures (Var, France), which a number of NGOs have deemed unsatisfactory. In particular, the National Nature Conservation Society (Société nationale de Protection de la Nature - SNPN) approached the Bern Convention secretariat in 2003, considering that the implementation of a Public Interest Plan (PIG) and the introduction of additional protection measures had not sufficiently contributed to conservation of the species.

The case was discussed by the Standing Committee as a possible case-file at its 25th and 26th meetings. Following an on-site visit in March 2005 at the French authorities' invitation, the committee adopted Recommendation No. 118 (2005), which included a request to the French government to adopt a more global management concept for the areas concerned by this species and to reject a new application for an extension of the Balançon waste storage centre. At its 26th meeting the committee took note of additional information provided by France on delimitation of the Natura 2000 reserve and the biotope protection decree and reserved the right to re-examine this file in the light of subsequent information.

The Standing Committee re-examined this file at its 27th meeting. The French authorities stated that the government was willing to take intensive action to protect the species and its habitats and confirmed the implementation of a global strategy for their conservation, including a restoration scheme. They also provided information on the other measures being taken, including the creation of a nature reserve, publication of the implementing decree for the Natura 2000 area, the establishment of a steering committee and a management scheme for the Natura 2000 area and other measures aimed at the species' conservation. Information on the timetable for implementing these measures was also provided.

The representatives of the NGOs - SOPTOM, MEDASSET and Sauvegarde de la Faune Sauvage - pointed out that the measures announced by the French authorities had been devised under pressure and with the NGOs' assistance. They considered them inadequate, taking the view that the proposed protection measures should go beyond those already called for in Recommendation n° 118 (2005) and asked for the opening of a case-file.

On the basis of this information the secretariat expressed the opinion that there was no presumption of a violation of the requirements of the Bern Convention in this case, which had been noted only as a possible case-file. It acknowledged the efforts made by the French authorities, but nonetheless requested that the LGV (high-speed rail-link) project should be implemented outside the Natura 2000 area and all areas home to tortoise populations

The Chair deemed positive the information supplied by the French authorities. The Standing Committee invited the French delegation to make a further statement at its 28th meeting, firstly to report on the implementation of Recommendation No. 118 (2005) and on the matters raised during this meeting (LGV, Balançon waste storage centre, ecological corridors linking the reserve with other populated areas outside it, state of progress of the restoration scheme) and secondly to take stock of the progress achieved and the results of the projects presented.

The Bureau was asked to deal with any further information transmitted pending the next meeting of the Standing Committee.

#### **- France: Protection of the Common Hamster (*Cricetus cricetus*) in Alsace**

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2007) 15 rev Summary of case files  
T-PVS/Files (2007) 24 Government report  
T-PVS/Files (2007) 11 NGO Report

In 2006 the secretariat of the Bern Convention received a complaint from the association "Sauvegarde Faune Sauvage" concerning the insufficient measures taken by the French authorities to ensure the maintenance of the habitats necessary to the survival of the Common Hamster in Alsace, the only part of France where the species was present. The government reported that the species had fallen below the viability threshold. The Standing Committee examined this file and instructed the Bureau to consider the issue with a view to the possible opening of a case-file.

The information supplied by the French authorities showed that the situation was highly critical

for the Common Hamster in Alsace and that co-operation and joint action by all the sectors concerned was of the utmost importance. This information concerned an Action Plan for the Common Hamster in Alsace (2007-2011), the preparation of a second scheme to save the Common Hamster to be run in 2007-2013, specific agri-environmental measures, the development of an area where the crops farmed would enable the species to flourish and the nature of the compensatory measures for farmers under the scheme for protection of the Common Hamster.

The associations "Sauvegarde Faune Sauvage", "France Nature Environnement" and CERPEA drew the secretariat's attention to the inadequacy of these measures, to their shortcomings (60 to 70% of the hamster population was located in areas not covered by biotope protection agreements) and to the scant consideration given to the NGOs' views, particularly regarding designation of the special area for the hamster.

The Standing Committee examined this file at its 27th meeting. The French delegation presented the entire range of measures taken, including a restoration scheme recently approved by the Conseil national de la protection de la nature (National Nature Conservation Board). Under this scheme 3,000 hectares of priority action areas had been designated for the farming of crops propitious to the hamster. These agri-environmental measures would be included in the relevant municipalities' land use schemes. They also included an increase in hamster numbers via the establishment of three off-site breeding centres run in co-operation with the association Sauvegarde Faune Sauvage. The delegation indicated that the hamster's "special area" was currently being defined with the various institutional partners involved.

The NGO representatives deemed these measures insufficient and mentioned in particular that the restoration scheme concerned only 2% of the area where the hamster was historically present in Alsace and the current conservation scheme did not provide for any compensation measure in the event of destruction of habitat within the special area. The French delegation made clear the fact that the compensation measures were foreseen.

In view of all the above considerations, the Standing Committee decided to open a case-file. This decision did not call into question the efforts already made by the authorities, but stressed the urgent need for action in the field now, as those efforts are still not enough. The Chair drew attention to the objective of halting biodiversity loss by 2010. It could be badly perceived by the international community if this species were to disappear by the time of that key date.

**- France: Protection of the European Green Toad (*Bufo viridis*) in Alsace**

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2007) 15 rev Summary of case files  
T-PVS/Files (2007) 23 Government report  
T-PVS/Files (2007) 12 NGO Report

The complaint was lodged in 2006 by the Association BUFO (Association pour l'étude et la protection des amphibiens et reptiles d'Alsace) and focused on dangers to the green toad's few remaining habitats in Alsace. It specifically targeted shortcomings in the impact studies carried out in connection with major bypass and urban development projects, and a project for construction of a leisure complex. The Standing Committee examined it at its 26th meeting and instructed its Bureau to follow the matter.

The government's report, received in 2007 confirmed that the environmental impact study carried out in connection with certain projects at Molsheim, Eckbolsheim, Wittenheim, Mulhouse and Strasbourg had neither confirmed nor disproved the presence of green toads. The authorities took the view that it was up to the applicant to show that there were indeed green toads in the disputed zones. The NGO Sauvegarde Faune Sauvage sent the Secretariat information on the shortcomings or absence of compensatory measures, and complained to the European Commission that France was not complying with the Habitats Directive in respect of protection for the green toad's habitat in Alsace.

In November 2007, the Conseil général of the Bas-Rhin sent the Secretariat some information on protection of the green toad, with special reference to the Oberschaeffolsheim and Wolfisheim bypass project. It stated that these areas were essentially unsuited to the green toad, and that the populations in question were on the outer edge of the settlement zone (the main populations in Alsace are close to Strasbourg). A specific study would be carried out by the client in spring 2008 to assess the actual

presence of the species, and the probability of the building site's being colonised from known reproduction sites. This study should lead to proposals on reducing the impact.

The French delegate confirmed that the national authorities had taken the action needed to protect existing populations. An action plan was being prepared for the green toad and for the common spadefoot (*Pelobates fuscus*). The French ministry had issued orders for protection of the species and its habitat, but the Conseil d'Etat had rescinded them, regarding them as over-protective. These protection orders should be published very soon. The NGO representatives disputed this information and demanded that the matter be considered.

The Chair thought that action had been taken in the field to reduce the green toad's conservation problems. On that basis, the Standing Committee acknowledged the efforts made by the French Government to preserve the species, but asked for more information next year, confirming that things were moving in the right direction. The Committee decided to take no further action on this matter.

### - **Turkey: Conservation of marine turtles in Kazanli**

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2007) 15 rev Summary of case files  
T-PVS/Files (2007) 29 Government report  
T-PVS/Files (2007) 16 NGO Report

This file was provisionally closed at the 24<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Standing Committee. However, the Committee asked the government to continue to report on the situation.

In November 2006, the Standing Committee took note of the information presented by the NGOs as to the existence of several outstanding problems that remained undealt with and instructed the Bureau to consider the possibility of reopening the file and engage the Barcelona convention.

In 2007, information was received too late for the Bureau to be able to consider it at its meeting in March 2007 and so the Bureau agreed to include this issue in the agenda of its September meeting as a "possible file". The Bureau agreed to keep this issue in the agenda.

The delegate of Turkey and a representative of the Chromium factory informed the Committee that the situation had improved significantly in many of the 14 points of the 2002 Recommendation. Much more research and monitoring on marine turtles is being carried out, including two national symposia and a workshop to find solutions to the problems present on the beaches; the underwater part of the jetty has been removed in order to reduce beach erosion; the greenhouses have been moved 5 metres inland from the beach; plastic rubbish removed and, specially a solution has been found to deal with the toxic waste. An important amount of financial resources will be spent to treat the waste and put it in a safe place far from the sea, a process that has started and will take approximately eight years to achieve. A very important step of the project is to establish the non-hazardous waste land filling facility.

The delegate of Monaco and RAC-SPA welcomed progress made. Help was offered to Turkey by RAC-SPA provided that Kazanli is declared a Hot Spot under the Barcelona Convention (MED POL).

The representative of MEDASSET referred to several non implemented issues regarding the restoration of the nesting beach and pointed out that certain issues regarding the toxic waste and conservation remained vague, and asked for the follow up of this case.

The Committee decided not to open a file but to request Turkey for the next year a report on the progress in implementing the 2002 Recommendation.

### - **Norway: Windfarms in the Smøla Archipelago**

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2007) 15 rev Summary of case files  
T-PVS/Files (2007) 14 revised Government report  
T-PVS/Files (2007) 32 NGO report

At its 21<sup>st</sup> meeting, the Standing Committee decided not to open a file on this case, but asked Norway not to authorise the second phase of the wind farm project before assessing the results of the first one. The case was raised again during discussions on wind energy and nature conservation at the 26<sup>th</sup> Standing Committee meeting in 2006.

The Secretariat received update reports from BirdLife International in 2007 showing concerns that relate to the threat to the important White-tailed Eagle (*Haliaeetus albicilla*) population in the immediate vicinity of the proposed windfarm. The Norwegian government licensed Stage 1 (20 turbines) of the wind farm in December 2000. According to BirdLife International, Stage 2 (reduced from 52 to 48 turbines) was constructed in 2005 following a “very limited study of Stage 1 (20 turbines)” completed in 2002, while assessment of collision mortality appears to have been undertaken “only since February 2006”.

In 2007, the Norwegian government reported on actions undertaken after the licence to build the windmills in the Smøla Archipelago was issued on 20th December 2000. A review by the Norwegian Institute for Nature Research (NINA) has addressed the following long-term effects of the windmills on the White-tailed eagle: reduced breeding population; increased adult mortality; reduced breeding success; and increased juvenile mortality.

The Bureau had agreed to keep this issue in the agenda and asked the Norwegian authorities to report at the Standing Committee, including on whether the results of the reviews undertaken would have consequences on the operation of the windfarms.

The delegate of Norway informed that a new research project will be conducted until 2010-2011 in collaboration with European experts in order to improve information on wind turbines and their impacts on birds and coastal birds population dynamics concerning both pre- and post-construction phases. She asked the Standing Committee to use the results of that research for future similar challenges regarding bird protection.

The delegate from Croatia wondered whether it is necessary to wait three or four years for the results of that research in order to take measures. She suggested that an on-the-spot appraisal may be useful in this case.

The delegate of BirdLife International stated that the Smola windfarms cause environmental problems and warn against waiting for four years while the windfarms will continue to kill birds. He stressed that the populations in Smola are unique at the international scale, especially for sea eagles. He further called for an on-the-spot visit in late April/early May 2008 as it is the period of highest mortality.

The Committee decided to keep this issue as possible case file and asked the government of Norway to submit annual reports to the Standing Committee, with the possibility of undertaking an on-the-spot appraisal in 2009, which had the agreement of the Norwegian delegation.

**- Turkey: Planned capture of Bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*)**

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2007) 15 rev Summary of case files  
T-PVS (2007) ... Government report  
T-PVS/Files (2007) 31 NGO report

At the 26<sup>th</sup> Standing Committee meeting, the delegate of Monaco informed the Committee of a complaint received by the Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society (WDCS), in its capacity of depositary of the ACCOBAMS Agreement. WDCS had approached the Secretariat of the ACCOBAMS Agreement to denounce a project envisaged by Turkey whereby 30 bottlenose dolphins would be captured in the Black and Mediterranean Sea. Bottlenose dolphins are protected not only by the Bern Convention, but also by the Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution (Barcelona Convention) and the Habitats Directive and the ACCOBAMS Agreement.

The Standing Committee took note of the information at its meeting in 2006 and considered that such captures were not justified. A brief note was received from the Turkish authorities in 2007, with information on the general situation of bottlenose dolphins in Turkey, and the conditions required for the captures.

The Bureau already expressed their concern about the status of the population in the Mediterranean and the impact of the authorised captures, which are conditions established in Article 9.1 of the Convention. Information was requested to the Turkish authorities concerning these points, including scientific studies on the impacts of the captures on those populations that may justify the application of exceptions under Article 9.1 of the Bern Conventions.

The delegate of Turkey informed the Committee that 23 dolphins had been captured out of a population estimated in many thousands. No more dolphins will be captured and none of them were intended for export but to therapy with children.

The delegates of Croatia, Monaco, Senegal, Portugal, WWF and MEDASSET regretted that Turkey had decided to capture those dolphins and hoped it would not be done again. Some delegation thought it was outside the scope of Article 9 because Turkey had not provided data on the impact on the population.

The Committee regretted the exception and requested Turkey to produce population data very fast so the Bureau may re-examine the case.

### **5.3 On-the-spot appraisals**

#### **- Bulgaria: Windfarms in Balchik and Kaliakra – Via Pontica**

Relevant documents: T-PVS/Files (2007) 27 Report of the on-the-spot appraisal  
T-PVS/Files (2007) 9 Report by the Government of Ukraine  
T-PVS/Files (2007) 30 Report by the Government of Romania  
T-PVS/Files (2007) 17 Report by the NGO  
T-PVS (2007) 14 Draft recommendation

This case concerns the building of the first windfarms in Bulgaria, at Balchik and Kaliakra, on the Black Sea coast. The NGO is challenging the chosen sites located on the Via Pontica which is one of the main migratory routes in Europe especially for soaring birds.

An on-the-spot visit was carried out in September 2005, on the basis of which the Committee adopted Recommendation No. 117 (2005), asking the Bulgarian government to reconsider its decision to approve the proposed wind farm in Balchik in view of its potential negative impact on wildlife and taking account of Bulgaria's obligations under the Convention.

In 2006, the Bulgarian government informed the Secretariat that it did not intend to review the decision approving the wind farm project. The Secretariat received information from NGOs on a similar case involving plans to build 129 windmills 20 kms away from Balchik, between the town of Kavarna and the Kaliakra Cape.

At its 26<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Standing Committee decided to open a new case file and organise an on-the-spot appraisal, with the approval of the Bulgarian government.

The on-the-spot visit was carried out on 20-22 June 2007 by the expert (Mr Eckhart Kuijken), accompanied by a member of the Secretariat and by the Executive Secretary of the UN Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds (AEWA), in accordance with the invitation issued by the Standing Committee in 2006.

The expert presented his report including the draft recommendation submitted to the Standing Committee. He stressed the importance of Via Pontica as the most important flyway in Europe and the need to apply the precautionary principle and address the cumulative impacts of the increasing number of windfarm projects in this area. The expert questioned the scientific validity of the reports provided by the investors and expressed his concern for the protected status of the sites concerned and the planned review of proposed sites to be designated under EU legislation.

The delegate of Bulgaria thanked the expert for his report and explained the difficulty of the situation, a common concern for other countries in Europe. She expressed the good will of the Ministry of Environment for finding efficient solutions for the future, although the SEA of renewable energy plans required by the Ministry in 2004 has not been undertaken yet. She further stressed the lack of a common methodology for EIA studies regarding windfarms which leads to different conclusions in EIAs prepared by NGOs and investors. The delegate mentioned a meeting to discuss this issue with all relevant stakeholders, and raised the possible creation of a system of monitoring the influence of windfarms on birds and the need to develop a package of compensatory measures.

The representative of BirdLife informed that the first turbine has been completed and that 60 others have been approved for construction in the Kaliakra IBA. She supported the draft recommendation and asked for the inclusion of two additional paragraphs asking the Government of



Bulgaria to send copies of the consent decisions and related maps to the Standing Committee, and to establish a compulsory stand-still on the sale of public land. The BirdLife representative stressed that Bulgaria's Environment Act makes possible to reconsider past decisions when new information becomes available. She further announced plans to submit soon a formal complaint to the European Commission.

The delegate of Portugal, on behalf of the European Union and its member States, shared the concern for this difficult situation and the fact that the 2005 Recommendation has not been implemented. She proposed to discuss the draft recommendation in a small ad hoc group and report back to the Committee.

The delegate of AEWA congratulated the expert for his report and thanked the Committee for the invitation to participate in the visit. He informed the Committee of a letter sent from CMS/AEWA to the European Environment Commissioner. He called for a strong recommendation to prevent further damage.

An amended version of the draft recommendation on the windfarms planned near Balchik and Kaliakra, and other wind farm developments on the Via Pontica route (Bulgaria) was adopted by the Standing Committee. (see appendix 10).

**- Croatia: Planned motorway across the Drava marshlands and hydro-electric power station in Lesce, across the river Dobra**

Relevant documents: T-PVS/Files (2007) 10 revised and 28 Reports of the on-the-spot appraisals  
T-PVS/Files (2007) 34 Report by the NGO on the planned motorway  
T-PVS (2007) 14 Draft recommendations

Two complaints were received from the NGO Friends of the Earth Croatia, highlighting the foreseeable negative effects of these two projects on local biodiversity and criticising the content of the relevant environmental impact studies.

- Motorway project: Work on the motorway which would form part of the corridor linking the Baltic to the Adriatic has started in the South and is supposed to continue in the North in 2008.
- Hydro-power station: The decision to build the hydro-electric power station was taken in 1988 and work is well under way. The last phase of the project, which poses the greatest threat to nature conservation, is not in the construction phase yet.

In 2006, the Standing Committee agreed to carry out an on-the-spot appraisal for both projects during 2007, with the approval of the Croatian government. The visits were conducted on 5-6 June 2007 by two independent experts (Mr Len Wyatt, for the motorway project, and Mr Pierre Hunkeler, for the hydro-power plant), accompanied by a member of the Secretariat.

Mr Hunkeler presented his report and draft recommendations concerning the hydro-electric power station Lesce on the Dobra River (Croatia).

The delegate of Croatia stressed the value of the on-the-spot appraisal and the lessons learnt from this case. She informed the Committee of new environmental laws adopted in Croatia, including the regulation of the validity of EIA studies, nature protection, and national ecological network. She further informed that the electricity company is commissioning an expert study for species mentioned in this recommendation.

The representative of AEWA, on behalf of UNEP/EUROBATS, commended the excellent on-the-spot-appraisal report on this case. He expressed concern for a key natural heritage site and important habitat for endangered bat species such as the Long-fingered Bat (*Myotis capaccinii*) because of insufficient EIAs allowing for construction permits. He regretted that the seriousness of the case had been noticed when the damage was already done and the project had reached an irreversible stage. He nevertheless hoped that a positive lesson will be learnt from this case as recent decisions and action taken by the Croatian Government in this regard are very promising. Finally, the AEWA representative referred to their recent publication on important underground habitats.

The delegate of Croatia proposed some amendments to the draft recommendations, which the Committee accepted (see appendix 9). The Committee agreed to follow-up on the implementation of this recommendation at its next meeting.

Mr Wyatt presented his report and draft recommendations regarding the Planned Motorway Vc (A5 Autocesta Beli Manastir to Osijek ) across the Drava Marshlands, Slavonia (Croatia).

The delegate of Croatia stressed that progress could be made as construction had not taken place. She informed the Committee that the expert study for a regional park had been finalised and awaited the signature of the Minister. She welcomed the recommendation of the Bern Convention and stated that the Minister of Environment will seek clarification with the investor to include the recommendations from the Standing Committee.

The delegate of Croatia proposed some amendments to the draft recommendations, which the Committee accepted (see appendix 11). The Committee agreed to follow-up on the implementation of this recommendation at its next meeting and asked the government of Croatia to report back in 2008.

#### **5.4 Follow-up of selected recommendations from previous meetings**

Relevant documents: T-PVS/Files (2007) 25 and 26 Government reports on the follow-up of Recommendation No. 79 (1999)  
 T-PVS/Files (2007) 21 Government report on the follow-up of Recommendation No. 96 (2002)  
 T-PVS/Files (2007) 2 and 8 NGO reports on the follow-up of Recommendation No. 96 (2002)  
 T-PVS/Files (2007) 5 Government report on the follow-up of Recommendation No. 107 (2003)  
 T-PVS/Files (2007) 33 Government report on the follow-up of Recommendation No. 108 (2003)  
 T-PVS/Files (2007) 1 and 18 NGO reports on the follow-up of Recommendation No. 108 (2003)  
 T-PVS/Files (2007) 22 Government report on the follow-up of Recommendation No. 112 (2004)  
 T-PVS/Files (2007) 7 NGO report on the follow-up of Recommendation No. 112 (2004)  
 T-PVS/Files (2007) 3 Government report on the follow-up of Recommendation No. 113 (2004)  
 T-PVS/Files (2007) 15 NGO report on the follow-up of Recommendation No. 113 (2004)

##### **- Recommendation No. 79 (1999) on protection of the common hamster (*Cricetus cricetus*) in Europe**

The Secretariat informed that written reports had been received from The Netherlands, Germany and Belgium (Walloon region). The situation of this species is critical in France, where a case file has been opened on the lack of conservation progress in Alsace.

The Committee agreed that an European Action Plan is developed for this species.

##### **- Recommendation No. 96 (2002) on conservation of natural habitats and wildlife, specially birds, in afforestation of lowland (Iceland)**

The Secretariat received a report from BirdLife International on the implementation of Recommendation 96 (2002) on the conservation of birds in afforestation of lowland in Iceland, asking the Bureau to include it in the agenda of this year's Standing Committee as a possible case file, claiming that the Government of Iceland had failed to ensure the satisfactory implementation of any of the seven points of Recommendation 96 (2002) in the past five years.

According to a report received by the NGO, afforestation plans in Iceland present a grave threat to birds as the vast majority of the planting is and will be in lowland Iceland, below an altitude of 100 m. The country's important breeding wader populations are likely to be threatened if the afforestation develops without taking care to avoid the most sensitive areas for birds, such as marshland, river plains and dwarf-birch bogs. They recommend that new plantings should preferentially take place on habitats avoided by breeding waders, such as on slopes and hillsides. They add that afforestation is likely to destroy the habitat for internationally important populations of birds on passage.

The Government of Iceland has reported that no strategic environmental impact assessment (SEA) of afforestation policy in Iceland has been conducted and that no single afforestation programme in Iceland has ever been subject to EIA. In addition, the ongoing work on identifying and mapping habitat types in Iceland has focused on highland areas with no habitat type mapping undertaken in lowland areas. Iceland's Nature Conservation Registry includes areas of high nature value, used as candidates for protection. The delegate of Iceland stressed that preparatory work for the Nature Conservation Strategy 2004-2009 includes the identification of areas of high biological value, most of

which are also listed in the Registry. He further added that the largest birch forest reclamation/afforestation project in Europe, launched in 2005, aims to reclaim some 60.000 hectares of birch and willow forest, increasing the native birch woodland by up to 50%.

The delegate of Iceland confirmed to the Committee that no SEA had been conducted as the law was adopted in spring 2006. However, the new government in post since summer 2007 has decided to move forestry issues and related agencies to the Environment Ministry, which is likely to change the situation. This change will be effective on 1 January 2008. He further reminded the Committee that the implementation of this Recommendation is a long-term task and that his country has the will to implement it as best as possible.

The representative of BirdLife International highlighted that Iceland is the most important country in Europe for breeding waders. She stressed that afforestation had rapidly accelerated since the Recommendation was adopted. She warned that unless better regulated, the policy of subsidizing the planting of non-native trees in the lowlands will have severe impacts on the wader population. Iceland was encouraged to implement 13 measures on this topic (see document with statements T-PVS (2007) 24 addendum).

The Committee agreed to ask Iceland for a report in 2008, to be examined by the Bureau which will consider whether to include it in the agenda of next year's meeting.

- **Recommendation No. 104 (2003) on the conservation of the Spur-thighed tortoise *Testudo graeca graeca* (Spain)**

The Secretariat informed that the report from Spain had been received too late to prepare an official document.

The delegate of Spain gave a presentation about the conservation of the Spur-thighed tortoise in Spain, where it can be found in the regions of Andalucia, Murcia and the Balearic islands. She further informed of the conservation measures applied in the Murcia and Balearic regions, where the species has the status of "vulnerable".

The Committee agreed to consider this species for a European Action Plan.

- **Recommendation No. 107 (2003) on the Odelouca Dam (Portugal)**

The Secretariat informed the Committee of the two reports received from Portugal on the implementation of Recommendation No. 107 (2003).

The delegate of Portugal stressed the co-operation established between Portugal and Spain for the conservation of the Iberian lynx; the breeding centre for the species and the national action plan for the Iberian lynx currently subject to public consultation, which includes the selection of priority areas. Other related conservation action includes an EU Life project in collaboration with other partners and involving local communities.

- **Recommendation no. 108 (2003) on the proposed construction of the "Via Baltica" (Poland)**

The 'Via Baltica' - part of the EU-funded TINA ('Transport Infrastructure Needs Assessment') transport network in Central and Eastern Europe - will be an expressway running from Warsaw to Helsinki. It will pass through Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia and Finland.

The "Via Baltica" project raised several problems regarding the protection of natural areas, according to the report of the independent expert prepared after the "on-the-spot" visit in 2003 (T-PVS (2003)26), which included consideration of the Knyszynska Forest and the Raspuda Valley.

At the 26<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Standing Committee, the Polish delegate informed the Committee that the strategic environmental assessment (SEA) was due to be finalised by the end of 2006. NGOs had been involved in the competitive tendering process and the report itself. The results would make it possible to take a decision on the ultimate route. The Committee took note of this information and asked the Polish Government to provide the decision on the choice of route, the relevant SEA and all other relevant information regarding this case.

In December 2006 the European Commission officially opened legal infringements procedures against the Polish Government based on the Augustow and Wasilkow bypasses. In March 2007, the

Commission took Poland to the European Court of Justice (ECJ) over the planned construction of the Augustow bypass and the Wasilkow bypass, due to the damage they would cause to natural areas of European importance

On 31st July 2007, the European Commission asked the ECJ to take interim measures to ensure that Poland does not go proceed with the construction of the road. According to a press release from the European Commission, the application for urgent action by the Court follows the Polish government's failure to give an undertaking that it will not start construction work on the Augustow bypass through the valley on 1 August 2007. The interim measures requested aim at preventing the works until the Court has had time to rule on the case brought in March.

The Secretariat contacted the Polish authorities in January, March and April 2007 but no reply was received.

An NGO report has been received informing about the construction of two sections of road no. 8, the Polish Government's preferred route for the Via Baltica international road corridor, started at the beginning of 2007, and so damage is imminent to key wildlife sites, including the pristine Rospuda Valley in the Augustow Primeval Forest. This will irreversibly damage habitats of a large number of species, including Lesser-spotted Eagle, White-tailed Eagle, White-backed Woodpecker and Capercaillie. Construction of further sections of the road might start in 2008. The NGOs will continue to monitor the case and will inform the Standing Committee of progress.

The Bureau decided to invite the Polish government to report on the case at the next meeting of the Standing Committee in November 2007.

The Polish government has sent a report to the Secretariat in October 2007 informing that more than 40 variants of the route course were determined in the 1st Phase of this work and then submitted to detailed analysis and tests during the 2nd Phase. Work of the 2nd Phase is being finalised, with the consideration of three recommended variants plus the S8 road planned. These variants will be assessed by mid-November 2007, including the "zero-investment" option in order to select the most favourable one in terms of the environment, human life and health. The assessments of the variants will also include the mitigation activities, the compensation opportunities and the scope of monitoring of the implementation effects, including evaluation of the implementation costs. The studies will be subject to formal public consultation under EIA procedure and will be carried out in late 2007 and early 2008.

The delegate from Poland informed the Committee that the SEA had been completed in mid-November 2007 and that they were preparing public consultation through various hearings. She stressed that the results of the SEA will decide the final route of this trans-European transport corridor and therefore no choice had been made yet, as it depended on the results of the public consultation. She further informed that there was no timetable for construction works and that any change on the original route would have to be accepted by the European Conference of Transport Ministers which was at the origin of this trans-European transport corridor. She added that the SEA dealt with three sections of Via Baltica and that only one of them presented problems of conflict with protected areas and Natura 2000 sites. In this area between Bialystok and Suwalki, no works are taking place, just rehabilitation of the existing national road for safety reasons.

The representative of BirdLife International stressed the limited implementation of Recommendation 108 (2003) and expressed her concern for the fact that road 8 was treated as one of the country's most important priorities in advance of the results from the SEA. She called on the European Commission to ensure that no EU funds are used in this work until the infringement procedure is finalised.

The Committee agreed to follow-up the situation with a report from Poland in 2008.

- **Recommendation No. 112 (2004) on hydro-electric dams at Kárahnjúkar and Nordlingaalda (Iceland)**

BirdLife International wrote to the Secretariat urging the Standing Committee to consider opening a case file regarding Iceland's failure to implement this recommendation and, at least to call for a progress report from the Icelandic Government at the next Standing Committee meeting in November

2007. They stated that even though an SEA law has been in place since spring 2006, there is no evidence that the Icelandic Government has made progress on undertaking an SEA of hydropower (or geothermal) energy plans in Iceland. They added that there is an urgent need for a Master plan for geothermal energy and for an SEA, as the NGO reports that the Icelandic Government currently appears to have plans to develop more power stations.

The Icelandic authorities have reported that it is too early to determine whether the impacts of the Kárahnjúkar hydropower project on Bern Convention species, especially Pink-footed Goose, have been within the range estimated in the EIA. The Hálsón reservoir is now in the first year of operation. In 2008 a complete census of Pink-footed Gees, as well as non-breeding Greylag Geese will be conducted in the Kárahnjúkar impact area. In addition, the protection of Guðlaugstungur and Álfgeirstungur wetlands- and tundra area north of Hofsjökull as a Nature Reserve in 2005, the protection of Eyjabakkar as a National Park and the planned extension of Thjórsárver Nature Reserve, will considerably increase protection of Pink-footed Goose in Iceland. It is estimated that some 30 % of the Icelandic population will be protected within these areas.

The delegate of Iceland stated that he did not have much more to report as they wait to see whether the predicted impacts have actually occurred. A survey will be conducted in 2008 to this effect. There will be a new protected area for the Pink-footed Goose as Iceland hosts the biggest colony in the world, meaning that 30% of the species in Iceland will be in protected areas.

The representative of BirdLife welcomed this development but raised concerns for the implementation of the rest of the recommendation. She asked when the new national park will be operational and complained about lack of public strategy and SEA for geothermal energy, and about the lack of transparency or any apparent benefit for biodiversity of the Kárahnjúkar Monitoring Board.

The delegate of Iceland informed that the new national park will be set up early 2008 as the law was already passed but it will not be fully operational before three or four years.

The Committee agreed to ask Iceland to report in two years' time but to keep the Bureau informed in the meantime for follow-up of this case.

- **Recommendation No. 113 (2004) on military antenna in the Sovereign Base Area (Akrotiri, Cyprus)**

The Committee regretted the absence of a United Kingdom delegate and further regretted that on this issue the United Kingdom report was not very thorough and had been sent only two days before the meeting, so it had been materially impossible to distribute to Parties.

The delegate of BirdLife regretted the absence of the United Kingdom at the meeting and the limited progress: SPA designation has been unjustifiably delayed, poaching of birds is continuing and the monitoring of the mortality of the antenna cannot be done because military authorities were not providing access to the area. The delegate should like an improvement of monitoring of the effects of the antenna on birds.

The Committee wished a more complete report for next year.

**Other issues**

- ***Illegal killing of birds in Cyprus***

At the request of Switzerland, supported by Croatia and Germany, the Committee decided to discuss the implementation of its Recommendation 90 (2000) on the illegal killing of birds in Cyprus.

BirdLife and Terra Cypria said that, following the adoption of Recommendation 90 (2000), strong action had been taken by the Cyprus government and the British authorities (SBA), and that the capture and offering for sale of migratory birds had been much reduced compared to the scale of killing in the 1990s. Unfortunately, the government's and SBA's efforts have either relaxed or are now insufficient to address the aggressive resurgence in trapping. They stated that both prosecutions and penalties should be increased. As well as the trappers themselves, restaurants and consumers should now be targeted as a priority. Such provision exists in the law, but implementation will require greater political will.

The delegate of Cyprus acknowledged that despite strong continuing efforts by the Cyprus government and British authorities, and significant progress made, the problem had not yet been resolved. Even though he was unable to confirm BirdLife's data, he pointed to the continuous co-operation between the Cypriot authorities, the SBA and BirdLife, and advocated that data interpretation should be harmonised.

The Secretariat will ask BirdLife and the government for reports. The Bureau will examine the case to see whether it presents a possible case file or as a point for information at its next meeting

- ***Illegal capture of birds in Mediterranean Parties***

Following interventions from a number of delegates, it became apparent that illegal captures should be examined on a pan-Mediterranean basis. The Committee decided to revisit its Recommendation 5 on that issue. BirdLife and concerned states will be asked to send reports. The Group of Experts on the Conservation of Birds and interested countries will be consulted and the Bureau will decide on future action.

## **PART V – STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONVENTION**

### **6. Strategic development of the Convention**

#### **6.1 Strengthened co-ordination and co-operation with the CBD:**

##### **✓ Signature of an enhanced MoC with the CBD Executive Secretary**

Relevant documents: T-PVS(2007) 3 Information note on the meetings held with the CBD Secretariat  
T-PVS (2007) 20 Enhanced Memorandum of Co-operation with the CBD Secretariat

The Secretariat informed the Committee that the Executive Secretary of the UN Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) had sent his apologies for having been unable to travel to Strasbourg and therefore the signature of the revised Memorandum of Co-operation (MoC) between the secretariats of the CBD and the Bern Convention would be postponed to a future date, possibly at one of the CBD meetings to be held in Europe in the first half of 2008.

##### **✓ Preparation for CBD COP-9**

The Secretariat informed the Committee that plans were underway to actively participate at next year's CBD meetings on protected areas subsidiary body and also at the ninth Conference of the Parties to the CBD to be held in Bonn, Germany, on 19-30 May 2008.

#### **6.2 Council of Europe activities**

##### **✓ European Diploma on Protected Areas under the Bern Convention**

Relevant documents: T-PVS (2007) 23 Integration of the European Diploma of Protected Areas in the activities overseen by the Standing Committee of the Bern Convention

The Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe has invited the Standing Committee of the Bern Convention to give its opinion on the proposal that the Standing Committee manages the European Diploma on Protected Areas, supervising the work of the Group of Specialists on the European Diploma. In this context, the Standing Committee is invited to give its opinion on the draft Resolution on the revised regulations of the European Diploma of Protected Areas. This request is due to the disappearance of the CODBP (Committee on Biological and Landscape Diversity) in 2007, and the fact that the Standing Committee of the Bern Convention is the only biodiversity committee left in the Council of Europe. The Bureau expressed its support to this idea, taking into account that this additional task does not have budgetary implications for the Standing Committee meeting and that it is not foreseen that consideration of the draft resolutions prepared by the Group of Specialists will take much of its time.

Following the discontinuation of the Committee for the activities of the Council of Europe in the field of biological and landscape diversity (CODBP), the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe examined the possibility of placing these activities under the Bern Convention, in the sense

that the Group of Specialists on the European Diploma would continue to carry out the specialised work and the Standing Committee would take the role of the CODBP, that is, to forward proposals to the Committee of Ministers, amending them when necessary.

The Committee held an exchange of views on the issue, enquiring whether the resources, the expertise and the time would be available at the Standing Committee. The Secretariat explained that resources for this activity were already available in the budget and that probably discussions of some problem cases would take some time of the Committee so that a more efficient planning of discussions was necessary.

The Standing Committee recognised the value of the European Diploma of Protected Areas for meeting the objectives of the Convention. Thus, the Committee would be pleased to incorporate into its portfolio of activities, the European Diploma and forward to the Committee of Ministers proposals on the awards, renewal and non-renewal, as stated in the draft resolution on the revised regulations of the European Diploma of Protected Areas (see appendix 13). The Committee approved the draft resolution and encouraged the Committee of Ministers to adopt it.

The Committee decided that decisions on the award, renewal, and non-renewal which, after consultation with the States, were not in conflict would be examined by the Bureau of the Committee and forwarded to the Committee of Ministers for possible adoption and then to the Standing Committee for information. Conflict cases will however be discussed by the Committee. The Committee agreed to the Secretariat's proposal that the Group of Specialists be renewed with experts from the following three countries: Italy, Germany and The Netherlands.

### **Retezat National Park (Romania), Bialowieza National Park (Poland) and Belovezhskaya Pushcha National Park (Belarus)**

Relevant document: T-PVS/Inf (2007) 14 Requests of Poland, Belarus and Romania concerning the possible revisions of the decisions of the Group of Specialists -European Diploma – to be examined by the Standing Committee of the Bern Convention

Romania, Poland and Belarus had asked the Standing Committee to give an opinion on the recommendations of the Group of Specialists on the European Diploma concerning these cases, with which they disagreed.

Further to the findings of a small working group, the Standing Committee decided to ask the Group of Specialists to re-examine at its next meeting, in March 2008, the feedback received on the three areas concerned. In the meantime the committee strongly recommended to the countries concerned that they forward to the secretariat all the documents necessary for the Group of Specialists to make an optimum assessment of the situation and of progress achieved since the preparation of the draft recommendations. The Bureau was asked to monitor this matter.

### **✓ Outcome of the Belgrade Conference “Environment for Europe”**

Relevant documents: T-PVS/misc (2007) 1 Ministerial Declaration from the Belgrade conference  
T-PVS/misc (2007) 2 Belgrade Statement on Biodiversity

The Secretariat described the outcome of the 6th Ministerial Conference “Environment for Europe”, held in Belgrade from 10 to 12 October 2007. It congratulated the Serbian authorities on the organisation of the conference. It reported on the conference declarations, which had mentioned and endorsed the work of the Council of Europe and the Bern Convention and encouraged the development of the Pan-European Ecological Network (PEEN), whose progress had been described in a publication presented at the conference and in a message to the ministers and policy-makers. Two side events on the theme of the PEEN had been held by the Council of Europe and the ECNC in co-operation with the Dutch government.

The Secretariat said that the Ministerial Conference process was being reformed. The Council of Europe, which worked with the UNEP to provide the secretariat for the Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy (PEBLDS), was still committed to continuing the process. It was also planned to establish closer ties with the CBD and its work programme on protected areas, in the context of the application of the CBD at European regional level.

The Chair confirmed that the reform process was continuing and said that efforts would have to be made to make sure that questions of biodiversity continued to be considered within the Environment for Europe process. She added that the Bern Convention could serve as one of the bedrocks for the implementation of biodiversity activities in the context of the new process, once it is established, and more generally in the framework of the regional application of the CBD in Europe.

### **6.3 Functioning of the case-file system: Analysis report**

Relevant document: T-PVS (2007) 6 Analysis of the Rules of Procedure for the Case File System

The Secretariat informed the Committee of the report prepared by former trainee Ms. Rodriguez-Valero and of the Bureau's proposal to prepare a draft recommendation on the basis of the recommendations included in the report, for submission to the Standing Committee in 2008.

The Committee agreed that the Secretariat prepares a draft recommendation for consideration at its 28<sup>th</sup> meeting in November 2008.

### **6.4 Draft Programme of Activities for 2008**

Relevant document: T-PVS (2007) 12 Draft Programme of Activities for 2008

The Secretariat presented a proposal of activities for the year 2008, prepared following discussions at the Bureau.

The Chair highlighted that staff costs had been added to the draft budget for 2008, as requested by the Committee last year.

The delegate of Switzerland asked for a new section to be added on protected areas and the European Diploma as the Committee has agreed to oversee this activity, which has its own funding.

The delegate of Norway confirmed the invitation of his country to host the next meeting of the Group of Experts on the Conservation of Invertebrates in Kongsvoll Alpine Garden, back-to-back with a seminar on the implementation of the European Invertebrate Strategy in Nordic countries, and an excursion, on 23-25 June 2008.

The delegate of Germany asked about the participation of the Bern Convention in CBD CoP-9 to be held in Germany in May 2008.

The Chair thanked Norway for their invitation to hold the meeting on invertebrates and confirmed that the Bern Convention will be represented at the CoP-9 meeting. She also thanked all Contracting Parties that have made voluntary contributions for the implementation of the programme of activities in 2007.

The Committee adopted its programme of activities for the year 2008, as amended (see appendix 14).

### **6.5 States to be invited as observers to the 28<sup>th</sup> meeting**

The Committee decided unanimously to invite the following States to attend its 28<sup>th</sup> meeting: Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Russia, San Marino, Montenegro, Algeria, Belarus, Cape Verde, Holy See, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Mauritania, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan.

## **PART VI- OTHER ITEMS**

### **7. Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman**

The Committee elected Mr Jón Gunnar Ottósson as Chair.

The Committee elected Mr Jan Plesnik as Vice-Chair.

### **8. Date and place of the 28<sup>th</sup> meeting, adoption of the report**

The Committee decided on the date of its 28<sup>th</sup> meeting (24-27 November 2008, in Strasbourg) and



on the possibility of using the Wednesday afternoon for the follow-up of relevant decisions from CBD CoP-9 in 2008, and the European Diploma of Protected Areas.

The delegate of Switzerland asked for these dates to be communicated to other biodiversity conventions so that they are taken into account in the international calendar of biodiversity-related meetings.

In accordance with Article 15 of the Convention, the Committee adopted its report, which will be submitted to the Committee of Ministers.

#### **9. Any other business (items for information only)**

The delegate of Norway raised the issue of elections and the need to revise the rules of procedure to include a set deadline to request nominations so that they can be circulated ahead of the meeting of the Standing Committee, as some delegates need prior consultation at the national level.

The delegates of The Netherlands, Switzerland and Sweden supported that proposal.

The Chair informed that the Bureau will discuss this issue next year.

**APPENDICES TO THE REPORT**

- Appendix 1 List of participants
- Appendix 2 Agenda
- Appendix 3 Recommendation No. 123 (2007) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 29 November 2007, on limiting the dispersal of the Grey squirrel (*Sciurus carolinensis*) in Italy and other Contracting Parties
- Appendix 4 Recommendation No. 124 (2007 of the Standing Committee), adopted on 29 November 2007, on progress in the eradication of the Ruddy duck (*Oxyura jamaicensis*)
- Appendix 5 Recommendation No. 125 (2007) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 29 November 2007, on trade in invasive and potentially invasive alien species in Europe;
- Appendix 6 Recommendation No. 126 (2007) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 29 November 2007, on the eradication of some invasive alien plant species;
- Appendix 7 Recommendation No. 127 (2007) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 29 November 2007, on the conservation and restoration of the European sturgeon (*Acipenser sturio*)
- Appendix 8 Recommendation No. 128 (2007) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 29 November 2007, on the European Charter on Hunting and Biodiversity
- Appendix 9 Recommendation No. 129 (2007) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 29 November 2007, on the construction of a dam and hydro-electric power station in Lesce on the Dobra River (Croatia)
- Appendix 10 Recommendation No. 130 (2007) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 29 November 2007, on the windfarms planned near Balchik and Kaliakra, and other wind farm developments on the Via Pontica route (Bulgaria)
- Appendix 11 Recommendation No 131 (2007) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 29 November 2007, on the Planned Motorway Vc across the Drava Marshlands in Slavonia (Croatia)
- Appendix 12 Recommendation No. 132 (2007) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 29 November 2007, on the conservation of fungi in Europe
- Appendix 13 Resolution on the revised regulations of the European Diploma of Protected Areas
- Appendix 14 Programme of activities for 2008
- Appendix 15 List of Parties and Observers having made voluntary contributions to the 2007 activities

## Appendix 1

### List of participants

---

#### I. CONTRACTING PARTIES / PARTIES CONTRACTANTES

##### **ALBANIA / ALBANIE**

Mrs Elvana RAMAJ, Senior Expert, Nature Protection Policies Directorate, Ministry of the Environment, Forests & Water Administration, Rruga e Duresit, No. 27, TIRANA.

Tel: +355 4 270 624/30 or +355 69 2121425. Fax: +355 4 270 627/30. E-mail: [eramaj@moe.gov.al](mailto:eramaj@moe.gov.al) or [eramaj@hotmail.com](mailto:eramaj@hotmail.com)

##### **AUSTRIA / AUTRICHE**

Mr. Harald GROSS, Amt der Wiener Landesregierung, Magistratsabteilung 22, 1082 WIEN

Tel: +43 1 4000 88349. Fax: +43 / 1 / 4000 9988344. Email: [harald.gross@wien.gv.at](mailto:harald.gross@wien.gv.at)

##### **BELGIUM / BELGIQUE**

Mr Patrick DE WOLF, Ingénieur attaché à la Direction de la Nature, Division de la Nature et des Forêts, Ministère de la Région wallonne, 15, avenue Prince de Liège, B-5100 JAMBES (NAMUR).

Tel : +32 81 33 58 16. Fax : +32 81 33 58 22. E-mail : [P.Dewolf@mrw.wallonie.be](mailto:P.Dewolf@mrw.wallonie.be)

[*Apologised / Excusé*]

##### **BULGARIA / BULGARIE**

Ms Rayna Hristoforova HARDALOVA, Head of Biodiversity Division, Ministry of Environment and Water, 22 Maria Luisa Blvd, 1000 SOFIA.

Tel: +359 2 940 61 63. Fax: +359 2 940 61 27. E-mail: [hardalovar@moew.government.bg](mailto:hardalovar@moew.government.bg)

##### **CROATIA / CROATIE**

Ms Andrea ŠTEFAN, Head of Department, Nature Conservation Directorate, Ministry of Culture, Runjaninova 2, 10 000 ZAGREB.

Tel: +385 1 48 66 124. Fax: +385 1 48 66 100. E-mail: [andrea.stefan@min-kulture.hr](mailto:andrea.stefan@min-kulture.hr)

##### **CYPRUS / CHYPRE**

Mr Demetris KOUTROUKIDES, Environment Officer, Environment Service, Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment, 1411 NICOSIA.

Tel. (00357) 22 303888. Fax. (00357) 22 774945. E mail. [dkoutroukides@environment.moa.gov.cy](mailto:dkoutroukides@environment.moa.gov.cy)

##### **CZECH REPUBLIC / RÉPUBLIQUE TCHÈQUE**

Ms. Jana VAVRINOVA, Bern Convention National Focal Point, Department for the International Conservation of Biodiversity, Ministry of the Environment, Vrsoviccka 65, 100 10 PRAGUE 10

Tel: +420 267 122 375. Fax: +420 267 126 375. E-mail: [Jana\\_Vavrinova@env.cz](mailto:Jana_Vavrinova@env.cz)

Mr Jan PLESNIK, Adviser to Director in foreign affairs, Agency for Nature Conservation and Landscape Protection of the Czech Republic, Nuselská 39, 140 00 PRAGUE 4 - NUSLE

Tel: +420 241 082 114. Fax: +420 241 082 999. E-mail: [jan.plesnik@nature.cz](mailto:jan.plesnik@nature.cz) or [janplesnik@hotmail.com](mailto:janplesnik@hotmail.com)

##### **ESTONIA / ESTONIE**

Mr Jaanus TANILSOO, Nature Conservation Department, Ministry of Environment, Narva Road 7a, 15172 TALLINN.

Tel: ... Fax: ... E-mail:

Ms Liina VAHER, Senior Officer, Nature Conservation Department, Ministry of Environment, Narva Road 7a, 15172 TALLINN.  
Tel +372 62 62 887. Fax +372 62 62 901. E-mail: [Liina.Vaher@envir.ee](mailto:Liina.Vaher@envir.ee)

**EUROPEAN COMMISSION / COMMISSION EUROPEENNE**

Mr András DEMETER, European Commission, Environment Directorate-General, Unit B2: Nature and Bio-diversity, rue de la Loi 200, B-1049 BRUSSELS  
Tel: +32-2-29.63245. Fax: +32-2-29.90895. E-mail: [andras.demeter@ec.europa.eu](mailto:andras.demeter@ec.europa.eu)

**FINLAND / FINLANDE**

Mr. Sami NIEMI, Deputy Director General, Department of Fisheries and Game, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, PO BOX 30, 00023 GOVERNMENT  
Tel: +358 400 238 505. Fax : +358 9 1605 2284. Email: [sami.niemi@mmm.fi](mailto:sami.niemi@mmm.fi)

Mr Matti OSARA, Ministry of the Environment, Land Use Department, PL 35, 00023 Valtioneuvosto, PO Box 35, 00023 GOVERNMENT  
Tel +358 (0)20 490 7122. Fax +358 (0)9 160 39364. E-mail : [matti.osara@ymparisto.fi](mailto:matti.osara@ymparisto.fi)

**FRANCE / FRANCE**

Ms Véronique HERRENSCHMIDT [*Chair*], Responsable de la mission internationale, Direction de la nature et des paysages, ministère de l'Écologie, du Développement et de l'Aménagement durables 20, avenue de Ségur, F-75302 PARIS 07 SP  
Tel : +33 1 42 19 19 48. Fax : +33 1 42 19 19 06  
E-mail : [veronique.herrenschmidt@ecologie.gouv.fr](mailto:veronique.herrenschmidt@ecologie.gouv.fr)

Mr Patrick HAFFNER, Expert Scientifique, Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Unité Inventaire et suivi de la biodiversité, 57 rue Cuvier, 75231 PARIS Cedex 05.  
Tel : +33 140 79 31 62. Fax : +33 1 40 79 35 53. E-mail : [haffner@mnhn.fr](mailto:haffner@mnhn.fr)

Mr. Michel PERRET, Chef de bureau de la faune et de la flore sauvages, ministère de l'Écologie, du Développement et de l'Aménagement durables, 20 avenue de Ségur, F-75302 PARIS 07 SP  
Tel: +33 142 19 18 69. Fax: +33 142 19 19 79. E-mail: [michel.perret@ecologie.gouv.fr](mailto:michel.perret@ecologie.gouv.fr)

Mr Patrice BLANCHET, Sous-Directeur de la chasse, de la faune et de la flore sauvages, ministère de l'Écologie, du Développement et de l'Aménagement durables (chef de délégation), 20 avenue de Ségur, F-75302 PARIS 07 SP  
Tel: +33 142 19 19 18. Fax: +33 142 19 19 30. E-mail : [patrice.blanchet@ecologie.gouv.fr](mailto:patrice.blanchet@ecologie.gouv.fr)

Mr Jacques LAISNE, Préfet du Var, Hôtel de la Préfecture, BD du 112 eme régiment d'infanterie, BP 1209, 83070 TOULON Cedex  
Tel : +33 ... Fax : +33 ... E-mail : [marie-claire.thomas@var.pref.gouv.fr](mailto:marie-claire.thomas@var.pref.gouv.fr)

Monsieur Raphaël LE-MÉHAUTÉ, Secrétaire général de la préfecture du Bas-Rhin, 5 place de la République, 67073 STRASBOURG Cedex  
Tel : +33 388 21 67 68. Fax : +33 388 21 61 55. E-mail : [raphael.le-mehaute@bas-rhin.pref.gouv.fr](mailto:raphael.le-mehaute@bas-rhin.pref.gouv.fr)

Mr Xavier LOUBERT-DAVAINE, chargé de mission espèces invasives au bureau de la faune et de la flore sauvages, ministère de l'Écologie, du Développement et de l'Aménagement durables, 20 avenue de Ségur, F-75302 PARIS 07 SP  
Tel: +33 142 19 11 33. E-mail [xavier.loubert-davaine@ecologie.gouv.fr](mailto:xavier.loubert-davaine@ecologie.gouv.fr)

Mr Vincent BENTATA, chargé de mission au bureau de la faune et de la flore sauvages, ministère de l'Écologie, du Développement et de l'Aménagement durables, 20 avenue de Ségur, F-75302 PARIS 07 SP  
Tel : +33 1 42 19 18 66 Fax : +33 1 42 19 19 79 E-mail : [vincent.bentata@ecologie.gouv.fr](mailto:vincent.bentata@ecologie.gouv.fr)

Ms Martine BIGAN, chargée de mission à la Sous-direction de la chasse, de la faune et de la flore sauvages, ministère de l'Ecologie, du Développement et de l'Aménagement durables, 20 avenue de Ségur, F-75302 PARIS 07 SP

Tel : +33 142 19 18 70. Fax : +33 142 19 19 79. E-mail : [martine.bigan@ecologie.gouv.fr](mailto:martine.bigan@ecologie.gouv.fr)

Mr Eric ROCHARD, Directeur de recherche, animateur du thème de recherche DYMECO, Cemagref, Unité de recherche : Ecosystèmes estuariens et poissons migrateurs amphihalins, 50 avenue de Verdun, F 33612 CESTAS.

Tel + 33 557 89 08 13. Fax + 33 557 89 08 01. E-mail: [eric.rochard@cemagref.fr](mailto:eric.rochard@cemagref.fr). Site: <http://www.Cemagref.fr>

#### **GERMANY / ALLEMAGNE**

Ms Christiane PAULUS, Head of Division, Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety, AG NI 4P, Robert-Schuman-Platz 3, D-53175 BONN

Tel: +49 228 99 305 26 30. Fax: +49 228 99 305 26 84. E-mail: [Christiane.Paulus@bmu.bund.de](mailto:Christiane.Paulus@bmu.bund.de)

Mr Oliver SCHALL, Head of Unit, International Nature Conservation, Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety, Referat / Division N I 4, Robert-Schuman-Platz 3, D-53175 BONN.

Tel: +49 228 99 305 2632. Fax: +49 228 99 305 2684. E-mail: [Oliver.Schall@bmu.bund.de](mailto:Oliver.Schall@bmu.bund.de)

Mr Edward RAGUSCH, International Nature Conservation, Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety, Referat / Division N I 4, Robert-Schuman-Platz 3, D-53175 BONN.

Tel: +49 228-3052663. Fax +49 228-30526814. E-mail: [edward.ragusch@bmu.bund.de](mailto:edward.ragusch@bmu.bund.de)

Mr Joern GESSNER, Society to Save the Sturgeon, c/o Leibniz Institute for Freshwater Ecology, and Inland Fisheries Berlin, Post address, Müggelseedamm 310, D-12587 BERLIN [PO Box 850119, D-12561 Berlin]

Tel./Fax: +49 30 64181626. E-mail: [sturgeon@igb-berlin.de](mailto:sturgeon@igb-berlin.de)

#### **HUNGARY / HONGRIE**

Ms Éva Anita HAÁZ, European Community Law Department, Biodiversity Unit, Ministry of Environment and Water, Fö u. 44-50, H-1011 BUDAPEST

Tel: +36-1-395-68 57. Fax : +36 1 275 45 05. E-mail : [haaz@mail.kvvm.hu](mailto:haaz@mail.kvvm.hu)

#### **ICELAND / ISLANDE**

Dr Jón Gunnar OTTÓSSON, Director General, Icelandic Institute of Natural History, Hlemmur 3, 125 REYKJAVIK

Tel: +354 590 0500. Fax: +354 590 0595. E-mail: [jgo@ni.is](mailto:jgo@ni.is)

#### **LATVIA / LETTONIE**

Mr. Vilnis BERNARDS, Head of Species and Habitats Conservation Division, Ministry of Environment, Peldu str. 25, LV-1494 RIGA

Tel: +371 2 7026524. Fax: +371 2 7820442. E-mail: [vilnis.bernards@vidm.gov.lv](mailto:vilnis.bernards@vidm.gov.lv)

Ms Inese GMIZO-LÁRMANE, Expert, Nature Protection Department Ministry of Environment, Peldu str. 25, LV-4149 RIGA

Tel: +371 2 7026484. Fax: +371 2 7820442. E-mail: [inese.gmizo-larmane@vidm.gov.lv](mailto:inese.gmizo-larmane@vidm.gov.lv)

#### **LIECHTENSTEIN / LIECHTENSTEIN**

Mr Michael FASEL, Head of Department, Amt für Wald, Natur und Landschaft (Office pour la forêt, la nature et le paysage), Dr. Grass-Strasse 10, FL-9490 VADUZ.

Tel / Fax: +423 236 6405. E-mail: [michael.fasel@awnl.li](mailto:michael.fasel@awnl.li)

*[Apologised / Excusé]*

**MOLDOVA / MOLDOVA**

Mrs. Ala ROTARU, Principal Consultant, Division of Natural Resources and Biodiversity, Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of the Republic Moldova, 9, Cosmonautilor str. MD-2005 CHISINAU.

Tel: +373 22 204 535. Fax: +373 22 281 873. E-mail : [rotaru@mediu.gov.md](mailto:rotaru@mediu.gov.md)

**MONACO / MONACO**

Mr Patrick VAN KLAVEREN, Ministre Conseiller, Agrégé de l'Université, Délégué Permanent auprès des Organismes Internationaux à caractère scientifique, environnemental et humanitaire, 13, rue Emile de Loth, 98000-MONACO

Tél: +377 98 98 81 48. Fax: +377 93 50 95 91. E-mail : [pvanklaveren@gouv.mc](mailto:pvanklaveren@gouv.mc)

**MORROCO / MAROC**

Ms Hayat MESBAH, Chef du Service de la conservation de la flore et de la faune sauvages, Haut-Commissariat aux Eaux et Forêts et à la Lutte contre la Désertification, 3, rue Haroun Errachid, Agdal, RA BAT

Tel: +212 37 67 42 70. fax: +212 37 67 26 28. E-mail: [Mesbah\\_ef@yahoo.fr](mailto:Mesbah_ef@yahoo.fr)

**NORWAY / NORVÈGE**

Ms Elisabeth JERNQVIST, Legal adviser, Directorate for Nature Management (Head of delegation), Tungasletta 2, N-7485 TRONDHEIM

Tel: + 47 73580500. Tel: + 47 73580807 (direct). Fax: + 47 73580501. E-mail: [Elisabeth.Jernqvist@DIRNAT.NO](mailto:Elisabeth.Jernqvist@DIRNAT.NO). site: [www.dirnat.no](http://www.dirnat.no)

Ms Solveig PAULSEN, Senior Advisor, Ministry of the Environment, Post-box 8013 Dep., 0030 OSLO.

Tel: +47 22245854 E-mail: [solveig.paulsen@md.dep.no](mailto:solveig.paulsen@md.dep.no)

Mr Øystein STØRKERSEN, Senior Advisor, Directorate for Nature Management, Tungasletta 2, N-7485 TRONDHEIM

Tel. +47-7358 0500. Fax: +47-7358 0501 or 7358 0505. E-mail: [oystein.storkersen@dirnat.no](mailto:oystein.storkersen@dirnat.no)

**POLAND / POLOGNE**

Ms Katarzyna WIKTOROWICZ - Director of Investment Preparation Department, General Directorate for National Roads and Motorways, ul. Żelazna 59, 00-848 WARSZAWA.

Tel: +48 2237587-10 Fax: +48 223758746 E-mail: [kwiktorowicz@gddkia.gov.pl](mailto:kwiktorowicz@gddkia.gov.pl)

Ms Katarzyna MARANDA General Directorate for National Roads and Motorways, ul. Żelazna 59, 00-848 WARSZAWA.

Tel: +48 22 ... Fax: +48 22 ... E-mail: [kmaranda@gddkia.gov.pl](mailto:kmaranda@gddkia.gov.pl)

Mr Łukasz WRÓBEL, Department of Forestry, Nature and Landscape Conservation; Ministry of the Environment, Ul. Wawelska 52/54, 00-922 WARSZAWA

Tel: +48 22 5792663. Fax: +48 22 5792290. E-mail: [lukasz.wrobel@mos.gov.pl](mailto:lukasz.wrobel@mos.gov.pl)

Ms Renata KRZYŚCIAK - KOSIŃSKA - Białowieża National Park, Head of Research Unit, Park Palacowy 5, 17-230 BIALOWIEZA.

Tel: +48 85 6812348. Fax: +48 856812306. E-mail: [rk.kosinska@bpn.com.pl](mailto:rk.kosinska@bpn.com.pl)

**PORTUGAL / PORTUGAL**

Ms Ana Isabel QUEIROZ, Biologist, Assessora do Secretário de Estado do Ambiente, Rua de "O Século", 51, 1200-433 LISBOA

Tel :: + 351 21 323 25 00 Ext. 1452. Fax: + 351 21 323 16 58. E-mail: [anaq@maotdr.gov.pt](mailto:anaq@maotdr.gov.pt)

Mr Paulo CARMO, Instituto da Conservação da Natureza e da Biodiversidade, Morada: Rua de Santa Marta, 55 - 1150-294 LISBOA  
Tel.: + 351 (21) 213 507 900. Fax: + 351 (21) 213 507 984. E-mail: [carmop@icnb.pt](mailto:carmop@icnb.pt)

#### **THE NETHERLANDS / PAYS-BAS**

Mr Peter BOS, Senior Executive Officer for International Nature Affairs, Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality, Directorate for Nature, P.O.Box 20401, 2500 EK THE HAGUE.  
Tel : +31703785529. Fax : +31703786146. E-mail : [p.w.bos@minlnv.nl](mailto:p.w.bos@minlnv.nl) (E)

#### **ROMANIA / ROUMANIE**

Ms Veronica ANGHEL, Attaché diplomatique, Direction générale des Affaires juridiques, Ministère des Affaires étrangères, Modrogan Rue, n° 14, Secteur 1 BUCHAREST.  
Tel : +4021 319 21 99. Fax : +4021 319 23 54. E-mail : [veronica.anghel@mae.ro](mailto:veronica.anghel@mae.ro)

Mr Costin-Horia ROGOVEANU, Legal Counselor of the Permanent Representation of Romania to the Council Europe, 64 allée de la Robertsau, F-67000 STRASBOURG  
Tel: +33 388 37 01 60. Fax: +33 388 37 16 70. E-mail : [horia.rogoveanu@gmail.com](mailto:horia.rogoveanu@gmail.com)  
[reprocoe@fr.oleane.com](mailto:reprocoe@fr.oleane.com)

#### **SENEGAL / SÉNÉGAL**

Mr Moustapha MBAYE, Conservateur du PNDS, Direction des Parcs nationaux, Parc zoologique et forestier de Hann, BP 5135, Dakar – Fann  
Tel: +221 33 832 2309 or +221 77 641 9215. Fax: +221 33 832 23 11. E-mail: [dpn@sentoo.sn](mailto:dpn@sentoo.sn) ou [fouleye.camara@yahoo.fr](mailto:fouleye.camara@yahoo.fr) ou [aichayacine@hotmail.com](mailto:aichayacine@hotmail.com)

#### **SLOVAKIA / SLOVAQUIE**

Ms Jana DURKOŠOVÁ, Senior Advisor, Department of Nature and Landscape Protection, Ministry of the Environment of the Slovak Republic, Namestie L Stura 1, 812 35 BRATISLAVA 1  
Tel : +421 2 5956 2211. Fax : +421 2 5956 2031. E-mail : [jana.durkosova@enviro.gov.sk](mailto:jana.durkosova@enviro.gov.sk)

#### **SLOVENIA / SLOVÉNIE**

Mr Peter SKOBERNE, Under Secretary, Ministrstvo za okolje in Prostor, Dunajska 48, SI-1000 LJUBLJANA  
Tel : +386 1 309 45 62. Fax : +386 1 309 45 93. E-mail : [peter.skoberne@gov.si](mailto:peter.skoberne@gov.si)

#### **SPAIN / ESPAGNE**

Ms Barbara SOTO-LARGO, Assistance technique, Dirección General de Conservacion de la Naturaleza, , Ministerio de Medio Ambiente, c/ Gran Via de San Francisco 4, E-28005 MADRID  
Tel : +34 91 596 4658. Fax : +34 91 596 5510. E-mail : [c.nuevo@mma.es](mailto:c.nuevo@mma.es)

#### **SWEDEN / SUÈDE**

Mr Peter ÖRN, Principal Administrative Officer, Landscape Unit, Natural Resources Department, Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, Blekholmsterrassen 36, SE-106 48 STOCKHOLM.  
Tel: +46 8 698 15 26. Fax: +46 8 698 14 02. E-mail: [peter.orn@naturvardsverket.se](mailto:peter.orn@naturvardsverket.se)

#### **SWITZERLAND / SUISSE**

Mr Olivier BIBER, Chef des Questions internationales Nature & Paysage, Office fédéral de l'environnement, des forêts et du paysage (OFEV), CH-3003 BERNE  
Tel : +41 31 323 06 63. Fax : +41 31 323 89 74. E-mail : [olivier.biber@bafu.admin.ch](mailto:olivier.biber@bafu.admin.ch)

Mr Reinhard SCHNIDRIG, Section Chasse et Faune sauvage, Division Gestion des espèces, Office fédéral de l'environnement, des forêts et du paysage (DETEC), Worbentalstrasse 68, CH-3003 BERN  
Tel : +41 31 323 03 07. Fax : +41 31 323 89 74. E-mail : [reinhard.schnidrig@bafu.admin.ch](mailto:reinhard.schnidrig@bafu.admin.ch)

**TURKEY / TURQUIE**

Mr İrfan UYSAL, Expert Biologist, Ministry of Environment & Forestry, Ministry of Environment and Forestry (Çevre ve Orman Bakanlığy), İskitlar Ek Bina / Istanbul Cod. NO:98, 06060-İskitlar/ANKARA.

Tel: +90 312 384 05 10

Mr Yakup KASKA, Pamukkale University, Faculty of Arts and Science, Department of Biology, DENIZLI

Tel: +90.258.295 3668. Fax: +90.258.295 3593. E-mail: [caretta@pau.edu.tr](mailto:caretta@pau.edu.tr). web-page:<http://caretta.pamukkale.edu.tr>

Mr Hasan KILIÇ, MSc, Agricultural Engineer, KKGm, Akay cad. no :3 BAKANLIKLAR/ANKARA-

Tel: +90 (312) 417 41 76/ 5051. Fax : +90 (312) 418 58 34. E- mail: [hasank@kkgm.gov.tr](mailto:hasank@kkgm.gov.tr)

Mr Asuman HAKSAL, Şişecam, Group Development Manager, SISECAM Chemicals Business, Soda sanayii AS. 33003 KAZANLI MERSIN

Tel: +90 324 241 69 01. Fax: +90 324 451 34 95. E-mail: [ahaksal@sisecam.com](mailto:ahaksal@sisecam.com)

Mr Faruk SANDER, Şişecam, HSE Manager, Soda sanayii AS. 33003 KAZANLI MERSIN

Tel: +90 324 241 64 85. Fax: +90 324 241 60 55. E-mail: [fsander@sisecam.com](mailto:fsander@sisecam.com)

Mr İrfan EKMEKÇİ, Expert Biologist, Ministry of Environment and Forestry, General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks, Department of Nature Conservation, Division of Protected Species, Söğütözü Cad. 14/E Söğütözü-ANKARA

Tel: +90-312-207 5922. Fax: +90-312-207 5959. Email: [irfancaretta@yahoo.com](mailto:irfancaretta@yahoo.com) or [ekmekci\\_hatay@hotmail.com](mailto:ekmekci_hatay@hotmail.com)

Mr Fehmi ŞAHİN, Manager of Department, Ministry of Environment and Forestry, General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks, Söğütözü Cad. 14/E Söğütözü-ANKARA

Tel +90-312-207 5895. Fax: +90-312-207 5959. E-mail: [sahin\\_fehmi@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:sahin_fehmi@yahoo.co.uk)

Mr Ümit TURAN, Ministry of Environment and Forestry, Söğütözü Cad. 14/E Söğütözü-ANKARA

Tel: +90 312 2221234. E-mail: [umttrn@gmail.com](mailto:umttrn@gmail.com)

**UKRAINE / UKRAINE**

Ms Iryna I MAKARENKO, third secretary, Dept. of Economic Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine, 1, Mykhailivska Sqr., KYIV 01018.

Tel.: +38 (044) 238 17 91. Fax: +38 (044) 238 17 91. E-mail: [i.makarenko@mfa.gov.ua](mailto:i.makarenko@mfa.gov.ua)

Mr Viktor BEZDOLNIY, Director, State Enterprise "Delta-Pilot", p.b.16, MYKOLAIV, 54017 - Office: 27, Lyagina St., MYKOLAIV, 54001

Tel: +38-0512-500 901. Fax: +38-0512-500 999. E-mail: [office@delta-pilot.ua](mailto:office@delta-pilot.ua) or [sea@delta-pilot.ua](mailto:sea@delta-pilot.ua)

Mr Igor SHEVCHENKO, State Enterprise "Delta-Pilot", p.b.16, MYKOLAIV, 54017 - Office: 27, Lyagina St., MYKOLAIV, 54001

Tel: + 38-0512-530122. E-mail: [office@delta-pilot.ua](mailto:office@delta-pilot.ua)

Mr Aleksandr VASENKO, State Enterprise "Delta-Pilot", p.b.16, 6, Bakulina str., KHARKIV 01166

Tel: +38-057-758 6418. Fax: +38-057-758 6419. E-mail: [vasenko@rPMC.com.ua](mailto:vasenko@rPMC.com.ua)

**UNITED KINGDOM / ROYAUME-UNI**

Ms Caroline COWAN, Climate Impacts and Adaptation, UK and EU Climate Adaptation, Defra, 3rd Floor, Ergon House, 17 Smith Square, LONDON, SW1P 3JR

Tel +44 (0)20 7238 3365. Fax +44 (0)20 7238 8143. E-mail: [caroline.cowan@DEFRA.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:caroline.cowan@DEFRA.gsi.gov.uk)



## II. MEMBER STATES NON CONTRACTING PARTIES / ETATS MEMBRES NON PARTIES CONTRACTANTES B

### SERBIA

Ms Snezana PROKIC, Counsellor for nature protection and biodiversity, Ministry for Science and Environmental Protection, Uprava za zastitu zivotne sredinen Omladinskih brigade 1, SIV III, 11070 NOVI BEOGRAD

Tel / Fax: +381 11 31 31 569. E-mail: [snezana.prokic@ekoserb.sr.gov.yu](mailto:snezana.prokic@ekoserb.sr.gov.yu) or [s\\_prokic@hotmail.com](mailto:s_prokic@hotmail.com)

## III. OTHER STATES / AUTRES ÉTATS

### HOLY SEE / SAINT SIÈGE

Mr Jean-Pierre RIBAUT, 27 rue Rabié, F-33250 PAUILLAC, France.

Tel : +33 556 59 13 64. Fax : +33 556 59 68 80. E-mail: [jeanpierreribau@wanadoo.fr](mailto:jeanpierreribau@wanadoo.fr)

### BELARUS / BELARUS

Ms. Galina VOLCHUGA, Deputy Minister of Environment and Natural Resources, Ul. Kollektornaya 10, 22048 MINSK.

Tel. +375 17 2003983. Fax °375 17 2005583. E-mail [minproos@mail.belpak.by](mailto:minproos@mail.belpak.by) or [icd@minpriroda.by](mailto:icd@minpriroda.by)

Mr. Mikalai BAMBIZA, Director General of the "Belovezhskaya Pushcha" National Park, 225063 KAMENYUKI, Kamenetski raion, Brest Region.

Tel +375 16 3156169. Fax +375 1631 25056. E-mail [nppbpy@rambler.ru](mailto:nppbpy@rambler.ru)

Mr Igor KACHANOVSKY, Director of the Protected Areas Department of the Administrative and Logistics Office of the President's Administration, Ul. K.Marx 38, 220016 MINSK

Tel. +37517 2223875,+375 293122817 (cell). Fax +37517 2066482. E-mail: [priroda@pmrb.gov.by](mailto:priroda@pmrb.gov.by)

Mr Dmitry YARMOLYUK, Representative of Belarus to the Council of Europe, Palais de l'Europe - Pièce 1514 - 67075 Strasbourg Cedex

Tél. +33 390 21 41 40. Fax: +33 388 41 36 07. E-mail [belmission\\_coe@mail.by](mailto:belmission_coe@mail.by).

Mr Andrei SUKHORENKO, Vice- Representative of Belarus to the Council of Europe, Palais de l'Europe - Pièce 1514 - 67075 Strasbourg Cedex

Tél. +33 390 21 41 40. Fax: +33 388 41 36 07. E-mail [belmission\\_coe@mail.by](mailto:belmission_coe@mail.by)

## IV. INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS AND SECRETARIATS OF CONVENTIONS / ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES ET SECRÉTARIATS DE CONVENTIONS

### Convention on Biological Diversity (UNEP/CBD) / Convention sur la Diversité biologique (PNUE/CDB)

Mr Ahmed DJOHLAF, Executive Secretary, Convention on Biological Diversity, World Trade Centre Building, 413, St-Jacques, World Trade Centre, 8th Floor, Suite 800, MONTREAL H2Y1N9, Canada

Tel: +1 514 287 8710. Fax: +1 514 288 6588. E-mail : ... Website: [www.cbd.int](http://www.cbd.int)

[Apologised / Excusé]

**European Environment Agency / Agence européenne pour l'Environnement**

Mr Tor-Bjorn LARSSON, Project manager forest and biodiversity, European Environment Agency, Kongennytorv 6, 1050 COPENHAGEN K, Denmark.

Tel: +45 333 67120. Fax: +45 333 67293. E-mail: [Tor-bjorn.larsson@eea.europa.eu](mailto:Tor-bjorn.larsson@eea.europa.eu)

[Apologised / Excusé]

**European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organisation (EPPO) / European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organisation (EPPO)**

Ms Sarah BRUNEL, Scientific Officer "Invasive Alien Plants", EPPO/OEPP, 1, rue le Nôtre, 75016 PARIS

Tél: +33-1-45-20-77-94. Fax : +33-1-42-24-89-43. E-mail: [brunel@epo.fr](mailto:brunel@epo.fr). Web: [www.epo.org](http://www.epo.org)

**Secretariat of the Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Waterbird (UNEP/AEWA) / Secrétariat de l'Accord sur la conservation des oiseaux d'eau migrateurs d'Afrique-Eurasie (UNEP/AEWA)**

Mr. Sergey DERELIEV, Technical Officer, UNEP/AEWA Secretariat, Hermann-Ehlers Str. 10, D-53113 BONN, Germany

tel: +49-228-815-2415. fax: +49-228-815-2450. e-mail: [sdereliev@unep.de](mailto:sdereliev@unep.de)

**Secretariat of the Protocol concerning Mediterranean specially protected areas / Secrétariat du Protocole relatif aux aires spécialement protégées de la Méditerranée (Geneva / Genève)****Regional Activity Centre for Specially Protected Areas (RAC/SPA) – Tunis / Centre d'activités régionales pour les aires spécialement protégées (CAR/ASP)**

Mr Abderrahmen GANNOUN, Directeur du CAR/ASP, Boulevard du leader Yasser Arafat, BP 337, 1080 TUNIS Cedex, Tunisia

Tel : +216 71 206 649 / 71 206 81. Fax : +216 71 206 490. E-mail : [gannoun.abderrahmen@rac-spa.org](mailto:gannoun.abderrahmen@rac-spa.org)

**Secretariat of the United Nations Environment Programme – Mediterranean Action Plan (UNEP/MAP) / Secrétariat du Programme des Nations Unies pour l'Environnement – Plan d'action pour la Méditerranée (PNUE/PAM)**

Ms Tatjana HEMA, MEDU Programme Officer, United Nations Environment Programme, Coordinating Unit for the Mediterranean Action Plan, 48, V. Konstantinou Ave.48, 15136 ATHENS, Greece

Tel: +30 210 7273115. Fax: +30 210 7253196,7. E-mail: [thema@unepmap.gr](mailto:thema@unepmap.gr)

**The World Conservation Union / L'Union mondiale pour la nature (IUCN/UICN)**

Prof. Robert KENWARD, Regional Chair (Europe), Sustainable Use Specialist Group (SSC), c/o Stoborough Croft, Grange Road, Wareham, Dorset BH20 5AJ, United Kingdom

Tel : +44 1929 553759. Fax : +44 1929 553761. E-mail : [reke@ceh.ac.uk](mailto:reke@ceh.ac.uk)

**V. OTHER ORGANISATIONS / AUTRES ORGANISATIONS****BirdLife International - Royal Society for Protection of Birds (RSPB) / BirdLife International - Société royale pour la protection des Oiseaux (RSPB)**

Ms Nicola J CROCKFORD – SUTHERLAND, European Wildlife Treaties Adviser, The RSPB - BirdLife in the UK, UK Headquarters, The Lodge, SANDY, Bedfordshire SG19 2DL, United Kingdom.

Tel: +44 (0)1767 693072. Fax: +44 (0)1767 683211 (or +44 (0)1767 692365). E-mail: [nicola.crockford@rspb.org.uk](mailto:nicola.crockford@rspb.org.uk). Website: [www.rspb.org.uk](http://www.rspb.org.uk)

Ms Irina MATEEVA, Bulgarian Society for the Protection of Birds (BSPB) / BirdLife Bulgaria, Yavorov Complex BL71 ent 4, ap. 1, 1111 SOFIA, Bulgaria

Tel: +359 2 971 58 56. Fax: +359 2 971 58 56. E-mail: [Irina.kostadinova@bspb.org](mailto:Irina.kostadinova@bspb.org)  
Site : [www.bspb.org](http://www.bspb.org)

Mr Alv Ottar FOLKESTAD, Chairman of NOF (Norwegian Ornithological Society/BirdLife in Norway), Aursnes, N-6068 EIKSUND, Norway.  
Tel.: +47 9431 6064. E-mail: [alv.o.folkestad@ulstein.kommune.no](mailto:alv.o.folkestad@ulstein.kommune.no)

Mr George PSYLLIDES, Campaigns Officer, BirdLife Cyprus, PO Box 28076, NICOSIA 2090, Cyprus.  
Tel: + 357 22 455072. Fax +357 22 455073. E-mail: [george.psyllides@birdlifecyprus.org.cy](mailto:george.psyllides@birdlifecyprus.org.cy)

Ms Christin GEYER, Cultural anthropologist student, Johann Wolfgang Goethe University Frankfurt, Nordring 91A, 60388 FRANKFURT, Germany.  
Tel.+49 6109 248055. Fax: +49 6109 21942. E-mail: [Chrissitin@gmx.de](mailto:Chrissitin@gmx.de) or [C.Geyer@volv.uni-frankfurt.de](mailto:C.Geyer@volv.uni-frankfurt.de)

#### **European Public Law Centre**

Mr Eleftherios LEVANTIS, Attorney at law, Senior Research Fellow , at the European Public Law Centre, Achaiou str. 16, ATHENS, Greece  
Tel: +3 210 7258 801. Fax: +3 210 7258 040. E-mail: [elan@otenet.gr](mailto:elan@otenet.gr). <http://www.eurpic.org>

Ms Kateryna NASTECHKO, Research Fellow, 158.5, 4esi Ukrainki Boulevard, 01133 KYIV, Ukraine.  
Tel +380 50 326 11 86. E-mail [knastechko@yandex.ru](mailto:knastechko@yandex.ru). Website: <http://www.eplc.gr>

#### **Federation of Associations for hunting and conservation of the EU (FACE)**

Mr Yves LECOQ, Secretary General, FACE - Federation of Associations for Hunting and Conservation of the E.U, Rue F. Pelletier 82 B-1030 BRUSSELS, Belgium  
Tel : +32 2 732 69 00. Fax : +32 2 732 70 72. E-mail : [ylecocq@face.eu](mailto:ylecocq@face.eu)

Mr Manuel ESPARRAGO, Deputy Secretary-General, FACE - Federation of Associations for Hunting and Conservation of the E.U, Rue F. Pelletier 82 B-1030 BRUSSELS, Belgium  
Tel. +32-2-732 69 00 Fax +32-2-732 70 72. E-mail: [publicaffairs@face.eu](mailto:publicaffairs@face.eu). Site web: [www.face.eu](http://www.face.eu)

#### **France Nature Environnement**

Ms Stéphanie MORELLE, chargée de mission, France Nature Environnement, Réseau Nature de France Nature Environnement, 8, rue Adèle Riton - 67000 STRASBOURG, France  
Tél : +33 3 88 32 91 14. Fax : +33 3 88 22 31 74 - Email : [nature@fne.asso.fr](mailto:nature@fne.asso.fr)

M. Frédéric DECK, Administrateur de France Nature Environnement et Président d'Alsace Nature, Réseau Nature de France Nature Environnement, 8, rue Adèle Riton - 67000 STRASBOURG, France  
Tél : 03 88 32 91 14 - fax : 03 88 22 31 74 - Email : [nature@fne.asso.fr](mailto:nature@fne.asso.fr)

M. Marc BRIGNON, Président du GEPMA (Groupe d'Études et de Protection des Mammifères d'Alsace), Réseau Nature de France Nature Environnement, 8, rue Adèle Riton - 67000 STRASBOURG, France  
Tél : 03 88 32 91 14 - fax : 03 88 22 31 74 - Email : [nature@fne.asso.fr](mailto:nature@fne.asso.fr)

M. Stéphane GIRAUD, directeur du GEPMA, Réseau Nature de France Nature Environnement, 8, rue Adèle Riton - 67000 STRASBOURG, France  
Tél : 03 88 32 91 14 - fax : 03 88 22 31 74 - Email : [nature@fne.asso.fr](mailto:nature@fne.asso.fr)

#### **Il Nibbio – Antonio Bana's Foundation for research on ornithological migration and environmental protection / Il Nibbio – Fondation Antonio Bana pour la recherche des migrations ornithologiques et la protection de l'environnement**

Mr Ferdinando RANZANICI, Environmental Certification and Natura 2000 Aspects, Via Perego, 22060 AROSIO (CO), Italy.  
Tel : +39 031 762162. Fax : +39 031 762162. E-mail : [fein@nibbio.org](mailto:fein@nibbio.org)

**International Association for Falconry & Conservation of Birds of Prey / Association internationale de la fauconnerie et de la conservation des oiseaux de proie**

Mr Christian de COUNE, Expert, Le Cochetay, Thier des Forges, 85, B-4140 GOMZE ANDOUMONT, Belgium.

Tel : +32 476 46 1424. Fax: +32 4368 40 15. E-mail: [christian.decoune@belgacom.net](mailto:christian.decoune@belgacom.net)

**International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC)**

Mr Kai-Uwe WOLLSCHIED, Director General, PO Box 82, H-2092 BUDAKESZI, Hungary.

Tel: +36 23 453 830. Fax: +36 23 453 832. E-mail : [k.wollscheid@cic-wildlife.org](mailto:k.wollscheid@cic-wildlife.org). Website : [www.cic-wildlife.org](http://www.cic-wildlife.org)

**Journées européennes du Cortinaire - European Council for Conservation of Fungi (ECCF)**

Mr Jean-Paul KOUNE, Expert, 27 rue du Commandant François, F-67100 STRASBOURG.

Tel : +33 3 88 39 67 76. E-mail : [jp.koune@wanadoo.fr](mailto:jp.koune@wanadoo.fr)

Ms Beatrice SENN (cf. Consultants)

**Large Herbivore Foundation / Fondation en faveur des grands herbivores**

Mr Joep W.G. VAN DE VLASAKKER, Nature Conservation Manager, Large Herbivore Foundation, Deskesven 3, NL-5815 EA MERSELO, The Netherlands

Tel: +31 (0)6-1007 8350. E-mail: [joep@largeherbivore.org](mailto:joep@largeherbivore.org) or [flaxfield@skynet.be](mailto:flaxfield@skynet.be) . Site: [www.largeherbivore.org](http://www.largeherbivore.org)

**Mediterranean Association to Save the Sea Turtles (MEDASSET) / Association méditerranéenne pour sauvaer les tortues marines (MEDASSET)**

Ms Lily VENIZELOS, President of MEDASSET, 1c Licavitou St., 10672 ATHENS, Greece.

[c/o 24 Park Towers, 2 Brick St., LONDON W1J 7DD, United Kingdom.]

Tel: +30 210 361 3572 and +2103640389. Fax: +30 210 361 3572. E-mail: [lilyvenizelos@medasset.gr](mailto:lilyvenizelos@medasset.gr) or [medasset@medasset.gr](mailto:medasset@medasset.gr) . Website: <http://www.euroturtle.org>  
<http://www.medasset.org> <http://www.medasset.gr>

Dr. Max KASPAREK, MEDASSET's Scientific Advisor, Moenchhofstr. 16, D-69120 HEIDELBERG, Germany

Tel.: +49 6221 475069. Fax: +49 6221471858. E-mail: [Kasperek@t-online.de](mailto:Kasperek@t-online.de)

**Sauvegarde Faune Sauvage (France-Alsace et Est de la France)**

Mr Jean-Paul BURGET, Président, Sauvegarde Faune Sauvage, 23, rue du Limousin, F-68270 WITTENHEIM / France.

Tel : +33 389 57 92 22. Fax : +33 389 57 92 22. E-mail: [sauvegarde-faune-sauvage@voila.fr](mailto:sauvegarde-faune-sauvage@voila.fr)

Ms Julie LEDIT, Chargée de mission Grand hamster, Sauvegarde Faune Sauvage, 7 rue des Dominicains, F-68500 GUEBWILLER / France.

Tel : +33 607 41 11 32. Fax : +33 389 57 92 22. E-mail: [ledit.julie@voila.fr](mailto:ledit.julie@voila.fr)

**SOPTOM, Village des tortues**

Mr Alain ZECCHINI, administrateur, SOPTOM, BP213, F-68000 GONFARON, France

Tel : +33 1 45 81 42 18. Fax : +33 145 81 42 18. E-mail : [a-zecchini@club-internet.fr](mailto:a-zecchini@club-internet.fr)

**Study, Research and Conservation Centre for the Environment in Alsace / Centre d'Etudes, de Recherches et de Protection de l'Environnement en Alsace (CERPEA)**

Mr Gérard BAUMGART, Président, 12, Rue de Touraine, 67100 STRASBOURG, France.  
Tel : +33 388 39 42 74. Fax : +33 388 39 42 74. E-mail : [gerard.baumgart@free.fr](mailto:gerard.baumgart@free.fr)

**Terra Cypria (Cyprus Conservation Foundation)**

Mr Adrian AKERS-DOUGLAS, P.O. Box 50257, 3602 LIMASSOL, Cyprus  
Tel: +357 25 369475. Fax: +357 25 352657. E-mail: [info@terracypria.org](mailto:info@terracypria.org)

Dr Artemis YIORDAMLI, Executive Director, P.O.Box 50257, 3602 LIMASSOL, Cyprus  
Tel : +357 25 358632. Fax : +357 25 352657. E-mail : [director@terracypria.org](mailto:director@terracypria.org) or [ccf@globalsofrmail.org](mailto:ccf@globalsofrmail.org)

**World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF Switzerland)/ Fonds mondial pour la nature (WWF Suisse)**

Dr. Edith WENGER, Programme Eaux douces, Rebstöckerstr. 55 , D-60326 FRANKFURT/MAIN, Germany.  
Tel : +49 6979144131. Fax : +496979144231. e-mail: [wenger@wwf.de](mailto:wenger@wwf.de)

**VI. CONSULTANTS / EXPERTS CONSULTANTS**

Mr Scott BRAINERD, Viltkonsulent/Wildlife Biologist, NJFF/Norwegian Assoc. of Hunters & Anglers, Box 94, N-1378 NESBRU , Norway  
Tel.: +47 66 79 22 39. Fax: +47 66 90 15 87. E-mail: [scott.brainerd@njff.org](mailto:scott.brainerd@njff.org)

Mr Pierre HUNKELER, Rue d'Orbe 3, CH - 1400 YVERDON-LES-BAINS, Switzerland  
Tel. + 41 24 420 13 02. Fax + 41 24 420 13 03. E-mail: [pierre.hunkeler@bluewin.ch](mailto:pierre.hunkeler@bluewin.ch)

Mr Eckhart KUIJKEN, Lindeveld 4, B-8730 BEERNEM, Belgium  
Tel: +32. (0)475 285413. E-mail : [eckhart.kuijken@scarlet.be](mailto:eckhart.kuijken@scarlet.be)

Mr Marc ROEKAERTS, Ringlaan 57, B-3530 HOUTHALEN, Belgium.  
Tel : +32 11 60 42 34. Fax : +32 11 60 24 59. E-mail : [marc.roekaerts@eureko.be](mailto:marc.roekaerts@eureko.be)

Mr Nicolac De SADELEER, Centre d'étude du droit de l'environnement (CEDRE), Faculté universitaire Saint Louis, 43 boulevard du Jardin botanique, 1000 BRUXELLES , Belgium  
Tel : +32 2 211 79 50. Fax : +32 2 221 17951. E-mail : [n.d.sadeleer@jus.uio.no](mailto:n.d.sadeleer@jus.uio.no)

Prof. Dr Harald ROSENTHAL, President, World Sturgeon Conservation Society, Schifferstrasse 48, 21629 NEU WULMSTORF, Germany.  
Tel: +49 40 - 700 6514. Fax: +49 40- 701 02 676. E-mail: [haro.train@t-online.de](mailto:haro.train@t-online.de)

Ms Beatrice SENN-IRLET, Swiss Federal Research Institute WSL, Zürcherstrasse 111, CH-8903 BIRMENS DORF, Switzerland.  
Tel: +41 44 739 22 43. Fax: +41 44 739 22 15. E-mail: [beatrice.senn@wsl.ch](mailto:beatrice.senn@wsl.ch). site web: <http://www.wsl.ch>

Mr Len WYATT, 67 Beckinton Road, Krowle, BRISTOL BS3 5ED, United Kingdom.  
Tel: +44 0117 9710672. E-mail: [len.s.wyatt@btinternet.com](mailto:len.s.wyatt@btinternet.com)

**VII. INTERPRETERS / INTERPRETES**

Ms Ingrid CATTON-CONTY, 26, rue de l'Yvette, F-75016 PARIS, France.  
Tel: +33 1 40 50 04 22. Fax: +33 1 40 50 80 84. E-mail: [ingrid.catton@wanadoo.fr](mailto:ingrid.catton@wanadoo.fr)

Ms Starr PIROT, Chemin des Mollards, CH-1261 St. GEORGE, Suisse.  
Tel : +41 22 368 20 67. Fax: +41 (22) 368 20 73. E-mail: [spirot@dellmail.com](mailto:spirot@dellmail.com)

Mr William VALK, 2, rue des Jardins, Duntzenheim, F-67270 HOCHFELDEN, France.  
Tel: +33 3 88 70 59 02. Fax: +33 3 88 70 50 98. E-mail: [william.valk@wanadoo.fr](mailto:william.valk@wanadoo.fr)

**VIII. COUNCIL OF EUROPE / CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE**

**Directorate of Culture and of Cultural and Natural Heritage / Direction de la Culture et du Patrimoine culturel et naturel, F-67075 STRASBOURG CEDEX, France**  
Tel : +33 3 88 41 20 00. Fax : +33 3 88 41 37 51

Mr Robert PALMER, Director of Culture and Cultural and Natural Heritage / Directeur de la Culture et du Patrimoine culturel et naturel DGIV,  
Tel. +33 3 88 41 22 50. Fax +33 3 88 41 27 55. E-mail : [robert.palmer@coe.int](mailto:robert.palmer@coe.int)

Mr Eladio FERNÁNDEZ-GALIANO, Directorate of Culture and Cultural and Natural Heritage / Direction de la Culture et du Patrimoine culturel et naturel DGIV  
Tel : +33 3 88 41 22 59 Fax : +33 3 88 41 37 51 E-mail : [eladio.fernandez-galiano@coe.int](mailto:eladio.fernandez-galiano@coe.int)

Ms Carolina LASÉN DÍAZ, Administrator of the Biological Diversity Unit / / Administrateur de l'Unité de la Diversité biologique  
Tel : +33 390 21 56 79. Fax : +33 388 41 37 51. E-mail : [carolina.lasen-diaz@coe.int](mailto:carolina.lasen-diaz@coe.int)

Ms Hélène BOUGUESSA, Principal administrative assistant / Assistante administrative principale, Biological Diversity Unit / Unité de la Diversité biologique  
Tel : +33 3 88 41 22 64. Fax : +33 3 88 41 37 51. E-mail : [helene.bouguessa@coe.int](mailto:helene.bouguessa@coe.int)

Ms Snezana MANCIC, Administrative assistant / Assistante administrative, Biological Diversity Unit / Unité de la Diversité biologique  
Tel : +33 3 90 21 42 45. Fax : +33 3 88 41 37 51. E-mail : [snezana.mancic@coe.int](mailto:snezana.mancic@coe.int)

Ms Véronique de CUSSAC, Administrative assistant / Assistante administrative, Biological Diversity Unit / Unité de la Diversité biologique  
Tel : +33 3 88 41 34 76. Fax : +33 3 88 41 37 51. E-mail : [veronique.decussac@coe.int](mailto:veronique.decussac@coe.int)

Ms Jan WILD, Administrative assistant / Assistante administrative, Biological Diversity Unit / Unité de la Diversité biologique  
Tel : +33 3 88 41 22 73. Fax : +33 3 88 41 37 51. E-mail : [jan.wild@coe.int](mailto:jan.wild@coe.int)

## Appendix 2

### AGENDA

#### PART I – OPENING

1. **Opening of the meeting and adoption of the agenda**
2. **Chairman's report and communications from the delegations and from the Secretariat**

#### PART II – MONITORING AND IMPLEMENTATION OF LEGAL ASPECTS

3. **Monitoring of the implementation of the legal aspects of the Convention**
  - 3.1 Implementation of the Convention in Morocco
  - 3.2 Biennial reports **2005-2006** concerning exceptions made to Articles 4, 5, 6, 7 or 8 and quadrennial reports 2001 2004

**\* Items for information:**

- T-PVS/Inf (2007) Implementation of the Bern Convention in Morocco
- T-PVS (2007) 5 and ... Bureau Reports
- T-PVS/Inf (2007) ..., ... Biennial Reports

#### PART III – MONITORING OF SPECIES AND HABITATS

4. **Monitoring of Species and Habitats**
  - 4.1 Group of Experts on Invasive Alien Species: Implementation of the European Strategy and IAS lists – Draft Recommendations
  - 4.2 Group of Experts on Plant Conservation. Draft guidance for mushroom conservation in Europe – Draft Recommendation
  - 4.3 Draft Action plan for the conservation and restoration of the European sturgeon (*Acipenser sturio*) – Draft Recommendation
  - 4.4 Draft European Charter on Hunting and Biodiversity – Draft recommendation
  - 4.5 Large carnivores/hervivores: Progress report on the European Bison SAP
  - 4.6 Group of Experts on Biodiversity and Climate Change – Progress report
  - 4.7 Habitats: Setting up of ecological networks: Emerald Network progress, PEEN

#### PART IV – MONITORING OF SPECIFIC SITES AND POPULATIONS

5. **Specific sites and populations**
  - 5.1 **Files opened**
    - Ukraine: building of a navigable waterway in the Bystroe Estuary (Danube delta)
    - Cyprus: Akamas Peninsula
    - Bulgaria: Project to build a motorway through the Kresna Gorge
  - 5.2 **Possible Files**
    - France: Conservation of the Hermann turtle (*Testudo hermanni hermanni*) in the plaine des Maures

- France: Habitats necessary for the survival of the common hamster (*Cricetus cricetus*)
- France: Conservation of the Green Toad (*Bufo viridis*)
- Turkey: the conservation of marine turtles in Kazanlı
- Norway: Windfarms in the Smøla Archipelago
- Turkey: Planned capture of Bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*)

### 5.3 On-the-spot appraisals

- Bulgaria: Windfarm in the Balchik and Kaliakra areas (Via Pontica) – On-the-spot appraisal – Draft Recommendation
- Croatia: Planned motorway across the Drava marshlands and hydro-electric power station in Lesce, across the river Dobra

### 5.4 Follow-up of selected recommendations from previous meetings

- Recommendation No. 79 (1999) on protection of the common hamster (*Cricetus cricetus*) in Europe
- Recommendation No. 96 (2002) on conservation of natural habitats and wildlife, specially birds, in afforestation of lowland (Iceland)
- Recommendation No. 104 (2003) on the conservation of the Spur-thighed tortoise *Testudo graeca graeca* (Spain)
- Recommendation No. 107 (2003) on the Odelouca Dam (Portugal)
- Recommendation no. 108 (2003) on the proposed construction of the “Via Baltica” (Poland)
- Recommendation No. 112 (2004) on hydro-electric dams at Kárahnjúkar and Nordlingaalda (Iceland)
- Recommendation No. 113 (2004) on military antenna in the Sovereign Base Area (Akrotiri, Cyprus)

**\* Items for information:**

Catching, killing or trading of protected birds in Cyprus

## PART V – STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONVENTION

### 6. Strategic development of the Convention

#### 6.1 Strengthened co-ordination and co-operation with the CBD:

- Signature of an enhanced MoC with the CBD Executive Secretary
- Preparations for CBD COP-9

#### 6.2 Council of Europe activities

- European Diploma activities under the Bern Convention
  - Retezat National Park (Romania), Bialowieza National Park (Poland) and Belovezhskaya Pushcha National Park (Belarus)
- Outcome of the Belgrade Conference “Environment for Europe”

**\* Items for information:**

- T-PVS/Inf (2007) .. Ministerial Declaration from the Belgrade Conference
- T-PVS/Inf (2007) .. Belgrade Statement on Biodiversity

\* These items are presented only for information. They will not be subject to oral presentations or discussion unless on the request of a Party at the adoption of the agenda.



**6.3 Functioning of the case-file system: Analysis report**

**6.4 Draft Programme of Activities for 2008**

**6.5 States to be invited as observers to the 28<sup>th</sup> meeting**

#### **PART VI- OTHER ITEMS**

**7. Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman**

**9. Date and place of the 28<sup>th</sup> meeting, adoption of the report**

**10. Other business (items for information only)**

### Appendix 3



## Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

### Standing Committee

#### **Recommendation No. 123 (2007) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 29 November 2007, on limiting the dispersal of the Grey squirrel (*Sciurus carolinensis*) in Italy and other Contracting Parties**

The Standing Committee of the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats, acting under the terms of Article 14 of the Convention,

Noting that an eradication of the Ticino population of Grey squirrels would delay invasion of the Central Alps and Switzerland of several decades;

Recalling that its Recommendation No. 77 (1999) on the eradication of non-native terrestrial vertebrate asks Contracting Parties to “regulate or even prohibit the deliberate introduction and trade on their territory of certain species of non-native vertebrates”, including the Grey squirrel;

Noting that important trade of Grey squirrels in Italy is still legal;

Regretting that no eradication efforts have been implemented by Italy, as requested by its Recommendations No. 78 (1999) on the conservation of the Red squirrel (*Sciurus vulgaris*) in Italy and No. 114 (2005) on the control of the Grey squirrel (*Sciurus carolinensis*) and other alien squirrels in Europe;

Noting that an eradication plan has been developed jointly by the INFS, the University of Varese and the University of Turin,

Recommends that Italy:

1. urge the Lombardia Region and the other competent local authorities to start without further delay the eradication program of the Grey squirrel in the Ticino Valley, so as to significantly delay invasion of Southern Alps;

Recommends that Contracting Parties:

2. ban trade and possession of the Grey squirrel;
3. eradicate new possible introduced populations of Grey squirrels;

Invites Observer states to apply as appropriate points 2 and 3 above.

Invites Contracting Parties, Observer States and organisations to inform the public why such eradication is essential for the conservation of the Red squirrel.

## Appendix 4



### Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

#### Standing Committee

#### **Recommendation No. 124 (2007) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 29 November 2007, in progress in the eradication of the Ruddy duck (*Oxyura jamaicensis*)**

The Standing Committee of the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats, acting under the terms of Article 14 of the Convention,

Recalling that hybridisation with Ruddy ducks is a major cause of concern for the long-term survival of the White-headed duck (*Oxyura leucocephala*), a species protected by the Convention;

Recalling its Recommendation No. 61 (1997) on the conservation of the White-headed Duck (*Oxyura leucocephala*);

Welcoming the very substantial eradication efforts carried out by the United Kingdom and other states;

Noting, however, that some states that have small or very small populations of Ruddy duck are failing to act,

Recommends relevant Parties:

1. carry extensive surveys to detect the presence of Ruddy-ducks in their territory;
2. eradicate as a matter of urgency all Ruddy duck found in their territory in the wild and control strictly them in captivity;
3. establish efficient alert mechanisms that may record new entries;
4. remove all legal barriers to carry out the operations above if there necessary.
5. enact legislation restricting the sale, keeping and release of Ruddy-ducks.

## Appendix 5



### Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

#### Standing Committee

#### **Recommendation No. 125 (2007) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 29 November 2007, on trade in invasive and potentially invasive alien species in Europe**

The Standing Committee of the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats, acting under the terms of Article 14 of the Convention,

Recalling that Article 11 paragraph 2 of the Convention Parties requires Parties to strictly control the introduction of non-native species;

Conscious of the harm that invasive alien species may cause to native species and natural habitats protected under the Convention;

Recalling Recommendation No. 99 (2003) of the Standing Committee on the European Strategy on Invasive Alien Species (IAS) and other recommendations concerning trade-related pathways for the introduction of invasive alien species, such as Recommendation No. 77 (1999) and Recommendation No. 91 (2002);

Recalling Decision VI/23 of the Convention on Biological Diversity and its annexed Guiding Principles for the prevention, introduction and mitigation of impacts of alien species that threaten ecosystem, habitats or species;

Recalling ISMP n° 11 on Pest Risk Analysis for Quarantine Pests, adopted under the International Plant Protection Convention;

Noting that trade provides increased opportunities for potentially invasive alien species to be transported to new locations, both intentionally and unintentionally;

Wishing to reduce the introduction or expansion through trade-related pathways of invasive alien species in the territory of Contracting Parties;

Recalling the reports “Overview of Existing International / Regional Mechanisms to Ban or Restrict Trade in Potentially Invasive Alien Species” by Ms Clare Shine [document T-PVS/Inf (2006) 8], and “Assessment of Existing Lists of Invasive Alien Species for Europe, with particular focus on species Entering Europe through Trade and Proposed Responses” by Mr Piero Genovesi and Riccardo Scalera [document T-PVS/Inf (2007) 2];

Welcoming the work of the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organisation (EPPO) and its Standards PM3/67 “Guidelines for the management of invasive alien plants or potentially invasive alien plants which are intended for import or have been intentionally imported” and PM5/3 “Decision-support scheme for quarantine pests”, existing animal health frameworks, the European Environment Agency’s programme *Streamlining European 2010 Biodiversity Indicators* (EEA/SEBI 2010), the European Union’s project *Delivering Alien Invasive Species Inventories for Europe* (EU DAISIE), the NEOBIOTA work, and, for the Nordic and Baltic states, the North European and Baltic Network on Invasive Alien Species (NOBANIS) portal, and recalling the need to avoid duplication of work with existing activities in other fora,

Recommends that Contracting Parties, in cooperation with other Parties where appropriate:

1. carry out in-depth analysis of and research into trade-related pathways, examining imports and international movements of species and commodities, to:
  - detect invasive and potentially invasive alien species that are intentionally moved in trade and strengthen measures to prevent unwanted introductions,
  - assess the extent of unintentional introduction of potentially invasive alien species through trade-related pathways and take integrated measures based on the precautionary principle to minimise such introductions;
2. examine, in particular, international trade liberalisation measures and intra-Community free movement of goods to assess their contribution to the introduction and spread of potentially invasive alien species;
3. review national standards and regulatory frameworks, species lists for consultation by potential importers and data on invasive and potentially invasive alien species that are currently imported to improve, where necessary, existing procedures and information systems to strictly control trade in invasive alien species;
4. strengthen and extend risk analysis prior to decision-making on the import of alien species that are invasive or potentially invasive, using risk analysis methodology and procedures based on objective and scientific criteria (such as EPPO Standard PM5/3);
5. regulate as appropriate the intentional introduction, possession and trade in their territory of the invasive or potentially invasive alien species listed in Appendix 1 to this Recommendation, herein referred to as the “metalist”, applying the precautionary principle and where necessary, prohibiting the introduction, possession of and/or trade in those species that present an unacceptable risk (i.e. there is sufficient evidence of their negative impact on ecosystems, habitats or species from a risk analysis or other objective sources). For species included in the metalist, which is an indicative alert list, consider the following management measures:
  - species classified as A category - alien species intentionally introduced as the commodity itself for release into the environment (such as game species, freshwater fishes, tree species of interest for forestry, biocontrol agents, etc.) : if the species presents an unacceptable risk, consider a regional or national ban on trade in such species and/or apply internal measures,
  - species classified as B category - alien species intentionally introduced as the commodity itself (such as ornamental plants, agricultural plants, pets, crayfish, etc.) in a containment facility or in a controlled environment (such as botanic gardens, greenhouses, agricultural land, zoos, animal-breeding establishments, fish farms, etc.) : if the species presents an unacceptable risk, consider regional or national regulation of trade and/or stringent regulation of containment facilities, or apply internal measures,
  - species classified as C category - alien species unintentionally introduced as a contaminant of a specific commodity (such as *Anoplophora chinensis* introduced in Italy through import of bonsai; parasites of specific fish species, fruit flies, micro cell disease *Bonamia ostreae* transported with oyster shipments, etc): if the species presents an unacceptable risk, consider applying specific treatments and measures across all relevant sectors (i.e. transport, agriculture, fishery, etc.) to prevent unwanted entry,
  - species classified as D category - alien species unintentionally introduced with movements of people or of machinery (such as pests in wood packaging, hull fouling, ballast waters, contaminants in containers, hitchhikers on planes, etc.) : if the species presents an unacceptable risk, monitor pathways of introduction and consider regulation of related vectors across all relevant sectors (such as transport, agriculture, fisheries, etc.);
6. ensure that trade regulations are accompanied – when feasible and appropriate - by stringent management provisions (such as regulation of containment facilities; eradication of already established populations; enforcement of control/containment campaigns, awareness raising at Customs points, effective communication campaigns, etc.);

7. propose, in the framework of the Convention, amendments that would permit the updating of the metalist presented in Appendix 1 of this Recommendation, taking account of work carried out by other organisations or based on risk analysis or other evidence of a species having negative effects on ecosystems, habitats or species, in order to build a comprehensive metalist of invasive alien species or potentially invasive alien species already present in Europe or expected to arrive in the next future, giving priority to species that are not yet widespread;
8. promote closer co-operation at the European and Mediterranean level to prevent introduction of invasive alien species through trade by exchanging information on trade, expanding species lists as appropriate and promoting coordinated risk assessment and other appropriate measures to control IAS movement and expansion.; in that context, support the development of international comprehensive registers of IAS, such as the Global Register of Invasive Species (GRIS) being developed by the World Conservation Union's Invasive Species Specialist Group (IUCN ISSG);
9. improve national and European information systems on IAS, in particular with respect to trade pathways and early warning systems; in this context, consider establishing more stringent reporting mechanisms for IAS in the framework of the Convention and other appropriate mechanisms,

Further invites Observer states to apply the recommendation above.

*Appendix 1 Metalist of known invasive alien species for Europe*

<b>Species / Group of species</b> *species listed in depoorted and pagad 2007	<b>Trade category</b>	<b>EPPO A1 list</b>	<b>EPPO A2 list</b>	<b>EPPO list of invasive alien plants</b>	<b>EEA/ SEBI</b>	<b>Nobanis</b>	<b>Daisie</b>	<b>Reg. 338/97</b>
<b>Mammals</b>								
Ammotragus lervia	A				1			
Callosciurus finlaysoni	B				1			
Castor canadensis	A				1	1		
Cervus nippon	A				1		1	
Eutamia sibiricus	B						1	
Herpestes javanicus *	A				1			
Muntiacus reevesii	A				1			
Mustela vison *	B				1	1	1	
Myocastor coypus	B				1		1	
Nyctereutes procyonoides	B				1	1	1	
Ondatra zibethicus	B				1	1	1	
Oryctolagus cuniculus *	B				1			
Procyon lotor	B				1		1	
Rattus norvegicus *	D				1		1	
Sciurus carolinensis	B				1		1	
<b>Birds</b>								
Acridotheres tristis	B				1			
Alopochen aegyptiacus	B				1			
Branta canadensis	B				1		1	
Corvus splendens	B				1			
Oxyura jamaicensis	A				1		1	1
Psittacula krameri	B						1	
Threskiornis aethiopicus	B				1		1	
<b>Amphibians &amp; reptiles</b>								
Chrysemys picta	B							1
Rana catesbeiana	A				1		1	1
Trachemys scripta elegans	B				1	1	1	1
Xenopus laevis	B				1			

<b>Fishes</b>							
Ameiurus nebulosus	A				1		
Aphanius dispar	D						1
Carassius auratus gibelio	A				1		
Carpio haematopterus/Cyprinus carpio *	A				1		
Fistularia commersoni	D				1		1
Gambusia affinis	A				1		
Lepomis gibbosus *	A				1		
Liza haematocheila ex Mugil soiuy	A, B, D				1		
Micropterus salmoides	A				1		
Neogobius melanostomus *	D, C?				1	1	1
Oncorhynchus mykiss	A				1	1	
Perccottus glenii	B, D				1		
Phoxinus phoxinix	D					1	
Pseudorasbora parva	A				1	1	1
Salmo salar	A, B				1	1	
Salvelinus fontinalis	A				1		1
Sander lucioperca	A					1	
Saurida undosquamis	D				1		1
Seriola fasciata	D				1		
Siganus luridus	D				1		
Siganus rivulatus	D				1		1
Silurus glanis	A				1		
Sphoeroides pachygaster	D				1		
<b>Crustaceans</b>							
Acartia tonsa	D				1		1
Balanus improvisus	D						1
Cercopagis pengoi	D				1	1	1
Charbydis logicollis	D						1
Chelicorophium curvispinum	D				1		
Dikerogammarus villosus	A, D				1		1
Elminius modestus	D				1		
Eriocheir sinensis	D				1	1	1



<i>Gammarus tigrinus</i>	D				1		
<i>Homarus americanus</i>	B					1	
<i>Marsupenaeus japonicus</i>	A, B						1
<i>Metapenaeus (Marsupenaeus) japonicus</i>	A, B				1		
<i>Orconectes limosus</i> *	A				1		
<i>Pacifastacus leniusculus</i>	A				1	1	
<i>Paralithodes camtschatica</i>	A				1	1	1
<i>Percnon gibbesi</i>	B, D				1		1
<i>Pontogammarus robustoides</i>	A, D					1	
<i>Procambarus clarkii</i> *	A, B				1		1
<b>Insects</b>							
<i>Acleris gloverana</i> A1/281	C	1					
<i>Acleris variana</i> A1/32	C	1					
<i>Aculops fuchsiae</i> A1/185	C	1					
<i>Aedes albopictus</i>	D						1
<i>Aeolesthes sarta</i> A2/307	C		1				
<i>Agrilus planipennis</i> A1/322	C	1					
<i>Aleurocanthus spiniferus</i> A1/186	C	1					
<i>Aleurocanthus woglumi</i> A1/103	C	1					
<i>Amauromyza maculosa</i> A1/152	C	1					
<i>Anastrepha fraterculus</i> A1/229	C	1					
<i>Anastrepha ludens</i> A1/230	C	1					
<i>Anastrepha obliqua</i> A1/231	C	1					
<i>Anastrepha suspensa</i> A1/200	C	1					
<i>Anoplophora chinensis</i> A1/187	C	1			1		1
<i>Anoplophora glabripennis</i> A1/296	D, C	1			1		1
<i>Anthonomus bisignifer</i> A1/189	C	1					
<i>Anthonomus eugenii</i> A1/202	C	1					
<i>Anthonomus grandis</i> A1/34	C	1					
<i>Anthonomus signatus</i> A1/164	C	1					
<i>Aphis gossypi</i>	C						1
<i>Bactrocera cucumis</i> A1/203	C	1					
<i>Bactrocera cucurbitae</i> A1/232	C	1					

Bactrocera dorsalis A1/233	C	1					
Bactrocera minax A1/234	C	1					
Bactrocera tryoni A1/235	C	1					
Bactrocera tsuneonis A1/236	C	1					
Bactrocera zonata A1/302	C	1					
Bemisia tabaci A2/178	C		1				
Blitopertha orientalis A1/33	D, C	1					
Cacoecimorpha pronubana A2/104	C		1				
Cacyreus marshalli A2/181	C		1				
Cameraria ohridella	D, C				1		1
Carposina sasakii A2/163	C		1				
Ceratitis capitata A2/105	C		1				1
Ceratitis rosa A1/237	C	1					
Choristoneura conflictana A1/205	C	1					
Choristoneura fumiferana A1/206	C	1					
Choristoneura occidentalis A1/207	C	1					
Choristoneura rosaceana A1/208	C	1					
Conotrachelus nenuphar A1/35	D	1					
Corythucha arcuata	C				1		
Cydia inopinata A2/193	C, D		1				
Cydia packardi A1/209	C, D	1					
Cydia prunivora A1/36	C, D	1					
Dacus ciliatus A2/238	C		1				
Dendroctonus adjunctus A1/43	C	1					
Dendroctonus brevicomis A1/263	C	1					
Dendroctonus frontalis A1/264	C	1					
Dendroctonus ponderosae A1/265	C	1					
Dendroctonus pseudotsugae A1/266	C	1					
Dendroctonus rufipennis A1/267	C	1					
Dendrolimus sibiricus A2/308	C		1				
Dendrolimus superans A2/330	C		1				
Diabrotica barberi A1/210	C, D	1					
Diabrotica speciosa A1/303	C, D	1					
Diabrotica undecimpunctata A1/292	C, D	1					

Diabrotica virgifera A2/199	C, D		1				1
Diaphorina citri A1/37	C	1					
Dryocoetes confusus A1/268	C	1					
Dryocosmus kuriphilus A2/317	C		1				
Epitrix cucumeris A1/299	D	1					
Epitrix tuberis A1/165	D	1					
Erschoviella musculana A2/318	C, D		1				
Eutetranychus orientalis A2/288	C		1				
Frankliniella occidentalis A2/177	C		1				1
Gnathotrichus sulcatus A1/269	C	1					
Gonipterus gibberus A1/301	C, D	1					
Gonipterus scutellatus A2/38	C, D		1				
Harmonia axyridis	A				1		1
Helicoverpa armigera A2/110	C		1				
Helicoverpa zea A1/195	C	1					
Heteronychus arator A1/297	C, D	1					
Homalodisca coagulata A1/336	C	1					
Hyphantria cunea	C				1		
Ips calligraphus A1/270	C	1					
Ips confusus A1/271	C	1					
Ips grandicollis A1/272	C	1					
Ips hauseri A2/326	C		1				
Ips lecontei A1/273	C	1					
Ips pini A1/274	C	1					
Ips plastographus A1/275	C	1					
Ips subelongatus A2/325	C		1				
Lasius neglectus	D				1		
Lepidosaphes ussuriensis A2/319	C		1				
Leptinotarsa decemlineata A2/113	C		1				1
Limoniuss californicus A1/304	D, C	1					
Linepithema humile	D				1		1
Liriomyza huidobrensis A2/283	C		1				1
Liriomyza sativae A2/282	C		1				
Liriomyza trifolii A2/131	C		1				

Listronotus bonariensis A1/168	C, D	1				
Lopholeucaspis japonica A2/289	C		1			
Lymantria mathura A2/331	D, C		1			
Maconellicoccus hirsutus A1/314	C	1				
Malacosoma americanum A1/276	C	1				
Malacosoma disstria A1/213	C	1				
Malacosoma parallela A2/320	C		1			
Margarodes prieskaensis A1/214	D, C	1				
Margarodes vitis A1/215	D, C	1				
Margarodes vredendalensis A1/216	D, C	1				
Melanotus communis A1/305	D	1				
Naupactus leucoloma A1/293	C, D	1				
Numonia pirivorella A2/184	C		1			
Oligonychus perditus A1/217	C	1				
Opogona sacchari A2/154	C		1			
Orgyia pseudotsugata A1/218	C	1				
Paysandisia archon A2/338	C		1			
Pissodes nemorensis A1/44	C	1				
Pissodes strobi A1/258	C	1				
Pissodes terminalis A1/259	C	1				
Popillia japonica A2/40	D, C		1			
Premnotrypes latithorax, P. suturicallus & P. vorax A1/143	C	1				
Quadraspidiotus perniciosus A2/117	C		1			
Rhagoletis cingulata A2/239	C		1			
Rhagoletis fausta A1/241	C	1				
Rhagoletis indifferens A1/242	C	1				
Rhagoletis mendax A1/243	C	1				
Rhagoletis pomonella A1/41	C	1				
Rhizoecus hibisci A1/300	C	1				
Rhynchophorus ferrugineus A2/339	C		1		1	
Rhynchophorus palmarum A1/332	C	1				
Scirtothrips aurantii A1/221	C	1				
Scirtothrips citri A1/222	C	1				
Scirtothrips dorsalis A2/223	C		1			

<i>Scolytus morawitzi</i> A2/309	C		1				
<i>Sirex ermak</i> A2 327	D, C		1				
<i>Spodoptera eridania</i> A1/196	C	1					
<i>Spodoptera frugiperda</i> A1/197	C	1					
<i>Spodoptera littoralis</i> A2/120	C		1			1	
<i>Spodoptera litura</i> A1/42	C	1					
<i>Sternochetus mangiferae</i> A1/286	C	1					
<i>Strobilomya viaria</i> A2/333	D		1				
<i>Tecia solanivora</i> A2/310	C		1				
<i>Tetropium gracilicorne</i> A2/311	C		1				
<i>Thrips palmi</i> A1/175	C	1					
<i>Toxoptera citricida</i> A1/45	C	1					
<i>Trialeurodes vaporarum</i>	C					1	
<i>Trioza erytreae</i> A1/46	C	1					
<i>Trogoderma granarium</i> A2/121	D		1				
<i>Tuta absoluta</i> A1/321	C	1					
<i>Unaspis citri</i> A1/226	C	1					
<i>Viteus vitifoliae</i> A2/106	C		1				
<i>Xylotrechus altaicus</i> A2/312	C		1				
<i>Xylotrechus namanganensis</i> A2/328	C		1				
<b>Anellids</b>							
<i>Artioposthia triangulata</i>	C				1		
<i>Ficopomatus enigmaticus</i>	D				1		1
<i>Hydroides dianthus</i>	D				1		
<i>Hydroides elegans</i>	D				1		
<i>Hydroides ezoensis</i>	D				1		
<i>Marenzelleria neglecta</i>	D				1	1	
<i>Marenzelleria viridis</i>	D				1		1
<i>Pileolaria berkeleyana</i>	D				1		
<i>Spirorbis marioni</i>	D				1		

<b>Molluscs</b>							
Anadara spp inaequalvis/demiri	A, B				1		
Anodonta (Sinanodonta) woodiana	C, A				1		
Arion lusitanicus	C					1	
Arion vulgaris	C				1		1
Brachiodontes pharaonis	D						1
Corbicula fluminea	D				1		1
Crassostrea gigas	A, B					1	
Crepidula fornicata	C, D				1		1
Dreissena bugensis	D				1		
Dreissena polymorpha	D				1	1	1
Ensis americanus	D				1		
Musculista senhousia	A, B				1		1
Petricola pholadiformis	A, B				1		
Pinctada radiata	A, B, C, D				1		1
Potamopyrgus antipodarum	D				1		
Rapana venosa	C, D				1		1
Ruditapes philippinarum	A				1		
Teredo navalis	D						1
<b>Comb jellies</b>							
Beroe cucumi					1		
Blackfordia virginica					1		
Mnemiopsis leidyi	D				1		1
<b>Hydroids, jellyfish, sea anemones &amp; corals</b>							
Cordylophora caspia	D				1		1
Craspedacusta sowerbyi	D					1	
Polypodium hydriforme					1		
Rhopilema nomadica	D				1		1
<b>Ascidians and sessile tunicates</b>							
Microcosmus squamifer					1		
Styela clava	D				1		1

<b>Bryozoans</b>							
Tricellaria inopinata				1		1	
Victorella pavidia				1			
<b>Flatworms</b>							
Artioposthia triangulata (Arthurdendyus triangulatus )					1		
Fasciola gigantica				1			
Gyrodactylus salaris				1	1	1	
Pseudodactylogyrus anguillae				1			
<b>Cestoda</b>							
Botriocephalus acheilognathi				1			
<b>Nematodes</b>							
Anguillicola crassus	C			1	1	1	
Aphelenchoides besseyi A2/122	C	1					
Ashworthius sidemi	C			1			
Bursaphelenchus xylophilus and its vectors in the genus Monochamus A1/158	C, D	1		1		1	
Ditylenchus dipsaci A2/174	C, D	1					
Globodera pallida A2/124	C	1					
Globodera rostochiensis A2/125	C	1					
Heterodera glycines A2/167	C, D	1					
Meloidogyne chitwoodii A2/227	C, D	1					
Meloidogyne fallax A2/295	C, D	1					
Nacobbus aberrans A1/144	C, D	1					
Radopholus citrophilus A1/161	C, D	1					
Radopholus similis A2/126	C, D	1					
Xiphinema americanum sensu stricto A1/150	D	1					
Xiphinema bricolense A1/260	D	1					
Xiphinema californicum A1/261	D	1					
Xiphinema rivesi A2/262	D	1					
<b>Plants</b>							
Acacia dealbata	A			1		1	
Acacia saligna	A				1		

<i>Acer negundo</i> *	A				1	1		
<i>Acroptilon repens</i>	C, D			1				
<i>Ailanthus altissima</i> *	A			1	1		1	
<i>Ambrosia artemisiifolia</i> *	C, D			1	1		1	
<i>Amelanchier spicata</i>	A, B			1		1		
<i>Amorpha fruticosa</i> *	A, D			1	1			
<i>Anthriscus sylvestris</i>	Indigenous					1		
<i>Arceuthobium abietinum</i>	C	1						
<i>Arceuthobium americanum</i>	C	1						
<i>Arceuthobium campylopodum</i>	C	1						
<i>Arceuthobium douglasii</i>	C	1						
<i>Arceuthobium laricis</i>	C	1						
<i>Arceuthobium minutissimum</i>	C	1						
<i>Arceuthobium occidentale</i>	C	1						
<i>Arceuthobium pusillum</i>	C	1						
<i>Arceuthobium</i> spp. (non-European) A1/24	C	1						
<i>Arceuthobium tsugense</i>	C	1						
<i>Arceuthobium vaginatum</i>	C	1						
<i>Aster novi-belgii</i> agg.	A				1			
<i>Azolla filiculoides</i>	C, D			1	1	1		
<i>Baccharis halimifolia</i>	A			1				
<i>Bidens frondosa</i>	C, D			1	1			
<i>Buddleja davidii</i>	A			1				
<i>Bunias orientalis</i>	D				1	1		
<i>Campylopus introflexus</i>	C					1	1	
<i>Cabomba caroliniana</i>	B			1				
<i>Carpobrotus edulis</i> * & <i>C. spp.</i>	A			1	1		1	
<i>Cenchrus incertus</i>	D			1				
<i>Cenchrus longispinus</i>	D				1			
<i>Cortaderia selloana</i>	A			1	1		1	
<i>Crassula helmsii</i> A2/340 (A2 in 2006)	B, C, D		1	1	1		1	
<i>Cyperus esculentus</i>	C			1				
<i>Echinocystis lobata</i> *	C, D				1		1	
<i>Egeria densa</i>	B, C, D			1				



<i>Elodea canadensis</i>	C, D				1		1	
<i>Elodea nuttallii</i>	C, D			1	1			
<i>Epilobium ciliatum</i>	D				1			
<i>Fallopia japonica</i> *, <i>F. sachalinensis</i> , <i>Fallopia x bohemica</i>	A			1	1	1	1	
<i>Galinsoga quadriradiata</i>	C, D					1		
<i>Grindelia squarrosa</i>	B				1			
<i>Halophila stipulacea</i>	C				1		1	
<i>Hedychium gardnerianum</i> *	A				1		1	
<i>Helianthus tuberosus</i> *	A			1	1			
<i>Heracleum mantegazzianum</i>	A			1	1		1	
<i>Heracleum sosnowskyi</i>	A			1	1	1		
<i>Hydrocotyle ranunculoides</i> A2/334 (A2 in 2005)	A		1	1	1			
<i>Impatiens glandulifera</i> *	B, A			1	1	1	1	
<i>Iva (Cyclachaena) xanthiifolia</i>	C				1			
<i>Lagarosiphon major</i>	A			1				
<i>Ludwigia peploides</i>	A			1	1			
<i>Ludwigia uruguayensis</i>	A			1				
<i>Lupinus nootkatensis</i> *	A					1		
<i>Lupinus polyphyllus</i> *	A			1		1		
<i>Lysichiton americanus</i> A2/335 (A2 in 2005)	A, B		1	1	1			
<i>Myriophyllum aquaticum</i>	A, B, C			1				
<i>Opuntia ficus-indica</i>	A				1		1	
<i>Oxalis pes-caprae</i>	B, C, D			1	1		1	
<i>Paspalum paspalodes</i> (= <i>P. distichum</i> )	C			1			1	
<i>Pinus mugo</i> *	A					1		
<i>Prunus serotina</i> *	A			1	1	1	1	
<i>Pueraria lobata</i> A2/341	A		1					
<i>Pueraria montana</i> var. <i>lobata</i> (A2 in 2006)	A			1				
<i>Rhododendron ponticum</i> *	A			1	1		1	
<i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i> *	A				1		1	
<i>Rosa rugosa</i>	A				1	1	1	
<i>Sambucus nigra</i>	Indigenous					1		
<i>Senecio inaequidens</i>	C, D			1	1	1		

Sicyos angulatus	C, D			1			
Solanum elaeagnifolium A2/342 (A2 in 2006)	C, A, D		1	1			
Solidago canadensis	A			1	1	1	
Solidago gigantea *	A			1	1		
Solidago nemoralis	A			1			
Spartina townsendi /anglica	A				1	1	
<b>Bryophytes</b>							
Campylopus introflexus					1		
<b>Macroalgae</b>							
Acrothamnion preisii					1		
Asparagopsis armata					1		
Asparagopsis taxiformis					1		
Bonnemaisonia hamifera							1
Caulerpa racemosa	D				1		1
Caulerpa taxifolia *	D				1		1
Codium fragile	D				1		1
Grateloupia doryphora					1		
Polysiphonia morrowii					1		
Sargassum muticum	C				1		
Styopodium schimperi					1		
Undaria pinnatifida	A, D				1		1
Womersleyella setacea					1		
<b>Phytoplankton</b>							
Alexandrium catenella	D				1		1
Alexandrium minutum	D				1		
Alexandrium tamarense	D				1		
Chattonella verruculosa	D				1	1	1
Coscinodiscus wailesii	D				1		1
Karenia mikimotoi	D				1		
Odontella sinensis	D						1
Phaeocystis pouchetii					1		
Prorocentrum minimum	D						1
Rhizosolenia calcar-avis					1		

<b>Fungi</b>							
<i>Alternaria mali</i> A1/277		1					
<i>Anisogramma anomala</i> A1/201		1					
<i>Aphanomyces astaci</i>	C				1	1	1
<i>Apiosporina morbosa</i> A1/10		1					
<i>Atropellis pinicola</i> A1/5		1					
<i>Atropellis piniphila</i> A1/280		1					
<i>Botryosphaeria laricina</i> A2/12			1				
<i>Ceratocystis fagacearum</i> and its vectors A1/6		1					
<i>Ceratocystis fimbriata</i> f.sp. platani A2/136	D		1				
<i>Chrysomyxa arctostaphyli</i> A1/8		1					
<i>Ciborinia camelliae</i> A2/190	C		1				
<i>Cronartium coleosporioides</i> A1/248		1					
<i>Cronartium comandrae</i> A1/249		1					
<i>Cronartium comptoniae</i> A1/250		1					
<i>Cronartium fusiforme</i> A1/9		1					
<i>Cronartium himalayense</i> A1/251		1					
<i>Cronartium kantschaticum</i> A2/18			1				
<i>Cronartium quercuum</i> A1/252		1					
<i>Cryphonectria parasitica</i> A2/69	C		1				
<i>Deuterophoma tracheiphila</i> A2/287			1				
<i>Diaporthe vaccinii</i> A1/211		1					
<i>Didymella ligulicola</i> A2/66			1				
<i>Endocronartium harknessii</i> A1/11		1					
<i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> f.sp. <i>albedinis</i> A2/70			1				
<i>Gibberella circinata</i> A1/306		1					
<i>Glomerella gossypii</i> A2/71			1				
<i>Guignardia citricarpa</i> A1/194		1					
<i>Gymnosporangium asiaticum</i> A2/13			1				
<i>Gymnosporangium clavipes</i> A1/253		1					
<i>Gymnosporangium globosum</i> A1/254		1					
<i>Gymnosporangium juniperi-virginianae</i> A1/255		1					
<i>Gymnosporangium yamadae</i> A1/257		1					

Melampsora farlowii A1/15		1					
Melampsora medusae A2/74			1				
Melampsoridium hiratsukanum					1		
Monilinia fructicola A2/153			1				
Mycosphaerella dearnessii A2/22			1				
Mycosphaerella gibsonii A1/7		1					
Mycosphaerella laricis-leptolepidis A1/16		1					
Mycosphaerella populorum A1/17		1					
Ophiostoma novo-ulmi					1		1
Ophiostoma wagneri A1/179		1					
Phaeoramularia angolensis A1/298		1					
Phellinus weirii A1/19		1					
Phialophora cinerescens A2/77			1				
Phoma andigena A1/141		1					
Phyllosticta solitaria A1/20		1					
Phymatotrichopsis omnivora A1/21		1					
Phytophthora cinnamomi					1		1
Phytophthora fragariae A2/79			1				
Phytophthora lateralis A1/337		1					
Phytophthora ramorum						1	
Pseudopityophthorus minutissimus		1					
Pseudopityophthorus pruinus		1					
Puccinia horiana A2/80			1				
Puccinia pittieriana A1/155		1					
Seiridium cardinale	C						1
Septoria lycopersici var. malagutii A1/142		1					
Sirococcus clavignenti-juglandacearum A1/329		1					
Stegophora ulmea A1/315		1					
Stenocarpella macrospora A2/67			1				
Stenocarpella maydis A2/68			1				
Synchytrium endobioticum A2/82	C		1				
Thecaphora solani A1/4		1					
Tilletia indica A1/23		1					

Verticillium albo-atrum & V. dahliae (hop-infecting strains) A2/85			1				
<b>Protists</b>							
Bonamia ostreae	C				1		
<b>Prokaryotes</b>							
Apple proliferation phytoplasma A2/87			1				
Burkholderia caryophylli A2/55			1				
Clavibacter michiganensis subsp. insidiosus A2/49			1				
Clavibacter michiganensis subsp. michiganensis A2/50			1				
Clavibacter michiganensis subsp. sepedonicus A2/51			1				
Curtobacterium flaccumfaciens pv. flaccumfaciens A2/48			1				
Elm phloem necrosis phytoplasma A1/26		1					
Erwinia amylovora A2/52			1				
Erwinia chrysanthemi A2/53			1				
Grapevine flavescence dorée phytoplasma A2/94			1				
Liberobacter africanum & L. asiaticum A1/151		1					
Palm lethal yellowing phytoplasma A1/159		1					
Pantoea stewartii pv. stewartii A2/54			1				
Peach rosette phytoplasma A1/138		1					
Peach X-disease phytoplasma A1/140		1					
Peach yellows phytoplasma A1/139		1					
Pear decline phytoplasma A2/95			1				
Potato purple-top wilt phytoplasma A1/128		1					
Pseudomonas syringae pv. persicae A2/145			1				
Ralstonia solanacearum A2/58			1				
Stolbur phytoplasma A2/100			1				
Vibrio cholerae					1		
Xanthomonas arboricola pv. corylina A2/134			1				
Xanthomonas arboricola pv. pruni A2/62			1				
Xanthomonas axonopodis pv. citri A1/1		1					
Xanthomonas axonopodis pv. dieffenbachiae A2/180			1				
Xanthomonas axonopodis pv. phaseoli A2/60			1				

Xanthomonas axonopodis pv. vesicatoria and Xanthomonas vesicatoria A2/157			1				
Xanthomonas fragariae A2/135			1				
Xanthomonas oryzae pv. oryzae A1/2		1					
Xanthomonas oryzae pv. oryzicola A1/3		1					
Xanthomonas translucens pv. translucens A2/183			1				
Xylella fastidiosa A1/166		1					
Xylophilus ampelinus A2/133			1				
<b>Viruses</b>							
American plum line pattern virus (Ilarvirus) A1/28		1					
Andean potato latent virus (Tymovirus) A1/244		1					
Andean potato mottle virus (Comovirus) A1/245		1					
Bean golden mosaic virus (Begomovirus) A1/204		1					
Beet leaf curl virus A2/90			1				
Beet necrotic yellow vein virus (Benyvirus) A2/160			1				
Blueberry leaf mottle virus (Nepovirus) A2/198			1				
Cherry rasp leaf virus (Cheravirus) A1/127		1					
Chrysanthemum stem necrosis virus (Tospovirus) A1/313		1					
Chrysanthemum stunt viroid (Pospiviroid) A2/92			1				
Citrus blight disease A1/278		1					
Citrus leprosis virus A1/284		1					
Citrus mosaic virus (Badnavirus) A1/285		1					
Citrus tatter leaf virus (Capillovirus) A1/191		1					
Citrus tristeza virus (Closterovirus) A2/93			1				
Coconut cadang-cadang viroid (Cocadviroid) A1/192		1					
Cucumber vein yellowing virus (Ipomovirus) A2/316			1				
Cucurbit yellow stunting disorder virus (Crinivirus) A2/324			1				
Impatiens necrotic spot virus (Tospovirus) A2/291			1				
Lettuce infectious yellows virus (Crinivirus) A1/212		1					
Peach mosaic virus (Trichovirus) A1/27		1					
Peach rosette mosaic virus (Nepovirus) A1/219		1					
Plum pox virus (Potyvirus) A2/96			1				
Potato black ringspot virus (Nepovirus) A1/246		1					
Potato spindle tuber viroid (Pospiviroid) A2/97			1				

Potato virus T A1/247		1					
Potato yellow dwarf virus (Nucleorhabdovirus) A1/29		1					
Potato yellow vein virus (Crinivirus) A1/30		1					
Potato yellowing virus A1/220		1					
Raspberry leaf curl virus (Nepovirus) A1/31		1					
Raspberry ringspot virus (Nepovirus) A2/98			1				
Satsuma dwarf virus (Sadwavirus) A2/279			1				
Squash leaf curl virus (Begomovirus) A2/224			1				
Strawberry latent C virus A1/129		1					
Strawberry veinbanding virus (Caulimovirus) A2/101			1				
Tobacco ringspot virus (Nepovirus) A2/228			1				
Tomato chlorosis virus (Crinivirus) A2/323			1				
Tomato mottle virus (Begomovirus - and other American Geminiviridae of capsicum and tomato) A1/225		1					
Tomato ringspot virus (Nepovirus) A2/102			1				
Tomato spotted wilt virus (Tospovirus) A2/290			1				
Tomato yellow leaf curl virus (Begomovirus) and related viruses A2/182			1				
Watermelon silver mottle virus (Tospovirus) A1/294		1					
<b>Protozoa</b>							
Eimeria sinensis					1		
Trichodina nobilis					1		

## Appendix 6



### Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

#### Standing Committee

#### **Recommendation No. 126 (2007) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 29 November 2007, on the eradication of some invasive alien plant species**

The Standing Committee of the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats, in accordance with Article 14 of the Convention,

Recalling that under Article 11, paragraph 2.b of the Convention, each Contracting Party undertakes to strictly control the introduction of non-native species;

Bearing in mind Recommendation No. R (84) 14 of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe to Member states on the introduction of non-native species, adopted on 21 June 1984;

Recalling Recommendation No. 57 (1997) on the Introduction of Organisms belonging to Non-Native Species into the Environment;

Recalling Recommendation No. 99 (1999) on the European Strategy on Invasive Alien Species;

Recalling that under Article 8.h of the Convention on Biological Diversity, each Party undertakes to prevent the introduction of, control or eradicate those alien species which threaten ecosystems, habitats or species;

Recalling Decision VI/23 of the 6<sup>th</sup> Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity, on Alien species that threaten ecosystems, habitats or species, and the definitions used in that text, in particular the following:

- eradication means the extirpation of the entire population of an alien species in a managed area; eliminating the invasive alien species completely/ from an area.
- containment means any operation, undertaken within a facility, installation or other physical structure, for the purpose of ensuring that invasive alien species are controlled by specific measures that effectively limit their contact with, their spread in,/ and their impact on, the external environment;

Wishing to contribute to improve the control of the introduction of alien species, and the mitigation of the effects of invasive alien species on the native flora and natural habitats;

Recognising the competent work done by the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organisation (EPPO) in the identification of alien species that may threatened European and Mediterranean biological diversity and wishing to pursue collaboration of the Convention with EPPO;

Recalling that, following an inventory of invasive alien plants for the European and Mediterranean region, a number species have been evaluated in the EPPO framework and that Pest Risk Analysis has been performed for 5 species which are now recommended for regulation by EPPO, listed in appendix 1 to this recommendation; furthermore recalling that EPPO has gathered information on other alien plants that have a high capacity of spread and a very limited distribution, examples of which are presented in appendix 2 to this recommendation;



Recommends that Contracting Parties:

- 1 carry out eradication of invasive alien plants which are not widespread and represent a threat at the regional scale or, when the invasion is taken at a late stage, containment or management action. This should apply to invasive alien plants, such as those listed in appendix 1 to this recommendation;
- 2 consider taking similar action against alien plant species having a high capacity of spread and presenting a very limited distribution, such as those in appendix 2 to this recommendation.

**Appendix 1 to the recommendation, alien plant species for which eradication or containment is recommended**

<b>Species</b>	<b>Ecosystems</b>	<b>Countries in which the species occurs</b>
<i>Crassula helmsii</i>	Uncultivated	Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom (Great Britain, Northern Ireland, Guernsey).
<i>Hydrocotyle ranunculoides</i>	Uncultivated	Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, the United Kingdom. Italy, Palestine, Israel.
<i>Lysichiton americanus</i>	Uncultivated	Denmark, Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom.
<i>Pueraria lobata</i>	Uncultivated	Italy, Switzerland.
<i>Solanum elaeagnifolium</i>	Uncultivated and cultivated	Algeria, Croatia, Cyprus, Egypt, France, Greece, Israel, Italy, "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia", Moldova, Montenegro, Morocco, Serbia, Spain, Syria, Tunisia.

**Appendix 2 to the recommendation, listing examples of alien plant species having a high capacity of spread and/or a very limited distribution.**

<b>Species</b>	<b>Ecosystems</b>	<b>Countries in which the species occurs</b>
<i>Acaena novae zelandiae</i> (= <i>A. anserinifolia</i> )	Uncultivated	United Kingdom
<i>Alternanthera caracasana</i>	Cultivated	Spain, Israel
<i>Alternanthera pungens</i>	Cultivated	Israel
<i>Araujia sericifera</i>	Uncultivated	Spain, France
<i>Azolla mexicana</i>	Uncultivated	Hungary
<i>Bothriochloa barbinodis</i>	Uncultivated and cultivated	France
<i>Cabomba caroliniana</i>	Uncultivated	The Netherlands, United Kingdom, Hungary
<i>Cenchrus incertus</i>	Uncultivated and cultivated	Spain, Italy, Romania
<i>Cotula coronopifolia</i>	Uncultivated	Portugal, Spain, Italy, United Kingdom
<i>Diospyros lotus</i>	Uncultivated	France
<i>Eichhornia azurea</i>	Uncultivated	the Netherlands
<i>Eichhornia crassipes</i>	Uncultivated	Portugal, Spain
<i>Eupatorium adenophorum</i>	Uncultivated	Spain
<i>Fallopia baldschuanica</i>	Uncultivated	Czech Republic, Spain, Italy, Slovenia, France, UK
<i>Glyceria striata</i>	Uncultivated	Austria, Czech Republic, Germany
<i>Hakea salicifolia</i>	Uncultivated	Portugal
<i>Hakea sericea</i>	Uncultivated	Portugal, France
<i>Muehlenbeckia complexa</i>	Uncultivated	United Kingdom
<i>Myriophyllum heterophyllum</i>	Uncultivated	Spain, Germany
<i>Pistia stratiotes</i>	Uncultivated	Spain
<i>Pueraria lobata</i>	Uncultivated	Switzerland
<i>Senecio deltoideus</i>	Uncultivated	France
<i>Sesbania punicea</i>	Uncultivated	Italy

## Appendix 7



### Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

#### Standing Committee

#### **Recommendation No. 127 (2007) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 29 November 2007, on the conservation and restoration of the European sturgeon (*Acipenser sturio*)**

The Standing Committee of the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats, acting under the terms of Article 14 of the Convention,

Having regard to the aims of the Convention to conserve wild flora and fauna and their natural habitats;

Recalling that Article 1, paragraph 2 of the convention requires Parties to give particular emphasis to the conservation of endangered and vulnerable species;

Recalling that Article 3 of the convention requires Parties to take the necessary steps to promote national policies for the conservation of wild fauna and natural habitats, with particular attention to endangered and vulnerable species, especially endemic ones, and endangered habitats;

Recalling that Article 4.1 of the convention requires Parties to take appropriate and necessary legislative and administrative measures to ensure the conservation of the habitats of the wild flora and fauna species, especially those specified in Appendices I and II, and the conservation of endangered natural habitats;

Noting that the European sturgeon is one of the most threatened fish in Europe, being in a critical danger of extinction;

Recalling the 2003 Kyiv Resolution on Biodiversity, which includes the commitment to ‘halt the loss of biodiversity by 2010’, as adopted by Environment Ministers and Heads of delegation from 51 countries in the Pan-European region;

Recalling the 2005 Millennium Ecosystem Assessment and its finding that “unprecedented increased efforts” are needed to achieve the 2010 biodiversity target at national, regional and global levels;

Desirous to avoid a further loss of biological diversity in Europe;

Aware that the drafting and implementation of Action Plans may be a useful tool to redress the situation;

Recalling its Recommendation No. 59 (1997) on the Drafting and Implementation of Action Plans of Wild Fauna Species;

Recalling its Recommendation No. 41 (1993) on the protection of freshwater fish;

Recalling its Recommendation No. 116 (2005) on the conservation of sturgeons (*Acipenseridae*) in the Danube River Basin

Referring to the Action Plan for the conservation and restoration of the European sturgeon (*Acipenser sturio*), adopted by the Committee [document T-PVS/Inf (2007) 4 rev and 4 add];

Desirous of taking prompt action for the conservation and restoration of the European sturgeon;

Considering this action plan as guidelines for competent national authorities,

Recommends Contracting Parties to the Convention and invites Observer States to consider drafting and implementing national Action Plans for the European sturgeon on the basis of the above-mentioned Action Plan, as adopted.

## Appendix 8



### Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

#### Standing Committee

#### **Recommendation No. 128 (2007) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 29 November 2007, on the European Charter on Hunting and Biodiversity**

The Standing Committee of the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats, acting under the terms of Article 14 of the Convention;

Having regard to the aims of the Convention to conserve wild flora and fauna and their natural habitats;

Noting that integrated ecosystem management and habitat protection have great advantages for the preservation of biodiversity and should go hand in hand with species protection efforts;

Aware that the identification of processes and categories of activities which have or are likely to have significant adverse impact on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity (as stated in Article 7 of the Convention on Biological Diversity, CBD) are also of utmost importance for the preservation of threatened species;

Recalling Decision V/6 of the Conference of the Parties to the CBD on the Ecosystem Approach, adopted in 2000, and including the 12 principles of the Ecosystem Approach;

Recalling the 2003 Kyiv Resolution on Biodiversity, which includes the commitment to ‘halt the loss of biodiversity by 2010’, as adopted by Environment Ministers and Heads of delegation from 51 countries in the Pan-European region;

Recalling the 2004 Strasbourg Declaration on the role of the Bern Convention in the preservation of biological diversity, and the need to reinforce the implementation and coherence of global and European biodiversity instruments such as the Convention on Biological Diversity and the European Community’s Birds and Habitats Directives;

Recalling Decision VII/12 of the Conference of the Parties to the CBD on Sustainable Use, adopted in 2004, and including the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity;

Recalling the 2005 Millennium Ecosystem Assessment and its finding that “unprecedented increased efforts” are needed to achieve the 2010 biodiversity target at national, regional and global levels;

Desirous to avoid a further loss of biological diversity in Europe;

Having regard to the EC’s Sustainable Hunting Initiative;

Recalling Recommendation 1689 (2004) of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, regarding Hunting and Europe’s environmental balance;

Desirous to ensure that hunting and hunting tourism in Europe are practiced in a sustainable manner, avoiding negative impacts on biodiversity and making a positive contribution to the conservation of species and habitats;

Referring to the principles and guidelines included in the European Charter on Hunting and Biodiversity [document T-PVS (2007) 7 revised];

Considering this Charter as guidelines for competent national authorities and relevant stakeholders;

RECOMMENDS Contracting Parties to the Convention, and INVITES Observer States and Organisations, to take into consideration the European Charter on Hunting and Biodiversity and apply its principles in the elaboration and implementation of their hunting policies so as to ensure that hunting is carried out in a sustainable way.

## Appendix 9



### Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

#### Standing Committee

#### **Recommendation No. 129 (2007) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 29 November 2007, on the construction of a dam and hydro-electric power station in Lesce on the Dobra River (Croatia)**

The Standing Committee of the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats, acting under the terms of Article 14 of the Convention;

Having regard to the aims of the Convention to conserve wild flora and fauna and their natural habitats;

Pointing out that Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Convention calls on the Parties to give particular emphasis to endangered and vulnerable species, including endangered and vulnerable migratory species;

Pointing out that, in pursuance of Article 3, paragraph 2, of the Convention, “Each Contracting Party undertakes, in its planning and development policies and in its measures against pollution, to have regard to the conservation of wild flora and fauna”;

Recalling that Article 4 of the Convention stipulates that “Each Contracting Party shall take appropriate and necessary legislative and administrative measures to ensure the conservation of the habitats of the wild flora and fauna species, especially those specified in Appendices I and II, and the conservation of endangered natural habitats”;

Recalling that Article 4 of the Convention also stipulates that “The Contracting Parties in their planning and development policies shall have regard to the conservation requirements of the areas protected under the preceding paragraph, so as to avoid or minimize as far as possible any deterioration of such areas”;

Recalling that Article 4 of the Convention further stipulates that “The Contracting Parties undertake to give special attention to the protection of areas that are of importance for the migratory species specified in Appendices II and III and which are appropriately situated in relation to migration routes, as wintering, staging, feeding, breeding or moulting areas”;

Referring to the other provisions of the Convention relating to the protection of habitats and the conservation of species;

Recalling that the long-fingered bat (*Myotis capaccinii*) and the Danube Salmon (*Hucho hucho*) are protected species listed in Appendix II and III of the Convention, respectively;

Noting the natural values of the karst region of Ogulin, to which the Dobra canyon belongs, and the high diversity of rare subterranean species it hosts;

Referring to Mr Pierre Hunkeler’s report (document T-PVS/Files (2007) 28) on the planned hydro-power station in Croatia, drawn up following a meeting with the Croatian authorities and relevant stakeholders and a site visit, and its concern that the consequences derived from the construction of the dam of the hydro-power plant may be significant for a number of protected species and habitats;

Noting with concern that the report found that the possibilities of mitigating or compensating the negative effects of the dam and the operations of the power plant are unfortunately limited in view of the nature of the impacts;

Further noting with concern its findings as to the likely inadequacy of the EIA, done in 1985, concerning the impacts which could be expected from the dam;

Aware that information from all relevant authorities, the State Institute for Nature Protection, NGOs and the national electricity company was available for consideration as part of the analysis of this project;

Emphasising the importance of the agreement of the electricity company in charge of the project to undertake further studies on the impact of the dam, especially on species linked to caves and to the river,

Recommends the Croatian Government to:

1. Fully review the expected environmental impacts of the project and the real possibilities of mitigation and compensation measures. On that basis, as well as in the light of its obligations in relation with the Bern Convention, re-examine the decision to authorise the construction of the dam.
2. If the decision is to continue the project, the Croatian Government should:
  - ✓ provide a full and up-dated environmental assessment of the impact of the dam;
  - ✓ develop and guarantee adequate mitigation and compensation measures such as plans to ensure the breeding, wild or captive, of the Danube Salmon, if it still exists in that part of the Dobra river, and to facilitate the relocation of species such as the long-fingered bat, if needed;
  - ✓ agree on a detailed monitoring programme to adapt such measures to the evolution of the situation;
  - ✓ require the advice of biologists to minimise impacts on specialised species if they close the caves with sand or concrete, and decide on the speed of the filling of the accumulation lake.
3. Develop and implement effective measures to ensure the long term protection of the most significant karst areas of the Ogulin region.
4. Ensure the protection of the other preserved karst canyons of high natural value in Croatia.
5. Draw the attention of Croatian authorities to learn lessons from this example as regards the need to reconsider outdated EIAs.



## Appendix 10



### Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

#### Standing Committee

#### **Recommendation No. 130 (2007) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 29 November 2007, on the windfarms planned near Balchik and Kaliakra, and other wind farm developments on the Via Pontica route (Bulgaria)**

The Standing Committee of the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats, acting under the terms of Article 14 of the Convention;

Having regard to the aims of the Convention to conserve wild flora and fauna and their natural habitats;

Pointing out that Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Convention calls on the Parties to give particular emphasis to endangered and vulnerable species, including endangered and vulnerable migratory species;

Pointing out that, in pursuance of Article 3, paragraph 2, of the Convention, “Each Contracting Party undertakes, in its planning and development policies and in its measures against pollution, to have regard to the conservation of wild flora and fauna”;

Recalling that Article 4 of the Convention stipulates that “Each Contracting Party shall take appropriate and necessary legislative and administrative measures to ensure the conservation of the habitats of the wild flora and fauna species, especially those specified in Appendices I and II, and the conservation of endangered natural habitats”;

Recalling that Article 4 of the Convention also stipulates that “The Contracting Parties in their planning and development policies shall have regard to the conservation requirements of the areas protected under the preceding paragraph, so as to avoid or minimize as far as possible any deterioration of such areas”;

Recalling that Article 4 of the Convention further stipulates that “The Contracting Parties undertake to give special attention to the protection of areas that are of importance for the migratory species specified in Appendices II and III and which are appropriately situated in relation to migration routes, as wintering, staging, feeding, breeding or moulting areas”;

Referring to the other provisions of the Convention relating to the protection of habitats and the conservation of species;

Recalling its Recommendation No. 117 (2005), adopted on 1st December 2005, on the plan to set up a wind farm near the town of Balchik and other wind farm developments, on the Via Pontica route (Bulgaria);

Drawing attention to its Recommendation No 109 (2004) on minimizing adverse effects of wind power generation on wildlife;

Referring to BirdLife International’s report: “Wind farms and Birds: an analysis of the effects of wind farms on birds, and guidance on environmental assessment criteria and site selection issues” [document T-PVS/Inf (2003) 12];

Recognising the value of wind power and other renewable sources of energy in the fight against climate change;

Recognising the value of SEA/EIA and policy guidance to provide certainty to investors and industry, and protection for the environment, including biodiversity;

Recognising the importance of the Bulgarian Black Sea coast as a part of the Via Pontica migration route of major global importance for birds breeding in at least 17 European countries;

Aware that within this area there are a number of key areas where migrating birds concentrate and the siting of wind farms in these locations is likely to be particularly problematic;

Further aware that the first wind farm developments along this coast will set a precedent for future developments;

Referring to Mr Eckhart Kuijken's report (document T-PVS/Files (2007) 27) on wind farms in Balchik and Kaliakra in Bulgaria, drawn up following meetings with the Bulgarian authorities and interested stakeholders and a site visit, and its concern that risks to migratory and resident species may be significant, especially given the ecological importance of Via Pontica as an internationally recognised long-distance migration corridor;

Noting with concern that the report found that the decisions seem to have been based upon incomplete or partial information brought together in EIAs that minimise the likely effects of windfarms at the very core areas of mass migration, contrary to the results of more detailed ornithological monitoring during longer periods;

Further noting with concern its findings as to the significant ecological problems that development of windfarms at Balchik and Kaliakra is likely to cause, given the presence of precious steppe vegetation in most current and future windfarm locations, and the specific topography and landscape structure, including cliffs and bare steppe plateaus, suitable for migrating soaring birds;

Aware that information from NGOs and investors was available for consideration as part of the analysis of this case;

Emphasising the need, before any decision within the SEA and EIA processes is taken, to carry out sufficiently thorough and detailed studies to inform the selection of wind farm sites;

Considering that the sites in Balchik and Kaliakra are important for the implementation of the Natura 2000/Emerald Networks;

Recommends the Bulgarian Government to:

1. review relevant decisions, at the local, regional and national level, concerning wind energy plants and ensure that new plants are not built in the region unless Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) prove they do not have a substantial negative effect on the biological diversity protected under the Convention - EIA reports should be more precise and scientifically sound than those already presented and should formulate independent peer reviewed conclusions;
2. fully reconsider the development of approved windfarms projects in the Balchik and Kaliakra region situated within or nearby sites designated as important bird areas and special areas of conservation;
3. investigate the possibility of relocating the windfarm projects already under construction as well as the single turbines (whose building is possible without EIA) in order to restore the integrity of sites to be considered as Natura 2000 sites, IBAs, or under other protection status;
4. select alternative locations for future and not yet operating turbines based on appropriate data (including long-term monitoring of biodiversity) and assessments (e.g. using multicriteria-analysis); key bird areas, potential SPAs, IBAs, intensive bird migration corridors and sites regularly used by large flocks of roosting species such as storks and wintering geese must be avoided from windfarm development;
5. assess the impact of the current operating turbines;
6. conduct an Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of Bulgaria's wind energy programme, taking into account possible conflicts of wind energy production within the most intensive bird movements areas, in particular along the Black Sea coast;

7. establish a strict moratorium on further turbines and windfarm projects in the coastal areas of Bulgaria until EIA and SEA reports mentioned in paragraphs 1 and 6 are completed;
8. respect the need to focus on the avoidance of the impacts coming from outside having negative effects on areas of recognised conservation importance;
9. take into account the following guidance to improve EIAs for future and not yet operating turbines, including in accordance with “Regulation about the conditions and the order for accomplishment of assessment for compatibility of plans, projects, programmes and investment intentions with the subject and the aims of the conservation of protected zones”:
  - further research and monitor birds, bats, other fauna, vegetations and key landscape-ecological structures and processes influencing biodiversity; to this end long-term monitoring of flora and fauna, review and validation of all data is required, included those from NGOs, institutes and independent scientists;
  - apply collision modelling of cumulative effects of several wind farms or turbines along intensive flyways, followed by the assessment of the suitability of localities using multicriteria-analysis methods;
  - develop compulsory procedures to peer review the completeness and quality of biodiversity chapters of EIAs and their conclusions before continuing the administrative and legal processes;
10. develop guidelines for appropriate planning of the construction of windfarms and/or individual turbines, taking account of the following issues in order to integrate biodiversity conservation concerns:
  - initiate a broad debate on the precautionary principle regarding development projects in relation to sites with outstanding biodiversity values;
  - take measures for the removal of turbines in case of unacceptable bird collisions where no alternatives exist; this require the drafting of a set of mitigating and compensatory measures when biodiversity losses occur;
  - promote capacity building for specific and independent control of the ecological effects of turbines (in terms of experienced staff, equipment, legal base, cooperation with other institutions and NGOs, appropriate procedures, etc);
  - to consider and properly investigate the social impacts of windfarms on local population and on the loss of nature and scenery as a significant source of recreation and eco-tourism.

**Appendix 11**

Convention on the Conservation  
of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

Standing Committee

**Recommendation No 131 (2007) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 29 November 2007, on the Planned Motorway Vc across the Drava Marshlands in Slavonia (Croatia)**

The Standing Committee of the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats, acting under the terms of Article 14 of the Convention;

Having regard to the aims of the Convention to conserve wild flora and fauna and their natural habitats;

Pointing out that Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Convention calls on the Parties to give particular emphasis to endangered and vulnerable species, including endangered and vulnerable migratory species;

Pointing out that, in pursuance of Article 3, paragraph 2, of the Convention, “Each Contracting Party undertakes, in its planning and development policies and in its measures against pollution, to have regard to the conservation of wild flora and fauna”;

Recalling that Article 4 of the Convention stipulates that “Each Contracting Party shall take appropriate and necessary legislative and administrative measures to ensure the conservation of the habitats of the wild flora and fauna species, especially those specified in Appendices I and II, and the conservation of endangered natural habitats”;

Recalling that Article 4 of the Convention also stipulates that “The Contracting Parties in their planning and development policies shall have regard to the conservation requirements of the areas protected under the preceding paragraph, so as to avoid or minimize as far as possible any deterioration of such areas”;

Recalling that Article 4 of the Convention further stipulates that “The Contracting Parties undertake to give special attention to the protection of areas that are of importance for the migratory species specified in Appendices II and III and which are appropriately situated in relation to migration routes, as wintering, staging, feeding, breeding or moulting areas”;

Referring to the other provisions of the Convention relating to the protection of habitats and the conservation of species;

Recalling that the project site hosts a number of bird, bat, fish, mammals, amphibian and reptile species listed in the Convention, and including the White-tailed Eagle, Black Stork, Ferruginous Duck and Yellow Bellied Toad;

Noting the natural values of the Drava wetland and the endangered woodland habitat types present in the motorway corridor;

Referring to Mr Len Wyatt’s report (document T-PVS/Files (2007) 10 revised) on the planned Motorway Vc (A5 Autocesta Beli Manastir to Osijek ) across the Drava Marshlands in Slavonia (Croatia), drawn up following a meeting with the Croatian authorities and relevant stakeholders and a site visit, and its concern that loss of areas either temporarily or permanently under the footprint of the road could negatively affect the species covered by the Bern Convention;

Noting with concern that the report found that the area of habitat lost under the motorway, or the crossing, including drains, is potentially significant;

Aware that information from relevant authorities, natural park authorities, NGOs and the motorway company was available for consideration as part of the analysis of this project;

Recommends the Croatian Government to:

1. Make sure that the Construction Permit for the section of the project between Osijek and Beli Manastir:
  - a. Ensures that the integrity of the Drava Marshlands as a habitat is protected and maintained during the construction process, including:
    - that the Drava Wetlands Bridge remains an open structure possibly including a cable stayed bridge to remove some of the piers from the wetlands across the whole wetland plain;
    - minimising and mitigating for habitat loss and potential disturbance; and
    - removing or reducing the risk of pollution during construction, operation and maintenance;
  - b. Ensures that the construction and operation/maintenance of the route will not significantly adversely affect the relevant species stated in the EIA (2003) as being present in the Motorway corridor, plus those believed to be present but not included in the EIA which are covered by the Bern Convention: White Tailed Eagle, Ferruginous Duck and Yellow Bellied Toad; and potentially plants and invertebrates.
  - c. Ensures that the project does not prejudice future designations of the Drava Wetlands for their landscapes, habitats and species, if the work on those designations has reached the stage where such information can be used.
2. Include in the construction works a requirement to monitor the White Tailed Eagles and Black Storks noted in the vicinity of the corridor at the Wetlands during the construction period, to provide evidence of the effects of construction process on those species.
3. Consider monitoring whether bird/amphibian vehicle collisions occur once the proposed mitigation is in place, and the motorway, especially over the Drava Wetlands, is open to traffic.
  - a. If the information is sufficient to suggest that there may be a significant negative effect on species covered by the Bern Convention, consideration should be given to providing further mitigation measures.
4. Consider providing information to the public, including at the Road Service Facility, about the landscape, habitats and species in the Wetlands, along with how the motorway took into account these issues, as a potential and valuable educational tool.
5. Continue to improve the communications between the relevant parties involved or interested in future road projects.
6. Continue to present information about future road projects in the same geographical area and within overlapping timescales, to enable those involved or interested to find that information.

**Appendix 12**

Convention on the Conservation  
of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

Standing Committee

**Recommendation No. 132 (2007) of the Standing Committee, adopted on 29 November 2007, on the conservation of fungi in Europe**

The Standing Committee of the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats, acting under the terms of Article 14 of the Convention;

Having regard to the aims of the Convention to conserve wild flora and fauna and their natural habitats;

Recalling that Article 5, paragraph 1, of the Convention requires that Contracting Parties take appropriate and necessary legislative and administrative measures to ensure the special protection of the wild flora species listed in Appendix I;

Referring to its Recommendation No. 30 (1991) on conservation of species in Appendix I to the convention;

Having regard to Article 4 of the Convention and to its Resolution No. 1 (1989) on the provisions relating to the conservation of habitats, and its Recommendation No. 16 (1989) on areas of special conservation interest;

Referring to its Recommendation No. 87 (2001) on the European Plant Conservation Strategy, recognised as a valuable contribution to the Global Strategy on Plant Conservation adopted under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD);

Desirous that Contracting Parties promote more conservation action on species listed in Appendix I to the convention and on endangered natural habitats;

Noting that integrated ecosystem management and habitat protection have great advantages for the preservation of biodiversity and should go hand in hand with species protection efforts;

Recalling Decision V/6 of the Conference of the Parties to the CBD on the Ecosystem Approach, adopted in 2000, and including the 12 principles of the Ecosystem Approach;

Recalling the 2003 Kyiv Resolution on Biodiversity, which includes the commitment to ‘halt the loss of biodiversity by 2010’, as adopted by Environment Ministers and Heads of delegation from 51 countries in the Pan-European region;

Recalling the 2005 Millennium Ecosystem Assessment and its finding that “unprecedented increased efforts” are needed to achieve the 2010 biodiversity target at national, regional and global levels;

Desirous to avoid a further loss of biological diversity in Europe;

Referring to the guidelines included in the Guidance for the conservation of mushroom in Europe [document T-PVS (2007) 13 revised];

Considering this Guidance as guidelines for competent national authorities and relevant stakeholders;

RECOMMENDS to Contracting Parties to the Convention, and INVITES Observer States and Organisations, to:

1. address habitat management as a priority within different sectors, for the conservation of fungi species in Europe;
2. take into consideration the Guidance for the Conservation of Mushrooms in Europe and apply it in the elaboration and implementation of their national conservation policies for larger fungi.
3. seek to engage all who benefit from fungi in efforts to conserve their habitats.

**Appendix 13**

Convention on the Conservation  
of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

Standing Committee

**Resolution of the Standing Committee, adopted on 29 November 2007, on the revised regulations of the European Diploma of Protected Areas**

The Committee of Ministers,

Having regard to Resolution (65) 6 of 6 March 1965, instituting the European Diploma for certain landscapes, reserves and protected natural features;

Having regard to Resolution (73) 4 of 19 January 1973 on the Regulations for the European Diploma;

Having regard to Resolutions (88) 39 of 5 December 1988 and (89) 12 of 19 June 1989 amending Resolution (73) 4 on the Regulations for the European Diploma;

Having regard to Resolution (91) 16 of 17 June 1991 on the Regulations for the European Diploma;

Taking account of the experience gained since the 1991 regulations were introduced.

Adopts the revised regulations for the award of the European Diploma of Protected Areas, as set out below and the appendices thereto.

**Regulations**

*Article 1 – Purpose*

1. The European Diploma of Protected Areas (the “Diploma”) may be awarded for adequately protected natural or semi-natural areas of exceptional European interest from the point of view of conservation of biological, geological or landscape diversity and which are managed in an exemplary way. It is awarded to them by virtue of their scientific, cultural or aesthetic interest if they have an appropriate protection system, eventually also in conjunction with programmes of action for sustainable development. The Diploma represents an important contribution to the Pan-European Ecological Network.
2. The Diploma may be awarded to natural areas situated in European states which are not members of the Council of Europe, under the same conditions and in accordance with the same procedures as apply to member states.
3. In the case of transfrontier areas, a sole Diploma shall only be granted with the consent of all the states concerned.
4. The effect of the Diploma shall be to place the area under the supervision of the Council of Europe. The Diploma shall be awarded for a period of five years, and shall be renewable for successive 10-year periods.
5. The Diploma shall take the form of a document certifying the said supervision. It shall be signed by the Secretary General of the Council of Europe, and shall bear the seal of the Council of Europe. It shall be presented to the authorities directly responsible for the management of the national area concerned.



### *Article 2 – Award of the Diploma*

The Diploma shall be awarded by the Committee of Ministers on the proposal of the Standing Committee of the Bern Convention (hereinafter the “Committee”), in accordance with the procedure set out in the following articles.

### *Article 3 – Application*

1. The government of any European state wishing to apply for the award of the Diploma to an area within its territory shall submit to the Secretariat, in one of the two official languages of the Council of Europe, documents on the area in question, at least three months before the date of the meeting of the competent Council of Europe Group of Specialists (“Group of Specialists”) set up under the terms of Article 4.1 of these regulations. The choice of the applicant area compared with other possible applications in the country must be clearly justified with regard to the interest of the area; its representativity in relation to biological and landscape diversity in Europe and the exemplarity of the management.

2. In the case of a transfrontier area for which a sole Diploma is requested, such an application can only be submitted to the Secretariat after approval by all the states concerned.

3. Any government simultaneously submitting several applications shall indicate an order of priority.

4. Any government submitting an application must prove that the area in question is of exceptional European interest. Accordingly, the documents should contain the necessary information to enable the Group of Specialists to ascertain whether the area complies with the relevant criteria established in Appendix 2 to these regulations.

5.a. All applications must meticulously follow the model of the questionnaire reproduced in Appendix 1 to these regulations and must include, in particular, cartographic documents as well as documents describing: the area concerned and its state of conservation; the various human or natural factors liable to have a negative effect on such state of conservation; measures taken to eliminate or minimise the effects of such factors; the system of legal protection applied to the area in question; and any administrative measures implemented.

5.b. Copies of the national laws and regulations and, where appropriate, regional and local acts governing the area for which an application is submitted, and information on supervisory measures actually implemented on the spot must be included with the application. If these documents are drafted in a language other than one of the two official languages of the Council of Europe, a translation in one of the Organisation’s official languages of the essential passages of the laws and regulations governing the area must be provided.

5.c. The protection status of the applicant area must be assessed in a dynamic perspective: as far as the award is concerned, it is necessary to analyse whether the existing protection is sufficient against foreseeable dangers, at least throughout the period of the Diploma’s validity (five years); for its renewal, the reference period is ten years. In both cases, the internal and external threats to the protected area are taken into consideration.

### *Article 4 – Consideration of the application documents*

1.a. Applications shall be examined by the Group of Specialists. The latter shall hold annual meetings. It shall examine applications in the order in which full supporting documentation is submitted to at the Secretariat. The Secretariat shall ensure that the documentation is complete before submitting it to the Group of Specialists and may, where appropriate, defer its submission pending receipt of additional information.

1.b. Any government submitting one or more applications shall be invited to send a representative, at its own expense, to the appropriate meetings of the Group of Specialists so that he or she may give members all information required.

2. After examining the documentation and hearing the representative of the state concerned, the Group of Specialists shall first of all state whether it considers that the area in question is of exceptional

European interest justifying the award of the Diploma. If the European interest has been sufficiently well established, the Group of Specialists shall declare the application admissible and undertake an on-the-spot expert appraisal (subject to the approval of the government concerned) to enable it to confirm the European interest, assess the efficacy of existing conservation measures as well as the aim of the objectives sought, and obtain any additional information it may need to decide whether to award the Diploma.

3. The appraisal shall be assigned to an independent expert directly appointed by the Secretary General. He or she must not be a national of the country in which the assignment is carried out. In order to help the Secretary General choose the expert the national delegations of the Committee shall, if they so wish, send to the Secretariat the names of experts qualified to carry out such appraisals, stating their specific qualifications and knowledge of foreign languages.

4. During his or her visit the expert shall be accompanied by a member of the Secretariat, who shall guarantee, *inter alia*, continuity in the assessment of the criteria for obtaining the Diploma.

5. Throughout the independent expert's visit, one or more person(s) responsible for the area shall be placed at his or her disposal in order to facilitate the task. The expert will also meet local councilors interested in the area, officials from associations and, as appropriate, and representatives of socio-economic groups and of the media.

6. Broadly speaking, the expert appraisal shall cover the aspects listed in Appendix 3 to these regulations and any other specific item mentioned by the Group of Experts during consideration of the application. The Group of Specialists shall draw up specific terms of reference for each case, with which the expert will be required to comply.

7. Expenses incurred by the expert during his or her visit (travel, subsistence, etc.) shall be met by the Council of Europe so as to ensure that the appraisal is completely objective.

8. On-the-spot appraisals shall generally take two days; if necessary, it may be extended.

9. The expert shall submit his or her written report to the Group of Specialists, drafted in one of the two official languages of the Council of Europe, and shall subsequently present it orally at one of the Group's meetings.

#### *Article 5 – Proposals of the Group of Specialists and conclusions of the Committee or its Bureau*

1. The Group of Specialists shall hear the expert, take note of any observations from the representative of the state concerned, and then submit its conclusions, accompanied by the expert's report, to the Committee or its Bureau. It may propose one of the following decisions:

- a. that the Diploma be awarded immediately by the Committee of Ministers with or without conditions or recommendations;
- b. that, subject to the approval of the Committee or its Bureau, the award of the Diploma be made conditional upon the adoption of additional measures;
- c. that the application be deferred pending receipt of further information;
- d. that the application be rejected, with reasons given.

2. Applications will not be re-examined between the meeting of the Group of Specialists and the meeting of the Committee or its Bureau. However, the Group of Specialists may make a favourable recommendation in specific cases, provided the government concerned can provide, before the meeting of the Committee, a favourable written response to a request from the Secretariat on a specific point raised by the Group.

3. In each case, the Committee or its Bureau shall inform the Committee of Ministers and the government concerned of the reasons for its conclusions, having regard to the observations made by the Group of Specialists. If it proposes awarding the Diploma it shall briefly set out the reasons for its

decisions, referring notably to the European interest of the area in question and the efficacy of the conservation measures adopted.

4. If the proposal to award the Diploma is conditional on fulfilment of specific conditions or is accompanied by specific recommendations, it can only be granted if the state concerned undertakes during the meeting of the Committee or by any other means in the event of being prevented from attending (written procedure), to comply with such conditions and recommendations.

*Article 6 – Decision of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, and award of the Diploma*

1. Decisions concerning the award of the European Diploma shall be taken by the Committee of Ministers by a two-thirds majority of the votes cast and a majority of the representatives entitled to sit on the Committee.

2. The decision of the Committee of Ministers and the reasons for the award of the Diploma shall be set out in a resolution and recorded in the certificate attesting the award of the Diploma.

3.a. The Diploma shall be presented to the authorities directly responsible for managing the area to which it has been awarded at a ceremony organised either at the Council of Europe or on the site, as soon as possible after the date of the award.

The following persons shall attend:

- the Chair of the Committee of Ministers (or his or her representative);
- the Secretary General (or his or her representative) or the Chair of the Committee (or his or her representative), who shall present the Diploma;
- the representative of the recipient (governmental or private) body;
- the members of the Committee or its Bureau who are nationals of the state concerned (or their representatives) and for States, which are not members of the Council of Europe, the members of the Council for the Strategy or its Bureau.

3.b. The costs of the ceremony shall be borne by the host state, except those incurred by the representative of the Council of Europe or the Chairman of the Committee (or his or her representative), which shall be met by the Council of Europe.

3.c. A press release shall be issued at the time of the ceremony. The Council of Europe will publish appropriate materials to mark the occasion.

4. The authorities responsible for managing the areas awarded the Diploma use the logo, as it appears in Appendix 4 to these regulations. The logo is used on signposts at the entrances to the areas, in information leaflets on them and in the visitor reception buildings. Regulations on the logo can be found in the graphic design specifications, available from the Secretariat of the Council of Europe. The reasons for the award of the Diploma as recorded in the Diploma itself must also appear on the above-mentioned signposts.

*Article 7 – Annual reports*

1. The authorities directly responsible for managing the area awarded the Diploma shall submit an annual report to the Committee or its Bureau. The report must be based on the model reproduced in Appendix 5 to these regulations. The report must be forwarded to the Secretariat in full by the central authorities of the state concerned, with any comments they may wish to make. It must, *inter alia*, state what measures have been taken to comply with the conditions and/or recommendations mentioned when the Diploma was awarded or renewed. The first annual report must be submitted in one of the two official languages of the Council of Europe by 30 November of the year following that in which the Committee of Ministers awarded the Diploma. Every annual report reflects the previous period from 1 September to 31 August.

2. The Group of Specialists shall examine the annual reports and may submit an opinion or recommendations to the Committee or its Bureau, which shall be forwarded, through the Committee of Ministers and the central authorities of the state concerned, to the authorities responsible for managing

the area awarded the Diploma. The Group may also identify some problems encountered in one Diploma site or common to several Diploma areas and make proposals aimed at remedying them.

3. In the event of failure to comply with the foregoing provisions, the Secretary General may, via the government concerned, invite the persons responsible for managing the Diploma-holding area to provide an adequate explanation.

*Article 8 – Appraisal in the event of a serious threat or serious damage*

1.a. Should there be a serious threat, significant damage to the area or serious difficulties in implementing the conditions attached to the award or renewal of the diploma, the Secretary General may appoint an independent expert to assess whether there is in fact any real danger and to carry out a further appraisal in accordance with the conditions laid down in Article 5 of these regulations. The expert shall be accompanied by a member of the Secretariat.

1.b. The expert's conclusions shall be examined by the Group of Specialists, which shall submit an opinion to the Committee or its Bureau. The government concerned shall be invited to send a representative to the Group at its own expense.

1.c. Should the danger prove real, the Committee or its Bureau may recommend that the Committee of Ministers request the responsible authorities to take appropriate protective measures within a reasonable time. Where such measures cannot be taken within a reasonable time, or where the damage is irremediable, the Committee or its Bureau shall decide whether or not to recommend to the Committee of Ministers that the Diploma be withdrawn before the end of the period of validity.

2. The decision as to whether to withdraw the Diploma shall be taken by the Committee of Ministers by a two-thirds majority of the votes cast and a majority of the representatives entitled to sit on the Committee. It shall be notified by means of a resolution, and the reasons for such a decision shall be transmitted to the government concerned and the authorities responsible for managing the area.

*Article 9 – Extension of the period of validity of the Diploma*

1. During the fifth year, unless the state concerned decides otherwise, the Committee or its Bureau shall consider extending the validity of the Diploma for a further ten-year period in the light, in particular, of the annual reports.

2. To this end, the Secretary General of the Council of Europe shall appoint an independent expert to carry out a fresh appraisal, particular attention being paid to information provided every year in the annual reports. The new appraisal is aimed at taking stock of the state and development of the area, having regard to the conditions and/or recommendations formulated previously, and proposing, as appropriate, new measures for the coming period. The working conditions for this expert shall be the same as those laid down for the expert who carried out the appraisal for the award of the Diploma. The expert will be accompanied by a member of the Secretariat if renewal raises any particular problems; otherwise the visit shall be made by the expert alone.

3. The independent expert's terms of reference shall be drawn up by the Group of Specialists. They shall take account, in particular, of the progress of action taken to comply with the conditions and/or recommendations in the resolution awarding the Diploma or the resolution renewing it on the previous occasion, and of the comments by the Group of Specialists and those set out in the annual reports.

4. The government concerned shall be invited to send a representative, at its own expense, to the meeting of the Group of Specialists, when the discussion on the renewal of the Diploma takes place.

5.a. After examining the expert's report and the findings of the Group of Specialists, the Committee or its Bureau will propose one of the following options to the Committee of Ministers:

- to extend the period of validity of the Diploma;
- not to renew the Diploma before certain conditions are met;
- not to extend the period of validity, which shall be tantamount to withdrawing the Diploma, in which case the Committee of Ministers shall inform the authorities directly responsible for the area concerned of the reasons for its decision, through the government.

5.b. If the Diploma is not renewed or its period of validity extended, the authorities responsible shall be requested to keep the Committee or its Bureau regularly informed of developments in the situation.

6. The decision concerning the renewal of the Diploma shall be taken by the Committee of Ministers by a two-thirds majority of the votes cast and a majority of the representatives entitled to sit on the Committee. It shall be the subject of a resolution.

7. After the first renewal, the Diploma will be automatically renewed every ten years, without any prior appraisal, except where there is an express request from the government of the country concerned or in the case of a recognised threat to the area.

## Appendix 14

# Draft programme of activities and budget of the Bern Convention for the year 2008

## Outline of activities

### 1. Monitoring of the legal application of the Convention

#### *Long-term aim*

To harmonise the legislation of Contracting Parties on biodiversity conservation and to ensure that Bern Convention obligations are converted to national legislation and applied. Monitor the implementation of Article 9 of the Convention.

#### *Medium-term aim*

To monitor case law on the Convention, to make proposals whenever the implementation of the Convention meets legal obstacles, to monitor appropriate application of obligations, to help new contracting Parties adapt their legislation to the Convention.

#### *Short-term aim*

To examine new nature conservation legislation of Contracting Parties. To elaborate reports on the implementation of the Convention in one or two states, to follow up the implementation of recommendations made to some states, to check biennial reports for possible abusive use of Article 9 of the Convention to assist new Contracting Parties in adapting their legislation to the provisions of the Convention.

#### *Funding*

Council of Europe and voluntary contributions.

#### *Political interest*

The harmonisation of biodiversity-related legislation in Europe is a necessary step in the implementation of the Convention. For states from the Caucasus and some states of South East Europe which have joined the Convention in recent years, the adoption of Bern Convention obligations permits a “modernisation” of their nature conservation legislation in accordance with “European standards” in this field.

### 2. Conservation of natural habitats

#### *Long-term aim*

Conservation of natural habitats and implementation of Article 4 of the Convention, as well as Resolutions (89) 1, (96) 3, (96) 4, (98) 5, (98) 6 and Recommendations (89) 14, (89) 15 and (89) 16 of the Standing Committee.

#### *Medium-term aim*

Setting up of the Emerald Network of Areas of Special Conservation Interest (ASCI) for Europe.

#### *Short-term aim*

After having started 29 pilot projects from 1999 to 2007, efforts are to be focussed on inviting states to make progress in the building of the network, providing a complete description of sites in a more substantial number of areas, with a view to designating them as ASCI. In 2008, efforts should focus on further pilot projects in the Russian Federation and Tunisia, as well as on designating selected sites as ASCI, including an increased number of marine sites.

#### *Funding*

Council of Europe and voluntary contributions

### *Methods*

Evaluation of pilot projects; technical meetings at national/regional level; groups of experts and/or consultants.

As foreseen in Resolution (98) 5, this exercise is to be carried out in co-operation with the European Union. The European Union is responsible for sites in EU member states and the Council of Europe for the building of this ecological network outside EU. The European Environment Agency is a common partner for both organisations in this exercise.

### *Political interest*

For states candidates to the EU accession, the setting up of the Emerald Network is largely perceived as an “approximation” exercise, which permits to better adapt their systems of protected areas to EU requirements. For other states non member of the EU, the Emerald Network permits a homogeneous system of protected areas at the regional level.

## **3. Preparation of a European conference on the development of ecological networks**

### *Long-term aim*

Conservation of natural habitats and implementation of Article 4 of the Convention, as well as Resolutions (89) 1, (96) 3, (96) 4, (98) 5, (98) 6 and Recommendations (89) 14, (89) 15 and (89) 16 of the Standing Committee

### *Medium-term aim*

Implementation of ecological connectivity in the framework of the ecosystem approach.

### *Short-term aim*

The preparation of a European conference on the development of ecological networks to be held in 2009, as a regional contribution to the implementation of the Programme of Work on Protected Areas of the CBD and taking into account the principles of the ecosystem approach. The conference's objective will be to have an exchange of views at European level of the regional application of the Programme of Work on Protected Areas of the CBD, especially in the context of climatic change. The conference is expected to lead to the support of ecological networks as implementation of the CBD at the regional level, as well as to the preparation of recommendations for specific measures to adapt existing instruments to take account of the impacts of climatic change.

### *Funding*

Council of Europe and voluntary contributions.

### *Methods*

Contribution to the preparation of the conference. The Standing Committee of the Bern Convention will be represented in the ad hoc organs in charge of the preparation of the conference.

### *Political interest*

The conference may be integrated in the events planned by the next triple Presidency of the European Union including France, the Czech Republic and Sweden. It represents a contribution to the 2010 biodiversity target of halting biodiversity loss, as agreed by European countries. The conference will present an example of regional implementation of the CBD's Programme of Work on Protected Areas through European initiatives leading to the setting up of ecological networks.

## **4. European Diploma of Protected Areas**

### *Long-term aims*

Use the European Diploma of Protected Areas to reward and encourage natural and semi-natural areas and landscapes that are of special European importance for the preservation of biological, geological and landscape diversity and are managed in an exemplary way. Establish a series of areas that can serve as reference points for heritage conservation and for promoting sustainable development models.

*Medium-term aims*

Regularly monitor Diploma areas, particularly as regards implementation of the recommendations made when European Diplomas are awarded or renewed. Organise, every five or ten years, a fresh on-the-spot appraisal by an independent expert, whose main duties will be to ensure that the conditions imposed when the Diploma was awarded or last renewed are still being satisfied and to produce a new expert appraisal reporting on any progress made or any deterioration likely to affect the area.

*Short-term aims*

Examine applications for the European Diploma sent in by the member state governments and submitted to a group of specialists. Examine the reports sent every year to the secretariat by each Diploma area manager, describing developments on site.

*Funding*

Council of Europe and voluntary contributions.

*Methods*

Group of specialists. Expert appraisals. Annual reports. Resolutions presented to the Committee of Ministers concerning the award, renewal or non-renewal of Diplomas to areas.

*Political interest*

The European Diploma of Protected Areas is a prestigious international award granted to areas with suitable conservation schemes. These areas comprise a full cross-section of the extraordinary variety of natural and cultural heritage in Europe and offer encouragement to the nature conservation work of all the countries in which they are located, as well as affording a practical opportunity for their managers to exchange views and experience.

**5. Monitoring species and encouraging conservation action***Long-term aim*

To record the conservation status of the populations of species in the appendices of the Convention and detect problem populations, so as to reverse negative trends. To propose common management standards through action plans. Monitoring of the implementation of Articles 5, 6, 7 and 8 of the Convention. Implementation of numerous Recommendations of the Standing Committee on species protection.

*Medium-term aim*

Drawing-up and follow-up of Action Plans for threatened species, establishment of strategies for the protection of some groups of species, elaboration of red lists, identification of threats to biological diversity in different ecosystems, prevention of effects of invasive alien species.

*Short-term aim*

Input into the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and its technical body, SBSTTA. Implementation of the European Plant Conservation Strategy, monitoring of implementation by Parties of species action plans for birds and large carnivores, elaboration and implementation of action plans for threatened amphibians and reptiles, implementation of the European Strategy on Invasive Alien Species, implementation of the European Strategy on Conservation of Invertebrates.

*Funding*

Council of Europe, voluntary contributions, budgets of partner organisations.

*Methods*

Working groups, workshops, studies.

This activity is to be largely implemented in co-operation with the European Environment Agency and through collaboration with special partners with particular knowledge in the groups of species concerned (Secretariats of agreements under the Bonn Convention, Barcelona Convention, IUCN,



Large Carnivore Initiative for Europe, Large Herbivore Initiative, BirdLife, Societas Europea Herpetologica, Planta Europa, European Invertebrate Survey and others).

#### *Political interest*

These set of activities permits to take a pro-active approach to species conservation and to implement Articles 5, 6 and 7 of the Convention, as well as to contribute to the implementation, at European level, to many of the obligations of the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (Rio de Janeiro, 1992). Such work is also necessary for harmonisation at European level on data collection and to set a common European approach to species conservation.

### **6. Sectoral policies and biodiversity conservation**

#### *Long-term aim*

To preserve wild species and natural habitats in coastal marine ecosystems, in agricultural systems and valuable semi-natural agricultural habitats and forests. Implementation of Recommendation (91) 25 of the Standing Committee. Implement obligations of Article 2 and of relevant obligations of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Introduction of biological diversity considerations into sectoral policies is an important permanent activity as success in conservation of biological diversity relies in a great part in how it is integrated in other policies.

#### *Medium-term aim*

Identification of processes affecting loss of wild biological diversity, identification of species and habitat-types at risk by intensification or neglect. Setting-up of models to monitor change in wildlife outside protected areas. Preparation of meetings of the Convention on Biological Diversity and of its technical body. Collaboration with the Ministerial Conference for the Protection of Forests in Europe (MCPFE). Monitoring of effects on biodiversity of sectoral policies (energy, transport, agriculture, forestry, hunting, etc.).

#### *Short-term aim*

Identification of main threats and proposal on a strategy to monitor wildlife outside protected areas or areas of high biological value. Study of effects on biodiversity of wind energy. Implementation of a European Charter on Hunting and Biodiversity.

#### *Funding*

Council of Europe and voluntary contributions.

#### *Methods*

Consultant/Groups of experts.

#### *Political interest*

The over-exploitation of marine resources, the urbanisation and degradation of coastal areas and the rapid change of farming and forestry practices and livestock rising are having a serious effect on wildlife and natural habitats. The public is worried about the changes in landscapes and the loss of biological diversity. This is also one of the main priorities of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

### **7. Monitoring of sites and populations at risk and emergencies**

#### *Long-term aim*

Monitoring of the implementation of the obligations of the Convention by Parties by examination of cases and eventual opening of files.

For emergencies: development of a task force of experts that may have the possibility to act rapidly in a situation of grave ecological damage as a result of a catastrophe, an accident or a conflict situation.

#### *Medium-term aim*

Follow up of files already opened and examination of the positive effect the Convention has had in their resolution.

For emergencies: identify experts relevant in different environment sectors in relation to the issues dealt with at the Bern Convention.

*Short-term aim*

Evaluate the file system and suggest improvements, to cover cases in which a “brokerage” action is needed but are not necessarily connected to potential branch of the Convention.

For emergencies: contact potential experts and donors.

*Funding*

Council of Europe and voluntary contributions.

*Methods*

Reports, on the spot appraisals, groups of experts, training.

*Political interest*

The file case system is regarded by non-governmental organisations as the most effective instrument to monitor the implementation of the Convention. It is a very effective way to open a debate on problem areas and threatened populations of species and permits a certain “brokerage” action by the Standing Committee, which helps to solve many problems. Contracting Parties have shown great interest to reach solutions that can be acceptable to the Standing Committee, which reinforces the interest of the Convention for Parties.

For emergencies: the establishment of a task force would permit the Convention to be rapidly present in areas that receive high attention by the media and governments alike, improving visibility of the Convention.

## **8. Awareness and visibility**

*Long-term aim*

Promote and disseminate general information on the need to conserve species of wild flora and fauna and their habitats (Article 3, paragraph 3). Keep the public informed about the activities undertaken within the framework of the Convention (Article 14, paragraph 1).

*Medium-term aim*

Make the Convention better known in Contracting Parties and decision makers more aware of the interest of European biological diversity.

*Short-term aim*

To guide present Council of Europe awareness instruments to take greater interest in the Convention. Maintenance of Web page. Continuation of traditional paperback technical publications. Preparation of outreach materials informing about the Convention, its importance and role.

*Funding*

Council of Europe and voluntary contributions.

*Methods*

Publications/Website/oral presentations.

*Political interest*

Visibility of the action of the Council of Europe has been set as one of the priorities for its Committee of Ministers, so greater information on Bern Convention activities can only help re-enforce the political support of concerned governments.

\*

\* \*

***Note:***

This programme of activities is implemented with the help and in collaboration with a number of conventions, organisations and initiatives. Memoranda of co-operation have been concluded with the European Environment Agency and the Convention on Biological Diversity. Privilege partners in the implementation of the programme of activities are, inter alia, BirdLife International, IUCN, WWF, Large Carnivore Initiative for Europe (LCIE), Large Herbivore Initiative (WWF-LHI), Planta Europa, Societas Europea Herpetologica (SHE) and the European Invertebrate Survey (EIS).

## Activities for 2008

		Euros
<b>1. Monitoring of the legal application of the Convention</b>		
<p><b>1.1 Reports of the implementation of the Convention in at least one Contracting Party and legal assistance to new Contracting Parties</b></p> <p>Reports providing a legal analysis of the implementation of the Convention in two Contracting Parties (Bulgaria, Italy), suggesting ways to improve such implementation and adapt it to the provisions of the Convention (for new Parties)</p> <p><i>Fixed appropriation for consultants</i></p>		12,000
<b>2. Conservation of natural habitats</b>		
<p><b>2.1 Group of experts for the setting-up of the Emerald Network of Areas of Special Conservation Interest</b></p> <p><i>Terms of reference:</i> To do the necessary work to implement Recommendation No.16 (1989) on areas of special conservation interest. The group will review the technical documents prepared by the experts and make proposals to build up the Emerald Network.</p> <p><i>Travel and subsistence expenses for 1 expert from each of the 23 states:</i> ALBANIA, ANDORRA, ARMENIA, AZERBAIJAN, BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA, BURKINA FASO, CROATIA, GEORGIA, ICELAND, LIECHTENSTEIN, MOLDOVA, MONACO, MONTENEGRO, MOROCCO, NORWAY, RUSSIAN FEDERATION, SENEGAL, SERBIA, SWITZERLAND, "THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA", TUNISIA, TURKEY, UKRAINE</p> <p><i>Travel and subsistence expenses for 1 consultant</i></p>	Strasbourg, 1 day	15,000
<p><b>2.2 Ad hoc select committee to prepare conference on protected areas in Europe</b></p> <p><i>Travel and subsistence expenses for 7 delegates</i></p>	2 meetings Strasbourg, 1 day	9,000
<p><b>2.3 Pilot projects for the setting-up of the Emerald Network at national level in some states</b></p> <p><i>Financial contribution for the setting-up of the Network in 2 States</i></p>		20,000
<p><b>2.4 European Diploma of Protected Areas</b></p> <p><i>Meeting of the Group of Specialists</i> <i>Travel and subsistence expenses for experts</i></p> <p><i>Other activities under the European Diploma</i></p>	1 meeting Strasbourg, 2 days	6,000 8,000 10,000

<p><b>2.5 Consultants</b></p> <p>Consultants will be hired to manage the setting-up of the Emerald Network and to do the necessary technical work required, including software, lists, handling of data, etc.</p> <p>Consultant to prepare materials for conference on protected areas in Europe</p>		<p>10,000</p> <p>6,000</p>
<p><b>3. Monitoring of species and encouraging conservation action</b></p>		
<p><b>3.1 Biodiversity and Climate Change</b></p> <p><b>Group of Experts on Biodiversity and Climate Change</b></p> <p><i>Terms of reference:</i> Recognising the need to adapt conservation work to the challenges of climate change so as to minimise its impact on the species and natural habitats protected under the Convention, the Group of Experts will provide guidance to Parties on understanding climate change impacts and threats, and developing appropriate measures in national policies regarding the species and habitats protected under the Bern Convention.</p> <p><i>Travel and subsistence expenses for 1 expert from each of the following 17 states:</i> ALBANIA, BULGARIA, DENMARK, FRANCE, GERMANY, ICELAND, ITALY, LATVIA, NETHERLANDS, MOROCCO, NORWAY, PORTUGAL, SPAIN, SWEDEN, TURKEY, UKRAINE, UNITED KINGDOM</p> <p>Participants: All Contracting Parties Observers: All observer states and qualified organisations active in this field.</p> <p><i>Travel and subsistence expenses of consultant</i></p>	<p>Seville, 2 days (tbc)</p>	<p>20,000</p> <p>4,000</p>
<p><b>Group of Experts on Biodiversity and Climate Change</b></p> <p><i>Terms of reference:</i> Recognising the need to adapt conservation work to the challenges of climate change so as to minimise its impact on the species and natural habitats protected under the Convention, the Group of Experts will provide guidance to Parties on understanding climate change impacts and threats, and developing appropriate adaptation measures in national policies regarding the species and habitats under the Bern Convention.</p> <p><i>Travel and subsistence expenses for 1 expert of each of the following 17 states:</i> ALBANIA, BULGARIA, DENMARK, FRANCE, GERMANY, ICELAND, ITALY, LATVIA, NETHERLANDS, MOROCCO, NORWAY, PORTUGAL, SPAIN, SWEDEN, TURKEY, UKRAINE, UNITED KINGDOM</p> <p>Participants: All Contracting Parties Observers: All observer states and qualified organisations active in this field</p> <p><i>Travel and subsistence expenses of consultant</i></p> <p>Consultants to prepare draft reports for consideration of the Group of Experts</p>	<p>Strasbourg, 2 days</p>	<p>20,000</p> <p>4,000</p> <p>12,000</p>

<p><b>3.2 Conservation of Large Carnivores</b></p> <p>These activities are carried out in co-operation with the Large Carnivore Initiative for Europe (LCIE), a number of regional working groups have been established to monitor implementation of European action plans.</p> <p><i>Consultants and co-ordination meetings. European conference on large carnivores (Slovenia)</i></p>		15,000
<p><b>3.3 Conservation of Invertebrates</b></p> <p><b>Group of Experts on Conservation of Invertebrates</b></p> <p><i>Terms of reference:</i> The Group of Experts will follow-up the implementation of the European Strategy for the Conservation of Invertebrates.</p> <p><i>Travel and subsistence expenses for 1 expert of each of the following 18 states:</i> ALBANIA, AUSTRIA, BELGIUM, CZECH REPUBLIC, DENMARK, GREECE, HUNGARY, ICELAND, IRELAND, LITHUANIA, NORWAY, POLAND, SLOVAKIA, SLOVENIA, SPAIN, SWITZERLAND, TURKEY, UNITED KINGDOM.</p> <p>Participants: All Contracting Parties Observers: All observer states and qualified organisations active in this field</p>	Norway 2 days	23,000
<p><b>3.4 Invasive Alien Species</b></p> <p><b>Group of consultants working on IAS reports</b></p> <p>Meeting of consultants preparing reports and studies to follow-up on the meeting of the Group of Experts held in Iceland in May 2007</p> <p><i>Travel and subsistence expenses for 8 consultants</i></p> <p><b>Consultants</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- potential impact of IAS used as biofuel plants</li> <li>- guidelines for states proposing mechanisms to implement recommendations on trade on IAS</li> </ul> <p><b>CBD SBSTTA</b> Side-event at SBSTTA-13 in February 2008 (Rome)</p> <p><b>National workshop/s on IAS</b> Possible national workshop/s on IAS</p> <p><b>Workshop on the water jacinth (in co-operation with the EPPO)</b></p> <p><i>Travel and subsistence expenses for 1 expert from 6 States (to be determined)</i></p>	<p>Strasbourg/Palma (tbc) 1 day</p> <p>Seville, 3 days</p>	<p>6,500</p> <p>15,000</p> <p>4,000</p> <p>7,500</p> <p>6,000</p>

<p><b>3.5 Contribution of the Bern Convention towards the 2010 target in Europe</b></p> <p>Ad hoc group to prepare a report on the contribution of the Bern Convention towards reaching the 2010 biodiversity target in Europe</p> <p><i>Travel and subsistence expenses for 1 expert from 6 States (to be determined)</i></p> <p>Ad hoc group to prepare a report on the contribution of the Bern Convention towards reaching the 2010 biodiversity target in Europe</p> <p><i>Travel and subsistence expenses for 1 expert from 6 States (to be determined)</i></p> <p><b>3.6 Contribution to International Symposium on marine turtles (Travel grants for participants)</b></p> <p><i>Travel and subsistence expenses for 10 experts</i></p> <p><b>3.7 Action plans on selected species</b></p> <p>Consultants and meetings (<i>Cricetus cricetus</i>, <i>Testudo graeca graeca</i>)</p>	<p>Strasbourg, 2 days</p> <p>Strasbourg, 2 days</p> <p>Tunis, 3 days</p>	<p>6,000</p> <p>6,000</p> <p>10,000</p> <p>18,000</p>
<p><b>4 Sectorial policies and biodiversity conservation</b></p>		
<p><b>4.1 Wind energy and biodiversity</b></p> <p>Contribution to guidance on wind energy and nature conservation developed by the European Commission</p> <p><i>Travel and subsistence expenses of 10 experts</i></p>	<p>1 meeting Brussels, 1 day (tbc)</p>	<p>12,000</p>
<p><b>5. Monitoring of sites and populations at risk and Emergencies</b></p>		
<p><b>5.1 On-the-spot visits</b></p> <p>On-the-spot visits, by independent experts designated by the Secretary General to examine threatened habitats and travel and subsistence expenses incurred by such experts to inform the Standing Committee or its groups of experts</p>		<p>8,000</p>
<p><b>5.2 Sites at risk as a result of an emergency</b></p> <p>Fixed appropriation to cover expenses for reports, travelling of experts or Secretariat to areas under a particular environmental stress as a result of natural catastrophes or accidents caused by man. It includes assistance to areas under political or military conflict. It may cover training of specialists, aid to establish environmental monitoring. This chapter will only be used under instruction of the Bureau and will be paid for both from the Council of Europe or by voluntary contributions.</p> <p><i>Fixed approbation for consultant</i></p>		<p>p.m.</p>

<b>6. Awareness and visibility</b>		
Funds for the conception, the translation, the photocomposition and publication of technical documents, posters, brochures, stickers, postcards, making of buttons, and other documents. It includes publication on Internet and conception and update of a Website.		20,000
<b>7. Operational expenditure of the Standing Committee's Secretariat</b>		
Fixed appropriation to cover travel expenses to attend the meetings of the Standing Committee and of the Bureau		
<b>7.1 Chair's expenses</b>		
Fixed appropriation to cover travel and/or subsistence expenses incurred by the Chairman or delegate T-PVS after consultation with the Secretary General. Expenses of the Chair to attend the meetings of the Standing Committee		4,000
<b>7.2 Delegates of African states and some delegates of Central and Eastern Europe</b>		
Travel and subsistence expenses incurred by the delegates of African states to attend the Standing Committee meeting or other meetings organised under its responsibility		7,500
Travel and subsistence expenses incurred by some delegates from Contracting Parties of Central and Eastern Europe (on a temporary basis and after decision of the Bureau) to attend the Standing Committee meeting.		8,000
<b>7.3 Travel of experts and Secretariat</b>		
Travel and subsistence expenses incurred by experts to attend meetings of special relevance under instruction from the Committee of the Chair, and Secretariat official journeys.		18,000
<b>7.4 Meetings of the Bureau</b>		
Travel and subsistence expenses incurred by the 3 members of the Bureau to attend the Bureau meetings		8,000
<b>Secretariat: Staff and office costs</b>		
<b>7.5 Permanent staff (provided by the CoE):</b> Part-time Head of Unit, Administrator, Principal Administrative Assistant, Administrative Assistant		308,039
<b>7.6 Temporary full-time secretary and part-time web-master</b>		77,000
<b>7.7 Office costs for temporary staff</b>		24,000
<b>7.8 Overheads (interpretation, translation and printing of documents, etc.)</b>		98,000
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>864,539</b>



The Bern Convention Special Account will be used to cover expenses that cannot be covered by the ordinary budget of the Council of Europe.

The Council of Europe is expected to provide around €595,039 in 2008 (€189,000 for financing the programme of activities and €406,039 for staff costs and overheads). Parties are expected to provide new voluntary contributions in 2008. A detailed report on 2007 expenditure and a list of voluntary contributions will be presented to the Committee for information.

## Bern Convention Programme of Activities and Budget for 2008 (Summary)

in Euros

<b>1. Monitoring of the legal application of the Convention</b>		
1.1	Reports on the implementation of the Convention in two Contracting Parties	12,000
<b>2. Conservation of natural habitats</b>		
2.1	Group of experts for the setting-up of the Emerald Network of Areas of Special Conservation Interest	16,000
2.2	Ad hoc select committee for the preparation of the conference on protected areas in Europe	9,000
2.3	Pilot projects for the setting-up of the emerald Network at national level in some states	20,000
2.4	European Diploma of Protected Areas	24,000
2.5	Consultants	16,000
<b>3. Monitoring of species and encouraging conservation action</b>		
3.1	Biodiversity and Climate Change	60,000
3.2	Large Carnivores	15,000
3.3	Invertebrates	23,000
3.4	Invasive Alien Species	39,000
3.5	2010 target in Europe	12,000
3.6	Marine turtles	10,000
3.7	Action plans on selected species	18,000
<b>4. Sectorial policies and biodiversity conservation</b>		
4.1	Wind energy and biodiversity	12,000
<b>5. Monitoring of sites and populations at risk and emergencies</b>		
5.1	On-the-spot visits	8,000
5.2	Sites at risk as a result of an emergency	p.m.
<b>6. Awareness and visibility</b>		
		20,000
<b>7. Operational expenditure of the Standing Committee's Secretariat</b>		
7.1	Chair's expenses	4,000
7.2	Delegates of African states and of some delegates of Central and Eastern Europe	15,500
7.3	Travel of experts and Secretariat	18,000
7.4	Meetings of the Bureau	8,000

<b>Secretariat: Staff and office costs</b>		
7.5	Permanent staff (provided by the CoE)	308,039
7.6	Temporary full-time secretary and part-time webmaster	77,000
7.7	Office costs for temporary staff	24,000
7.8	Overheads (interpretation, translation and printing of documents)	98,000
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>864,539</b>

**Appendix 15**

**List of Parties and Observers  
having made voluntary contributions to the 2007 activities**

Andorra

Croatia

Czech Republic

European Commission

Denmark

EEA

France

Germany

Iceland

Italy

Luxembourg

Monaco

Norway

Slovakia

Switzerland

**Addendum to document: Measures agreed by Iceland and BirdLife on implementation of Recommendation No. 96 (2002) on conservation of natural habitats and wildlife, specially birds, in afforestation of lowland (Iceland)**

1. Ensure that the June 2006 national law on Strategic Environmental Assessment is employed without delay to avoid adverse impacts of national afforestation policies and practices on Iceland's internationally important breeding wader populations and other important biodiversity.
2. Implement, by 2009, the Nature Conservation Strategy for 2004-2009 as adopted by parliament in 2004.
3. Ensure production, within two years, of a national or a complete set of regional indicative forestry, strategies, which clearly map area where forestry can be encouraged and areas where it should not be permitted, including on biodiversity conservation grounds. Areas where afforestation should be avoided include all lowland wetlands, including those that have previously been drained but still provide, or have the potential to be restored to provide, suitable wader breeding habitat.
4. Revise the EIA law (106/2000) to stipulate that any two plantations must be divided by an area at least twice the area of the bigger plantation and to remove the proviso that EIA is only necessary if the area is not included in the land use plan of the area of jurisdiction.
5. In line with the polluter-pays principle, ensure that the Icelandic Forestry Service (IFS) is in the forefront of the EIA of the regional forestry projects, and that the expenses are covered by the Ministry of Agriculture or Alþingi (ie Icelandic Parliament).
6. Officially endorse the Afforestation Guide and put in place a system that ensures it is appropriately followed in all planting projects, for example by making subsidy dependent on compliance with the Guidelines.
7. Ensure that no planting takes place and no grants are made available to forestry projects in areas that have special nature conservation value, including all those listed in the Nature Conservation Register.
8. Undertake public education to transmit the message of the "Afforestation guide".
9. Discourage planting on land that could be restored to wetlands, providing state funding for restoration of wetlands as an alternative to planting grants.
10. Iceland needs to develop a sound survey and monitoring programme for breeding waders, given its responsibility for such an outstandingly important proposition of Europe's waders. Together with Russia, Iceland is the country that most urgently needs to improve the precision of its data on breeding wader populations and trends <sup>1</sup>. It is also important to identify with some accuracy the most important breeding areas for the different wader species.
11. Agree within a year, the list of areas that should be protected on the nature protection register, including the list of sites for the Emerald Network.
12. Take account of relevant experience from other countries, such as Scotland, on environmental impact assessments of afforestation and on repairing damage caused by subsidised afforestation.
13. Report to the next meeting of the Standing Committee on progress made in implementing the Recommendation.

---

<sup>1</sup> O Thorpu 2005 *Breeding waders in Europe 2000*. Wader Study Group